

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 11th June, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready. I have further to inform the House that many of them are in the Printer's hands and every attempt is being made to have them dispatched as quickly as possible.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1963.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1963.

Selected Monthly Indicators — January, 1963.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 28th February, 1963.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st March, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1963".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1963".

Resolution to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to borrow, by the issue of Treasury Bills, sums not exceeding one million dollars and such sums as may be required to pay off at maturity such Bills as are already issued and outstanding.

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

Resolution to amend a certain condition in the lease of a parcel of land at Cheapside to the Caribbean Development Company Limited, approved by Resolution No. 39/1961, to allow the construction of supporting columns to a building situated thereon.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$26,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1963-64, No. 4 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

I should also like to ask leave of the House to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today as it is a matter of urgency.

I should like also to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution of which I have just given notice.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Rates of Income Tax Act, 1963.

A Bill to exempt from penalties under the Firearms Act, 1896 persons who, within a specified period, surrender unlicensed firearms to the Commissioner of Police.

A Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.
12. 25 p.m.

NOTICE OF REPLIES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice that oral Reply to Parliamentary Question, No. 107/1962 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph regarding the dissatisfaction among the staff of the Fire Brigade due to the lack of privacy while executing certain domestic chores is now ready.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 111/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas regarding inconvenience to residents in Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, after a rainfall is now ready.

QUESTIONS

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

Is Government aware that the people of Porey Spring, St. Thomas are very annoyed over the fact that they are without the uses of a toilet and bath for some time?

2. Will the Minister explore the possibility of having a toilet and bath constructed in the said area without delay?

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

1. Do any Bus Concessionaires have written concessions from the Government to operate buses along their respective routes?

2. If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, what are the names of such Concessionaires and the respective dates of such concessions and will copies of the concessions be laid on the Table of the House for the information of Members?

3. If the answer to (1) is negative in whole or in part, why, and what action does Government intend to take to remedy such a situation?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to amend the rates of Income Tax Act, 1963, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to exempt from penalties under the Firearms Act, 1896, persons who, within a specified period, surrender unlicensed firearms to the Commissioner of Police, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947, was read a first time.

MISS MAYNARD TO ACT AS DEPUTY CLERK

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Miss Norma Maynard, qualified solicitor of the firm of Messrs. Haynes and Griffith, Solicitors, be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for four weeks as from today.

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

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

(Miss N. Maynard was called upon to take up her duties immediately).

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: Second reading of a Bill to consolidate and revise the law relating to Trade Unions.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that notice was given this morning of a Money Resolution for the sum of \$26,500 and that the Hon. Minister of Social Services intimated that he was going to ask leave to

deal with it in all its stages today in view of the urgency of the matter. I understand that the Resolution has been circulated and hon. members have their copies.

I now beg to move that Committee of Supply be the first Order of the Day and that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Money Resolution given notice of today.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It would seem that as you have two Resolutions bound in one, we better separate them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that the Money Resolution of which notice was given today be the first Order of the Day, hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the Ayes have it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Resolution. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-64, No. 4

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the sum of \$10,000 was provided in the Estimates of 1963-64 for the purpose of the control of infectious diseases.
12.35 p.m.

Recently we have had in Barbados an unusual number of cases of poliomyelitis. That is quite understandable because in any country where the sanitary situation is improving tremendously, the growth of poliomyelitis must follow. In a community where there are bad sanitary conditions, your incidence of poliomyelitis is rare, but the fact cannot be gainsaid that in Barbados our health standards are improving considerably. There is not that vast amount of refuse knocking around our streets; there is not that vast amount of exposed faeces on the by-ways and on the banks of the canefields, and in these circumstances we can expect an increase in the number of polio cases. Last year we had seven cases for the entire year; within the first four months of this year we have had no fewer than ten cases and we found it necessary at that stage to embark on a sort of anti-polio campaign.

The bulk of the cases which we have been having in Barbados is amongst the age group of one to six years. Of the 38 cases of poliomyelitis which have been reported we have had about 80% of them in that age group. We have also had, through the co-operation of the World Health Organization, an expert adviser to come down to us and he has advised that the epidemic is not an all-age epidemic, but it is one amongst children under the age of six years. It was therefore necessary to immunize these children, as many of them as possible, and this has necessitated the expending of the vote which we had; it has also meant an increase in the expenditure under this item.

This sum of \$25,000, which is now being asked for, is for the purchase of 100,000 doses of oral vaccine which we hope will satisfy the children in that age group. We are well aware of the fact that that cannot satisfy the entire requirements inasmuch as we have more than 100,000 people in this island; but there is no epidemic in the age group above six years. I would like to make that clear. As a matter of fact, there have been no cases over the age of 30 years. We can quite clearly see that that is because of the fact that the health standards in the island have improved to such an extent in the past few years that the incidence of polio would be greater amongst children under the age of six years. Expert advice has shown that the reason why we were not having more cases of poliomyelitis

under that age before is because children under the age of six years, when they were creeping and so forth, came into contact with the polio virus and they built up their own immunity against the virus; but since our health standards have improved, there is not that incidence of the virus in our country which the children under that age group come into contact with, and therefore they are not capable of building up that strong immunity against the polio virus. In the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 39, Item 39, Control of Infectious diseases, do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, when there are 38 cases of polio in our population, that is a very serious matter and it is time that we take steps to see that all children in the age group which are most likely to be overtaken by this disease be inoculated. I know that the Government has been doing that over the past week and this is a means of stepping it up. I do know that parents are very worried over the incidence of poliomyelitis in this island.

Mention was made of the sanitary arrangements in Barbados but we can never be satisfied in our efforts in cleaning the streets by day and by night, I may add that the City of Bridgetown is as clean, if not cleaner, than anywhere else in the West Indies. The efforts of the Bridgetown City Council have been commented on by the World Health Organization in a Report to us. The W.H.O. have very favourably commented on the efforts of the Bridgetown City Council; they have said that they could not believe, had they not inspected it themselves, that such a tremendous job of collecting 300 tons of refuse a day could be done at such a low cost. It is not because this matter comes under my immediate notice but this is something of which we can be proud. That department works quite well and it works all hours of the day and night. If we can, by our continual efforts at sanitation in that field, help to prevent any such diseases from spreading in the island, you can rest assured that we will do that. The funds of the Bridgetown City Council are very limited because the incidence of taxation has been very high.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, what I did say was that the fact that sanitation in Barbados in general and in St. Michael in particular is good, is the cause of an increase of this disease. The higher the standard of sanitation, the higher will be the number of cases of poliomyelitis in any community. I think that that is a compliment to the Bridgetown City Council because we have had more of the cases in St. Michael than in any other part of the island. That is because of the improved sanitary conditions in the island.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, that theory sounded so strange to me that I do not know where it could come from. He must have made a mistake and said the reverse.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this is expert advice. In any country where the sanitation conditions are very high, you have an unusual number of polio cases.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I have often heard that as the standard of living rises in a community, the incidence of poliomyelitis is more likely, and if that came from experts, I would disbelieve it, because my conception of sanitation here is as such that it would eliminate diseases generally. Anyhow, I rose to defend the City Council, but I can see he is commending the efficient service being rendered particularly in St. Michael.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I can feel very elated in having called on the Minister to pull his socks up and view this situation most seriously. I am going to challenge the Minister before I commend the Government for actually bringing the Resolution which all of us, I believe, will support, because this is a very important matter. You must be careful when you quote experts. My colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church is absolutely

correct when he said that the incidence is high where the standard of living rises. I do not care what expert you bring, if it was the standard of sanitation, then all of us would be dead if we got a perfect standard of sanitation; so whoever told you so is wrong. Neither one of us is an expert, but I will tell Dr. Byer or anybody else so. The reason why the incidence of poliomyelitis is so high in America is because America has a very high standard of living.

Where I have to offer criticism to the Hon. Minister is that like myself he is very fond of the Church, and though I am not repeating parrot-like what appeared in the Editorial yesterday, I do think in a matter of this sort, to those of us who come directly in contact and meet, the impact, of this situation should have been released from your Information Department or from your Ministry a sufficiently knowledgeable paper so that the public would appreciate the situation. You have told us today that there are thirty-eight cases, and we appreciate the fact that you are not hiding anything from us. You would be surprised to know the circulation of the two daily papers in the country, and if you look around the streets and in the Green, you would see the number of people who read the newspaper, and it would have been so much easier and you would have put people's minds more at ease if you could have given us through the Information Department the necessary information concerning the age group which is likely to be affected most. I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Social Services has sent out a paper to some of the Churches; it was a very good attempt, but in my considered opinion while that paper was released on Sunday night to all the churches, it should have been released simultaneously to the Press. It is really telling people the truth, that they need not be afraid, and that you are doing everything you possibly can. I do not think we could offer any other criticism to this other than to say that I hope you have broken all regulations and laws in this case. I say that now to get some of those people who call themselves my friends to criticise me. I really hope that you imported this before you came here for the money, because I do not believe in any stupid red tape. I do not believe you should have waited until you came here for the money to import this stuff, and I hope you had it in the Island two weeks ago. When you are dealing with the health of people, you cannot talk about waiting to come for money. This is where you need to be a dictator. Anyway, I know it is in the Island because I have been having to make a racket, as it were, to press our medical officers of the municipality into service to cooperate in this matter wherever it affects not only children under six years of age, but other people.

You will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that in the absence of giving the Press any information, that nurses at all the institutions in the Island who are not knowledgeable enough to know what medically trained men would know and possibly instruct the Ministry, will be afraid because they feel they are exposed to the danger to which the children are exposed, and you find that nearly every nurse is asking when she is going to get the vaccine. I hope I am right in saying that you have this stuff here already and you are going to pay for it after, because that is what you should do when it comes to the health of people, as long as your name is good. While commending the Minister for this, I do hope that on another occasion such information will not be withheld from the Press. I am not criticising you for giving the information via the Churches, but I think you should give information over the air and in the Press all the time. You have said that there are 38 cases, but as a member of this House, though I do not go around kow-towing, I asked Dr. Byer to tell me what was the position because I wanted to know. People not knowing have said there are 300 cases or 380 cases, and there are all sorts of rumours, and that is why I feel you should give us the facts like some of the Ministers who go on the air when they want you to know something. I commend you for bringing this and I feel very strong steps should be taken as suggested against people coming in from islands such as British Guiana where the disease is prevalent.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on this Resolution because I do not think it is necessary. I am going to speak, however, on what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just said, because it is an extremely

dangerous statement to give currency to. The hon. member said that in matters of health you have to be a dictator. You have passed laws dealing with emergency cases and financial arrangements are made to deal with certain funds that are meant to be dealt with in emergency cases, but if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is giving any currency to a Government anywhere in any part of the world that he would do that, I want to tell him that he can only do it if he is spending his own money in his own private capacity; but the Ministers do not spend their own money. They are spending public money. This Legislature is not a mockery. This is a place where the approval of things to be done must take place under the most extreme circumstances. 12.55 p.m.

If a hurricane occurs in this Island today, laws have been passed to deal with such extreme cases, so it is not a matter of your not coming to Government and spending money without going through any red tape. It is an age old practice which must be adhered to and in no case must people take up money and spend it without control or coming to the Legislature. Do not tell me about little children are dying; little children will die. I am not giving any currency to that idea of your telling the Government that you hope you spent the money. Are you crazy?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Let the hon. member sit down. I am not accepting that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will not sit down. Is this a burlesque; a circus?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is always talking about a burlesque or a circus. He is making a mistake. I did not say that I hope they will spend the money. What I did say was that I hope they have ordered. If I were running the Government and this Government was threatened with polio, you could not come in and tell me that you were waiting on this Resolution to order. I said that in my opinion you should order. The community is threatened with something. You should order with the intention to pay. The hon. member said that I said I hope you spent the money. I said I hope they have ordered.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what they are going to do next. Do you regard that as a point of order? If I get up each time the Government says anything and say what the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown has just said, would you regard that as a point of order? What point of order has he made? That is making a second speech. This is Government Business with which we are dealing; this is no pastime. Hon. members must pay attention to the Rules.

What is the hon. member advising the Government to do? You do not need any advice to order. Orders are made against your budgetary arrangements. You do not have to come and advise anybody by saying that we hope you have ordered because the Government may be ordering things subject to the approval of the Legislature.

All I was talking about was the reference to red tape. Whatever red tape there is in Government machinery, we cannot ignore it in Government because a lot of corruption can take place under the guise of an emergency.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know from the Hon. Minister of Social Services is this. He said that this new epidemic is only attacking children in the age group of six years and below. Am I to understand that we are to wait until we see a lot of mangled bodies afflicted by this most contagious disease before we can be immunised? I am therefore advocating.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The campaign is presently island-wide and we are not refusing anybody the oral vaccine. I would like that to be clearly understood by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BOXILL: Sir, if the campaign is island-wide, do the people in the island know that it is island-wide? If it is not, you should notify the people where they can go and get vaccinated free.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on another point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas seems to be the only person in the Island of Barbados who does not know that it is island-wide. This morning, we are covering the whole of St. Michael. The vaccine is given at 32 centres. The hon. member does not go to church? he does not read a newspaper or anything?

Mr. BOXILL: Is that a point of order? Is the question of where I go and where I do not go a point of order? The Hon. Minister said that this money which is to be voted is to cover only enough vaccine for children of six years and under.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Oh no!

Mr. BOXILL: Sir, it is either that the Hon. Minister cannot explain or I cannot understand. Some time ago, you brought in a question asking this Government to embark on an island-wide vaccination campaign for poliomyelitis and because of the so-called medical expert knowledge at the Government's disposal, this thing was turned down.

I am going to admonish the Hon. Minister or any Minister of Government on this or anything which affects the lives of the community. You do not have to go to a University or to any doctor whether it is "Dr. Booby", for him to tell you something which you can see plainly for yourself. We are saying that it is only a matter of 38 cases so far but if you are going to go on allowing people to advise you, you do not know how many cases there will be. It seems as if some of these people suffer from a complex because they do not have a university training. If Dr. Byer tells you that everybody is suffering from false teeth, are you going to pull out everybody's false teeth?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The question which the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is referring to was answered on the 19th March, 1963. Up to that time we did not have one case of polio in Barbados. The first case was reported on the 11th April.

Mr. BOXILL: That, Sir, is a very stupid point of order. The Hon. Minister has risen and said that we did not have a polio case up to that time but we had cases of polio in the neighbouring colonies. That is why you cannot leave certain things to certain people. The Minister says that you do not have to be vaccinated. You cannot leave this Island and go to certain colonies unless you prove by certificate that you have been vaccinated. Are you going to wait until half of the people of this Island dies to embark on a polio campaign?

I have nothing against the Minister but I am warning him not to sit down there and allow anybody to stuff trash down his throat. You must over-ride your adviser sometimes. You cannot be right all the time but you cannot be wrong all the time. 1.05 p.m.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this stage only to make an appeal to the Hon. Minister to see to it that there is not this wall of secrecy established in certain offices where information cannot be obtained as to the true state of this incipient polio epidemic. It seems to me that certain people who are afflicted with the Civil Service mind are very slow in giving information. Although they are well aware of the danger of this epidemic yet, if a decision had been made in the past that no information would be given until the end of a month, they are determined, even in the face of a growing epidemic which is causing the growth of fear in the minds of many members of the public, not to release the information before the 30th or the 31st day of a particular month. I would like the Hon. Minister to use his influence to see that that stupid attitude does not prevail at this time.

As to whether with the improvement in our sanitary services there is a danger of more and more cases of poliomyelitis, why then for our sanitary services, one should come in here and ask for money to be voted? because with the voting of that money we would be seeing that the figures with respect to poliomyelitis in the colony go up. I do not think that the Hon. Minister should allow the influence of a so-called expert to do violence to his commonsense.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the purpose of eradicating such an evil as poliomyelitis from our midst and getting it out of existence. The best possible means of getting such an evil out of existence is to get a suitable remedy and we can only have a Resolution like this brought forward in this House. If an epidemic is declared in this island it is the responsibility of the Government to find some sort of remedy or to have the advice of some expert to prevent such an evil from spreading. I am saying that the longer we hold up a Resolution of this sort the more the evil will spread. It has been proved that we have this epidemic in this island and we have to find some means of eradicating it.

The Hon. Minister has said that where you have a high standard of sanitation obtaining, there is where this evil is existing. I would like to know if that is correct. If that is so, if we have a high standard of sanitation and such an evil is existing, what about the case where you have a low standard of sanitation existing? I would like to know something about that. Anyway, Sir, I am very glad to know that in Barbados we have such a high standard of sanitation that we can eradicate yellow fever, typhoid fever, small pox and such things. I have recommended to the Government that they should have the whole island in their hands and have proper people to run the administration where sanitation is concerned. You have the Northern District Council, the Southern District Council and the Bridgetown City Council. You have so many departments in this little island of 21 x 14, but I am suggesting that you should have one central administration and the Government should be running the whole island where sanitation is concerned, instead of having this piece-meal administration. In that case, the Government would be responsible for carrying out administration in its fullness. I sincerely hope that the Government is thinking about carrying out the entire matter of sanitation in the whole island.

I know that this money is needed and therefore I will not hold up this Resolution any longer, because the longer we hold it up, the wider the evil will spread. I will vote wholeheartedly for this Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, just before the Minister replies, I should just like to deal specifically with the question of the supply of information because, constitutionally speaking that information happens to fall within my responsibility. There is no point in attempting on the part of the Government either consciously or unconsciously, to withhold any information as to the rapidity of the alarming increase of this disease. The Government feels that there is no need for newspapers or other organs to be publishing information in order to create near panic in these matters because the incidence of this disease and other notifiable diseases by law is to be published, and therefore it is quite possible to know not only the number of cases of poliomyelitis but also the number of any other cases of other diseases occurring anywhere which are notifiable.

The second thing is this. Newspapers must necessarily have a slant on these matters, a slant which is not necessarily shared by the rest of the community, and the desire of newspapers to give publicity in times of crisis is not necessarily a desire which would be shared by a Government. The Government may well feel that, because it knows so much more than the particular newspaper, it does not have to give weight to a situation of panic, but has to ignore it if the information at its disposal were only sparse. I have good grounds for saying this. It is true that one section of the daily press did clamour for mass

immunization against poliomyelitis but that section of the daily Press did not take the necessary steps to have this immunization at once. It is only yesterday that the staff of this section of the daily press were immunized *en masse*. One would have thought that in a matter which was so urgent, in a matter where the daily Press clamoured for this immunization, they themselves would have this immunization carried out on their employees at once. I am not blaming them for only waiting until yesterday to do that, but they were asking the Government to accept a standard of panic which they themselves were not prone to accept because they attended to the matter in their own time. We feel that if any information on the progress of this disease is to be given out it should be given out in the channels through which we are accustomed to give it out and not in any day to day manner.

1.15 p.m.

Imagine the statistical trouble to which people would be put, if as was requested from the Information Service, we should say from day to day the number of people who have been immunized. It is true that records are kept, but you could not know at the end of the day all over the Island the exact number and you should not be asked, but certainly the Government would have no objection every month, and in this particular instance at the end of this month and following months, if this campaign continues to let all the facts and figures connected with it be known, but we decline to be pushed into a panic situation because newspapers merely feel that it is news. We appreciate the interest which every section of the entire community feels in this matter and the anxiety which quite rightly informs their judgement and their concern, but one has to keep a sense of balance, and it is better for us while doing all we can and all that is necessary to halt the spread of this disease, at the same time not to give the appearance that there is panic.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would not have risen again if the Minister of Education had not replied to the points I have made. I must confess that the Minister is usually logical in his arguments, but I fear he is very illogical on this matter. Now poliomyelitis is a compulsory notifiable disease within a number of hours by every doctor in this Island to the Medical Department. The reason why I have raised this is because I feel it is better to give people facts if rumours are spread about, and the rumours are greater in number than the facts which actually exist. It is better for those responsible for the facts to let people know them, and secondly, from an economic point of view, it would be much better for the Government. Parents become very worried about their children. I will say to the Hon. Minister who has just sat down that there is a number of people — I am not talking now about the newspapers raising a scare or doing something for publicity purposes — who if they knew the facts, without waiting to have the vaccine free through the Government, would themselves attend their private doctors and pay for the vaccine. That is why I say it would be more economical to the Government. There is no point in hiding information of this nature from people. They are facing facts today, and on the question of giving information through the correct channel, I disagree entirely with the Minister of Education. We cannot wait for the information to come through proper channels. Any notifiable disease is to be notified as soon as any registered medical practitioner is aware of it to the Head of the Department, and then figures are compiled at the end of the month. These figures are sent out during the next month to the Advocate, News and other newspapers; so that the facts for the month of May are published some time in June. I am speaking with a tremendous amount of experience on this matter. As a matter of fact, it is part of my duty as a member of the Committee of Health in the municipality to see these figures, but I can only see them when they are released from the Department when doctors have notified the cases, and that is why I can say that when doctors notify the Health Department of poliomyelitis cases, cases of enteric fever or of tuberculosis, they are then compiled by that Department and released for publication. This is not an ordinary matter, however; it is not a case of three cases of typhoid fever or seven cases of tuberculosis re-

ported during the month of May which we get in the month of June. Tell me when last, if ever, were there 38 cases of poliomyelitis reported in Barbados? You must therefore get rumours spreading.

Mr. Chairman, if a doctor notified two cases of poliomyelitis, it is natural for one to ask at what school they were detected, and I feel that so long as the stuff is in the Island, and private practitioners have it, it would do the Government a tremendous lot of good because parents would not wait to have vaccine given to their children by the Health authorities, but would go to their doctors and pay two or three dollars which I am sure they can afford. I am saying that I agree with things going through the usual channel under normal circumstances such as where there are five cases of tuberculosis or so many cases of enteric fever and the like reported for a month, but not with 38 cases of poliomyelitis in Barbados. Suppose you had a number of cases of yellow fever; what would you do? Would you wait to go through the usual channel to report the number of cases. I am afraid the Minister's argument is very illogical. I see everything good in releasing the facts as they actually are to the public, and if the facts are released under the authority of the Ministry, then the public can regard the rumours as nonsense coming from somebody who is spreading propaganda. As a matter of fact, my way of handling it would have been different. I would release the facts and say that the Ministry has done everything to get the vaccine into the Island and a campaign would be starting off on a particular day.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it abundantly clear that we on this side are entirely in agreement with the provision of this money, but what I personally object to is this reversion to the horse and buggy mentality in announcing an important matter like this at churches on Sunday night. In the presence of modern media of communication, why should the radio and the Press be avoided? Later perhaps we will have bonfires lit on the hills like after the Spanish Armada had been dispersed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, neither the radio nor the Press was avoided in these things. From Friday last the radio was given a release to the effect that this campaign would begin today, tomorrow and Thursday. Last week we announced it over the radio and in the Press, and we had a very poor response. Already today we have checked on the response which we have got by announcing it over the air, in the Press and in the churches, and the response is about 300% to 400% better than the response we had last week. Another thing is that many of the churches have opened their doors today and have asked their followers to come and get a vaccine, and some of the pastors and other representatives from the churches are assisting us in the campaign.

Mr. LYNCH: With all that I agree, Mr. Chairman, but is the Minister denying that the Press was denied and refused information on this epidemic as recently as yesterday? All I am saying is that this is an intelligent community and information ought to be given to people and not only what is felt is good for them to know. It is usual when rumours are flying about for garbled and distorted versions of the truth to become current in a community.
1.25 p.m.

It is very much better to let people know the truth by every modern media of communication.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which I would like to add to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Education. A certain section of the Press did ask for daily information on the number of polio cases. That is impossible. I am telling you why it is impossible. There are many cases which are sent to the General Hospital which are not polio cases. These are sent by private practitioners to the General Hospital for observation, but they are not polio cases. For some time, as recently as yesterday, we had four cases which were sent in as polio cases and they were proven not to be polio cases. In order to determine whether they are polio cases we have to take laboratory tests so as to be sure. I remember two weeks

ago two children were sent to the General Hospital, one from a school in St. Philip and one from St. James, supposedly to be suffering from polio but it turned out that one was suffering from influenza and the other from bronchitis. We did immunize the schools but when a diagnosis was made of the children it was discovered that one was a case of influenza and the other a case of bronchitis. That sort of thing was happening at the Hospital over the past fortnight.

We can only announce the number of cases which we have as polio after they have been diagnosed. What the Press wanted was the number of cases admitted. We can only give the number of confirmed cases.

Mr. Chairman, I have already pointed out that the Press was informed that there would have been this island-wide campaign and why we did refer to the churches was the fact that we felt that if the followers of the churches got to know about it, we would get a better response. We felt that we should get the co-operation of the churches, particularly as we had failed through the propaganda in the Press last week. Last week when we had an all-out campaign, the first day we only vaccinated 2,000 children. This morning I visited a centre and we have already vaccinated 600 cases at that centre and there are 32 centres. During the island-wide campaign last week after depending on the Press and the radio, we had only been able to urge as many as 2,000 people so it has been proven that the announcement in churches has done a wonderful job and I would like to thank the Ministers of those churches for that here and now.

The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown mentioned that at the various institutions the nurses should be immunized. I should like to point out that at the Health Centres and at the General Hospital all the nurses were immunized ever since in April.

There is one point which I would like to take up with the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who mentioned that expert advice should not do better than commonsense. Now, hon. members on the other side did not seem to understand what I was saying when I said that the better your sanitation, the higher the incidence of polio. Polio is spread chiefly by flies from the bacteria of the faeces of human beings. If the faeces happen to be exposed, the more exposed it is, this is taken into the house by flies. (A VOICE: You are wrong.) It seems as if I cannot convey to the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown this part of it. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown and his colleague seem to be greater authorities on public health affairs than the people who have taken years to specialise in that field.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister is trying to be facetious. I know a lot of idiots specialise but when they specialise, they are fools and asses. The Hon. Minister needs not be sarcastic about that. You are talking about enteric fever when you are talking about faeces. In a City like New York with a higher incidence of sanitation than ours, you get polio. The Hon. Minister of Education will tell you that the higher your standard of living and not the higher your standard of sanitation is a reason for your getting polio. There is a big difference between the two. It is not sense for the Hon. Minister of Social Services to say that it seems as if we are greater authorities in public health affairs than the people who went out to study it. The Hon. Minister should not worry to say that.

The Hon. Minister said that they announced it from the church but we also appreciate that there is this question of your having these unfounded rumours going around of their being so many cases of polio. Therefore, I think that it would be a good idea for the Government to say, as the Hon. Minister has put it, that private practitioners have sent in so many cases which they suspect to be polio but under a proper diagnosis they were confirmed not to be polio cases. We agree with that and nobody would disagree with private practitioners sending suspected cases to the General Hospital because it is a matter of caution.

Now, as regards what the Press and Rediffusion wanted to know. Once, you had seven cases of poliomyelitis in Barbados and there was a tremendous scare around here. I am supposed to be a member of the St. Michael Public Health Committee. Some people came to members of the Committee and said I hear that there are 300 cases of polio. We told them, do not believe that.

All that we are saying is that polio is a notifiable disease but it is not notified until you prove it to be polio. In other words, if private medical practitioners send 60 cases — and nearly all the suspected cases are sent to the General Hospital by the medical practitioners — on suspicion, they have to be diagnosed and then those cases which are proven poliomyelitis, must be notified.

Now, these cases come directly under the Ministry of Social Services. I would like to say that I was not at any disadvantage at all.
1.35 p.m.

I would like to say this. I was not put to any disadvantage because of the courtesy of Dr. Byer. It would be very difficult if he did not co-operate with me, because if he did not do that, on the next occasion when he sat around a table with me he would be very glad to get up and leave. One of the reasons why the campaign was not successful was that it was not approached in the right manner. We have thirty-two District Inspectors going around, we also have Nurses and we said that we would put these people to do this work. I was not in the dark about this matter at all. We could have told them that we could not do this thing, but we took these Nurses from attending to the houses and we put them to work at these various centres. The Nurses and the District Inspectors know the people and therefore they were able to do an admirable job. You have at your disposal the facts which you give to the people; I would have been the first to say: "Dam the Press which just puts a scare on people and does the tourist trade and the country harm." I am sure that if the Ministry concerned had called in the Press and suggested to them that the facts are so and so and say what the Government is about to do in the circumstances but told them: "please do not scare the country because that would not be doing the country any good," that would have been the right thing. As Minister of Health, the man who contributed most to public health in this way, never studied medicine. The Minister of Health can prove that for himself. The man who contributed mostly to preventive medicine never studied medicine. That is a fact. I will meet you privately and discuss this matter. You are making a mistake as regards the standard of sanitation; it is a question of the standard of living. In New York there are no faeces around the hedgerow and that sort of thing. You are talking about enteric fever and I quite agree with you there. I myself was more than shocked when I discussed this matter with the Medical Officers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I do not propose to enter this controversy with the experts on either side; I just want to confirm that the Hon. Minister was right in what he has said, according to the most authoritative reports we have had, that the virus is found in faeces. The Hon. Minister was talking about poliomyelitis and not enteric fever. The virus starts in the bowels and is discharged in the faeces. What has brought me to my feet is that earlier in the day the hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to remarks which were made by the hon. senior member for the City with regard to the expenditure of public funds in the manner in which they could be expended. I am not contesting for a single moment his assertion that legislative sanction must of necessity be sought for all public expenditure which is not already sanctioned in the Estimates of Expenditure. I quite agree with him there, but I am a bit doubtful as to where he stands on this question of dictatorship. There is a suspicion that he endorses dictatorship but today he is decrying it.

The hon. member said, when we were discussing the question of tourism, what he would do with the north east

coast of Bathsheba if he were a dictator. He said that he would have done certain things with the Bathsheba coast if he were a dictator and nobody could stop him; he did not dismiss the idea that he would be a dictator some day. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit at a loss in my mind as to whether the hon. member supports dictatorship; perhaps he would be good enough to let us know whether or not he likes this idea of being a dictator. I would be glad if he would set my fears at rest in this matter.

The question that Head 39 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 — MEDICAL (2) GENERAL HOSPITAL

ANAESTHETIC EQUIPMENT

Head 39 — Medical (2) General Hospital — was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part of the Schedule, I would like to point out that there is at present only one respirator used by the Anaesthetist. In our Estimates for 1963-64 we were given permission to order another one; that has been ordered but with four operating theatres for the new Hospital and with the incidence of Poliomyelitis which we have now, it becomes necessary for us to have more than one respirator at the Hospital. At the present time one respirator is used permanently with the cases of poliomyelitis and we have had another polio case which the authorities have pointed out will require the use of another respirator. The Anaesthetist does not consider it advisable to have operations performed in the operating theatres unless there is an additional respirator at his disposal. In these circumstances, I beg to move that Head 39 Medical (2) General Hospital stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head 39 Medical (2) stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$26,500 do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

1.45 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to Trade Unions.

THE TRADE UNION ACT, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is actually in effect a new Trade Union Bill which brings the law up to date with regard to Trade Unions in the country, and as set out in the Objects and Reasons, it consolidates and revises existing legislation.

Now you will note, Sir, that included in the new provisions are a number of rather far-reaching matters. In Clause 2 Civil Servants and, subject to the exceptions in Clause 44 which deals with persons in the naval, military

or air services of the Crown or in the Barbados Police Force, will now under the provisions of the Bill be entitled to join a Trade Union, and in the same Clause, Sir, provisions are being made for the Trade Union Act when it becomes law to apply to all employees of Local Government Councils, agricultural workers, and for the first time in the history of the Island, domestic servants will now come under the protective provisions of Trade Union legislation. You have now therefore Civil Servants with certain exceptions, Local Government employees, agricultural workers and domestic servants all brought under the protection of this Act.

Now Clause 20 provides for the penalty of an officer attached to the Trade Union who may be convicted for withholding or mis-applying trade union effects, and also prevents him from holding any office in a Trade Union after that. Then in Clause 39, there is the controversial matter with regard to peaceful picketing at or near the homes of an employer which we have discussed from time to time in the Legislature and which preceding Governments have seriously avoided providing for with legislation. This Party, Sir, has always supported the contention of the Trade Union that these provisions of peaceful picketing at or near a house or place where a person resides, which is practised in Great Britain and some other countries, should also be applicable in Barbados, and this amendment today will enable trade unionists for the first time in the history of the Island to picket at or near the House of a person who is involved in a dispute with the Trade Union in connection with their terms of employment.

As I said, the Bill in a general way revises and consolidates all the existing laws of the Island relating to Trade Unions, and its main controversial part is Clause 39 with regard to peaceful picketing. I do not think we want today of necessity to re-open all the arguments for and against this Bill. So far as we are concerned, we accept the proposal, and it is left for those who are not in favour of it to ventilate their point of view, because our support is already well known. I do not think I need say anymore except that I know there is one point in connection with the matter with which the Government and the Union are not in complete agreement. This is in connection, Sir, with the persons who are to be allowed to picket, at or near the homes of employers. We contend that these persons must be either members of the Union or appointed by the Union. We feel this is an indispensable provision which should be retained in the Act when it becomes law, and we have therefore opposed the suggestion, Sir, that persons other than those authorised or belonging to the Union should be allowed to participate in peaceful picketing.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I be to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will very well understand that it would be expected that I should speak on a matter like this, because I should be more knowledgeable than any other hon. member on this, since it is my business to be so. The Government and the Union and myself are more or less in complete agreement with this, but it is only the closing remarks of the hon. member when he said there is a difference, and I was a bit surprised to hear him use such strong words, because with persons who are not acquainted with the particular Clause on peaceful picketing, we cannot now, fifty-six years after this had been done, be quibbling about this. Twenty-five years ago this country was advised to do this, and I have a Trade Union Bill similar to what we are introducing today; so this Bill is twenty-five years late. What the hon. member has said is true. The last Government was hypocritical. They introduced a Bill during their regime in 1949 on peaceful picketing even better than this one, and after it was not passed in the Legislative Council though it was passed in this House, it was amazing to hear some of the same people who produced the Bill with this stupid chat about the Trade Union after they no longer had any direct bearings with the Trade Union.

What I am surprised about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Hon. Minister himself sent out a draft Bill which

contained a Clause that was even better than the amendment I introduced, and I want to grant to the Government that their draft was a better Bill than this.
1.55 p.m.

I want to grant the Government this. Their Draft Bill was a better Bill than that one. For example, the Draft Bill says:-

"It shall be 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 carried on business or happens to be, 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."

That was in the Draft Bill which the Hon. Minister sent out and to which the Union agreed. We agreed because it was in accordance with the English Act of 1906. In the colonies we have always mixed up the Trade Disputes Act with the Trade Union Act. They always put the Trade Disputes Act in the Trade Union Act but you do not find the two getting mixed up under the English Act because under the English Act they are separate and distinct. However, it may be that because they were dealing with members of colonial mentality that you pass this type of colonial legislation.

In this Bill you speak about trade disputes. Now, a trade dispute does not have to be between a Trade Union and anybody. Do not let us get the idea that a trade dispute connotes a dispute between a Trade Union and an employer. Are you suggesting that the Trade Union should only have the right to stage a strike? Suppose a body of workers who are not members of a Trade Union have a dispute with their employer. Are you suggesting that they should not have the right to strike?

You have this idea when you put in a Bill "at or near the place" that it is put in for anyone to be inquisitive and for someone to go behind a man's fence and peer through it to see if some domestic chore is being carried out.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 o'clock p.m. this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On re-assembling.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum and I ask that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is Question Time. The replies to questions 107 and 111 are ready.

Question No. 107/1962 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you not mind taking the other one first?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am forced to take Question No. 107 because the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is not in his place.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it a fact that grave dissatisfaction exists among the staff of the Barbados Fire Brigade due to firemen having to clean the yard, toilet bowls, basins and places where they may be observed by the passing public?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider stopping such a practice?

3. Will Government further consider the employment of janitors for such work, thereby relieving some of the unemployment in this country?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, the reply to that questions is as follows:-

"Firemen are not called upon to clean toilets and basins except in an emergency where the interests of communal health would demand it. Firemen clean the yard at Headquarters Station at irregular intervals as necessity dictates. This latter type of cleaning is traditionally done by firemen in Services elsewhere in the West Indies and abroad. I do not see how grave dissatisfaction could exist among firemen on these counts.

2. Does not arise.

3. A female Scrubber/Cleaner is already employed at each of the four Fire Stations to clean offices, toilets, wash basins etc.."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a supplementary I am asking: is it a fact that these men never were called upon at no time to do these jobs?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If they were never called upon it means that they were not called upon.

INCONVENIENCE TO RESIDENTS OF WELCHMAN HALL, ST. THOMAS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question 111/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the 2nd April, 1963.

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

Is Government aware that many residents of Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, are experiencing inconvenience in getting out of their homes after a rain fall?

2. Would Government take the necessary steps to have proper tunnels or gutters constructed in order to check the said water from running under houses in the area complained of?

HON. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reply to Question No. 111/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is as follows:-
2.35 p.m.

"The Government is aware that residents in Welchman Hall, St. Thomas are suffering some inconvenience after heavy rainfall and investigations are being carried out in an attempt to ameliorate the difficulties which are being encountered by the residents."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Reply to the question brings Question Time to a close.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

Mr. DEPUTY 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. On the last occasion on Tuesday of last week when Government Business was called at 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the hon. junior member for Christ Church was speaking.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the last occasion I had covered the subject of direct and indirect taxation and I had drawn the relevant positions to the attention of members of the House, but the problem as to how we are going to speed up the economy of this island and so endeavour to reduce taxation to the individual. If by some means we can attract to Barbados sufficient sums of capitals for investment whereby new enterprises, whether they be of industry, of manufacture, of tourism or of other forms of business, could be embarked upon eventually, that is business which would produce the economy, resulting in a fall of taxation on existing taxpayers. The Hon. Premier in his

remarks stated that he would look favourably on any organization which could put up proposals that would encourage savings among the people, by which he meant that those savings could be, through that organization, re-invested in enterprises in Barbados. He realised what I have said, that what we need is a filip and a push and actual capital can give that. How are you going to appeal to the public to put aside something of their earnings into an organization in which they will have trust and confidence so that the organization can re-invest those earnings in worthwhile approved enterprises? That is a problem throughout the world, and even wealthy countries, comparatively speaking, such as England have, from time to time, embarked upon schemes for that very purpose.

In 1955-56 there was a Conservative Government at that time which proposed and instituted a scheme of premium bonds whereby the wage-earner could invest his savings in these premium savings bonds at a reasonable interest rate; but the great attraction is that every month or at every quarter a drawing was held - it was in the form of a lottery - and the winner for that month or quarter earned a sum of money which he re-invested in the bonds and it was a sufficient sum to be attractive. When the English people can embark on a thing such as this, because they have been all through history very opposed to lotteries, when the Government could fall on that scheme so as to encourage savings which were re-invested in England, that is something of which the Premier could take note. Let us do something like that here; let us appeal to all and sundry in Government to hold out a premium bond as a reward. It is not a lottery in the true sense of the word, because what they invest they will get back and they will get it back with interest; but they will also get a premium on a reward if they are lucky.

Today we see our young people investing heavily in football pools and all sorts of things, and most of this money is going overseas. A few premiums are returned and they are slashed all over the newspapers and everyone, after a good win, thinks he is going to win the next time; but with the law of lotteries you are going to be a loser at times. I think that the Government should be advised to encourage savings in this island and any Government should investigate carefully the institution of premium bonds for that purpose. Another means of re-investment of capital is, of course, through Life Insurance Companies. That is nothing new, but if we invest in our local companies it is a fact that our local Life Insurance Companies have been thinking more of ploughing back their funds into the local investment now than they did in the past. That is another worthwhile way of saving, and also protecting your family in case of the death of the bread-winner. The Government should give encouragement, as they do give encouragement to that now, but they set a ceiling which, on investigation, should be increased.
2. 45 p.m.

I think it is about 6% or 9% of a person's income which may be applied to life insurance. Probably that percentage could be raised so as to encourage larger sums to be taken out in insurance because it is a form of investment, in a local company which will redound to the improvement and strengthening the economy of this island. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this may be something new to the Local Government, but it has been done successfully in Canada, and I am going to propose to the Government that they should study this in preparation for next year's budget. It is going to take time to put your financial wizards to work and see what it costs immediately to the Government, but it would also strengthen small businesses. It is a proposal that small businesses should pay half the rate which a corporation pays on the first \$20,000 of their profit. It is the small businessman more than anyone else who needs help, and when he has out of his slender earnings to fork out 40% to the Government, and as I said, 19.5% by way of trade tax, and 52.5% of his profits, it does not leave him with a sufficient sum to plough back into his small business for expansion. It is going to cost the Government something, but it will eventually in years to come redound to their benefit, because by ploughing back into a small business the large sums of money they now have to pay out, they will be able to equip their business and expand and so employ more

people. This had been done not today, but for many years in Canada. Let us look around therefore and pick the best from any country. I think it should appeal to the Government and to anyone who is interested in driving forward our economy. It has been stagnant for five years, and it needs every effort that we can give to move it forward again. You cannot afford to allow it to be stagnant much longer, otherwise we will start to slip back. That is why I am throwing out this suggestion. This is June and you have until January next year to investigate what I am saying, find out what the reduction by 50% on the first \$20,000 of business would mean to Government, and assess that alongside of what it would mean in increasing the economy of the Island in the next few years.

It may be felt by Government at this moment Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they are so concerned about increasing the cost of living to the individual by way of direct taxation that it would be inappropriate, but I do not take it that way. The sooner it is done, the better, because if these things are done and if capital is attracted back to Barbados or is left with the small businessman, it will mean increased employment within a matter of months, since it takes capital to employ people. How are you going to get capital here if you allow direct taxation to remain at such a high level as we have in Barbados. This may not be a very popular appeal to the masses, but when it is explained to them, they will understand that by that means their sons are more likely to get a job. I feel confident that the electorate of today is so far different from what it was ten years ago that you can go to them with these views, and they will hear and accept the proposal, because they have been frustrated by the proverbial handout or promises which have been offered, only to find that these promises can only be met by increased taxation. It is time for us now to find taxation from another level. Let industry do it. Give industry a chance to employ more people. Leave them with the means of attracting capital back here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will go even further and say that we are hoping that a healthy tourist industry will be the answer to our prayers for something to take over as a measure of relief from agriculture, because by agriculture alone, we cannot exist. We are too thickly populated and not like St. Vincent or St. Lucia where there are acres of fertile land and a handful of people on them. We are a very densely populated area and although we still pay high regard to agriculture and to sugar, we for years have been crying out for something else and we have been landed with projects that need capital. You should go further to attract visitors to become permanent residents in this island. We have the benefit of a very healthy atmosphere, we are a very friendly people here, and visitors from overseas, especially English-speaking visitors, like conditions in Barbados, and would welcome setting up permanent residence here. You cannot offer it to all and sundry, but you can offer it to *bona fide* retired North Americans and allow them to reside in Barbados free of income tax. It would be a measure of help, and it may be an attraction to them if they knew they could retire from the rigours of the Canadian climate and spend their remaining months in Barbados and know that their retired pay cheque or pension would not be taxed by the Government of Barbados. This would be new money and money they had earned in Canada flowing into this island every month, and it would give a form of employment, because they would be buying their consumer goods at the tax rate at which you and I have to buy. To me it is logical; I am seeing it from a business point of view. It is not that we are giving up something to them, but we are giving an inducement whereby they can come here, set up residence and instead of having to leave our shores within six months every year and travel north again, they would save themselves the expenses of air travel to and from Canada or the United States. They should be allowed to set up permanent residence in Barbados, and any *bona fide* pension that they may be drawing up to \$400 a month should be free of income tax. That money would come into Barbados and help to move forward the economy which cannot be allowed to remain as it is.

2.55 p.m.

We have to induce capital to come here. We have to find ways and means of getting capital to come here and you are

only going to get it by inducement. That is well known because every territory in the West Indies is trying to do something to induce capitalists. As a matter of fact, the other territories always seem to have a jump on us, even when the last Government was in power.

I am therefore appealing to this Government along those lines. Let us be ahead of them. We have the advantage of a very stable community. It is well known that Barbados is the most stable in the entire West Indies from Jamaica back down. Let us capitalise on that but you must not extract every last penny from the visitor when he is coming here and expect that he would be happy or that he would spend more than his allotted three or four months.

We are now going all out to attract the permanent resident from somewhere else to come here. Recently, I was in St. Vincent. I paid a short visit there and when I visit these places, I like to talk to the local people about their conditions and their attitude to the Federation. In St. Vincent there is a telephone system but let us say it is non-existent because you cannot telephone any person a half mile away and, as a matter of fact, you cannot even telephone anybody next door. It is in a deplorable condition. There is one newspaper which is published twice a week. The media of communications are absolutely poor and almost non-existent.

What do the people of St. Vincent depend on to get information? There is no rediffusion but radio. That became forcible to me when I realised that we have neglected to put up a radio station here for so long. If we are to be leaders in the new federation, if we are to have the capital here, the very first priority we must have here is a radio station. We have lost out for how long, I do not know, by not having it. You cannot get it over to the people of the Caribbean that we in Barbados are leaders in any Federation if we cannot get it across to them by means of radio. The people of the Windwards and Leewards are now listening to the radio stations of Trinidad, Grenada and the Leewards Islands. They only know of Barbados when they get a letter from somebody. That is not good enough and a broadcasting station should be the number one priority of Barbados.

Let me also sound this warning. It would be wise for Government to invite someone with the knowledge of radio broadcasting to set up the station here. The Government can draw by way of taxation or whatever they like but I say let it be in the hands of private enterprise. Government does not have the experience to run a radio station and it is going to cost them money and it would not be run satisfactorily under Government. I am going to appeal to the Government before the year is out to invite responsible and qualified persons or organisations to set up a radio station in Barbados for the very reasons which I have given and one is that we cannot afford not to have one. We are very late already. Government should ask somebody outside to set it up and then see what revenue they can derive as a result of that. I say that it can be properly run where all views can be expressed over the radio and we can have a measure of control that is necessary in any properly run means of communications.

Now, the last thing is this. It is a very important bit of advice which I am giving to Government. It is that our expenditure has been rising every year and I am going to advise Government to pay attention to their expenditure. It is not good enough for the taxpayer to be told every year that a cent is going up here on this commodity and a penny is going up there on that commodity and you are expected to pay something more somewhere else and at the same time you are neglecting what expenditure exists. There are many of your departments which need to be tightened up on. You are not getting full value for your expenditure in many of your Departments. Make a note of that. The electorate is noticing that. They have to pay for it and they are not satisfied to pay for it heavily in taxes when they see shoddy work and people just drawing money and doing nothing. I am not calling any department by name but it is more than one. Take a note of that because unless something is done about that, soon our expenditure will be so high that we will not be able to catch it up with any form of taxation whatever.

Another suggestion which I would throw out is this. There are many opportunities which Government has to assess what I am saying, whether it is correct or not. In many of your building projects you will be well advised to call in outside contractors. They are many contractors in Barbados. For some of your small jobs, you should call them in or give them out to contractors if you find that your departments are calling for estimates greater than what you think they should be and from that you will be able to gauge whether your departments are estimating too high or not. You are running a race with one horse. Any speed he may average he has to come first. Take the building of the new hospital. It started at an estimate of \$4 million and it is now estimated to cost \$8 million. That is not good enough. You are talking about building the Hilton Hotel. The one condition which you should do is that it should be done by a private contractor. Ask for tenders from outside and let it not be done by one of your departments. Your departments are costing this island too much money and it is time to stop that practice. That is something on which you will be well advised.

3.05 p.m.

I have recently noted the difficulty where they have contractors in Barbados even for road making. You can test them out and you can call in these people, and say: "I have a portion of road to be repaired, what can you do it for?" You can get a department to put in tenders and see what the relative costs are. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I am wrong I would be glad to hear, but I do not know that unless you have a means of comparing the work which is done by your public departments every year, you will have to find more and more money for doing less and less work. I think that between now and the end of the year, some of these small jobs should be given out by tender or at least you should invite tenders for doing some of these jobs and then tell your Public Works Department or the Highways and Transport Department: "Your estimate seems to be at variance with that of a private contractor", and you will test that out. They are the same Barbadian workmen and therefore you cannot say that the Barbadian workmen would be out of jobs; it is only that one set of workmen is working harder than the other set of workmen, but you can test them out like that and in the next year you will have a better department because people will be on their toes and you will get a better job done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you take up the *Trinidad Guardian* and you will see the number of contracts which are called for by local Government and also by Central Government. You can have a Tenders Board and put impartial people on it. You will have the final say, of course, and you can say that your Tenders Board had reported to you that a job has been put out for tenders and they quoted for that job "X" dollars whereas your department says that it will cost "X + 6" dollars. You put these men to supervise that work. I say that the time has come when you have to look very carefully into your departmental expenditure and see that you get the work done for which you are paying.

I feel that these remarks which I have made have been constructive and they have been a lead and a guide to the Government. If they can put their officers to work along these lines, they will be able to assess whether the cost or the reduction of the companies tax on small businesses will be too great. I am suggesting a 50% reduction. They may say that it should be made 30%; it is for them to decide, but they do need a reduction. Small businesses need a boost and a filip; they have to employ more people and we have to depend upon them.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could not allow the debate on this Resolution to be terminated without giving the Resolution my unstinted support. In doing so, I would like the public to know that no country can function without the imposition of taxation. If we are to improve the social and economic conditions of this country, then the masses must realise that they must contribute financially towards the improvement of the country. The Government has embarked upon several projects — you have free secondary education, the provision of hot meals for school children,

the building of more schools and, as you know, as soon as you build more schools we will need more teachers. The erection of the Hilton Hotel is another project as well as the construction of the East Coast Road and we are also thinking about putting into effect a scheme of social security. I have not doubt that with the building of the new hospital we must have a bigger staff so that these projects will cost money. Considering the amount of money which these projects must require to be carried out, we are compelled to tax certain commodities.

In Trinidad, commodities have been taxed and it is only a few days ago that they have taxed certain commodities in Jamaica, if we are not as financially fit as those countries which have to tax certain commodities, I fail to see why we would not have to tax commodities as well. As a Councillor, I come into direct contact with the masses daily and I would like this Honourable House to know that they are clamouring for and demanding certain amenities. I shall mention a few of them. There is the extension of the water mains so that these people can have water installed in their homes. The people are even considering that we should do something to improve the lighting system of this island. They expect to have better roads and more roads; they need tenantry roads so that in case of sickness the doctors will be able to get to the homes of these people so as to attend to them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these schemes must cost money and where must the money come from? We can only get that money by imposing taxation on the people. I am saying, Sir, that the time has gone when the masses can be fooled. You cannot fool them, as a matter of fact, you should not fool them. We, as the representatives of the people should let them know that if conditions are to be improved, if they are clamouring for certain amenities, they can only be given these amenities if they contribute their quota to the improvement; they must contribute their quota of taxation.

3.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, let us deal with the three major items which have been taxed — gasoline, rice and soft drinks. Gasoline has been increased by five cents per gallon. Could you think of a more appropriate item to tax? The point is that we need the money. Some members in the Opposition feel that the increase of five cents is an exorbitant amount but I am saying that if we did not get the money from that source, we would have to tax other commodities, and regardless of what commodities we tax, the people will talk. It is for us to realise that the time has come when we should let them know in no uncertain terms that they must contribute their quota to the improvement of this island.

On the question of rice, on account of reducing the subsidy, we are called upon to pay one cent more per pint. I have come from among the people and I am very interested in them. On the other hand, I have worked out the figures and I can assure you, Sir, that it does not exceed in any way a farthing per day per person. Could anyone say that that amount is exorbitant?

Let us deal with the question of soft drinks. It is a fact that Government in increasing the amount said that small drinks should be increased by one cent and the large one by not more than two cents, but the manufacturers have found it possible to increase the cost too. That is where the burden has fallen on the consumer. I am suggesting to this Government to keep their eyes out in connection with this very important matter, because failing to do so, we will have to carry the blame and not the manufacturers.

Finally, Sir, I should like to commend the Minister of Finance for the painstaking manner in which he has dealt with these increases. I have no doubt that these proposals caused him sleepless nights, because to be a Minister of Finance is a very unpopular job. No Government likes to tax people, because it makes them become unpopular, but how can you run a country without money? The point is that the poor man contributes five cents to the Treasury, and I can say without any contradiction that he takes back out of the Treasury one dollar. Therefore in contributing to the improvement of this island, the masses are contributing to

their own progress as well as to the progress of their children.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals made by the Hon. Premier on the 7th May, 1963, I must say first and foremost that instead of hon. members coming to this Chamber and criticising these budgetary proposals, they should have complimented the Government, and I will prove beyond any reasonable doubt why the Government should be complimented. The first thing that hon. members should realise is that this Government had a deficit of \$1,228,000. Now let us be factual. If you are starting out a business and before you can obtain stock, you owe away \$1,228,000, there is no person in the world who would pay you any mind. The first thing you must do is to bridge the gap, and in bridging that gap, the Hon. Premier has done it wisely. When I hear hon. members stand up here and criticise the proposals, it makes me feel grave within my heart to think that members can try to fool the populace in the Island of Barbados about these proposals. In trying to lessen the deficit, the Hon. Premier imposed a tax of one penny on ten cigarettes. Cigarettes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are a luxury in every capacity. You light it at one end and blow the smoke in the air until it goes. It is not a necessity, therefore when they are taxed you are not supposed to smoke, but if you like to smoke, you will pay the penny more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you consider the question of soft drinks in the Island of Barbados, you will remember that at one time we had beer shops and mauby cans, but no person raised any hue-and-cry when cokes came into existence and destroyed those poor women and men who worked for their daily bread by selling mauby and ginger beer. This Government in its wisdom has seen fit to impose a tax of 16 cents per gallon on soft drinks, and the hon. junior member for St. John has given us simple figures of the breakdown on a case of small cokes and a case of large cokes and the amount of liquid contained in the 48 bottles. Three gallons at 16 cents per gallon are 48 cents, and it is only one cent on each bottle, but what we have to watch, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are the companies, and this is where I would admonish the Government to go about this most seriously, because the companies have taken it upon themselves to place 28 cents more on a case of small cokes and 40 cents on a case of large cokes. To sell a case of small cokes of eight cents each, you make a profit of 52 cents and to sell a case of cokes at 11 cents, you make a profit of 80 cents. You will find that formerly you made 72 cents in selling a coke at 9 cents, but now you are making 80 cents, but now in selling a case of small cokes, you now make 72 cents where formerly you made 56 cents by selling at 8 cents. There are some unscrupulous shopkeepers with whom I have nothing in common, and although I am a shopkeeper myself, I am prepared to throw down the gauntlet. 3.25 p.m.

There are not only some shopkeepers but some prominent people whom you expect to do better but who see it fit to destroy the masses and then tell you that the Government is destroying them. They say: I have a deep freeze for \$1,200. Must I still sell a coke for 11 cents? What is the difference between selling a cold coke when your profit remains the same thing. No business man will tell you that he is going to buy a deep freeze to sell only cokes from it. They say so just to charge you more.

We also have some people in charge of schools. I think the very first thing they should teach is honesty but their honesty is charging children 15 cents for a coke.

These are things which should come up in here to be criticised. Hon. members should not be criticising the consumption tax of 16 cents per gallon of soft drinks. These things should come up in here and hon. members should ask the Government to see to it that these exorbitant profits should not be carried on to destroy the unfortunate community under the pretext that your Government has put on this in order to make the Government look as if it does not know what it is doing.

We come now to the increase in the prices of gasoline. Let us be factual. I cannot remember whether it was in 1956 or 1958 but at that time gasoline was sold at 61 cents per gallon in the Island of Barbados and the former Government had a reserve. Those are facts which we must remember. The Government then was not in need; they did not have a deficit of \$1,228,000 but out of the clear blue sky gasoline went up to 65 cents per gallon. You heard no hue and cry; nothing at all but now in this instance where we have a deficit of \$1,228,000 and we intend to distribute it among those who are more able to bear it, you hear this hue and cry.

If you buy a motor car for \$5,000 what is a paltry five cents more per gallon for you to pay for gasoline to run that car? All it means, if you cannot afford to spend more in gasoline, if you used 100 gallons, you will now use 50 gallons.

What must be borne in mind is that this Government must obtain the necessary revenue in order to balance this Island's economy. If you are fighting to get investors to come here and invest money and you are going to show a picture of a deficit of \$1,228,000, the first thing, if I were an investor, which I would say is: I cannot understand this colony; it does not look healthy at all.

What we have to consider? Let us be factual. Do not let us beat about the bush. If hon. members of this Chamber would stand up to the challenge and stop playing politics with the people's destiny and allow the people to know the facts, it would be better for the country. In any developing country you must give incentives to outside capital in order to facilitate and find employment for the masses of your people. This is one of the things which we must realise. Two hundred and fifty thousand people is no mean joke in an Island of 166 square miles, therefore, the further you can develop it and the more employment you can obtain in your own island, the more your economy goes up.

Therefore, Sir, with the gasoline question, I think the opposition should have complimented the Government. That is my honest feeling.

We come now to the rice question. We have to remember what happened over the years. There were many articles which were subsidised such as sugar, pickled meat, rice and so forth. Subsidies were taken off gradually, one after the other, and I have not heard one member of the Opposition talk about the year 1958 when the people within this Island were actually destroyed with taxation. Salt beef went to 72 cents per pound, pig tails to 66 cents, neck bones, 40 cents and no person made any human cry.

Let us compare the price of commodities and the salaries that were paid in 1958 with the price of commodities today and the salaries paid. I heard one hon. member say that you are attacking the poor people's rice. Where the poor people are? The people in St. Lucia are paid considerably less than the people here and they have to pay 17 cents for a pound of rice which is about one pint and a gill, therefore, that is more than what the people here pay. They pay now 12 cents a pint.

The only thing which I blame this Government for is that when British Guiana last year demanded more for their commodity, this Government should have come out and let the public know that British Guiana was demanding this increased amount for their rice, therefore, they will have to pay it. Any reasonable person in the Island of Barbados would be sympathetic in paying one cent more for a pint of rice. The only thing is that the politicians take these things and try to play ball with the destiny of the people. I know Barbados and I know Barbadians as well as any other person in the Island. If we tell people our case and we can prove to them beyond any reasonable doubt that it is a necessity that they should pay a greater price for this commodity, they will pay it without any further grumble.

Sir, there are a lot of things which I would like to prove to many members in this honourable Assembly relative to

this present Government and the things which they are prepared to embark on. You can look around the Island of Barbados and see that the present Government is employing more people than at any time in the Island's history with any other Government. I hear some people trying to make capital of this Government's crash programme. I agree with it. When this Government came into power in December, 1961, were it not for the wisdom of the Hon. Minister of Finance and he did not see to it quickly to remedy the conditions of the masses it would be true to say that we would be back to the days of 1937 but because of his wisdom, his understanding and his love for the masses, he was able to put everything in order. That is what I would like hon. members to realise in this Assembly. We come here as representatives of the people to see to the benefits of one and all.
3.35 p.m.

The merchant has to depend upon the worker and the worker has to depend upon the merchant; and when capital is not in existence everybody must suffer. Do not let anybody go away with an idea other than that. This Government is taking such a different approach to the problems of the island of Barbados that we are allowing the masses to know this; we are not allowing them to know that the merchant has done this and the shopkeeper has done that; we are allowing them to know that we are responsible for taxation so that they can say "Our Government, in order to carry out certain social amenities within our island, has taxed us and therefore we are quite satisfied in paying this small pittance in order to obtain these social conditions."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us consider the new General Hospital; let us give credit where credit is due. The former Government embarked on the project. They were thrown out of power and we now have the liability to go on and complete the Hospital. You have to consider the construction on this Hospital carefully. I can afford to tell you that the cost of the services of the present Hospital has gone up by over \$200,000 and where are we going to get that money from? We have to employ more Doctors and we have to employ more Nurses because we have more sickness; at once you must see that the cost of the services has gone up by 100% and therefore you must look for that money in order to meet the conditions of the unfortunate people. It is the people in the Barbados General Hospital and therefore the people in Barbados will benefit and indeed are benefiting from the services which are implemented today at the present Hospital.

Let us consider the Mental Hospital; it is most disheartening when you look left and right. Every now and then you hear that somebody is mentally deranged? Why has he become mentally deranged? It is because of the conditions with which he is faced, that when he looks right and left he sees no alternative where his position can be improved, and therefore automatically he is taken to the Mental Institution. Right now this Government is spending over \$50,000 more for food alone at the Mental Hospital and where must we obtain this money from? Let us look at the over-all picture. We have removed the subsidy half-way and I am against my Government for doing that. I am quite willing to go to any Electorate and let them know that they should be paying the full price for rice. Do not let anybody fool you; if the price of rice is put at 13 cents a pint and I pay a penny more in order that you can get it for 11 cents a pint, that penny will be utilised in some other direction; but if you had to budget for the rice at 13 cents a pint there and then you would have seen what the position is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I hear hon. members talk about "My poor people", I would always like them to remember that our poor people like the best of everything in this island. Let us consider the price of box rice; ask any business man about this; ask anybody if you do not find the average domestic servant is buying box rice because she will tell you that what half a pint of box rice will do you cannot get done with the other kind of rice. Do not let us try to fool the populace; if you cannot obtain rice from British Guiana and we have to import it from Burma or from the United States of America and it had to be sold at 30 cents a pint, it would be sold at that price; but the fact is that instead of buying 12 pints of rice you will buy

four pints and you will make it up with some of your locally grown produce. It is most surprising that hon. members stand in this Chamber and try their best to play with the people's matters and do not give the people the true facts. In my closing remarks I say that I compliment the Head of the Government in bringing forward his Budgetary Proposals because I realise that the taxation has been distributed in such a manner that the whole community will bear their fair share of it and they will benefit from the conditions under which this Government is prepared to administer the colony and give of its best. (Cheers!)

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate has been going on for some time and I think that you have displayed the patience of Job. I do not want to intrude on that patience.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER knocked the gavel.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member continue his remarks. I heard the hon. member but I was also hearing other voices.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is human nature to object to the expenditure of more money, despite the fact that one may be rich or poor. I am not objecting to such a thing at this stage because I do not have any objections to make generally. I am conscious of the fact that the services of this island must be maintained; these services must be paid for and they must be paid for out of money which is raised from the people of this island. I know that hon. members will agree with me when I say that from this presentation of the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals, the Hon. Premier has made a thorough survey of matters before he made this pronouncement. I can quite remember that in June last year when similar proposals were made there was an outcry against any rise in the price of gasoline.
3.45 p.m.

Some of those who were crying out to raise on gasoline have not bought, or it is not their intention to buy, one-tenth of a gallon for 7 cents. Consequently they felt that gasoline could be raised to \$1.00 a gallon. I personally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, very much regret that gasoline was raised, because it will be much harder for concessionaires in this island who are operating buses with a small fare. There was a time when a matter of this kind came to this House and members here did not have the experience about motor omnibuses, but they cannot say so today because the Government is operating buses, and they know only too well that over one-third of the takings goes in gasoline alone. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it would have been more reasonable if the Government had brought in a Resolution whereby the gasoline used on motor buses could be kept at the old price or whereby motor omnibuses could be given the facilities that are given with diesel oil for tractors for agricultural purposes, because you must realise that motor buses are one of the essential services of this island. I heard a member not so long ago say that he can limit himself with less gasoline, but that cannot happen with buses today. We have to use the same amount of gasoline because we have to operate scheduled trips. If on the other hand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution was brought down whereby gasoline for buses remained at the same price, you might have heard from someone in here that there is a Transport Committee sitting that is going into this question of the buses. That is true, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but it is not the first time that a Committee sat and went into the question of buses. Some time ago a Committee made recommendations to Government, and those recommendations were ignored, and as a result the Government had to step in the game, and it is only after the Government had thrown away over \$1/2 million, that they then thought it necessary to make a small increase in bus fares.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, along with the small bus fares that exist, the buses carrying school children are operating at a 40% reduced rate, and it also takes 40% of the number of units to carry school children alone, which means a further increase in the price of gasoline. I will repeat, Sir, that I know the services of this island must be carried on,

but I feel it is my duty to point out that the section of the community which is already being squeezed should not be squeezed further. I am not a member of the Government and I cannot tell the Government who should be taxed, but I feel that some consideration should be given to those who are already severely squeezed. I think it is time for the Government to face facts and to be firm. They should reach a decision and let the general public know, otherwise it may well be that Government will have to resort to retrenchment.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, after hearing most of the members on both sides of this Chamber on the Financial Statement, and after especially hearing three hon. members on this side of the Table commenting on the Budgetary Proposals, I feel most heartened that members, irrespective of their political feelings, can come out clearly and put the facts to the people, because the people of this Island have been led too far astray in cases where taxation is used as a weapon against Government. It is with a very hard heart that any Minister of Finance would come to tax people in an Island unless it was necessary. If Barbados must maintain its position and live to the standard of other countries, then taxation is very necessary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on what is the United States of America, one of the world's most progressive and up to date countries thriving? It is thriving on taxation, and it is only on taxation that any country can thrive. A Government has one or two alternatives; either they can deteriorate the living standards of the people, or increase taxation. With medical science and Government pensioners living longer, and with the prospects of people generally living longer, this Government has got to view things from a long term policy, and we have got to do it not only for the benefit of us who are here now, but for our children. People in Barbados must be realistic. I can think of the days when as a boy I joined a ship as a cabin boy, but today I can see my son board my own ship to avoid him from the hardships I went through. If the people in this Island want to see their children thrive and achieve a better standard of living than they have had, they must also pay for it. Like the Hon. Premier, I make no apology for these things.

Years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when very few people in Barbados had a pipe, a bath or a water toilet in their houses, there were standpipes half a mile, a mile and two miles apart which they had to go to. Today this Government is making provision for as many people as possible to have water in their homes. Last year the estimated deficit in the Waterworks Department was almost \$3¼ million. 3.55 p.m.

With the standard of living getting better for the poor classes in this country, it is a harder burden on the Government and they themselves must appreciate it and pay for it. They possibly can contribute.

It is quite easy for some hon. members on the other side to state that taxes should be imposed on a different basis. It is human nature to rebel against taxation — any type, any class. Let us be realistic and see that from any source which we impose taxation somebody must rebel but be sensible enough to study all sources and the right sources on which you can impose taxation.

The big problem in the Island, in an Island like Barbados, is unemployment. With the years advancing it must become greater and greater, especially with no emigration to the United Kingdom. Along with that, there is a greater life span of the average person in Barbados. We are faced with a greater and greater population every year, therefore, we have to make provision for the necessities and up-coming of the future generation. Housing is very essential to the people in the Island of Barbados. Take a three-bedroom house built by the Housing Authority. It costs over \$4,000 and that is exclusive of the land. The rent for that House demortised over twenty years cannot pay the interest on the money. Those are things which the public must be made well aware of if we are to continue with these projects to help the people.

Some hon. members may say that taxation should be imposed on those who are in a position to pay but you have to be very careful about that. We have to be very careful less we kill the goose which lays the golden egg. We have to see to it that the people receive a fair wage for the work they do and it is also for the employer to see that he gets a fair return because if he does not get a fair return he is going to sit down on his investment. We ask people to come to the Island of Barbados to help develop it. The first people whom those people get into contact with are the business people of the Island and the first thing they ask them is what is the position of your Government. They have to deal with the Government. If the big people say that they are scared, those people are not coming in.

We have to weigh together whether the increase of taxation is worth while against the increased standard of living or reduce the taxation and let Barbados deteriorate. This is an age of progress and if we are to progress, we must pay for it. Every man, woman and child must contribute to it and it is the Government to make sure that people do not use the taxation to benefit too much on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if any businessman realises that he is losing too much money and not making sufficient on the capital investment he has in his business, he is going out of business and one man going out of business is likely to mean as many as forty or fifty people unemployed. All of these are facts which we have to weigh when imposing taxation.

I have heard certain hon. members talking about taxing the poor people's rice. Last year, due to increased prices in British Guiana, the price of rice was increased. Nobody actually knew about it. The Government had to pay it. The subsidy on rice works out at less than 75 cents per man per year. If you take the amount of money which was taken off for the overall population of Barbados and the amount of rice imported, it works out to less than 75 cents per man per year. Is that something for somebody to quake about?

I can remember quite clearly after the last elections some people said that this is a wild Government. Those are things which I will never forget; those are things which are spoken by people playing on the ignorance of people who know not how the Government is run. The average man does not know where a Government receives its money from. Money is not dropped from Heaven as some people believe. In my Government I have to tell the Hon. Minister of Finance how much money I require for housing and how much I require for water. Each Minister has with his various portfolios to tell the Minister of Finance how much he requires to carry out certain projects. We would have to carry out less housing, less water, less public works, less social works and less of everything in order to keep taxation at its lowest. With the increase of wages and pensions, we would have to balance our revenue with expenditure, therefore, if we have to carry out the necessities required and stated by each Minister under his portfolio, the Hon. Premier has no alternative than to increase taxation to make up for the deficit or to cut down on the projects which we have to carry out. Unfortunately, the people in the street have an idea that taxation is something repulsive and they have no idea where a Government gets its revenue from. Barbados is not in a position like some of the other Islands which can depend on Colonial Office when they make out a budget and it is short, it will be financed by Colonial Office. If we have to cut down on our projects and deteriorate the standards of living here all the other Islands whose standards of living are not below that of Barbados would catch up with Barbados. Must we sit down and let the other Islands overtake us?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, like the Hon. Premier, I make no apologies because I have no intention of fooling the people. The people should know the truth and know exactly the position and pull their weight if they and their children are to progress in the future.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite a lot has been said in this debate on both sides and quite a lot has

been interesting but I fear that it is only at this stage of the debate that the true facts of this budget are coming out. 4.05 p.m.

It is as well that the debate has gone on for this length of time because now that we are farther away from the introduction of the Budget itself, we are more likely to regard it in a less emotional atmosphere. I fear that since I have to speak at some length on this matter I have to go back to Budget day and examine some of the arguments in respect of and the reactions to the Hon. Premier's Speech, which took place in the course of debate on that day. The first thing is with respect to the circumstances of the motion itself under discussion. Because a backbencher of the Party in power had moved the motion for the passing of a Resolution to approve the Budget Proposals, certain hon. members on the other side of the House imagined that there was something sinister about that, forgetting, perhaps conveniently, that it is common practice in all British Parliaments that whenever approval is to be sought for important measures of Government, backbenchers of the ruling party are asked to initiate a debate which Ministers and other members of Parliament may join in as they will.

It is common practice, for instance, in the United Kingdom after a State opening of Parliament, for the debate on the Queen's Speech to be initiated by backbenchers of the Government Party and you would never hear in the House of Commons any charge levied against the Government that because a backbencher introduced an important motion, it stood to reason that the Government of the day had some sinister intention of stifling debate; and yet we were treated to these, in my opinion, very unfair imputations by hon. members opposite which were so gravely unfair, that I believe the whole atmosphere of this debate which could have got to a higher level even on the first day, has been spoiled almost completely.

The next thing was that in the debate itself was caught up another consideration which was quite irrelevant to the issue before the House as to why, on that particular day, the House should have met at 12 o'clock Noon and not at 2.30 o'clock p.m., as we were accustomed to meet before. The facts as to this point are simple. Some weeks ago hon. members on the other side of the House chided the Government for its lack of legislative programme and one hon. member, as far as my memory goes, went so far as to say that if the Government could find no more than one or possibly two items to put on the Order Paper under Government Business, it would be as well to adjourn the House for three or four weeks until there was an accumulation of business to be transacted. This criticism was not resented by us at all although we did explain that the paucity of Government Business was due to the fact that the requests made by the Cabinet to the Attorney General's Office were more than could be fulfilled at the present time and there was a bottle neck which we hope to get cleared soon and so the difference came about. As soon as the Government discovered that it had a steady flow of legislation which could keep the House occupied from 12 o'clock Noon until whenever the House adjourned in the afternoon, we said in making the motion for the adjournment some six weeks ago that we would start our meetings at 12 o'clock noon and we have done so for every consecutive Tuesday. I cannot therefore see the wisdom in castigating the Government for meeting at 12 o'clock noon on Budget day when, on the Order Paper, it could quite clearly be seen that there was some business to be transacted with the introduction of the Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to tell hon. members opposite this: If they rightly, in my opinion, were to request fair treatment from this side of the House, it is no more than we should ask that the same courtesy should be extended to this side of the House, and that unfair imputations should not be cast on anything we do. The third most unfortunate element which was introduced in the debate which, in my opinion, also prevented a calm and dispassionate discussion of these Budget Proposals was the imputation that because the Hon. Premier had introduced the Budget on a Tuesday and left for Canada on the Wednesday, that there was necessarily something bad about that.

That imputation hurt me personally very much because I had imagined that people would realise that public business, as far as Ministers are concerned, may not always be done at the Minister's own convenience and that very often all competing claims of various activities come so quickly and fast that you must make your choice. Since above a certain level all public business is of equal value, it is not unnatural to suppose that a Minister might meet all the claims upon him by doing one thing on one day and starting to do something else on another day. In any case, it would not be supposed that members of this Government are so backward in their understanding and their grasp of public affairs that the absence of the Minister of Finance would bring the entire administration to a standstill. That used to be the case in this island under a foreign regime which happily is not now the case.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to prove that that was not the case, all the allegations made in the course of debate on the Budgetary Proposals which stemmed from this misconception as to what the public duties of a Minister are — all of these allegations and imputations were answered by the Hon. Leader of the House when he had occasion to interpolate in the course of debate. The fourth point is this: quite a lot of play was made in the debate about the sinister intentions and the near dictatorial propensities of the Minister of Finance and the debate, as it developed from the other side of the House, certainly gave the impression that this island was cowering under the lash of a tyrant and for that matter the only level upon which finance could be discussed is the level of a slave versus a slave master. We, on this side of the House, reject that contention entirely. The whole Cabinet stands, by virtue of collective responsibility, behind the Budget Proposals. I do not have to stress that.

4.15 p.m.

What I have to stress is this: it is not always understood that when the hon. senior member for St. John speaks as Minister of Finance he is discharging a constitutional responsibility which is not necessarily the same as the responsibility which he discharges as Premier of this Island. When he is doing the budget, he speaks as Minister of Finance; in all other respects he speaks and acts as Head of the Government, and it is largely, or I would say entirely, due to him that a Ministry of Finance was created in this Island, because until he became Minister of Finance there was not any, and all the financial affairs of the Government of Barbados before December, 1961 were arranged in a separate section, but still a subordinate section of the Premier's Ministry. That is not now so. There is a separate Ministry of Finance just as there is a separate Ministry of Education, Home Affairs, Development, Communications and Works or any other, and the person who is constitutionally charged with the responsibility for financial matters must take his responsibilities seriously, because if he does not so do, the whole machinery of Government is liable to come to a standstill. I will go on to say as a member of the Cabinet that we frequently find that the hon. member whom I am now discussing is more serious, if that could be possible, in the discharge of his duties as Minister of Finance than he is as Premier, and we frequently also find that where we could possibly get around him when we approach him as Head of the Government, he bears a sterner aspect when we approach him as Minister of Finance. That is how it should be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to let the House know, therefore, that on Budget occasions he is exercising a special constitutional responsibility which rests upon him for finance, and is not at that time speaking or acting as Head of the Government. As Head of the Government, it is possible and practical and sensible for him to make compromises of all sorts; such compromises are not always desirable or even practical in his capacity as Minister of Finance. That brings me to another point. In the course of the debate quite a lot of play was made of the fact that the confidential papers from which he introduces his proposals to the House were not brought by him in the usual red despatch box, but in a black box, and some people who should know better profess that they discover something sinister merely in a difference of colour. Some of them have been on Parlia-

mentary courses and they should know that it is common practice in British Parliaments for financial papers whether confidential or not to be kept in black boxes, so that they can be easily distinguished by the persons who have to deal with them, and this would be an important point in a Ministry, shall we say, in the United Kingdom or Canada where tens and scores of boxes pass through a Minister's hands everyday to be able to distinguish clearly which ones contain the financial papers, instead of opening ten boxes to find what you want. There is nothing sinister about it, and so as with everything British, one good custom follows itself around the whole Commonwealth, and even here in Barbados the custom has grown up that the financial papers are kept in a black box which is the property of the Ministry of Finance, and obviously if the Minister of Finance is bringing out his papers for a special occasion, he would bring them in a black box. On other occasions you see him with his two red boxes and nobody comments on the size or number of the boxes, but they commented for want of something better to do on the colour of a different box merely because it is the custom to keep financial papers in them. I myself would have thought it strange if he had brought them out in a red box, because I am a bit of a traditionalist myself, and I would have wondered why he had broken tradition to bring out financial papers in a red box. It would not occur to me to find it strange to see him bringing them in a black box, but a lot of ignorant play has been made about it, merely because black, I suppose, with a lot of people is a sign of mourning, and merely because the taxation proposals this year were impositions.

Suppose for argument sake, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the taxation proposals were different. Suppose the economy of the country had allowed the Minister of Finance to bring in proposals which offered wide-spread tax reliefs, but he had still brought them in a black box. Would the same hon. members have taken the trouble to comment? Would they then not discover that black, far from being a colour of doom, would be a colour of something pleasant? It is as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we should keep debates on these matters away from emotionalism, and in order perhaps to raise our standard of debate to the highest possible levels, use only those arguments which tell and tell in the right way.

Now one thing that has struck me about all the criticism to these Budget Proposals, save only the criticism made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. His is a sensible exception for this reason; although he did allow his rhetoric to get away with him and in some cases did make some rather unfair comments on Government policy, yet his contribution to this debate was the only contribution so far in that period based on some understanding of the issues involved, because the point at issue is this; very few people remembered that two papers were laid in the House on that day by the Minister of Finance. One of them consisted of the Budgetary Proposals which formed the whole cut and thrust of this debate now in its fifth week, but the other equally important document was the survey which he laid of the economy of Barbados for 1962. It was from that survey and on that survey that the Budget Proposals were laid, and if I were a member of the House in opposition to this or any Government, and I had wanted to criticise with some justice and even with some intelligence the Budget Proposals, I would take the Economic Survey for 1962 and thoroughly peruse it, because having heard the Minister of Finance commit himself to saying that the Budget Proposals arose out of the facts disclosed in the survey, I would examine the survey to see if there were any flaws, and if there were any flaws in the survey, that is, if there were flaws in his analysis of the economy of the country, then anything based on that analysis would be bound to be faulty. 4.25 p.m.

That is the attitude for which I would have attacked the budget but apart from the hon. senior member for St. Peter, no hon. member on that side took the trouble even to examine the Economic Survey and therefore, having not done that, much of the criticism missed the whole point. They were arguing in a vacuum and the vacuum they assumed was that you prepared the budget out of your head in the sense that the first idea that comes into your mind you

act upon. Some hon. members on the other side seemed to say: "why you tax them on this and why not that?" as if the Minister of Finance in deciding what to tax approached his problem as a juggler might do throwing three balls in the air and hoping that at any one time one would be in the air and two in his hands. It is not done in that way and if hon. members had studied the Economic Survey carefully, they would have been in a position to make perhaps constructive criticisms and probably would be in a position to guide us in matters which quite conceivably we might have overlooked. One thing I can say of this Party. It consists of people who are always willing to learn and you never hear from us the arrogant expression that nobody can teach us anything. We have learnt a lot from the debates of this House and there is scarcely a debate which has not taught us something and which has not become valuable to us in the present or future policy of the Government. If hon. members had taken the trouble to study the Economic Survey, because it was on the Economic Survey that the whole budget was passed, they would not have been arguing in a vacuum.

Now, that survey sets out in simple terms the position of various sectors of the Island's economy more especially the position which we are up against in our international trading question and very few people in this Island seem to understand what we are up against. It is as simple as this. We buy from outside of this Island some \$88 million of goods and services. We sell to people outside of this Island about half of that amount. The rough figures are \$44 million so it means for every \$2.00 we buy, we sell only \$1.00.

REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That brings to an end for the day Private Members' Business. We now revert to Government Business.

When the Sitting was suspended at 2.00 o'clock p.m., the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

THE TRADE UNION BILL, 1963

MR. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made the point earlier that so far as this amendment to the Trade Union Act is concerned, I am in complete agreement with the Government as well as my own organisation but I think I would take this opportunity this evening to at least enlighten hon. members as to the controversy of the Clause because I do not think at this stage members of any Legislature should not be so unenlightened about things like this as if it is something new.

The particular Clause to which I am referring is Clause 39 which is the one dealing with peaceful picketing. There is much which has been said about it, as I have stated already, that I am a bit surprised to hear the Hon. Introducer of this Bill in his closing remarks make a more or less unfortunate statement in relation to the retention of this particular Clause.

Why I say that? We received from the Government a Draft Bill and we agreed with the Draft Bill substantially and whatever amendments we suggested to the Government were accepted. We did not have to make an amendment to the Draft Bill which the Government sent to us in relation to Clause 39. In the Draft Bill, this Clause was worded as follows:-

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a Trade Union or of any 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 so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

Now, Sir, I must bring hon. members' minds a little further back. That same amendment is in the Trade Disputes Act of Great Britain. Hon. members must not consider

that I am lecturing to them but I am telling them something of these Acts because I find that they are not acquainted with Trade Union matters as much as I am.

Some hon. members have the idea that if you put into the Act "to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides" that it is put in for somebody to go in for some undignified action to pry into some private person's business, may be, to be some Peeping Tom to see if some domestic performance is taking place at some person's home. Some members feel, on the other hand, and have the concept that an employer has a right to retire to his feudal sanctuary when there is a strike on and to have peace but the man or the employee who is aggrieved has no right to go to his home. His home can be abandoned for ever.

I would like to show the Hon. Minister of Trade the error he has made in his last statement for which he says he gives the Trade Union the right. I do not know if it is a habit of the Hon. Minister, but you will remember the previous Minister of Labour opposed this Clause although in 1949 surprisingly this Clause was passed by him. I will remind the Hon. Minister of Trade now that he voted for it then in the same way as it stood. I have here in front of me the speech he made on it in 1949.

The particular Clause which was Clause 6 at that time read as follows:-

"It shall be 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 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 of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

I can read Mr. Deputy Speaker, the speeches of many members of the House at that time on that and when it came to the vote but I will only read the names of the members when the division was taken.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative as follows:-

AYES: Mr. Speaker, Messrs. ALDER, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER and Dr. CUMMINS - 9

NOES: Messrs. BETHELL, MOTTLEY, GILL, GODDARD, REECE, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD - 8

In those days it was amazing. The members who voted against it then said that the Trade Union was only ten years old and to give it a chance to develop. More years have passed after this was introduced than the years which have gone before by the Trade Union. What I do not understand in the statement of the Hon. Minister today is why he is insisting on this Clause when his own Government took the initiative and sent out a Draft Clause exactly the same as in the English Act and which he has supported. I am going to show you the illogicality of saying what he is saying. I am going to show you what is in the English Act to show you that what is in this Act is not exactly the right thing. 4.35 p.m.

This Clause deals with a Trade dispute. Hon. members know what a trade dispute is, and if you look at page three of this Bill you will see what is the definition of a Trade dispute. This is what it says:

" 'trade dispute' means any dispute between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment, or the terms of the employment, or with the conditions of labour, of any person."

You are now consolidating the law. You do not have to be a workman to be employed; it could not be stated here "the non-employment of a person who is not a workman."

A workman connotes that you may be working at a place. You also have the definition of a workman and this is what it says:

"workman" means any person who has entered into or works under a contract with an employer, whether the contract be by way of manual labour, clerical work or otherwise, be expressed or implied, oral or in writing, and whether it be a contract of service or of apprenticeship or a contract personally to execute any work or labour and includes any person who is employed in a civil capacity under the Government or is employed by a Council established under the Local Government Act, 1958, and, subject to section 44, any other person employed by or under the Crown in the same manner as if such person were employed by or under a private person.

A workman means anybody who has entered a contract; and a dispute means that it can be applied to any person whether under contract or otherwise. Hon. members must understand what the Trade Union is too. There is a definition of a Trade Union and this is what it says:

"trade union" means any combination, whether temporary or permanent, the principal purposes of which are under its constitution the regulation of the relations between workmen and employers, or between workmen and workmen, or between employers and employers, whether such combination would or would not, if this Act had not been enacted, have been deemed to have been an unlawful combination by reason of some one or more of its purposes being in restraint of trade;

When it comes to the question of peaceful picketing, if the hon. member says that there must be a Trade Union we have this Clause 39 and I want to show this hon. member where it is illogical. Clause 39 says this:

39. 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 of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working.

When you say: "It shall be lawful for one or more persons, appointed by the trade union, the firm or the individual..... in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house....." and so on, I should like to say that a trade dispute is not confined to a Trade Union. Do not let us get mixed in our ideas. A trade dispute means any dispute between employers and workmen or between workmen and workmen. You cannot have a trade dispute between employers and employers. If employers were to have a row between themselves that is not a trade dispute. There is no such thing as a dispute between employers and a trade union. If you write in these words you will exclude all persons other than persons in a trade union from a dispute with an employer. You can have a dispute with people who are not members of a Trade Union. You can employ, for instance, a group of artisans to build your house and you may refuse to pay one of them or you may dismiss one of them, and you have a strike. You talk about peaceful picketing but do not want to preclude people from demonstrating that they are on strike because a trade union has not appointed them. You are taking away a fundamental right which you have already given.

You sit down and pass these things but no legal man can look at the English Act and look at this Act and say that it means the same thing because it does not mean the same thing. A man who is in a trade union has no more right now to peaceful picketing than a man who is outside the trade union. A trade dispute is nothing to do with whether a man has ever been in a trade union building or not. As a Trade Unionist one would think that I would catch at this. There are people in Bridgetown and you do not tell me that they would be denied the same right that the Trade Union would be denied. I cannot understand how, as to the

original draft, you take out the words which were in that original draft and refer to this draft which is not as good as the original one. My amendment which I originally introduced is what they are putting in now, but the draft which was sent down by the Government is an improvement. The Government is apparently more inclined to go along with the views of the people who know nothing about the law as regards peaceful picketing - in fact they have never seen it practiced. I spoke with one hon. member here today and he told me that he does not mind having peaceful picketing at a place where a man works; but they are forgetting that an employer as well as a workman is a person and a workman does not work with the building; the building did not dismiss him but it is the person who dismissed him, so that it is a person whom you are talking about. A trade dispute is a dispute between an employer and a workman in connection with employment or non-employment, not in connection with a building. Some employment is general; if you employ a bus driver to drive a bus, the bus station is not the important thing.

4.45 p.m.

A very important thing in an age like this is that people talk in terms as if a worker is some inferior beast, and an employer is some superior person who has the right to retire to his sanctuary which he says is his home after he has made certain impositions on the lives of persons who may never be able to return home. Let me give a classic example: an employer dismisses a man wrongfully, he has no money to pay rent, no other job to look forward to and no home to repair to, because the landlord is looking to throw him out of the place; but he and his colleagues must sit down in the open air or maybe go to some public institution, while the employer can retire to his sanctuary, and you say that employees should not go to the man's home because that is his home, and his home is his castle. Apart from that sort of philosophical reasoning where social justice makes you agree it is wrong, the legal aspect is still there because there are three definitions under this. You have a definition which defines what is a trade dispute; so you cannot have a trade dispute in one breath and talk about a person, and in another breath refer to a Trade Union. A Trade Union under the Act is a combination of people, but if you have a trade dispute you do not have to be in a Trade Union. Men who have never seen a Trade Union door can have a trade dispute, and when they have a trade dispute, what are you going to tell the men? Are you going to tell them that they cannot picket if there is a dispute because they are not members of the Trade Union? That is why I said that the draft amendment had the English Clause in it which says "it shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union"; it does not preclude a Trade Union from acting, therefore if the Minister is insisting that it should be a Trade Union, I am a Trade Unionist, and this would deprive in the first instances the persons that you are talking about. One or more persons should be able to act on their own behalf because in the first instance it could be a dispute with a person.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Deputy Speaker. A Trade Union may rise up against an employer for the unfair dismissal of a man and under the law you can picket; but that same man in a similar case not belonging to a Trade Union cannot picket. Why should he be deprived of the right if there is a dispute? The law or the definition of "dispute" does not say it must be with a Trade Union, and therefore I do not see why you should write it into the Act as you have done in Clause 39. I say that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I have reached the stage in my life to know that Barbados is a backward place when it comes to passing legislation, and that this would come here positively not as good as the draft, and you would get a bunch of people sitting down in the House of Assembly and passing it. The Opposition on the other hand thinks this will give somebody the right to peep in somebody's backyard to see if they are washing clothes or bathing in the yard as if you can go at somebody's house peacefully picketing to look in the back of his premises, or as has been suggested to me, as if it is peaceful peeping. It is nothing like that.

Moreover, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the law does not permit any person to enter a person's private property in peaceful picketing. The employers in this House who are nearly all of the members of the Official Opposition are projecting the idea that when workers go at or near a home, it is only the employer's home, forgetting that when you are speaking about this Act, you are speaking about workmen and workmen. A dispute can be between a workman and a workman, and in some instances picketing at or near a home is going to be applicable to a workman's home because you want to persuade him to work or not to work. Hon. members must understand what the Trade Union Act and a Trade Dispute Act mean. You cannot pass one which gives the employer the right that you do not give to the worker under a trade dispute, because even without this Act, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an employer can send a motor car for the workers. We had this instance in Barbados during the strike at the Advocate. The employers were sending motor cars to the homes of workers and bringing them out to work, because they had a legal right to send for a worker. Unfortunately the Union did not have the legal right to go to the man's home and tell him not to come to work. That is the whole essence of having peaceful picketing for both sides. It does not prevent the employer from persuading a man to come to work, nor does it prevent a worker from persuading another worker not to come to work. Moreover, it makes a strike effective. There is no point in saying you have the right to strike but you are going to take all the effective elements.

What I want to point out to the Hon. Minister is that it does not matter to me as an individual what kind of laws you pass in this respect, because in my humble opinion, I believe in many cases that we have passed the stage by and large where we have to use a strike or picketing as such to be able to get what we regard as reasonable out of an employer, but it does not mean that there are not instances where you would require this. In the United Kingdom where Trade Unionism has been going on for many years, they still have this on the Statute Book. It does not mean that you strike every day or have peaceful picketing, and I believe you can count the number of cases on your hand; but when it is required, the law should be there that you can use without having to adopt unlawful methods to get what you require. I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the original clause which was sent down in the draft was better. Why should a person who has a dispute with an employer be precluded from having things in his interest and has to be appointed as a member of a Trade Union to do these things? He should not be required to join a Trade Union, because he is not under contract to work with an employer based on the fact that he has to be in a Trade Union. An employer does not employ workmen in this Island based on the fact that they are members of a Trade Union; they employ them as persons, and joining a Trade Union is something subsequent.

Let me give a classic example, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the number of people that is employed by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I believe there are more non-Union members than Union members, and the ones in the Union under this law can go and picket his business, but the ones who are not in the Union cannot picket; but the Act was not intended to be like that. It was not intended that the Trade Dispute Act should limit persons, and I would say that the lawyers in England in 1906 when framing the Trade Dispute Law - and that is why draughtsmanship is such an expert job - looked into all the circumstances, because they realised they could not put in one clause the definition of a trade dispute and then in another clause say if a dispute occurs how it is to be operated, and preclude some of the same people whom you have put in under the Clause where you say a dispute means "any dispute between an employer and workers", and then you come here and restrict it by saying "it shall be lawful for one or more persons appointed by the Trade Union", and take out the words "acting on their own behalf" which is a logical sequence to the definition of a trade dispute.

4.55 p.m.

I have here one of the best books written by Sir Norman Citrine. He cited cases to show that a workman did not have

to be a person who was employed and that is why you may be dismissing a man. It may be through the unemployment of a man that caused the dispute so that it is not a question of anybody working with you. It may be a dispute because they feel that this person should be employed and the dispute arises out of that.

It seems to me that the original Draft Bill which they have not brought down now, covered the whole thing completely because there is no necessity to water down that. That is one of the restrictive elements which went on in 1959 and 1949. In 1939 when the Trade Union Act was passed this Island refused to pass the Clause dealing with peaceful picketing. As Your Honour knows, 25 years ago the Royal Commission came here and recommended Trade Union law with peaceful picketing and 25 years hence we are still struggling to put in an amendment which is the same as in the English Act of 1906 and it is the same as when you had all the other things in the like English legislation defining what a dispute is, what a workman is, and so forth.

A workman, as you have it in this Act, is one who must be appointed by a Trade Union. There is nothing in the English Act to say that you must be appointed by a Trade Union. You must give a man the fundamental right to tell you that "I am on strike."

The phrase which the employers opposed was "at or near a house." There is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing illogical in my going to anybody's home anyhow. As regards this idea of going "at or near a house" hon. members have forgotten that I cannot go to anybody's house now. What you can do is to stop me from trespassing. As I see it, I have found out that we must have special parliamentary courses so as to make hon. members understand when you are making reference to something for them to see that it is not something different. Do you think you can speak the same way all the time as if you are going over a record? As the law stands now there is nothing illegal of my going to anybody's home. When a dispute arose between workers and an employer, they said that the workers should not go and molest people at their homes and although it was proved by a number of cases that a strike was going on, going to people's homes was regarded as an offence and so as to put it beyond any doubt that going at or near a person's home was not an offence, they put it in the Act and said that it shall be no longer unlawful.

"At or near the house" does not mean in your house. People have a right to go on the highway. There is no special privilege in going on the highway at or near a man's house than to go on any other highway. All these Clauses are put in the English Act. A strike is on. Why is it that a workman can go to his colleague and persuade him not to go to work but you say that the workman cannot go at or near the employer's home to let other people see that he is contracting out. An employer may think of contracting out and withdrawing to his sanctuary and leaving the workers exposed to all sorts of things. You have a case of a work's lockout. An employer can repair to his home and leave workers picketing the work premises. What nonsense is that? Hon. members should bear in mind that when you are dealing with this, you are not dealing with just a dispute, you are dealing with people with whom sometimes their lives are exposed. In all of these things, there can be the unpleasant side of them but the law is there.

I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in the last session when his party was in power with the idea that a man can go up to another man's yard. I am amazed to know when you are putting the same things on the Statute Book as what is contained in the English Act, you get people saying that Barbadians who are as tolerable and law abiding as English people, are going to shoot down the whole lot of them. You get people saying that just because they are exercising certain rights. As a matter of fact, you cannot enter into people's private places anyhow. As a matter of fact, as regards where some of them actually reside, it would be pointless of your going to their homes. Why should a man's home not be picketed? It is not the man's home which you are really picketing, it is the man.

You have this ignorance about your going to a man's home. No man has the right of safety to his sanctuary after he has done something to aggrrieve people. What home are you telling me about? You do something to people and then run away to your home and they are saying that you should be protected from that. Why? The Minister who introduced this Bill said that he could not agree to a man picketing unless the person was appointed by a Trade Union. He does not understand the whole begining of the Trade Disputes Act.
5.05 p.m.

A dispute does not arise within the community because you are a member of a trade union. An employer can dismiss a servant; a man has kicked a domestic servant who was not a member of the Trade Union and that was a trade dispute. Do you mean to say that the person who has been kicked could not demonstrate that she was kicked? I have a classic example of what I am saying. A European kicked a man in Barbados and if that man had not been a member of the Trade Union what would be the difference in that man drawing public attention to this matter? Why should an employer be able to repair to his sanctuary at night at ease? Why should he be able to kick somebody in Broad Street and then be able to withdraw to his sanctuary in Christ Church? The minds of hon. members must become emancipated from these things. Since 1906 this was the law in England; this is now 1963 so that 57 years ago this law was passed in England. I want to say this: those who want to withdraw to their sanctuaries when they commit these things should not be allowed to do so easily.

Peaceful picketing does not give a man the right to go into an employer's bedroom or kitchen or even to enter upon his private property. All he can do is to go at or near the premises and that means on the highway. Peaceful picketing cannot take place on people's private property and the cases of these instances are replete. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am in agreement with the Bill but, so far as I am concerned, I have reached the stage where, if you have to pass laws in Barbados and you modify the laws as they are in England, and you have a majority of people who are willing to go along with that, that will be no heartache with me. This is the law which is on the Statute Book but, as to the draft which the Government has sent down, they did not accept what the Union was putting forward. We were willing to accept the draft and we would stress that the draft was amended to what it is now. I thought that I would withdraw my Bill if something better than that was coming down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I have to say anything more about the wording: "To attend at or near a house"; they must read the Act and understand what it means. A man drinks rum and you go at the rum shop and tell him: "Things are tight tomorrow; do not come down". That happens to be the place where you happen to meet the man which is not necessarily his place of abode. You will realise that if you have it worded as to what a trade dispute is, and in relation to peaceful picketing you have where a dispute occurs with any person, and you have it that that person must be employed by the Trade Union you will be taking away the right of exercise which the Statute law gives to a person. If you say that it must be a trade union, you are saying that you must only have a trade union where a trade dispute occurs.

LEAVE TO LAY STATEMENT *re* FEDERATION CONFERENCE

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, due to circumstances over which we still have no control unfortunately, I am wondering if I could lay a Statement now which will be the subject of debate if hon. members consider it necessary to do so. It is not considered, in view of the misleading publicity which is likely to be given in the local and overseas Press, that this matter should be left over for another week to be bandied about by irresponsible people without the true facts being disclosed. In the circumstances, I am asking leave to make an official statement relative to the Federation Conference. I regret very

much, due to the fact that I have had to get certain parts of the Statement, that I was not in a position to enter the House at the appropriate time to make this Statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members have heard what the Hon. Premier has said and, in those circumstances, he is asking leave to make a Statement. Unless there be an objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Premier. (After a pause). There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Premier to make the Statement.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the honour to lay a Statement in connection with the Federation Conference. The Statement is as follows:-

From 20th to 24th May, 1963, the Premier of Barbados and Chief Ministers of Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Kitts, St. Lucia and St. Vincent met at Government Headquarters, Bay Street, and reviewed the proposals for a Federation of the East Caribbean Territories as outlined in the White Paper Command 1746. The Ministers also considered the proposals contained in the Reports of the Fiscal Commissioner and the Civil Service Commission.

On Friday 24th May, the Regional Council of Ministers commenced its meeting with Mr. Nigel Fisher, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the Council presented to Mr. Fisher a Statement embodying the areas of agreement which by and large had been reached by the Ministers at their preliminary meeting. The Statement is attached in Appendix "A" and I intend to read that because I consider it a most important Document.

Before the conclusion of the meeting with the Regional Council of Ministers, Mr. Fisher presented a Statement setting out the reactions of the United Kingdom Government to the proposals of the Regional Council for variation of the procedure for the establishment of a Federation as recommended in the White Paper.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies last night, that is, 10th June, 1963, issued the following statement in connection with the East Caribbean Conference which it had been proposed to hold in June, 1963:-

"Following upon the break-up of the West Indies Federation and the decision to grant independence separately to Jamaica and Trinidad, a conference of the remaining Eight West Indian Colonies was held in London in June, 1962. At this Conference the representatives of these territories agreed to form a Federation. The main features of the proposed Federation were set out in the Conference Report (Command 1746). 5.15 p.m.

"Shortly afterwards there were elections in Grenada which resulted in a change of Government. The new Government decided to seek association with Trinidad in preference to joining the proposed Federation.

In December, 1962 the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Duncan Sandys, took the opportunity of his visit to the Caribbean to hold a joint meeting of the Chief Ministers of Antigua, Barbados, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Kitts, St. Lucia and St. Vincent."

If I may dilate for a moment, I would prefer to say "the Premier of Barbados and the Chief Ministers of the other territories.

"In a statement issued after this meeting the Ministers unanimously re-affirmed their conviction that Federation offered the best prospects for the economic and political progress of their peoples; and it was agreed that a conference should be convened in London in June 1963 to reach final decisions about the form of the Federation.

In preparation for this conference, M.P., Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, had discussions in Barbados with the Chief Ministers of the Seven territories on 24th to 31st May. These discussions revealed a significant divergence of opinion between the Governments concerned.

Some of the differences arose from further reflection upon the original proposals while others arose from consideration of recent expert studies of the administrative, fiscal and to reservations of three of them."

I am quoting direct from the Despatch from the Secretary of State which arrived last night; so if at any stage it does not make sense, I hold no responsibility for that.

"Since the suggestions in this statement involved radical changes in the proposals previously considered and since time would clearly be required to study them, it was agreed that the constitutional conference in London would have to be postponed until later in the year."

That is the end of the quotation and statement, Sir, except for two Appendices which are attached. I do not intend to make any comment at this stage; I am only making the statement because I do not think it is right for me to make a comment. I will have a lot to say when members have to debate the statement which has been laid. I should now like to read Appendix "A". You will remember, Sir, that I said that the Council presented to Mr. Fisher a statement embodying the areas of agreement which by and large had been reached at the Regional Council of Ministers meeting. This is the paper presented to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies by the Governments concerned.

"The Conference unanimously recommend that the Federation of the West Indies be independent from its inauguration with constitutional guarantees for the subjects set out in the Bill of Rights.

2. The Federal Government when established and the Unit Government accept the arrangement that the Unit Governments will continue to administer the departments responsible for the collection of Income Tax, the provision of Postal Services and the local Police Forces for a period of five years from the inception of the Federation at the end of which period the position will be reviewed by the Federal and Unit Governments, subject to the proviso by the Government of Antigua that any Unit Government not agreeing to transfer any of these services to the Federal Government should have the right to continue to administer such services.

3. That the Federal Government exercise legislative authority in relation to the subjects set out in the Exclusive Legislative list and concurrent legislative power with the Unit Governments over matters in the Concurrent Legislative List.

4. That the Federal Government administer the departments of Audit, Prisons, Customs, and Excise, the Police Training School and the Mobile Police Force, Overseas Commissions and Regional Services, Advisory Services, Federal Public Service Commissions and Telecommunications as limited in the Exclusive Legislative List.

5. That a Federal Judiciary as proposed in the Report prepared by the Legal Committee of the Conference be established.

6. That a Unified Service for Administrative, Technical and Professional Staff be established.

7. That the terms of the Financial Assistance to be given to the Federal Government and Unit Governments by Her Majesty's Government during the ten year period 1963-1973 be settled at the Conference to be held in June 1963 or later as the Secretary of State may decide, and should provide for open grants for administrative purposes, grants for establishing the Federation, Development Grants and Development Loans.

The Conference further recommends that the steps to the Establishment of the Independent Federation should be in the following order:

(1) Appointment of Interim Federal Public Service Commission to appoint key Federal Officers;

(2) Preparation of Constitutional instruments and organisation of Federal Departments and Services.

(3) Introduction of Independence Bill in House of Commons June-July, 1964.

(4) Appointment of Governor-General and creation of Federal Council of Ministers into a body corporate with power to legislate by Regulations made by the Governor-General on the advice of the Federal Council limited by a number of subjects, such steps as are necessary for the launching of the Federation.

(5) Federal Elections in 1965.

(6) Inauguration and appointment of Prime Minister and other Ministers on advice of the Prime Minister.

(7) Between July, 1963, and the inauguration of the Federation full internal self-Government to be given to all Unit Territories."

That was the paper, Sir, which was presented and which is referred to in the Secretary of State's Despatch released last night. I will now read, Sir, Appendix "B" which was referred to in paragraph 5 of Appendix "A", that a Federal Judiciary as proposed in the Report be established. I am sorry, Sir, but the Legal Report was taken away so that copies could be typed, and I intend to lay that with the rest of the papers which I have laid. Perhaps if hon. members would like to hear it, as soon as it is available, I will resume and read it. I should like to make it clear, Sir, that at the insistence of the Government of Barbados and the delegates to the recent Conference, the Secretary of State made the release which he made last night, because we feel the people of the Caribbean area should know and not leave it to wild speculation, the real reasons for the postponement of the conference.

5.25 p.m.

Sir, I do not intend to go into it now; and I thank the House for giving me the indulgence of interrupting the debate. Perhaps, now I am on my feet I can take over from where the hon. senior member for St. Peter left off on the Bill before us, therefore, I would be only interrupting my own speech and nobody else's.

Sir, I consider the Bill which is before the House from the point of view of labour relations and trade union developments in this country as one of the most significant laws in our history which must be regarded as a natural corollary in the development from colonialism to a state of independence. You will remember, Sir, — perhaps you may be too young then — that in 1939 we had our first Trade Union Act. That Trade Union Act only came to these territories after there had been a series of widespread disturbances. In other countries they would call them uprisings or rebellions against conditions which the people were suffering from. You will also remember in the same year the Act was introduced that the Royal Commission headed by Lord Moyne and the General Secretary of the Trade Union Congress in Great Britain, now or then Mr. Walter Citrine came to this territory and recommended that trade union legislation was necessary.

The position was, and still is, that in Great Britain the registration of a trade union is not compulsory. Starting in 1881 with the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act or perhaps going back to the Combination Act, 1799 which was on the Statute Book long before trade unions were developed, a large number of repressive bits of legislation was passed against workmen who wanted to get together in order to fight for what is now regarded as their fundamental rights. In the 1790's it was definitely illegal and in Barbados it continued to be illegal until 1949 for workmen to get together even in their own houses and hold meetings about the conditions under which they were working or to discuss better wages and conditions of employment. Far from not only being illegal to discuss those sort of things, we read where certain people in order to dilate on labour conditions that they sent some labourers away out to Antigua merely for holding a meeting to decide upon their conditions of work.

The reason why I mentioned the year 1799, it appears that the thinking of a lot of people in Barbados is just like that when we had the Combination Act of the eighteenth century. It is remarkable the statements made on the floor of the House not only from the Conservative benches but from those of labour, the people who profess to be championing the cause of the working classes. They speak of "at or near a person's place" as if it is the antithesis of democracy. You have heard all kinds of nonsense spoken about it. It shows how benighted we are that 170 years after the Combination Act you still get people and responsible organisations putting forward views which would be laughed out of Court by Her Majesty's judges and even by the right wing elements of the Tory Party in England, Scotland and Wales. You hear them putting forward theories which are even out of date in the United States after they passed the Wagner Act and the Sherman Act. Even in the United States, in some of the more enlightened states, those theories would now be regarded as industrial heresies. This is the misfortune of living in a territory where there is a terrific amount of social and intellectual snobbery and when people still publicly are proud, people whom you regard as knights of labour, people who should be in the vanguard of industrial legislation, getting up and saying that they are against your picketing "at or near a man's house," because by your doing so you are interfering with the fundamental rights of the subject.

Our approach to industrial relations on this side of the House is that we feel we can accomplish these things fortunately by the constitutional processes when in the eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries the British working people had to revert to other methods. It is a fortunate thing for this country that sandwiched between forces of reaction and the working class, you have a Government which is not backward but forward-looking. Up to 1939 a Trade Union was illegal so much so that the first recognised and organised body of working class people, Sir — and here again you may be too young to have a knowledge of it — was known as the Working Man's Association, just the same as it had to be known in Trinidad. It could not describe itself as a Trade Union; it had to be masqueraded under the banner of a Friendly Society and Co-operative Movement when in truth and in fact its aims were to improve the conditions of employment and terms under which working people of this country had to live. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, up to 1939 not only was such a combination, such a group of persons considered to be illegal but there could be no agreement by two or more persons to try to control the kind of wages which they were supposed to get after working because that in itself would be regarded as a conspiracy and restraint of trade.

5.35 p.m.

Strange enough the law by which, until today, conspiracies in the restraint of trade are still illegal, a very wide interpretation has been granted by Court decisions not necessarily in Barbados but by Court decisions written all the way back to 1899, 1906 and 1909. You have the cases of *Mogul Steamship Company versus McGregor, Gull and Alleyne versus Flood, Quinn versus Leatham, Sorrel versus Smith*. There is a whole long list of decisions in the House of Lords. Because of the expansion of trade and commerce it was discovered that the very law seemed to put negotiations on the working-class people, also inhibited the right of organized employers to do as they like. Therefore we find a lot of decisions which appear to conflict to be susceptible of explanation on the hypothesis that these magistrates just at the time decided that an unnecessary inhibition was being imposed upon expanding commerce and industry by the law restraining trade. The last decision was given in 1945 and we do not worry to go to the United Kingdom any more. There is the case of *Crofton Handwoven Harris Tweed Company versus Vietch* but between 1945 and 1961 there was a single court decision of the House of Lords in which a case went from Antigua to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the result of which is well known and is now enshrined in the Reports of leading English cases. The part which I played in that decision I would not mention at this stage. That is the very last outstanding Trade Union case, that is in 1961.

If I may go back to 1936, I think I can claim to be the first person, at the age of 16 years to hold a public lecture on the building of a Trade Union organization on the law relating to Trade Unions. The record is still there. I am not a latter-day convert to the idea of Trade Union legislation because it is something which has interested me for a long time. Therefore if I speak with a great deal of feeling of people who oppose changes it is **because I have been** in the movement of the revision of the law relating to Trade Unions for such a long time that I do not think that people should be permitted outside of this Chamber seriously to be entertained when they raise all kind of illusory objections to the amendments which we are now introducing.

What I find to be rather peculiar in one sense is that this country has been represented from 1946 until 1961, a period of 15 years, by a Government whose leadership was identical with the leadership of the Trade Union, identical not in all respects, and the only change which was ever introduced was the Act of 1949 to which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has referred. We now have provision made for contracting out of a political fund; but the Clause of peaceful picketing is not the only revolution which is being witnessed and affected here today; because the Bill is remarkable in another direction and that is that Civil Servants are now free to join Trade Unions. In my humble opinion, there was no reason why a Civil Servant should not join a trade union even with the law as it stood; but there is a large body of the Officers in the Public Service of this island — I do not refer to the Key Scale people and the Unestablished Staff who themselves feel that they should not join trade unions — but to the people in the clerical grades. I make no apology for saying this; here you have a group of people being paid out of the public purse who have been previously brought up to believe that they are dedicated to the **idea that they are some army of occupation in the country** in which they were born. That is why people think that I am unduly harsh when I speak about the attitude of people in the Public Service. You will never get a public servant come to his representative, and say 'Is there any reason why I should not join a Trade Union?' They regard themselves as some army occupation sent down here by the Colonial Office. I can truthfully say that if I had decided to make the Civil Service my career, the iron would have entered my soul as well, but I escaped from the Public Service; I am no longer in that army of occupation.

I feel that if a visitor comes to this island and he likes the climate so much and he decides to live in Barbados, then he becomes committed to this island. If a business firm is making money out of the people of this island then that business firm is committed to the people of this island. You cannot come to Barbados to live and write letters to the Press because, in that case, you should go back to your political climate and atmosphere. You have people who want to live in the community but they do not want to be committed to the community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will see that we have made certain provisions in this Bill in Clause 2. We have widened the definition of "workman" which means: "any person who has entered into or works under a contract with an employer, whether the contract be by way of manual labour, clerical work or otherwise, be expressed or implied, oral or in writing, and whether it be a contract of service or of apprenticeship or a contract personally to execute any work or labour, and includes any person who is employed in a civil capacity under the Government or is employed by a Council established under the Local Government Act, 1958, and, subject to section 44, any other person employed by or under the Crown in the same manner as if such person were employed by or under a private person."

5.45 p.m.

How anybody in the Civil Service could sit down and accept a status which they may regard as superior but from the juridical point of view must necessarily be inferior to that of the ordinary citizen is more than we can understand on this side of the House, because the moment that you give currency to the idea that a Civil Servant is some minor order of cherubim or seraphim and is not allowed to do the things that ordinary mortals are allowed to do, you are

restricting his freedom of movement, and that is something they themselves could not understand. They thought that by not being allowed to join a Trade Union that they were in a superior position. In truth and in fact, they are in an inferior position, because the man who is working on the waterfront, the man who is working building a house, the man who is working on a sugar estate or in a sugar factory, that man has a greater freedom of movement to decide over his own destiny than the man who is strutting about like a member of any army of occupation saying he is not supposed to have anything to do with Trade Unions or politics. But the same people who tell you they are nothing to do with Trade Unions and politics always want somebody to go and negotiate for higher wages for them. They are nothing to do with a Trade Union Organisation, and then sheltering behind the Report submitted by a Salaries Commissioner, they can put forward more objections and raise more points than any Trade Union division I have had the good fortune to deal with. Not only that, but when it comes to the political angle now, they have definite political affiliations, and there is not doubt about that at all, but they do not have the courage of their convictions like the Civil Servants in England who went around with me in 1945 and in 1950 after work on evenings persuading people that they should support a political Party; but they can always tell you that the Government does not know what it is doing and they are the people carrying on the work of the Government. That is the kind of conflict which we have in a backward community like this, conflicts which have not been resolved after fifteen years of Government whose identity at that time, I must stress, was the same as that of the Trade Union leadership in all respects.

This Bill, Sir, is another milestone in bringing the Trade Union within the reach not only of the Civil Service, but of the agricultural workers and domestic servants as well. Very soon we will be introducing in this Chamber legislation of far-reaching consequences in which domestics who form a labour force of between 18,000 and 23,000 in this community — the precise figures are not regularly known because they fluctuate from day to day — fishermen and other neglected sectors will come within its protection, and that is the Workmen's Compensation Act. I will not deal, Sir, with any more of the provisions in detail, but there are two clauses particularly which I want to mention. You will see, Sir, that under the old Act a Trade Union did not have the right to change its name. In this Act we are giving a Trade Union the right to change its name provided they have made provision for it in the Rules of the Trade Union, and then we have made a provision that the Registrar shall within fourteen days either register or give some indication as to his grounds of refusal to register the change of name of the Trade Union. The only reason why that Clause has been put in is this: right now under the Company's Act in Barbados, there are certain things which you cannot do. You cannot call a company "The Royal Company of So-and-So" unless it had got the Royal assent. You cannot call a Company by the name of a previously existing Company which is still in operation or by a name which is too closely associated like Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola; there was a big case on that under the Companies Act in America. You cannot call a Company by a name which is too closely similar to that of another Company, and the only reason in saying the Registrar has fourteen days to register the change of name is that the Registrar has to have time to look through the list of existing Trade Unions and decide whether this new change of name may not be in some way misleading to the general public if there was a Trade Union registered under a similar name before.

The clause which perhaps was the immediate occasion for the amendment to the Trade Union Act which we are now considering, and the only clause, as far as I can understand, over which the largest registered Union in the Island may have some reservation, is Clause 39. You will remember, Sir, that as early, I believe, as 19th December, 1961, the hon. senior member for St. Peter introduced a short amendment to the Trade Union Act which went to Select Committee, and in that amendment the hon. member sought to introduce a principle which he knew the Government was committed to amending and on which he would look for support — the idea of peaceful picketing not only of a place where a person carries on business, but peaceful picketing

of a place where a person resides or happens to be. All of this has gone under the mill already. This was debated at length in the House of Commons and House of Lords. In 1927 the Conservative Government completely emasculated the Trade Union Act of 1906 as a result of the general strike and in 1946 Mr. Ernest Bevin who was then Foreign Minister got up in the House of Commons and repealed all the amendments which Mr. Winston Churchill had introduced in 1927.

5. 55 p.m.

The Labour Party in England and the Trade Union movement had to wait 19 years. The Trade Union movement in Barbados has had to wait 15 years to see this amendment put on the Statute Book and although Mr. Ernest Bevin was Foreign Minister when the 1947 Act was on the Statute Book; at that time Clement Attlee was Prime Minister, I cannot remember whether the Minister of Labour in the United Kingdom allowed Mr. Ernest Bevin to move the amendment. At any rate. The Hon. Minister of Labour has allowed me to speak at length on something which is more to him, so we have the analogy.

Before any other member gets up, I just want to say as regards the idea of the peaceful picketing of where a man resides, it is as simple as this. You either believe in peaceful picketing, you either believe in reaction, or you believe in progress. The difference is as simple as that. It is fundamental. You might think in the twentieth century in terms of eighteenth century concepts. You cannot now think in terms of the 1799 Combination Act, when with the fear of the people, the French Revolution and all that kind of thing you had to erect walls against the masses, physical barriers as well, when the Government knew that they had to invoke laws to secure the privacy of their homes against all the unwashed, like what Conservative members of Parliament called them. However, I do not think that we are going to have that kind of society for many years to come.

Although we cannot have the breaking down of the barriers between classes in any part of the world and you still get people who want to be with certain people and not to be with certain people, yet, at the same time, you have to recognise the concepts of mobility, people being able to move around from one job to another, from one ceiling to another ceiling or from one income into another. That mobility is becoming more and more fluid and the people who were employers yesterday are the workers tomorrow and *vice versa*. Therefore you cannot erect walls around your residence saying that you are keeping out people, saying that if your servant goes on strike, you do not want her to bring her boyfriend to picket your premises.

When you say "at or near the place of residence" is an invasion of the privacy of a man, I want hon. members on the other side to consider this. A man is living in let us say James Street or Roebuck Street. We still have places where people live on top of their shops or place of business. Because that employer has chosen to live on top of his place of business, the way how the law stands, if there were a trade dispute at his place of business because he is living on top of his place of business, you cannot picket his business. There is nothing in the Trade Union Act to prevent a man living on the top of his shop or place of business. Whereas with a man who has tried to build a residence somewhere else, his business place can be picketed, but the man who is living on the top of his business place, that place cannot be picketed. A Labour Government in this Island consented to an enactment which made it impossible for workers to picket a place where a man resides but only the place where he carries on his business.

What is the point of picketing his place of business when he has shut it up at four o'clock and gone home? What is the point of picketing it when he has taken a bus or car and gone to his home and sipping a glass of whiskey or is sitting down laughing at the people who are picketing his place of business? At the time when other workers are going home, you want to let them know that something is going on. You cannot go to his home where you can shame him into coming to a settlement with his labourers because he does not want any pickets patrolling his house or because he does not want his neighbours to know he has had trade relations.

It is not only that. The other point is that by an amendment, you have brought domestic servants under the provisions of this Act, and nobody objected to that. Nearly all domestic servants by virtue of their calling and the business they do for other people, the service which they render work in private residences, so it means that domestic servants in a Trade Union do not have the right to strike, whether they be hotel maids or not. As regards domestic workers, once they are brought within the provisions, it stands to reason that you have to give them the right to demonstrate in the same way you give the right to other workers, otherwise it does not make any sense at all.

You will be surprised to know that there was a case in 1950 in a neighbouring island over the same point because they had legislation sent down from Colonial Office and they did not have "at or near the place where a person resides." There was a dispute over domestic servants and because the Union sent down about half dozen people to picket the premises of that employer, as a result of one of them having been dismissed, damages were awarded against the Trade Union. The Trade Union was represented by a former member of this House.

6.05 p.m.

The two things are not necessarily connected. (Laughter) I want to make that clear. The difficulty was due to the law rather than to the lawyer. Hon. members can readily see that if you bring domestic servants within the Bill, you cannot say that you cannot have picketing at a place where a man resides. I guess that it would be unlikely for you to see much picketing anyhow, unless the employers get a rush of blood to their heads and decide that they would use measures to bring the Labour Party back to the Government of this country. Unless that kind of madness suddenly afflicted them, I do not see that tomorrow morning or whenever the Officer administering the Government gives assent to this Bill, which he will do, that you will get people walking up and down with picket bands on their arms. Since the introduction of the Bill by Mr. Ernest Bevin in 1946 nobody has read of any cases where there has been any demonstrations on the part of the employing classes against working classes to delay peaceful picketing at residences. From 1951 until 1963 we have had a Conservative Government in England and they have not been so crazy as to interfere with the provisions of peaceful picketing at homes. They could not have been in power for all this time in England unless they had the support of the Trade Union. If only employers voted for the Conservative Government they could never get into power; they got into power in 1951 and they remained there because the Trade Unions were supporting them. The Trade Unions must have been supporting them because there were nine million who were organized in the United Kingdom; but apart from people who have not given careful study to this matter, I do not think the fears which have been expressed that this Bill can give people this licence will in any way be realized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to deal now with the objections which have been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I have almost an open mind on the objections which he has raised. His objections appear to be that the present wording of Clause 39 of this Bill does not give a person, who is not a member of a Trade Union, the right to picket. Let us get the whole position quite clear; as the law stands, from 1949 until 1963, and as it will probably stand for another two or three weeks, a person who is going to picket a another person's place has to be appointed by a Trade Union. Clause 6 of the Act, 1950, Chapter 8 says this: "It shall be lawful for one or more persons appointed by the Trade Union...." That Clause did not appear in the Act of 1947 as amended by the English legislation at all; that is what is our law now. It says:-

"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."

That is why you call it peaceful picketing. It does not give you the right to loiter or to watch or to beset because those are things which are actionable. The law of watching and besetting which we find in the Statute Law really did not advance the common law at all, nor does this Clause exempt a person from an actionable nuisance except that it does underscore the right of a person to attend at a place merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information. You would be prepared to argue that **there is nothing at all illegal about a person going and standing up or passing by somebody else's house and telling other people who are passing the road: "That man has a strike either at his home or at his workshop;"** there is nothing illegal about doing so. It has to be made clear that that is the right to do so because it goes back to the law notwithstanding what is written by Mr. Citrine and I query some of the pronouncements here. Of course, this is not the same Mr. Citrine who was the General Secretary of the Trade Union Council.

What I am saying is that the reason why you find this Section 6 of the 1949 Act as amended by the Act of 1950 Chapter 8 which is now Section 39 of our amended Act, is that the presence of more than two or three people in large numbers outside a man's residence can be interpreted as having by self-agreement or conspiracy, as they call it, to watch and beset a person's premises, especially people who are acting in concert and with a common design; but it can still be argued that there is nothing wrong with persons going to another person's place without keeping a noise for passing on information. A lot of the provisions which have been inserted in the Act and in the English Legislation as well have been put in there at the instance of the Trade Union and to guard against the unnecessary molestation by the strong arm of the law.

6.15 p.m.

When policemen nowadays see a group of people patrolling outside a business place and they realise there is some strike or some kind of trade dispute on, they do not go up as they did in the old days up to 1927 and arrest them and bundle them in a police van for obstructing the footpath and that kind of business. That is what they used to do and if they did not get them on one charge, they used to get them on another, so it is not only that you are not doing something which is illegal, but you are doing something which the law has underscored or which you have the right to do in contemplation of the furtherance of a trade dispute. The 1949 amendment in Barbados did a very peculiar thing. It said a person should be authorised by the Trade Union. The hon. senior member for St. Peter with some degree of justification, the exact amount of which I have been unable to assess accurately, asks why should the person be authorised, I am merely suggesting that a Trade Union is not normally interested in the individual or in any disgruntled worker who does not take the trouble to join a Trade Union. If you are going to bring in domestic workers and people like that, and expand the scope of the Bill to bring other **categories of workers within the provisions of the Bill**, are you going to give this right to the individual worker who has not taken the trouble to get organised, but who wants to enlist the sympathy of his fellow workers at a time when he is feeling the pinch or had some kind of row, the merits or demerits of which the people whose support he is trying to enlist or succeeds in enlisting are unable to calculate or assess. He goes into the highway and calls in whoever is not working on that day and says "let us picket this man's house; I just gave the mistress a piece of mind and she told me to go home. I want you to picket." That is one of the reasons why they say "authorised by the Union."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a Clause like this strengthens the hands of a Trade Union, because it gives the Trade Union body something which the individual cannot arrogate to himself, and therefore if a man wants the protection of Trade Union legislation, he should go and get organised. As one member put it, he should get into some kind of gear and not be in neutral. The amendment says "authorised by the Trade Union or authorised by the employer" because a lot of people do not recognise that Trade Unions are not all Workers' unions. Employers' Organisations have to register as well under the Trade Union Act as Trade Unions. This is a point not often brought out in Barbados. The Employers'

Federation has to register as a Trade Union in this country; the Sugar Producers' Association has to register as a Trade Union, otherwise they do not have the right to bargain and make collective agreements on matters of that kind; that would be illegal within the meaning of the Trade Union Act if they did not register as a Trade Union. It is true that the words "Trade Union" have become synonymous with workers, but there are more Employers' Trade Unions than Workers' Organisations registered under the Trade Union Act, therefore you could not give one side of the Trade Union the right to picket and not give the employers the right to picket too.

I understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the general strike in British Guiana was called by the Employers' Trade Union. I do not know if it is true, but from observations it might not be far from the truth, because last year you may remember, if I may dilate for one moment, the Employers' Federation called a meeting and decided that if the workers would go on strike, they would pay them strike pay. They were begging the workers to go on strike and they would pay everybody strike pay. What I am postulating is not so fantastic as a lot of people would imagine. It may be remote to our actual conditions in Barbados and unlikely to occur, but you do have circumstances where an employer may organise a strike himself. Employers organise lock-outs and therefore an employer has the right according to the law to go and tell other employers what the lock-out is about. This is not any kind of legal deduction on my part as you will appreciate. I can quote actual cases and give **illustrations of the point which I am trying to make** from our way of looking at it, there were two reasons why Government decided to re-insert the words "authorised by a Trade Union." One was, from our way of looking at things, that it was more in the interest of a Union that people should be encouraged not to be able to stand outside of the Organisation and then get all the benefits of the Trade Union Act, and secondly to discourage the idea of wild cats strikes without the Union knowing there was a strike on, with two or three men getting together fighting, and then organising a strike with picketing and everything. The Union should have some kind of control if we are going to get harmonious, industrial relations in this country. The men do not go by themselves to negotiate wages, they let the Union do that. Even the agricultural workers are not all organised, but have the benefit of every single increase organised for them by the Union. They do not negotiate their own wages; why therefore should they be given the right, one should ask — I am not necessarily saying these are my restrictions on the matter, but I am trying to give the reasons behind it — to cause major disruptions in the country when they contract out of the Organisation, but want to contract in all the protection of the Trade Union Act? That is one thing we have to ask ourselves.

The other aspect of this matter, Sir, is this: looking very closely at the English legislation, it says that it shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on the behalf of a Trade Union — I am speaking from memory, Sir — or individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute to carry on peaceful picketing. It shall be lawful for one or more persons, but the significant thing in England itself is that it is almost impossible outside of the catering industry to find workers who are not organised in a Trade Union, and in any event Trade Union registration is not compulsory in the United Kingdom, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter could probably give you more accurate figures.

6.25 p.m.

From what I can remember, some 80 per cent or more of English Trade Unions are not registered at all, so although you have the English legislation, it gives anybody the right to picket. If you have a personal dispute with your employer, you can have a one-man picket and you can picket up and down in front of his place, but while that is so in truth and in fact, when we look at the situation in the United Kingdom, nearly everybody is organised anyhow. I do not think it is easy to find a single case of a strike taking place by individuals. Although every strike cannot be authorised by a Trade Union, the people who go on strike are trade unionists and in the final analysis a Trade Union

will have to ratify it for them when they come to a show down.

In the Eastern Caribbean you find 25 per cent of the labour force organised and now that you have brought in domestic servants you have brought in not more than 17 per cent nearly each one having an individual employer.

Now, let us see what would be the position if you have the same kind of provision as that you have in the United Kingdom. I am not speaking for or against. Let us say a domestic servant has a dispute with the mistress or the person who pays the wages. The two of them give each other the length of their tongue and they come to a position where they can never be reconciled and to embarrass the mistress in front of the householders around, the domestic servant calls in her boyfriend. Is that the right of the worker which you want to safeguard or you want to safeguard a responsible worker?

It is no use to say that every single Barbadian is going to get on with an employer or every single Barbadian understands the limit to which he must go before the extension of the law is actually removed. A Trade Union Secretary or a Divisional Secretary is supposed to know these things so that when they go about talking, they can tell the people "you walk from here to there and you must not push anybody off the sidewalk and you must keep the peace and be quiet."

It is quite possible for all kinds of abuses to take place so that the Government bringing forward this revolutionary amendment, the fact that it is opposed by people, all of us agree that we should put it only in the hands of the Trade Union. We prefer it to be under the authority of organised labour than the individual whims and fancies of a person who imagines he has got a grievance. We are not giving individuals that licence. What we are doing therefore is embodying fully the amendment introduced by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who at the time apparently did not bring his mind to bear on this other particular point. He was hitting at the main track and at that time did not fully take into cognisance the idea of the deletion of the words "appointed by the Trade Union".

Perhaps I can ask a rhetorical question. If any member of the Trade Union Movement in Barbados can demonstrate one single case I will make him the promise to bring this back and delete these words. I will go further and say that if any working man who has had reason to go on strike in Barbados can bring to the attention of this Government a single case since 1939 where he, she or they have suffered some hardship by the insertion "by the authority of the Trade Union", I personally guarantee that we would immediately after having that information vindicated to our satisfaction and the satisfaction of hon. members, bring down an amendment deleting the phrase. At no time since we have had the Trade Union Act in this country has there been one single case in which somebody was locked up, persecuted, lost their job or suffered any hardship or any miscarriage of justice as a result of those words in the Act of 1939. I really cannot do anything more than that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Government sent out a Draft Bill and I said that I agreed with it so if the Government feels that way about it, they should put it in the Clause. We said we agreed with the Draft Bill, therefore, why all this talk about it?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not think the hon. member understands me fully. The Government sent out a Draft Bill. What the Government does is this and this is the normal procedure. You say that you want an amendment to the Trade Union Act, the main amendment being to bring it into line with the English amendment to make peaceful picketing at or near a place or residence the law. You ask your draughtsmen to draft it for you and he drafts it according to the English Act. When we looked at it, for the reasons which we have given, we felt it more desirable not to follow slavishly the English legislation and to draft it that way.

I can give you other very good reasons from cases which I have had to deal with inside and outside of this country. This is not England. Anybody can go and join a line of picketers and create any kind of disturbance and then you find officers of the Trade Union prosecuted for creating a disturbance by having people unauthorised picketing because all the people have to say is that I was acting on behalf of the Trade Union. He does not have to get any authorisation. There is a strike going on here. I am not a member of the Trade Union but I can say that I am a member of the Trade Union and I was acting on behalf of the Trade Union. The Trade Union has sent out its own pickets but those persons get a steel band and wait until the employer passes either in his motor-car or on foot and that band brings about 500 people outside the man's place of residence where the legal picketing is going on and they all join in a dance, create a disturbance and then the whole Trade Union Executive is hauled into court. They cannot prove that they were authorised by the Trade Union. What happens? Whereas, the Trade Union pickets may have been behaving in a perfectly legitimate manner, you can say that this was not a perfectly legitimate manner. Peaceful picketing does not give you the right to abuse people. I do not see there is any real difference between the hon. member and myself. The only contention he has is that the Draft Bill which came down to the Trade Union was drafted along conventional English lines and now this Bill which has come down to the House is slightly different. If it were something substantially changed, the whole thing would have gone back to the Union.
6.35 p.m.

We have got no time to get our legislation through and we have to apologise for our undue haste if it does create any undue hardship. I will again repeat the offer that if a single case from the point of view of a case in court or individual hardship can be proved to inure to any member of the Trade Union Movement or to any worker by the insertion of these words by the authority of the Trade Union the Government will have to withdraw this legislation. This is something which is in the interest of the Trade Union and if they can establish that this legislation is against the interest of the Trade Union Movement, I do not mind eating my words and withdrawing this Clause next week. I will do that if we can establish that some benefit will inure to the Trade Union workers if we should delay the passage of this Bill in order slavishly to imitate the conventional English law.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am wondering if the Hon. Premier had anything more to say with respect to this Statement which he has laid.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Statement will be printed and circulated. If Your Honour wants me to read over any part of it I am prepared to do so.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the House have, from 1949, been in favour of the Trade Union Bill with the exception of this matter of peaceful picketing. Our Party opposed peaceful picketing then, we opposed it when the present Government adopted it in the last House and we find no reason to change our opinion today, that is, peaceful picketing at or near a person's home. In this respect we actually offered an amendment to the Bill and we said that in order to overcome those cases where an employer's place of business is also his residence, we would introduce an amendment so as to provide for peaceful picketing at or near that employer's business, because that amendment gave the worker the right to picket at a person's business which would also be his residence.

This matter has been debated in this House on many occasions and although we stated that things have changed so tremendously today in labour relations — as a matter of fact, as the last speaker has said, the public relations existing between the employer and the employee in Barbados today hardly needs any amendment at all. In the words of an English Trade Unionist, labour relations in England have gone so far and have made such rapid strides that the weapon of the strike today is almost outmoded. If that does not

satisfy the trade unionist it is because he wants to know that he has things at his disposal or that he wishes to be armed to the teeth so that he can bring to the attention of the public the grievance of the strikers whom it is found have been dismissed wrongfully.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter in his speech was making a very strong plea for the insertion of this Clause; and in all instances he feels what whenever the worker was dismissed or had reason to go on strike, the employer was wrong.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, only a convulsed idiot would have made a statement like that. I would never be such a convulsed fool as to say that whenever an employee was dismissed the employer was wrong. I cited instances to show where a man who has been dismissed is right and where the employer would want to retire to his sanctuary and call it his home. I never said that whenever a workman is dismissed the employer is wrong and the worker is right. I repeat; only a convulsed idiot would have said that.

Mr. GODDARD: Well the hon. member is not a convulsed idiot; he says that he is not a convulsed idiot and I would not accuse him of being one. I did not say that he was one either, but he did imply that whenever a worker was dismissed, the employer retired to his sanctuary.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was making out a case to show where a man's home cannot be regarded as his private sanctuary, because whenever a dispute arises, it arises between persons and persons and not between employees and buildings. I said that you cannot regard an employer's sanctuary as a place to which he can retire at ease. The hon. member cannot say that I have said that by implication because I read from an authority.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member did not say that, I repeat, but on every occasion on which the employer was wrong, the employee was justified in striking. That was the impression which the hon. member gave when he was making out his case. I agree that the Trade Union should have some say as to whether a picket should be set up or not, but I do not agree, and I will vote against it, that picketing should take place at or near a person's home. You dismiss somebody, he refuses to leave the place and some officer of the Police Force is called in to settle a dispute between yourself and the person who has been dismissed, and all he has to say is; "I am picketing". He is doing that without a judgment from anyone as to whether the employer is right or not. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you must remember that tempers are raised at that point. We, in Barbados, have had very happy relations all along and we expect those relations to continue but we still say that the conditions obtaining in England do not satisfy us that they are always the same as those in Barbados. 6.45 p.m.

As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we agree with the entire Bill which now allows Civil Servants, Local Government employees, domestic and agricultural workers to be unionised and formed into a trade union. No one is denying them those rights, but we do say that in this Clause on peaceful picketing we would be prepared to go so far as to move an amendment that the Trade Union or workers can picket peacefully at or near a person's home, provided that home is also his place of business. The Union has argued that the particular reason for putting this in is for one worker to get at the other workers and prevent them from coming out. I am satisfied that that can be done in another way, but what we are particularly concerned about is that peaceful picketing can start very peacefully at a person's home, but that the employer is not the only person at the home. Employers are not all bachelors; some have a wife and children, and they can be very susceptible to disturbances created by pickets outside. It is not always possible for an officer of the law to be on the spot, and you may then get a curious bunch of children getting upon the wall to see what is happening. There may be a dog around and a stampede may start, and the entire household, wife, children and servant can be very disturbed

as a result of that. That is how we feel about it and we will vote against it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not believe that either Trade Union Leader or the Government will accuse us of being hypocrites in this matter, because we are not turncoats in this respect. The stand we take today is the stand we took when the Trade Union Bill came before this House. However, this Bill makes several changes, and like the last speaker I say we are supporting the Bill. To some scribes who would see people of a different political outlook supporting a Trade Union Bill, I believe the answer lies in what the Hon. Premier has just said, that although the Conservative Government amended several clauses and sections of the Trade Union Bill, when the Labour Government came back into power they put back in the sections exactly as they were, and today the Conservative Government in power in England has over the last ten years not seen fit to interfere with them. That I think should settle the idea that conservatism today is not what it was immediately after the War or the last ten years.

This Bill, however, to my way of thinking, is really a new Bill altogether because I have read it, and there are one or two things which I should like to speak on. I am not going to deal yet with the Clause on peaceful picketing because we actually agree with peaceful picketing. What we do agree with, and we made it quite clear at the time when the amendment came before the House where we stood, is that there should not be peaceful picketing at or near a person's home unless it was where the person also carried on business. At that time we offered an amendment in which we suggested that peaceful picketing should take place at a business where the man also lived, and we referred to a case where a man kept a business downstairs in Roebuck Street and resided upstairs. We will have to offer a further amendment today because this Bill brings in domestic servants. One of the first Secretaries of the Barbados Trade Union once said to me that the relationship existing between the Trade Union and employers was harmonious because they got on so well. The present leader of the Trade Union in those days was very hot and fiery, and I am not trying to flatter him by telling him that he did tell employees to give a day's work, and when he found they were wrong, he was courageous enough to tell them they were wrong. What I personally think is that we have had so many dishonest people associated with the Trade Union in Barbados that it is not funny.

There are several things in this Bill which I realise must be in the Bill because they are in the English Bill, but I do not suppose the Hon. and Learned member on the other side of the House or the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Unionist, appreciates this as much as I do from the point of view that they have not been victims of so much as I have been. There were so many dishonest people using the name of the Barbados Trade Union on a paper and libelling people Saturday after Saturday, saying the most disgusting, wicked, immoral and untruthful things. I am going to be vile because you had people associated with the judiciary and people responsible for registering them who did not do their job, and when questions were asked in the Registry in this country, you could not get a reply.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, everybody knows what happened here in the Forties when the former Prime Minister masqueraded as Editor of the Beacon, and what was said about those of us in here who could not see eye to eye with them. The fact is that the Workers' Union did not have anything to do with the Paper at that time, and that is what I was afraid of. I queried this from legal luminaries who said that in England you could not publish a newspaper. 6.55 p.m.

Hon. members on the other side of the Table who are pressing this Bill have every right to press it. The present Trade Union Secretary himself will remember the advantage which was taken because you took refuge in this section. It was not until he was courageous enough to say that this was not the organ of the Trade Union. That is the gall which was put forth to people who could not see

eye to eye. Although we have to pass it, I am still glad that I am present today because you have people who still insist in saying that if papers or periodicals are registered that they will be in truth and fact the property of the Trade Union.

I did not hear the trade unionist in this House when he spoke on this matter but I suggested to him when I was leaving the House that my party would stand firm on the track which we took many years ago and to which we converted members of the last Government into seeing our way. It was during that period when certain members voted for "at or near a person's house" and my party refused to pass it with that phrase. I myself was surprised to see the somersault which those same hon. members had taken. On that occasion, certain members of the Government voted with me.

Sir, I would like to say on behalf of my party and more especially on behalf of myself, how can I vote for this? I suppose modesty has prevented some hon. members in this House from saying the same thing. I can remember one of the very first strikes which we had on the Wharf with a load of flour. As the Hon. Premier rightly said, it was then known as the Working Man's Association. Things have gone a long way since that time. I still remember all these things which took place before I came in here and declared my hands on this side of the fence. In those days Sir Frank Holder and Mr. Erskine Ward were men whom we called Liberals and they all debated the Bill to provide for a Trade Union which was then the idea of the late Dr. O'Neale who was then the father of socialism in this country. I think that is what the Hon. Premier referred to. I myself, have lived in the United States and I realise what a Trade Union means but I take it that I always apply things to local conditions. Sir, I do not think we have much time to waste over this.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 7.00 o'clock p.m., this sitting now stands suspended for three quarters of an hour until 7.45 p.m. o'clock.

On re-assembling,

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there being no quorum, I request that the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

HOUSE RESUMES TRADE UNION BILL, 1963

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At 7.00 p.m. when the Sitting of the House was suspended, the hon. senior member for the City was addressing the Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said in my opening remarks that I did not think that there was much use my wasting any more time of the House on this matter, because as I have said, my party agrees entirely with the principle of the Bill. We are glad to see the amendment to the Trade Union Act and we can appreciate all it means and stands for. I must confess that I am glad to say that the part of the Section with which I agree is the question of granting authority to the Trade Union. This is a section which we think would give some measure of protection in a country such as this which is not fully developed.

Section 39 reads 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 of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

I can agree with that. We have discussed it and we realise what can happen here. You are taking in a new type

of worker. I am very happy that domestic servants are included in the Trade Union and I do think that somebody should carry that responsibility so that if some damage is done you will find somebody to sue. We know what can happen if somebody went on strike after a mistress and a servant giving one another the length of their tongue, because we know that you can always find some passerby who would go up and say: "Oh yes, she did so and so" and then the crowd starts to come and you find people not realising what is happening, a row tumbles down.
7.50 p.m.

That is not really peaceful picketing and, from that point of view, I agree that some organised body should be responsible in the matter. I would say, however, that the law previous to this consolidating Act only provided for persons engaged in trade to be acknowledged and it also provided for the Trade Union's right to be acknowledged. I must say something which has been brought to my notice and I think that it should be brought out here. What I think gives a bad impression in Barbados today is the fact that there is the type of person who is doing business in the City who, instead of paying what other persons in business are compelled to pay, is hiring people and paying them much less. I could not resist the temptation to refer to this matter because only today such a matter was brought to my attention and I had to contact the Labour Department in connection with it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I represent all sorts of people in here but there are some people who, I am sorry to say, are not carrying out the directions as to paying this minimum wage and other people are getting blamed for that. I think that that matter should be gone into very thoroughly. When it comes to Section 39 of this Bill, we on this side of the House, will have to offer an amendment whether that amendment is carried or not, for the purpose of the record. As regards the first amendment, we have already made objections as regards picketing of any kind at a person's home; that would not be peaceful picketing and it did not come within the ambit of domestic servants. Our amendment therefore will not only deal with the business but with the person. We will have to offer a further amendment to cover not only where the business is carried on but the place where a person is employed.

It is not a question of thinking only of the employers. I have always thought, and I do not think I take second place to anybody in this matter, that I understand the mentality of people in Barbados. People have taken it upon themselves in some instances to carry on what are referred to as "wild cat" strikes. I have always thought what would be the fate of a person who went on a "wild cat" strike and went up some long avenue and decided to picket at a man's home; because the next thing you might hear is that a shot is fired, nobody knows who has fired the shot or who has been shot and there you provide a lawyer's paradise. Nobody knows who is guilty of firing the shot and you might find that a woman is left with her children. I am quite sure that hon. members will appreciate that a man's business might be located in one part of a big country or in the City and the owner or the directors of that business firm might live far away from that business premises. And even if they did live near to the premises, they would be living probably in an apartment where they can be reached only by means of an elevator. In that case, if you were to picket those premises, nobody would know in connection with whom the picketing is going on. In a big country like the United States of America, you may be picketing at "Shearns" or "Macey's" in the City but the director of either of those business places may live in another part of New York. The same thing applies to London. When we come to Barbados, let us say that the workers at the Rum Refinery or at Haggatts or at Bulkeley went on strike and you have directors of each of those businesses living in another part of the island. We know what the situation is here in Barbados. This Section 39 says this:-

"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....."

We might accept the interpretation given by the lawyers but for the workers who are going on with the placards, it is one thing for people to go around business places and it is another thing for them to go around other people's homes. You want to break the morale and people will become nervous. People may be sent to a place which is in the dark; dogs may be in the place and they may be let loose; you can never tell what may happen. Suppose you had a strike at the "Advocate" or at the "News"; I can see people walking up and down. I am always in sympathy with the workers and I can see them picketing all day long at the place of business of the "Advocate" or the "News" in case there was a strike at either of these business places.

This Section says: "It shall be lawful for one or more persons," and so on, "to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be..." I do not know what the Premier's interpretation would be as to where a person resides. A person may decide that he will go to the Crane or to the Sandy Lane Hotel and I would like to ask: "Are you going to picket there?" Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I need say anything more on this matter at this stage; it is of no use my wasting any more time on this matter. 8.00 p.m.

I do not think we should waste any more time, because you know how we are going to divide on this matter. As far as I am concerned, we have not changed our minds, otherwise we wholeheartedly support the Government and the Trade Union, because even the most die-hard Conservatives in England have made this decision. I was reading a few nights ago where four out of every ten Trade Unionists voted Conservative in England. I of all people should know after nearly eighteen years here and being a member for Bridgetown where you have the Trade Union predominating, that Trade Unionists had to vote for me, otherwise I could not be here. How could I therefore oppose the Trade Union? What I am opposing, however, is the particular section in the Trade Union Bill which I think would be detrimental to the workers and not really and truly in their interest.

I therefore have much pleasure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in supporting the Bill, and when we go into Committee, I shall be offering an amendment.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to take umbrage to the last speaker and his colleague, because they were very irrational in their statements about wives and children. The object of this Bill, Sir, is to make it felt most where it should be felt. For instance, let us assume that an argument occurred in cane-piece, since the hon. members said that they agree with this provided workers are allowed to picket at the place of work or if the man was living on the premises where the business was carried on. If the Manager went to his house and was sitting down drinking, would people not look absolutely foolish picketing the cane-piece?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order,....

Mr. BOXILL: What point of order are you rising on now?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must hear the point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member talked about an argument in a cane-piece, but a cane-piece can only belong to a plantation. The owner of the Belle Plantation is the Earl of Harewood who lives in London, and if an argument takes place in his cane-piece, how is the dispute going to be settled?

Mr. BOXILL: Let us assume, Sir, that this man was keeping business at the place where he was living and an argument ensued. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Not an argument, a dispute.) A dispute is an argument.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must tell hon. members that everything must be directed to and through the Chair.

Mr. BOXILL: If a dispute arose, Sir, and the man decided not to settle this dispute, then the Union or whoever is involved decides to picket this man's premises. One of the main reasons for picketing is to persuade people not to go to work for this man; it is not to terrorise people, but what is to stop that man from leaving his place and going down to Bathsheba? You would then have to stand up near the man's place like an idiot. You are to go where this man is so that the people living in that area where the man is living will know that the man is not all the gentleman he is purporting to be. A man can be a gentleman at home, but when he gets to the place of work, he can be a devil. It is all right for a fellow to dress decently and have a nice car, but he could be giving the workers a fit. You want to bring home something to this man; but he can leave this place which the hon. junior member for Christ Church says he agrees you should be able to picket, but not at the man's residence. I do not agree with that. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown said suppose this man lives down a long gap and these pickets went down there and somebody got shot. It would serve him right because the law does not say you are to trespass on the man's land. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What does it say?) You had better read it again. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that you are not to become a peeping-tom at a man's place.

The object of this peaceful picketing is to bring home to the man and the residents in that area in which this man is living the unfair practices that he has been carrying on. When you talk about a man having a wife and children who might be terrorised, are you trying to tell me that the wives and children of people in Barbados are so much different from the wives and children of people in England, Australia, New Zealand and the United States? Why are they not terrorized? As was pointed out before in the case of the Advocate strike, the Advocate was allowed to send cars for workers or would-be workers to bring them to the place of work and take them back home so that they could not be intimidated by the people who were on strike; but it did not give the Union or the other members who went on strike an opportunity to persuade those people from going to work. It would have meant that they were breaking the law and as a result could have been charged.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not entertain exchanges across the Table.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all due respect to you, Sir, I would like to adhere to what you have said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not you would like, you must.

Mr. BOXILL: But you cannot avoid cross talk; you get it all over the world. I do not mean to be disrespectful, but I would be a moron to stand up here and talk and play deaf to those epithets. However, I think I have made myself clear to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. This thing goes on in England and I have not heard of any wives or children being terrorized. It goes on in the United States and in every country where you have peaceful picketing, and I do not agree with these two gentlemen that for the sake of the wives and children of employers, we should put in the amendment which they would like us to do.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We have never said that for the sake of wives and children you should have this amendment.

Mr. BOXILL: The hon. member did not say that directly, but he implied it, and you know what an implication can mean. With those few remarks, Sir, I thank you.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not criticising this Bill, but there are a few things in it that I should like to speak on. 8.10 p.m.

Inasmuch as I am one strong supporter of tradesmen, I objected through the length and breadth of my constituency and encouraged everybody who came to me.

I cannot agree or can never agree to peaceful picketing "at or near a home". I think if a dispute arises between an employer and a worker at the place of business and the residence happens to be coupled with the business place, well then, I would say to picket that place morning, noon and night. But I do not agree with workers picketing private people's homes, especially when they are not trained picketers.

I have sat and listened through all the debate and not one hon. member has said that a trained man should picket at private people's homes. In Barbados where there is a lot of unemployment, you only have to go anywhere and hold your hands up and you get a crowd. Such a happening can push this thing far beyond the letter of the law, therefore, I cannot agree with this amendment. Only a couple days ago, in a certain district a dispute arose between a certain girl and a man and in precisely five minutes her boyfriend was there with a knife and a stick. Ten to one it would be murder.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think I would take this opportunity to reply to some of the things which the Hon. Premier said on this matter and in reply to which I would say that he was more in defence of the Clause than he was thinking in his own legal mind.

When you look at Clause 2, how is the Hon. Premier going to be reconciled on those matters. You have a definition for "employer" and it says a person who has entered into a contract to employ a workman. The Hon. Premier said something of "knights of labour". I do not know what he means by that phrase but I would be benighted enough to say that the Hon. Premier is a lawyer and lawyers argue a point to suit themselves. You have a definition Clause saying that a person should have the right and the liberty of a person and then in a subsidiary clause you reduce a person to a trade union. In so far as the Trade Dispute Act is concerned, it can only be a dispute between a Trade Union and an employer for the persons employed.

There was a labour case in the West Indies versus the Cement Company in Trinidad, and it went to the Privy Council which ruled, when the Government instituted a Board of Enquiry, that it was wrong, that it was not a dispute because nothing went wrong between the Trade Union. That is a celebrated case. Go and look at that ruling.

When you come and say a person, what do you mean? Do you mean to say that a man cannot contract out because he owns a store in town? There is no contract between Goddard & Sons and the people who work in it. An employer is the person having a contract with another person, that is the workman. A trade dispute is not between an employer's organisation. I was amazed to hear the Hon. Premier saying that you do not have to follow slavishly the English Act. You have to follow it. Who trained Englishmen 56 years ago? Do you think there were people in countries 56 years ago with our concept of trade unionism today? Therefore, the affiliation and the emancipation of the mind of the Barbadians today, 56 years after are such that it would have to be more in line with the English Act than behind it. There is no logic in saying that a person means a different thing and therefore you have to allow for a person in Barbados.

A trade dispute means any dispute between employers and workers. The Hon. Premier said that he does not always agree with Mr. Norman Citrine. I do not believe there is any man in the world who has not had his judgement upset. Did not Sir John Simon the great English jurist make a mistake? And did not Sir Stafford Cripps disagree with him? Both were brilliant men and both differed on the General Strike in 1926. If there are any better books written on trade unionism and trade disputes than those written by Citrine, I am still to read them. There are no better books than those written by Citrine and the last volume he wrote was regarded by people knowledgeable as the best. Sir William Jowell said that it was an excellent document on Trade Union law and he is a solicitor. Some barristers suffer from an overdose of pride and it is not surprising that some solicitors in a particular field of practice know more law than barristers. How many practising barristers in Barbados can sit down and write a document like that written by Mr. Norman Citrine? Some pride themselves in doing this and that but it is people like Citrine who produced something. You do not produce a document like this by Citrine by just reading enactments. Sir Norman Citrine explained that because you have the plural, it does not mean that a trade dispute does not take place between one man and his employer.
7.50 p.m.

Do you think that one man is going out with a banner? In another context Garvey did not start with a large crowd; he must have started by himself and people like that went on the streets. I am not glossing around this matter because I do not have any interest to protect. This does not deprive the Union of anything; it means that the Union will be in and others will also be in. This Clause goes on to say this: "trade dispute" means any dispute between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment, or the terms of the employment, or with the conditions of labour, of any person;

Therefore you can have a dispute in Barbados today so that the Minister and the Governor could institute an enquiry which is based on such a dispute and which is nothing to do with the Trade Union. Let us take a classic example. You have some organization in England where there is no Trade Union existing for instance, and they have to have an enquiry. You bring in some pioneer legislation allowing somebody to sell hollyhocks or something like that and a dispute comes along. You are passing a Clause which says that "workmen" means any person who has entered into or worked under a contract with an employer....." A workman is a person and an employer is also a person. You are saying that "workmen" means this, "employer" means this and "trade dispute" means this. All I am saying is that you must be logical. You pass a definition Clause which says that a workman means any person, etc., and when you come later on in the Bill you deprive any person from doing this thing. I say that that is illogical.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am taking the point which has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. In the Interpretation Clause you say what a trade dispute is: - "Any dispute between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment, or the terms of the employment, or with the conditions of labour of any person." The reason why you say that is that very often a Trade Union calls a strike because a person who is not a member of the Union is employed in a factory or business undertaking. There are two different Clauses here and they are not on all fours. You have to say that a trade dispute can relate to the non-employment as well of any person; so that a trade dispute can arise because you have refused to allow a person who is not a member of the trade union to go in there and work. Very often that is what most lock-outs are about. I think you have to distinguish between the interpretation of what is a trade dispute and the right of a person to picket. I know of no occasion on which an individual person who is not even interested in paying the Union subscription is so gifted with organization that he will organize a picket line when he cannot pay the union subsidy. I do not think that picketing would take place where the Union would not be involved.

I must draw this to the attention of the hon. member. The definition of a trade dispute in the Interpretation Clause, which is Clause 2 of this Bill, is deliberately worded like that so as to take care of a situation in which you have the strike or lock-out of a person who has not been employed before and the Union says to him "This is a closed shop; we do not want anybody who is not a member of the Trade Union here." All of these clauses are slanted in favour of the Trade Union, not in favour of the Government. We are now legalising Civil Servants as members of the Trade Union. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is worthwhile extending the debate on this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Government is not original in this matter; this is on the Statute Book now. What I am pointing out is that this is the law in Barbados today and what we have before us now is a consolidation of the law. The point I am making is this; you cannot regard this as strengthening the Union; it strengthens anybody's hands. You have a dispute between the Trade Union and somebody else and when it comes to picketing you cannot picket at all unless there is a trade dispute or there is the contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute. For instance, you cannot go home and dream anything in connection with a trade dispute; this is not the song which we have here; "Too late, too late Cocky; too late to contemplate." This is nothing that you can contemplate, that you are going to Trinidad or that you are going to strike. You cannot tell a man that we are picketing out here because we contemplate that something is going to happen next week; the fact is to be existing; it has to be existing that something is in the making that you can prove. We have the provision in our Trade Union Act whereas in England it is in the Trade Disputes Act. I am only drawing to the attention of the Committee that where we have this provision we make it applicable to any person and when we come to the operative Clause we have something else. I do not think that for half a century all the jurists both in the Labour Party and in the Conservative Party would not have got down to the idea that it was wrong to continue with this Act. Sidney and Beatrice Webb never contemplated that this would give rise to these things.
8.30 p.m.

Moreover in England the Trade Union was in existence when this came along, and they fought for it as distinct from what we are getting as model legislation, and we are more in a position to put this in, and that is why I said when we pass this.....

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 8.30 p.m., and the moment of interruption. I am to enquire if the matter now under discussion is controversial.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I have to move an amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that means the matter is controversial. Is there any other Order under Government Business that is non-controversial?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

THE CASUAL EMPLOYEES PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1963

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill which we have before us now is a very short one. I think the implications of the Bill must be clear to hon. members, as they will see from the Objects and Reasons that provision should be included in the 1961 Pensions Act whereby a casual employee would be permitted to exercise an option to enable him to receive a gratuity and reduced pension in

lieu of a full pension provided by the Act. It also provides that such provision should be effective from the date that the Act came into operation, that is from 1961. I think I made some reference to this at the last meeting of the House, and therefore it is unnecessary for me to dilate on it to any further extent.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the last occasion when we dealt with pensions, I drew to the attention of the Government that some time ago a man retired, and up to today it is about two years that this man has retired. When we pass legislation like this which deals with the Casual Employees Pensions Act, there seems to be little solace to the recipients of this kind of legislation we are passing, if people have to wait as long as two years. I mentioned the man's name at the time, and subsequently another man came to me. It seems to me to be grossly unfair to call upon someone to retire from the Government Service when it is compulsory for them to retire, and then he has to wait two years to get what the Pension Act provides for him. My view is that you should either have his pension and gratuity ready prior to the time of retirement, or allow him to continue working on a non-pensionable basis until such time as you can get the records, because people in this category cannot afford non-employment for these long periods, and I feel that the administration should be set in gear. I have been told that you have been searching records at the Drill Hall to find these things, but you must evolve a system where the administration can take two or three years as the period of service and then let somebody swear to an affidavit that the man joined the Service at a certain point so that you can arrive at a payment. If you cannot find the records, and take a longer period to find them than the period during which the man has worked, you will find you are looking for another pensionable period before he gets it. The man working as a mason or carpenter in the Public Service is going to get a pension that is nothing to write home about, and if you are going to give a pension and gratuity, let the poor old souls get them instead of waiting two years. Two years is a long time, and you should either allow them to continue working until you have the records straight or make some arrangement to help them; but it is very grievous.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can support the hon. member on this, because many persons have been to me from time to time from the Waterworks Department and the Public Works Department. No records can be found for those who have retired after being employed for years and years, and they have to wait two and three years before they can get any satisfaction. I can call the name of a fellow who is almost blind; he was able to work, but because of his eye-sight was not given employment, and although they knew he worked in various Departments he could not get his pension.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support the Bill because of the gratuity which would be involved and because it gives them a lumpsum to start something with. There is another case in Christ Church where I think it is a matter of broken service, but hon. members will remember that under the old vestry system, when there was a change of Government, there was also a change of employment, and people would go out and come back in. Those were days long before my time, but I am speaking for those employees in these days who have had broken service. There is one person now, old Beckles who was Inspector of Highways in that parish. He has been to me on many occasions to try and get them to consolidate his service. There is nothing I can do and I agree that an affidavit should be certified, and that Government should look into the matter of rectifying these injustices. In other words, they would be rectifying injustices of the past. There are not many of these people, but there are old and poor and deserve a pension in relation to the work they performed in the parish in their days.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: It must be borne in mind that not only..

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My eyes caught the hon. senior member for the City first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It must be borne in mind when you are dealing with human beings that it does not necessarily mean party politics. I have never been able to forgive those who thought that they were spiting me when I brought up in this House a case of a woman who had given 28 years of service at Codrington Experimental Station and carried proof and showed persons who had worked there alongside her and who had worked after the age of retirement; in my plea that she be granted something, the only answer which I got in this House was to the effect that they could not find the day or the year she was employed. As a matter of fact, I remember quite well that I was considered rude because this old lady came to me, she was told by officials in that department that she had no right going to any politician. I believe everybody has the right of going to any politician.

Unfortunately, this woman died in an almshouse cot. If you have people in your service and you know that they are retiring at 65 years, it is very simple, you must have records kept of their service; compute their pension so that instead of their having to wait two years, they can get it immediately as they retire. You say that you have got to make it up and all sorts of things. That red tape can stretch from here to London and back. Those responsible for these people in this department can work it out beforehand so that these old people, carpenters and masons, can receive their pensions and gratuities early. It is better than waiting until they die. In some cases, these old people do not know that their estate would be entitled to it. I know of some cases where the people actually died and did not receive theirs. I agree with the hon. member entirely.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I got up to disagree with the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. senior member for the City but now I could not be more in agreement with them. What I want to bring to the Government's attention is not a unique case but what I would call an ironical one. There is a man by the name of Egbert Austin who worked in the Transport Department from 1934 to 1961. As a result, he is home with a stroke and there is no need my going to the Ministerial Buildings any more because I have been going there so often that it looks as if I am working there. I want to bring to the Government's attention that if this thing continues to be delayed, this man would die before he receives it because he is in a derelict state and the fact is that he needs this thing.

I am asking the Government, therefore, to use its good graces and go into this thing and see to it that Egbert Austin gets what really should come to him. I would like him to die in comfort and I would like him to know that he has somebody who is seeking out matters for him.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to gang up with the other hon. members who have spoken relative to these pensions. I know of two people in St. Joseph who have resigned long enough that they could have gone back to work a second time and yet up to now, nothing has been done for them. I believe the people in the Government Departments are waiting until these two persons die because no one can convince me that after some persons have resigned for so many years that you could not have given them by now the little berry which is due them by this Government.

There are two persons who were working with the Highways and Transport Department who were told this week that they cannot work any longer as from next Saturday, because their time is up. They knock the people off without giving them any notice, or telling them one word before. These persons have gone home with the little mite they worked for that week and every day they are walking and asking when they are going to get a pension. It is not fair to them. Something is wrong and I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister in charge would see to it and get behind those people who have something to do with it. I sometimes hear you say that you cannot find papers and so on.

You have put down somewhere some record of these people, therefore, you are bound to find some record of them. You just keep them on fair promises.

There is a man who retired from the Public Works Department for the last three years and he cannot get his pension yet. There is something wrong and it is not fair to these people who are retired. I do not hear any such thing happening with those people who were employed in the Civil Establishment. I have not heard one retired Civil Servant who has said that he or she did not get his or her pension immediately after he or she retired. As a matter of fact, I believe it is computed even before they go out of office. Why cannot it be done to these people in the non-established posts? I can only say that it is because they are poor. It is not fair.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I have been hearing all of this, and if you look at Clause 2, Subsection (2) you will see that it reads as follows:-

"(2) The option referred to in subsection (1) of this section shall be exercisable not later than the day immediately preceding the date of such employee's retirement; but if the employee does not exercise the option before such day, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may, if it appears to him in all the circumstances equitable so to do, allow him to exercise the option at any time between the date of his retirement and the actual date of award of pension under this Act."

Now, this Section gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee as distinct from anybody the right to do certain things. With the comments which I have heard today I think it would not be out of place to know now that we are passing this, what are the Government's views on what we have said. I take it that we have not concocted any stories. What can the Government hold out to these people now? Are you going to still have them subjected to this administrative bamboozling without the Executive Committee deciding and reaching some positive decision in a situation like this? It must have been drawn to your attention before. Let us have some assurance and say what you intend to do.
8. 50 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer the hon. junior member for St. Joseph first, I have been doing some quick mental arithmetic. If he says that he knows of a case in which somebody has been waiting for three years to receive his benefit, then the responsibility for that must be equally divided between his Government and this Government. I have never heard him mention it before and that must be attributed to the practice masqueraded by the Government to which he has had the honour to belong. We take no responsibility for this whatsoever; what has happened is that no one has been able to keep any accurate record of casual employees because nobody seriously considered — nobody connected with the last Government seriously considered — that these people were entitled to any kind of consideration. The very people who are concerned with these employees are casual employees themselves. Mr. Chairman, to be quite honest, those who are entrusted with the payment of these people are selected or used to be selected in a most casual manner and they were employed

to be dismissed or taken on in a very casual manner. Primarily, no accurate records or no records at all had been kept and that must be a situation of which hon. members are well aware. We have found instituted a system by which the people with whom they were associated were sworn or they merely swore to an affidavit to the effect that such and such a person was employed for such and such a time and then these people are paid on that account.

The hon. member says that some people have died without having received their pension. I should like to say that yesterday I gave approval for the payment of \$800 to the estate of a man who died and who had only retired a short time ago. You do not have to go to the Courts in order to get this money either. That is a situation which we have inherited. We have to clean up the Augean stables which have been left behind by the people with whom the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been associated. That saps the vitality not only of the Civil Servants but of the Ministers as well; it prevents us from going ahead as quickly as we would like to go ahead but we find ourselves bottle-necked. It is surprising, Mr. Chairman, how many simplifications of procedure are being made and steps are being made at organisation and method in different departments. You have the Works Departments themselves being, to a large extent, streamlined since this Government has come into office, and the number of cases where people have to wait for a little time is diminishing from day to day.

I should like to say that most of these cases which are still outstanding are due to the fact that it is difficult for the Personnel and Establishment Department to get satisfactory proof of the length of service of these persons; that is all that is holding up these matters. It is largely due to the fact that the persons themselves cannot establish the length of their period of service. You may find that a person had a donkey-cart working in the road and then he went to the United States of America and that sort of thing; but the Government is doing everything in order to get these matters straightened out.

Mr. WALCOTT: I agree with the hon. member; when you find these political givings they begin to boomerang. I think that on one occasion they passed a Bill in which a casual employee was asked to put in 250 days so as to be entitled to this provision. That is the sort of thing which you give a man who was permanently employed. You will ask a man to give an average of four days a week which he cannot do for ten years. This legislation was passed hurriedly when we were coming to the end of the Session and it has given administrative difficulties because you held out a bait to people. You say: "Those who were working in the Government Service can now get pensions". It may be found

that they have spent more hours on the money involved than the amount of money which they are paying out.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Premier, I should like to say this: It is quite true that this was something to do with the last Government. I did not know anything about it until the hon. senior member for St. Peter mentioned something about a particular case in his constituency. It was after that time that these men came to me and put forward their case. They did not tell me about it before, because, when the hon. senior member for St. Peter brought forward his case, I would have brought forward my own case too. These people thought that they would have to wait until they received the money so that they did not ask any question before. Anyhow, Sir, from now on you will find that all of these people will be going to their representatives about this matter when they read this thing in the newspaper tomorrow. I am saying that this is something which is wrong.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the consideration of that Bill brings Government Business for the day to a close.

ADJOURNMENT

At this stage, it now being 9.00 p.m., of the clock,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 9.00 p.m., of the clock, this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday next, 18th June, 1963 at 12.00 o'clock Noon.

This House now stands adjourned.
9.00 p.m.