

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th November, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour F. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; 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*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the last meeting have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and in the absence of any objection, they will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are confirmed.

I have the honour to inform the House that His Honour the Speaker is engaged as Defence Council at the Assize Courts, and circumstances are that he cannot reasonably be here today.

PAPERS LAID

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

"Annual Report of the Barbados Fire Service for the year 1962".

"Statistical Service - Abstract of Statistics No. 3 1960".

Quarterly Digest of Statistics No. 26 June 1963".

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement *re* the appointment of members of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. The Statement reads as follows:-

Statement made by the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing regarding the appointment of members of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

"In pursuance of the provisions of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation Act, 1963, the Governor-in-

Executive Committee has been pleased to appoint the following persons to be members of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for a period of three (3) years with effect from 16th November, 1963:-

Mr. R. C. Springer, M.A. (Chairman)
Mr. E. L. Cozier (Deputy Chairman)
Mr. Jack Teller
Mr. I. C. McC. St. Hill, B.A., B.L.S.
Mrs. Muriel Sealy, B.A.
Mr. Clifton White
Colonel David Stirling, D.S.O., O.B.E.
Mr. A. H. Begg
The Permanent Secretary, Minister of Education.

The Chairman, Mr. R. C. Springer, who recently retired from the post of Government Statistician, attended Harrison College and was Barbados Scholar in 1929. He went on to Jesus College, Oxford, where he took first class honours in Mathematics. He was for several years a teacher - Assistant Master at Harrison College and Queen's Royal College in Trinidad and Headmaster of the Coleridge-Parry School.

The Deputy Chairman, Mr. E. L. Cozier, was educated at the Boys' Foundation School, Lodge School and Harrison College. He has had a long career in Journalism. He has held the posts of Editor of "Barbados Advocate" and Information Officer with the Caribbean Commission. He is now Editor of the "Daily News".

Mr. Jack Teller has been resident in Barbados for the past twelve (12) years. He is an experience broadcaster.

Mr. I. C. McC. St. Hill, Public Librarian since 1959, was educated at Combermere School and was a teacher for about twenty (20) years at that school. He holds the degree of Bachelor of Arts from London University and the degree of Bachelor of Library Science from Toronto.

Mrs. Muriel Sealy who is now Senior Tutor at Erdiston Teachers' Training College was educated at Queen's College and the Universities of Oxford and London where she was awarded a B.A. degree, the Teachers' Diploma and a Diploma in Education. She taught at St. Michael's Girls' School and Queen's College before being appointed Woman Tutor at Erdiston College when that College was opened in 1948.

Mr. Clifton White is an accountant and a member of the Bridgetown City Council. He was educated at Combermere School and is now a member of its Governing Body as well as President of its old Boys' Association.

Colonel David Stirling, Chairman of Television International Enterprises, served in the Commando Brigade of the Scots Guards in World War II. Between 1947 and 1959 he lived in Rhodesia, South Africa and Kenya. He is President of the Capricorn African Society, an organisation whose aim is to promote racial harmony in Africa.

Mr. A. H. Begg is Chief Executive of Overseas Operations of Thomson Television International Limited.

The other member of the Corporation is the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education (ex officio). The present holder of the post is Mr. Alfred Forde, who is an old Harrisonian. He taught at Bishop's High School in Tobago and Grenada Boys' Secondary School and entered the local Civil Service in 1957. He is a B.A. of London University and one of the editors of the magazine "Bim".

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are no Government Notices except Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 67 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 137 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve the Statement made by the Honourable Premier on the 5th November, 1963, relating to the additional profits accruing to the Sugar Industry in respect of the 1963 sugar crop, 12.25 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have informed the members of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition that it is my intention to deal with this Resolution today, and I am asking that the Standing Orders relating to Private Members Business and General Business be suspended in order that we would have the opportunity to deal with this matter. The Resolution is nothing new in itself because of the Statement which the Hon. Premier has made and which has been in hon. members' hands for the last two weeks; this Resolution is only now approving of that Statement in order to have a debate on it. This Resolution is not in itself the introduction of something which the House is not aware of; so I am asking at a later stage to deal with this matter as Order No. 1 under Private Members Business.

QUESTION

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government explore the possibility of placing a Mobile Clinic at the disposal of the people living in the rural areas?

2. Will the Minister immediately set about negotiating for the said Mobile Clinic with a view to putting same in operation as from the coming crop season?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

NOS. 5, 14, 16 & 18

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the Suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 & 18, for the remainder of the Day.

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

Mr. SMITH: I am objecting to that. You will be taking away the time of Private Members doing Private Members' Business. Am I right?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As far as I understand, this is purely for the House to decide.

The question that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 & 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BATSON, Hon'bles. W. A. CRAWFORD, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, J. C. TUDOR, Messrs. WEEKES, LOWE, YEARWOOD, WALCOTT. - 9.

NOES: Messrs. COWARD, HOLDER, SMITH, and SEALEY - 4.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the First Order of the Day.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that Order No. 4 be the First Order of the Day.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg your pardon, I should have said Order No. 6.

I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the First Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the lease by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of a parcel of land in the Port Area, Bridgetown, containing by admeasurement 38,295 square feet to the Barbados Fancy Molasses Company Limited.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to lease to the Barbados Fancy Molasses Company 38,295 square feet of land situated in the Port Area. This area of land is for the erection of a molasses tank so as to export molasses from the Deep Water Harbour rather than from tanks which were situated along the inner basin of the Careenage. 12.35 p.m.

It is proposed to lease this land of approximately 38,295 square feet at a peppercorn rental of \$5.00 per annum for a period of 99 years with either party having the right to terminate the lease by giving 25 years' notice of his intention to do so. This lease is similar to the lease which was granted to the Bulk Sugar Installation; they also have a lease for 99 years with a period of 25 years' notice on either side of its intention to terminate the lease. Mr. Deputy Speaker, although it is a very small amount of money, namely \$5.00 per annum, it must be borne in mind that the amount of money in revenue paid into the Port over the last five years for molasses would have been in the vicinity of \$47,376.

A rate is collected on molasses of \$4.00 per ton just as it is collected from the Bulk Sugar Installation, and molasses is calculated at the rate of 290 wine gallons to be the equivalent of one ton of sugar. In the year 1962, the amount of 3,021,879 wine gallons of molasses or 10,420 tons of sugar were shipped from the Harbour; in 1963 the amount of 3,796,285 wine gallons of molasses equivalent to 12,745.8 tons of sugar were shipped from the Harbour. And, as I have already said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the average over the years from 1958 until 1962 would have been in the vicinity of \$47,376. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE BETTERMENT CHARGE (EAST COAST ROAD, BELLEPLAINE TO BATHSHEBA) ORDER, 1963"

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3, standing in the name of the Hon. Premier, be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

The question that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled 'The Betterment Charge (East Coast Road, Belleplaine to Bathsheba) Order, 1963'.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the Order entitled 'The Betterment Charge (East Coast Road, Belleplaine to Bathsheba) Order, 1963', made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on 5th October, 1963, under the provisions of Section 12 of the Land Development Duty Act, 1962. The Land Development Duty Act was passed in this House quite recently, and under its provisions the Government has the power to declare any area as a special development area. According to the Addendum to this Resolution, on the 23rd April, 1963, in the House of Assembly, the Government announced its intention to commence construction of the portion of the East Coast Road running from Belleplaine, St. Andrew, to Bathsheba; the construction has since begun. As stated in the Development Programme 1962-65, the cost of construction of the entire road is estimated at \$2,500,000 and it is proposed that in view of the substantial expenditure from public funds, the area of land influenced by this road should be declared to be a special Development Area for the purpose of the Land Development Duty Act, 1962.

In view of the present inaccessibility of the land, it is considered that any increase in the value of the land as a result of construction of the road would be due almost wholly to the Government expenditure on the road, and it is considered fair and reasonable that the Development Duty and Betterment Charge in the case of the proposed development area should be 50%.

Accordingly, on October 5th, 1963 an Order was made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 12 of the Land Development Duty Act, 1962, determining the rate of Betterment Charge, and in accordance with the provisions of sections 12 (3) of the Land Development Duty Act, 1962, this Resolution seeks the Legislature's approval of the Order.

The position, Sir, is that, as hon. members are aware, this question of the construction of the East Coast Road was under consideration for some time; it was under consideration for over 20 years. Naturally, Sir, the construction of the road will appreciate the value of the land through which it passes. Since the Government is undertaking the relatively high cost of the construction of this road, it is felt that the Land Development Duty Act should be effective in so far as this area is concerned. The Land Development Duty Act provides for the making of Orders; it provides for the declaration of any area as a special development area; it provides for the determination of percentage not exceeding 6% charged for capital gains duty in any special development, and it provides for a determination of the percentage not exceeding a 50% charge for any special development area. It also provides, of course, for the specification of the base date which shall not be more than one year before publication in the *Official Gazette*.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think hon. members will readily concede that the Government is undertaking the expenses of this land. In other words, the Public Treasury is being called upon to pay the expenditure for the construction of this road and, therefore, there is no reason why the Government should not also share in the value of the land which will accrue to the owner or owners in consequence of the

construction of the road. The principle of this matter has already been settled. The rate of Betterment Charge has already been specified in the Act, and all that remains is for the Government to declare any specified area a development area to be controlled under the provisions of the Act. This Resolution merely seeks to declare this area as a special development area in order that the Government may get its fair share of the increased value of the land or what is known as the Betterment Charge.
12.45 p.m.

There can be no argument against the actual principle of these matters because all these matters have been resolved long ago, and the Government feels justified in view of the expenditure involved — \$21½ million — in developing the roads in this area to place the area under the provisions of the Land Development Duty Act.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

THE SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT AREA (EAST COAST ROAD) (BELLEPLAINE TO BATHSHEBA) ORDER, 1963

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled 'The Special Development Area (East Coast Road, Belleplaine to Bathsheba) Order, 1963'.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this next Order is to approve the Order declaring this area a special development area. The first one dealt with the fixing of the betterment charge at the rate of 50% which the law allows, and this deals with the declaration of the area as a special development area: and as I said earlier, Sir, under the provisions of the Land Development Duty Act, provision has been made for the fixing of development charge, the declaration of this area as a special development area and determining the percentage to be charged in any special development area. This Resolution now seeks to declare the area a special development area, and the Addendum sets out more or less what the preceding Addendum has stated — the reasons why in the Government's opinion the area should be so declared.

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

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a certain part of that land at Cattlewash where there is a road already, and I should like to find out from the Minister if the declaration of this special development area will take in this part. I do not feel it would be fair to the owners there who are enjoying the road for Government to share in any part of that land. I should therefore like to find out from the Minister whether this area will come under the special development area.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: First and foremost, Sir, you can only collect a betterment charge in case the value of the land is appreciated. Secondly, the hon. member says there is a road there now, but to where does this road lead? If he means the road beyond Edgewater Hotel, that road is a cul-de-sac. You can enter it.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not mean the Edgewater Road. I said the Cattlewash Road which is below Edgewater. There is a certain part where there are bay houses and you can drive along that road.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is exactly what I am talking about. The road going to Edgewater and the road to Cattlewash are both culs-de-sac. You can enter from the

Bathsheba side to a certain point, and then you can proceed no further at all. The East Coast Road will provide access beyond the point, and you can enter it from either side. So far as I know about the area, you can enter from the road leading down at the bottom from Edgewater or the road at the top of Cattlewash; but after you come to the point where there are no houses, you have to stop, reverse and come back out; so the hon. member must appreciate the fact that what we are doing is to provide a through road from Bathsheba and Cattlewash right on to Belleplaine. The precise area which we are seeking to declare under the provisions of this Resolution as a special development area begins from a point midstream in Joes River where the railway crossed to a point 300 yards away..... there is no point in giving the hon. member this information unless he had a map, because he would not be able to follow it; but I do think.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I only want to let the Minister know that I was born and bred in St. Joseph and I know up there. I would not want a map; he would want a map.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I would say, Sir, that everybody else would want a map except the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, because the fact that he was born there would not entitle him or any other human being in the world to be able to picture in his mind's eye what is a point 300 yards parallel to another point unless he had a map. The road goes along a point midstream in Joes River to a point 300 yards to the centre line in highway 3 to Cattlewash. You could not picture it in your mind's eye unless you had a map to follow it, and that is why I felt that to read out this geographical information to hon. members would convey nothing unless they had a map. The road he is talking about is not a through road at all. I know the road quite well; I was there about two or three weeks ago and I bathed at the extreme point where there are no houses. Beyond the houses there is no road to travel by vehicle, so that the East Coast Road will provide access and egress on both sides, and I am sure the hon. member must appreciate that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not like to keep back this, but I would like to say that if the Government did not do this, some one would come along and say that because the Party to which the hon. member belongs condemned the very thought that the East Coast Road could have been built, it was not attempted. If the hon. member's Party was in power, he would not be asking about the development of Cattlewash, but it is the biggest piece of hypocrisy that I have come across that when something is being done, there is all this talk, because they said they were not going to do it and the whole bug bear was that Josh Haynes and somebody else would become richer. 12.55 p.m.

Now that the Government has done it in the face of the stupid opposition by the hon. member's Party, instead of his shouting "Hallelujah," because they are giving the people in St. Joseph something, he is opposing it in the same way they opposed the Deep Water Harbour when they were pressurized to build it at a cost of \$30 million and they would want to wait another 25 years to build the East Coast Road. They have this subtle idea of trying to dig holes in something. The hon. member has said that you are going on with the building of this road and he wants to know what is a "cul-de-sac". There are people who do not understand ordinary English terms. A "cul-de-sac" is when you reach the dead end of a road. It means that you have come to the end of a road.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that I wanted to know what is a "cul-de-sac"

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oh no! My interpretation is that the hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the hon. member does not understand what is a "cul-de-sac".

Mr. WALCOTT: I heard the conversation which was going on between the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. member who is next to him. A cul-de-sac

means that you come to the end of an entrance and there is no further for you to go, and you have to turn around and come back.

The hon. member explained the reason why land around there would cost more. If you have two entrances to your house, it must cost more. If any member of the House bought a piece of land and that land had only one entrance, he would not get the same price for it as if it had two entrances. The Government has taken all these things into consideration. If you are going to get added benefits from this land there, now that the Government is building that road, what more do you want than that?

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not criticising this Resolution at all, because I feel if the wisdom of this Government had been taken into account ten years ago, the Progressive Bank would have been living today. If the step which has been taken today had been taken ten years ago, the Progressive Bank and the people who belong to that Bank or were operating that Bank would have been better off as well as the economy of the Island.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as one of the representatives of the people of St. Joseph, I have great pleasure in supporting this Resolution. It was for some time that the East Coast Road was talked about and nothing was done. I remember hearing that if this East Coast Road were built, it would have been only a luxury, and only a help to the rich people; but I fail to see how any road in this Island can be a luxury. I feel that the East Coast Road is a necessity. All along the East Coast where that road is being built, you have quite a lot of land which is lying waste, and that land is only lying waste because there is no proper road.

There is growing need in this Island for building sites, and I am sure that the construction of this road will help to solve much of the unemployment in this Island today. Not only would you find hotels being built in this area, but residences; and, in the first place, you will get artisans getting work to do and, and in the second place, there would be a lot of domestics who would benefit from this cause.

For that reason, I strongly support this Resolution and I feel that with regard to the people who would now have to pay a little more taxes as a result of the development of this road, it would be better that they pay tax for something rather than pay tax for nothing. By the development of this area, their properties would automatically go up and be worth something.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, this Resolution as it stands before us is very necessary because for the longest time - from the time I was a boy - people were thinking of building this East Coast Road. I remember that from the time the railway ceased to operate, there was a portion of money - I think it was £60,000 which the Conservatives granted to do something about this road; and up to today, I do not know where that money has gone. For a long time, the people in this area and all over the area were asking for this road. They asked the Barbados Labour Party Government when they were in power, and members of that Party did not think it fit to build this road. They said that it will be a luxury road.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there can be no better road than a luxury road. This road, however would not be what I would call a luxury road, because in that area there are thousands of acres of land lying waste and it is uncultivated for the reason that the road is not constructed. Thousands of people who walk up and down that road have listened to people and foreigners who have visited there and said that it is one of the best sceneries in the Island, but there was no road to it. If you do not have a road, the land there can have gold but its value will be very little. Where a road is situated, the land is valued more.

I remember the late Mr. "Josh" Haynes said that he would give over the land which he had there to the Government if they built a road. He said that if you built a road there it would increase the value of the land, and he told

them to take the increased value and only pay him what the value of the land was at the time. With all that, that land remained lying dormant until this Government came into power, and this Government promised the people that they will construct the East Coast Road for the benefit of the community as a whole.

Sir, when we see that road built from Belleplaine to Bathsheba, I am sure that no man would speak against it. I know that it is going to be a boon to this Island. I am certain that foreigners will come in and build houses there as well as the people of Barbados. Carpenters, masons, blacksmiths, painters, domestic servants and all kinds of categories of workers will be employed when that road is completed. I think it is a remarkable and sensible job which the Government has undertaken: it is a very good step which this Government has taken.

1.05 p.m.

I would not criticise anybody. I am sure that when this road is completed, whoever owns land around the area of the East Coast Road will not harden his heart, but will give 50% of the Betterment Charge or the increased value of the land in consequence of the construction of this road. If the land is worth \$1,000 an acre before the road is constructed, and it is worth one thousand five hundred dollars when the road has been constructed by the Government, then the Government will take \$200.00 out of the extra \$500.00 because, at the present time, the owner is not getting either \$2.00 or \$5.00 out of the land. If this road is constructed from Belleplaine to Bathsheba, then that will be a benefit to the parish of St. Andrew and to the island as a whole. It would be one of the best things which the Government could have done. There are people who say that nobody knows the people of St. Andrew because they are living behind the devil's back; but when this road is constructed back and the place is illuminated at night, it will look like a city behind the mountains, and it will be a great consolation to the inhabitants of the island. Moreover it will strengthen the economy of the island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when a gentleman leaves Bridgetown to go to Bathsheba, when he gets to Belleplaine and he sees Bathsheba and Windy Hill, he has to go all around in order to get to Bathsheba; but he would not mind spending a little money in buying some more gasoline in order to go around the island. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting a Resolution of this sort, and I am sorry that this road was not constructed many years ago.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not intend to delve into the old history of this road because I think every hon. member of this House would appreciate the significance of this road and what the Government is trying to do. However, there have been a few misstatements made during the course of the debate - misstatements which I would like to correct, and I would also like to endorse many of the things which have been said. To begin with, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that the people would not mind paying a little more taxation when the Government was trying to get this road constructed down there. I hope that the hon. member does not mean that this matter represents any additional taxation on the public in any part of this island for this particular road. The cost of this road is coming from the Public Treasury, and therefore we all have to contribute to the cost of the road in a general way. This Resolution does not impose any taxation by this Government on anybody in respect of this road; this Resolution ensures that the Government shares in the value of land which has appreciated because of the construction of the road. I do not want anybody to feel that any special taxation is being imposed so as to get this road constructed.

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has referred to the fact that the late Mr. 'Josh' Haynes, a former member of this House, had pledged to the Government the entire accretion in value of his land in the area if the road was constructed. That is quite right. In the 1940's when I was pressing for the construction of this road, the then Leader of the Party of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, Sir Grantley Adams, not only refused to have this road constructed, but said on the floor of this House that he would not do it because it would mean more value to the land. It

was then that Mr. 'Josh' Haynes immediately got up on the floor of the House and said: "Do not mind me; this road will mean a lot to the people of this island; you can have every cent of the increased value of my land if you will do this road." Although Mr. Adams was told so, he still refused to have this road constructed. Even now he is still opposing the Resolution of this Government to construct this road. He is going all over the place and saying that we are wasting money in constructing this road.

Mr. Speaker, the British Government offered us the sum of £80,000 under Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes for the construction of this road. As a matter of fact, in 1944, Sir George Seel came to this island on a short visit and the then Governor, Sir Hilary Blood, knowing my interest in having this road constructed, asked me to take him from Thickets to Bathsheba and show him what it was proposed to do. I took Sir George Seel down there one afternoon, and on his return to the Colonial Office he strongly recommended that this road be constructed and the grant of £80,000 was offered us for the construction of this road. As a matter of fact, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was, as far as I remember a member of the Vestry of St. Joseph and the St. Andrew Vestry recommended to the Government that they would supply the equipment. (ASIDES) I am sure that the hon. member was a member of the Vestry of St. Joseph then because that was sometime in 1946. He knew that his Vestry had passed a Resolution along with the Vestry of St. Andrew calling on the Government. (ASIDES).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing too many voices.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As I was saying, Sir, the hon. member knew that his Vestry said that they would find the equipment and everything for the construction of the road passing through their parish and the Government refused to touch it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have sent for the Resolution in order to confirm the Statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. There are many acres of land lying waste down there because people cannot get their canes out of that area. The railway was closed down on the condition that they construct a road from St. Philip to Belleplaine.

1.15 p.m.

As a matter of fact, there was a lot of opposition to the closing down of the railway. Some of the greatest speeches made on the floor of this House were made on the railway - that is before my time - by the late Mr. Elder and others; but the Committee only got away with the recommendation because it insisted that as an indispensable condition to closing down the railway you must construct your road to enable the peasants and farmers to cultivate their land and get their food crops and canes out. The closing down of the railway and the refusal of the Labour Party to build the road meant that every single piece of cultivable land had to remain fallow, could not be cultivated at all; people lost their income from the land which could not be cultivated, workers lost labour; and the Island lost the income that would have resulted from the sale of sugar and other crops produced down there. As a matter of fact, I estimated once that there were 220 people put out of work who would have been working cultivating this land in the area, and the value of the sugar and food crops which the country lost was also estimated in the Resolution which I tabled here in 1946 or thereabouts, and I am trying to get a copy of it. But it is to the eternal shame of the Barbados Labour Party that they allowed this land and this entire area to remain like a wilderness, completely undeveloped, when the road could have been constructed without a single cent in cost to the taxpayers of this country. A completely free grant of £80,000 from C.D. & W. was ignored completely. (Shame!) Now, Sir, with the increased cost of material and increased cost of labour and what not, we have got to find \$2 1/2 million out of the Public Treasury to do something which should have been done 16 years ago and would have cost us nothing at all. (Shame!) I said nothing about the background because I felt that even he would have been ashamed to talk, and I had hoped to get the Resolution through in ten minutes, but he gets up and gives us all sorts of unnecessary obstacles. He probably still feels as the Leader of his Party still does, that the Government is completely wrong to build this road.

They are still living in the 1870's when a donkey cart or horse and buggy could traverse anywhere and when people did not want a bus to get out because they could walk or ride a mule, I do feel that the records should be perfectly clear. As the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said, no action or very few actions of the present Government can surpass in importance and significance to the country the action of constructing this road. It means a lot to the economy of the country to put back land into cultivation which was out of cultivation for 20 years, employ more people, and open up land which is completely undeveloped for development which is bound to result in the construction of new houses, new hotels and new resort areas in that area, because that area is one of the finest in the Island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I once took a lady there who has spent all her childhood days in Russia. Her father used to be the Chinese Ambassador to Moscow under Sun Yat Sen before the Bolsheviks took over in Russia, and she told me she had never seen any part of the world which resembles the Black Sea coast of Russia as that area does, and everybody knows that the Black Sea coast of Russia is one of the finest resort areas in Europe. The diplomats used to leave Moscow and go down to the Black Sea Coast. As the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said, in the not distant future that area is going to be one of the most luxurious areas in the entire island. It is the healthiest part of the Island. There is no land at all between Bathsheba and Dakar so that you get pure ozone coming from the Atlantic which you do not get any other part of the Island, and you will find, with a proper road running through there, that land values are bound to appreciate. Government will get some money out of these appreciative values, the construction and development of the area will begin, and the entire Island will benefit enormously from the construction of this road.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am at a loss to see how anybody in his right mind can get up in the year 1963 and oppose the construction of this road in Barbados. The fact that they do indicates that they have lost all or any rationality they had before and they are all fit for the Lunatic Asylum. I do not think Sir, that I need say anything more on this Resolution except that the peasants themselves and the workers in the area ought to welcome this opportunity again to start cultivating the thousands of acres lying down there fallow, and producing some more food and revenue for the Island.

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

THE DEVELOPMENT DUTY (CAPITAL GAINS) (EAST COAST ROAD, BELLEPLAINE TO BATHSHEBA) ORDER, 1963.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Development Duty (Capital Gains) (East Coast Road, Belleplaine to Bathsheba) Order, 1963."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the third Resolution in this category is a Resolution again entitled "The Development Duty (Capital Gains) (East Coast Road, Belleplaine to Bathsheba) Order, 1963," and this one seeks to impose the full betterment charge of 50% on this proposed development area. The background, the principle and the reasons therefor are the same as in the case of the preceding two Resolutions, and without any further ado, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not have the opportunity of speaking on the first Resolution, but I could not allow this to pass without adding my contribution, because the hon. senior member for St. Andrew made a speech which possibly I would have made relative to a member of my Party and what my Party did in the House during the period when we were pressing for the development of the East Coast Road. The Hon. Leader of the House will agree that it was one of the planks of our platform then, and I do

not think he would deny us the fact that it was a hardy annual with Mr. Josh Haynes who was the member of our Party who brought it forward, and as a result what the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said, to the effect that the Government expressed the view through the then Premier that they would not be prepared to do it because it would only enhance the value of one man's land and he would have been getting rich out of it, is an absolute fact, I think it is a great tribute to pay to an outstanding Barbadian who made it quite clear that although he was a member of a Conservative Party, he was prepared to give up every cent from the increased value of this land, and not what the hon. member is asking for in this Resolution. This Conservative owned the greatest stretch of land in that area, and said to Government that if his land was worth six cents per foot and he could get 30 cents a foot according to Government's development plan, he would allow them to take the 24 cents a foot. I can give you that in black and white.
1.25 p.m.

That was the submission made on the floor of the House, not once, twice, three or four times, but many times. What the hon. member has said about the development of land is quite true. He was absolutely correct in saying that one of the promises made on the closing down of the railway was that they should build a road there known as the East Coast Road and coming from Boscobelle so as to allow peasant proprietors the opportunity of bringing out their canes, vegetables and produce from down there without having to carry them over the hills. Those of us with some experience of that time can remember that in those days power-driven vehicles were not even powerful enough to get their canes over the hills and they had to use cattle-drawn vehicles. This idea of building the East Coast Road was one which my Party always agreed to. You will see, Sir, that there are things which the Socialists and Conservatives can come together on and there are also things which we must part friendship on. We were always at one with the Socialists on this question of the development of the East Coast Road.

Sir, all this Government is taking as a Betterment Charge is 50% and I see nothing wrong with it. I am one of the oldest real estate agents in this Island, and I would say that if this land is worth three, four or five cents per square foot, now, after this place is being developed, it will worth 50 or 60 cents per square foot. I can foresee what the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said and it is quite true. He said that you could draw a straight line from there to Dakar which had people so frightened during the last War when Rommel was advancing in Africa. What would have happened if Dakar had been taken, nobody knows. As the hon. member said, Dakar is 3,000 miles off Barbados and then there is another 1,800 or 1,600 miles as the crow flies to the United States. You could very well see that the position would not have been quite so good for this Island.

Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution. I may have stressed that at one time it was coming from this Party that we give up all the development charges that will accrue from this for the good of Barbados. It is just like this. If Mr. X has so many acres of land but it has no saleable value because it has no water, light or road, if the Government steps in and puts in these things, then the Government should benefit from that. It has been backed up by the Hon. Leader of the House as a truthful statement that a man of the background of the late Mr. "Josh" Haynes was willing to say to the last Government: "I think you are making a mistake by not developing this bit of land here." The hon. member has brought to light that all that time we were talking and the Government did nothing. In those days, there was something like 39,000 people unemployed and we had reached a stage where people in St. Lucy had began to pick potato slips and eat them. At that time, we were imploring the Government to find work for the people by developing the East Coast Road, and all that Government was saying was: "No, do not develop it."

The hon. member has found papers to the effect that £80,000 were offered to develop it. I can hardly believe the hon. member. He said that £80,000 was offered by the British Government, not as a loan, but as a gift to develop this road, and along with that, the owner of the largest

strip of the land there had said to the then Government that it could take all the Betterment Charge. The Government had a right under the Public Health Act to say that they valued it at so much per square foot, and the late Mr. "Josh" Haynes in his wisdom, generosity and interest in Barbados said to the Government at that time: "I have people out of work and they are willing to work when the crop is over in the building of that road; therefore, let us develop that road."

Now, the Hon. Leader of the House said that that sum of £80,000 was refused. The only way I can describe that as, is "scandalously criminal." There is no parliamentary way to describe it other than that. Nobody would refuse £80,000 to spend on a venture like this. I say this to the present Government. There are some of us - and when I say that, I include myself - no matter what you do, you will not stop money coming our way. It just would come. There are some other people that no matter what they do, money would not come their way.

Sir, I support this Resolution and I support it because I feel the Government is entitled to a Betterment Charge. That means that if you develop this land and you had set the value of the land at, let us say, four cents a foot, whatever more you got for it, half of that would go to the Government. It means that the original value and the other half of what it would bring will go to the owner. I think this is very generous. I would never say that I would not support the Government in a case like this. I will not support the Government in all cases if they took 50%; but in this case, when the Government is only taking half, it is very lenient. There are some people who feel that some people should not have money. However, we have lived to see that this is passed and those same people who dined and wined with them have cursed them. I speak *ex cathedra*.
1.35 p.m.

The same people who got in here and cursed them because they made money and because they had money, dined and wined with them. I speak *ex cathedra*; I speak with authority on this matter. I know whereof I speak. I do not consider myself great, but Alexander said that some people or rather every man had his price. The price of some people is power; the price of other people is social ambition. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have nothing more to say on this matter; it may be that you will live long enough to see that what I have said in this House is true.

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

LAW REFORM (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be taken as the next Order of the day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the Second reading of a Bill to amend the law as to the effect of death in relation to causes of action and with respect to the assessment of damages under the Fatal Accidents Act and to abolish the defence of common employment; and for purposes incidental to and connected with the foregoing.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a sort of companion piece of legislation to the Workmen's Compensation Bill which we passed last week. The Government likes to regard these two Bills as indicating their profound interest in the workers of this country and as symptomatic of the Government's policy that human life is not a cheap commodity. The Government feels that if it does

nothing more than elevate the appreciation of the value of the life of a worker to a proper level, it has achieved the purpose which it has set out to achieve when it was elected to office in this country. We feel that, in spite of the attractive items in our programme, in spite of the innovations which we are trying to make and in spite of the far-reaching nature of the aspects of our policy, these two Bills, the Bill which we passed last week, namely, the Workmen's Compensation Bill and the Bill which is now before this House - will serve for all time to mark the coming into office of this Party and will serve for all time to demonstrate to the workers of this country our unceasing determination to contribute what is needed to the cause of the improvement of the conditions of these workers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are three main provisions which this Bill seeks to enact. In the first place it seeks to abolish the doctrine of common employment; secondly, it seeks to bring our Fatal Accidents Act of 1883 in line with the British Legislation as it is today. As a matter of fact, our Act is almost 80 years old; and in the third place this Bill seeks to abolish the doctrine of *actio personalis moritum cum persona* in order to ensure that the dependants of the worker are not deprived of any benefits to which they were entitled because the person involved or because the persons involved in the action brought by a person or persons against his or their employer in respect of injury had died. In so far as the doctrine of common employment is concerned, it has been pointed out that this doctrine has survived in Barbados in the Law of Master and Servant as a defence to an action brought by a person against his employer in respect of injury sustained in the course of his employment. The doctrine may be expressed as follows:-

If the person occasioning and the person suffering an injury are fellow servants engaged in common employment for and under the same master, the master, where he has taken reasonable care to select proper and competent servants, is not liable for the consequences of the injury. This doctrine is considered to be irrational. The anomalies associated therewith have long been recognised and among the places in which the doctrine has been abolished may be mentioned England, Northern Ireland and Jamaica. Clause 5 of the Bill seeks to make such provision as is necessary to abolish this doctrine of common employment.

It is also proposed that the Employers Liability Act, 1896 should be repealed. The original purpose of this Act was to mitigate the rigour of the doctrine of common employment.

Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill will bring our Fatal Accidents legislation in line with the United Kingdom legislation. Clause 2 which is perhaps the most important Clause in the whole Bill, makes provision for the abolition of the doctrine that a personal action dies when the parties to the cause of the action die. In this Bill this doctrine will no longer apply. Provision is sought to be made in this Bill whereby it will be a general rule that on the death of any person in the future, all causes of action subsisting against or vested in him will still survive for the benefit of or, as the case may be, to the detriment of his estate. If the person dies, the cause of action will still survive for the benefit of his estate. In other words, if a worker gets injured at a factory and legal proceedings have been commenced in respect of the compensation to which he is entitled and he dies in the interim, under the prevailing doctrine of *actio personalis moritum cum persona* the legal proceedings died with the death of that person. In other words, when the person dies his estate or his dependants would not have any right further to continue the litigation. The cause of action dies, and therefore the benefits which might have accrued to the dependants if the person who dies had won the action, would no longer accrue to those dependants because there is no legal right for the continuance of the action after the party who instituted the legal proceedings has died.

1.45 p.m.

This Government feels that this is the sort of outmoded policy which has no right on the Statute Book of this colony.

The fact that an injured worker is dead should not prejudice his dependants against obtaining the benefits to which he was entitled under the Workman's Compensation Order, and therefore, Sir, the Bill will abolish this doctrine. There are a few exceptions to which the revised legislation will not apply. There would be no survival of causes of action for defamation or seduction or for inducing one spouse to leave or remain apart from the other, or to claims in matters of divorce for damages on the grounds of adultery. It is clear that different considerations may apply to cases in which the executor or administrator is plaintiff from those which apply to cases in which he is the defendant; and Clause 2 of the Bill recognises this fact. Those are the three main provisions of the Bill, Sir, the continuance of an action if a person dies during the hearing of such action; bringing the Fatal Accidents Act of 1883 in line with the United Kingdom legislation and the Master and Servant Act.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be long on this, because those of us who have to do with industrial law and industrial legislation would not have to make a long comment on this. The only thing that surprises me is that when a Government introduced something that is acceptable after many years of hammering - and I was very pleased to hear the hon. member make that speech - even they do not seem to understand what is current today. Do you think this Fatal Accidents Bill is anything new? We have been pressing for this years ago. Do you know how long this was going on in England? Do you think this was something passed in 1962? When a person dies in an accident, we still have some bogus things about here when they are Coroners' inquiries and people believe that some of them are closed circuits. I know of a case where a man got locked up in a triple boiler and was killed at Spring Hall Factory. To what extent could the owner have been sued? One does not know how the man could have been locked up and boiled, as if you are boiling syrup; but because you are dealing with a community with fright, you do not get people bringing damages when Workmen's Compensation should have been paid. This is something to which any Trade Union would agree because it is progressive. I do not want to go over everything that has been said, but what I am surprised about is that you talk about the United Kingdom, and then there are things done in the United Kingdom that cannot be applied here. This has been done in the United Kingdom for a long time, and I am glad to see it is being abolished. I would like to see, coming along with this, legislation to protect people at work. Nobody can say that we cannot pass a law making it obligatory on any employer who dismisses an employee and cannot show good cause for dismissal, for the person concerned to be compensated for the loss of employment. That in itself *vis-a-vis* an injury is as much as an injury to the continuance of a person's living and standard of livelihood as a fatal accident is to the cutting off of one's life, and I hope it would not be difficult to pass a law giving human beings in this Island and workers that protection.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will begin by saying that I am entirely in favour of the principle of this almost new comprehensive Bill. It certainly has certain new features and I am positively certain that almost every member of the House will welcome the inclusion of this Bill on the Statute Book. However, I have made certain sketchy observations regarding the aims and objects, and I think that these observations more or less concern new features in an Act of this sort.

As hon. members know, we already have on the Statute Book the Workmen's Compensation Act which has been going on for a long time, and of course it has certain deficiencies. This new Bill seeks to include, as persons who are eligible for compensation, domestic servants. There is one feature about the administration of that that strikes me as needing a little explanation on my part, and that is in relation to the sort of incident when a domestic servant may become involved in a traffic accident and of course is able to claim compensation from the employer. At the same time, everybody knows that in Barbados every vehicle that runs on the

road is supposed to be licensed and insured against Third Party damage. I am wondering if the domestic servant who is injured under this will benefit from Workmen's Compensation or Third Party insurance. I see that the employer of the domestic servant is always liable, and I am wondering now what is going to be the true position. Already that is covered by Third Party Insurance by the owner of the vehicle who gets involved in an accident with that worker, and yet the employer of that worker is also liable under the law as far as this Bill is concerned when it becomes an Act and must insure against such compensation.

There is another new feature in this Bill and that deals with the Labour Department. I see under certain provisions of this Bill that the Labour Department would be competent to inquire as to whether these insurance companies are operating legitimately as far as Workmen's Compensation is concerned. One thing I must say here is that I have known the working of the Labour Department. The Labour Department is presently in charge of the administration of the Shops Act and similar Acts and I know there have been many lapses.
1.55 p.m.

Those of the Trade Union Movement also know about these lapses, but we have never seen a prosecution brought. If that is just going to be put on the Statute Book and this class is going to be included and nothing else is going to happen, that is not good enough. Just to say that the Labour Department is going to make inspection, while that is very good to have it included, as to the actual working of this, it is not very hopeful that anything much will be done.

I am speaking very candidly. I had something to do with the administration of the Shops Act. It is also good to see that certain workers who formerly because they came into a certain wages bracket were excluded under the old Act are now included.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member is completely off beat with the Fatal Accidents Bill. What the hon. member is speaking on has been passed by the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I apologise for taking up your time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I, myself, was giving just a little latitude to the hon. member because I thought when the Bill was discussed that he had no opportunity of speaking on it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I really thought I was speaking on the Workmen's Compensation Act. However, Sir, I do not think I have much to say on this Fatal Accidents Bill, more than to point out that I think it was long overdue. However, it does have something to do in connection with Workmen's Compensation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I will not allow this opportunity to pass without saying something on this matter. You need not be a Trade Unionist; you need only to be a man in public life to come in contact daily, as I have been, with bread-winners of families to know that when such bread-winners are taken off by fatal accidents, their families are left to the mercies of the present legislation which is so limited. What has the hon. member for St. Peter said? This is still in itself new to Barbados, but it is nothing new to the legislation of human beings. A life is a life; therefore, when a life is taken away by fatal accidents in respect of persons who are breadwinners of families, it is sometimes very disgraceful when you have some very wealthy companies and businesses operating outside of this Island and which can afford to give some aid to that family, but just because of the legislation which we have on the Statute Book, they do not give anything at all.

Sir, this Fatal Accidents Act is long overdue. What the hon. member has said has been drawn to my attention by many legal luminaries. They have told me that a cause of action actually dies with the person's death; therefore, this Bill makes it possible that the family of the bereaved person will be able to carry on the action.

2/
1669

I have been recently brought into close contact with similar actions, and have had to take legal advice so as to be able to get some help for a poor widow and her five children. I hope that matters of this sort will appeal to the hearts of some of those diehards.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not a question of Party, but a question of being a humanitarian. Today, you leave home to go to work, and tomorrow you are gone the other side. I have seen only yesterday someone who came to me who had someone very close to her who died as a result of a fatal accident. That person was working in the fishing industry and this woman was making a baby for the person who died and also had six other young children.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in associating myself with this Bill. Some people think through their extreme stupidity and policy that because you are in the Opposition, everything which the Government brings to this House you should get up like a convulsed idiot and say that you are opposed to it. I am speaking of those nasty minded people. This is something which I personally feel, whether you are Socialist or Conservative or anybody else, is necessary for human assistance. There are those of us who come into contact daily with people who are left alone as a result of their breadwinner being snatched away. Therefore, what else can we do but give our wholehearted support to this Bill? I therefore give my wholehearted support to this worthy Bill.

The question that this 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.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called separately and passed.

2.05 p.m.

Clauses 6 to 7 were called and passed.

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

Hon. 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. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no quorum present and I am asking that the bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must inform hon. members that the Rules of this House must be strictly adhered to. It will be prudent if hon. members will keep their eyes on their watches.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. LOWE: I beg to second that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before we go on to Private Members' Business, may I suggest that we dispose of the Replies to Questions first? There are Replies to be laid to Questions; I am not sure in whose name those Questions stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter made a motion and it was seconded by the hon. senior member for St. George. The Hon. Leader of the House has suggested that Question Time be taken now.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would say that the laying of Replies to Questions is also Private Members' Business. Anyhow, Sir, I have no objection to answers to questions being taken at this stage. I have not got to withdraw my motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. WALCOTT: As I pointed out, Sir, Question Time comes within Private Members' Business as well; and if the Hon. Leader of the House wants to have Replies to Questions laid, he can have them laid now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Following what the Hon. Leader of the House has asked, I take it that Question Time is now to be taken. I gather that that is what hon. members want.

The Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 67 and 137 have been laid.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

In view of the Statement made in the Honourable House that the operators at Bagatelle Quarry were operating illegally and that Government was awaiting the return of their Legal Adviser to the Island, will the Honourable Minister, at his earliest convenience, make a Progress Report on the operations of the Quarry?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Bagatelle Quarry was purchased by the Government in 1958 in order that the contractors of the Deep Water Harbour could obtain an adequate supply of stone and other material needed for the construction of the Harbour.

2. The Contractors completed quarrying operations at Bagatelle in early 1961. On 1st March, 1961, an approach was made to the then Government by a group of persons, who subsequently registered a company called Quarry Products Limited, for the lease of the Bagatelle Quarry site.

3. Discussions ensued between the representatives of Quarry Products Limited and representatives of the Government on the matter and on 10th March, 1961, the Company's representatives were informed that, subject to the approval of the Government and the Legislature it was agreed, in principle, to lease the quarry provided agreement could be reached on the terms and conditions of the lease. No Cabinet decision had been taken and Government's Legal Advisers were not consulted.

4. On 14th March, 1961, the Company replied to the letter of 10th March, requesting that further discussions be arranged between the Government's representatives and representatives of Quarry Products Limited to finalise the terms and conditions of the lease.

5. On 20th May, 1961, the then Cabinet considered a paper containing proposals for the lease of the site. The proposals were accepted.

6. Prior to the terms and conditions of the proposed lease being finalised by the then Cabinet and before the Legislative action necessary to give effect to a lease was initiated, the Company, on or about 17th May, 1961, entered upon the site and commenced the quarrying of stone.

7. This Government has carried out a full investigation into the aspect of the matter and it has been ascertained that the Government at the time was fully cognizant of the fact that Quarry Products Limited had taken possession of the Quarry and was actually engaged in quarrying stone. This is borne out by the fact that representatives of the then Government, including Ministers of that Government, had held discussions with representatives of Quarry Products Limited and representatives of small quarry operators to consider the effect of the operation of Quarry Products Ltd. on small undertakings. Verbal authority to enter upon Government lands appears to have been given by the then Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, but Legislative approval of all leases of Government land is required by the provisions of the Executive Committee Act of 1891 as amended by the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951 (1951/27).

8. This Government has also investigated, in consultation with sixteen (16) small quarry owners and operators the effect of the continued operations of Quarry Products Limited on the small operators throughout the Island and, in consequence of these discussions, the Government has decided to submit to this Honourable House, as soon as the necessary Instruments have been prepared, a Resolution for the lease of Bagatelle Quarry site to Messrs. Quarry Products Limited in order to regularise matters and collect the agreed rents and royalties now due to Government on account of the occupation of the Quarry by the Company."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 137 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

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

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Rehabilitation of the Highway at Rock Hall, St. Thomas was carried out by the Department of Highways and Transport this year, and concrete drains were provided for a part of the area at that time.

Consideration will be given to completing the construction of the concrete drains in the 1964-65 programme of road works to facilitate the proper drainage of the area."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was made to understand that Parliamentary Question No. 134 was ready at the last meeting, but unfortunately I was not then in my place. I should like to know if I can carry on now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

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

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

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

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Government was aware of the condition of entrances to residences in the Braggs Hill-Alley Road Districts which were removed by the Highways and Transport Department while road repairs were being carried out in the area.

2. When this question was asked, plans had already been finalised and the permanent entrances were eventually replaced during the month of August, 1963."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 135 has been ready for some time. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew would like to put the question now.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

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

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

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to give the reply on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries: It reads as follows:-

As this Honourable House was informed in a statement made by the Honourable Premier on Tuesday, the 5th November, 1963, arrangements have been made for the sugar factory at Haggatts to continue to operate as a sugar-cane grinding factory for the 1963/64 cane crop.

The Government will assist in improving road communications to facilitate the haulage of canes from peasants' plots if an indication is given of the area in which such assistance is required, and if it is economic to do so.

Mr. CORBIN: I thank the Hon. Minister.

RESOLUTION re ADDITIONAL PROFITS ACCRUING TO SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that we can now take the Resolution given notice of earlier today standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking as I indicated earlier today, leave that the Resolution which I

gave notice of earlier today, be the first Order of Private Members' Business.

I now beg to move that the Resolution which I gave notice of earlier today, be the First Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. LOWE: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve the Statement made by the Honourable Premier on the 5th November 1963, relating to the additional profits accruing to the Sugar Industry in respect of the 1963 sugar crop.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Statement by the Hon. Premier was made on the 5th November, last, which is two weeks ago; so I am sure that hon. members are quite aware of the Statement. But in opening this debate, I will read it so as to refresh hon. members' minds on it. It reads as follows:-

I have the honour to inform this Honourable House that proposals have been submitted to the Ministry of Finance jointly by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados on the equitable distribution of additional profits accruing to the sugar industry during the year 1963.

2. As a result of the unexpected rise in the price received for sugars sold in the free market this year, it is anticipated that the industry will benefit by a windfall of approximately \$6.7 million.

3. Agreement has been reached between the recognised bodies representative of workers and employers in the sugar industry as to the division of this windfall. It is proposed that there should be established a fund administered by a board comprising:

The Financial Secretary or his nominee - Chairman

One Member nominated by the Sugar Producers' Federation

Five Members nominated by the Barbados Workers' Union and that the sum of approximately \$1.6 million should be paid into this fund for the use and benefit of the workers in the industry, namely

- (a) Workers employed on Sugar Estates
- (b) Workers employed in or about Sugar Factories
- (c) Workers employed by Sugar Transport Ltd.
- (d) Workers employed by Sugar Terminals Ltd.
- (e) Workers employed by Molasses Terminals Ltd.

Details of the purposes for which the income and capital of this fund will be appropriated are being worked out, and the Legislature will be requested to enact the necessary legislation to give effect to this part of the agreement.

4. It is further proposed that, in accordance with a precedent recommended by the Lewis Commission in 1958 when an *ad hoc* bonus of 7% was paid to the workers out of the windfall profits of the previous year, an *ad hoc* bonus of 10% should be paid to each individual worker in the industry on his total crop time earnings during the year 1963.

5. It has also been agreed that the balance of the windfall should be paid to all cane farmers and suppliers of sugar cane on the direct basis of the tonnage supplied.

6. The Government considers that this agreement is a remarkable achievement in the field of industrial relations and willingly concurs.

7. This Honourable House will therefore shortly be requested to pass the legislation necessary to give effect to these proposals.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, since this Statement was made on the 5th November, last, this Island has witnessed an unprecedented affray in the manner in which an agreement drawn up in a proper form by the National Union of Workers and the Sugar Producers Association is now becoming the subject of political manoeuvres by one of the political parties of this Island. Therefore, right at the beginning of my speech, I would have to be very clear and strict in my submission to this Chamber on this matter because it strikes at the roots of industrial relation practices, and I feel sure that Your Honour will agree with me that there are some established practices in all different types of organisations: and anything which strikes at the roots of these organisations destroys the very organisations and the things with which they deal.

The Barbados Workers Union is the accredited representative of the sugar workers of this country. The Barbados Workers Union has been negotiating agreements with the Sugar Producers' Federation from the time that body was formed in 1947 - sixteen continuous years; therefore there can be no question in the sixteenth year that that organisation is an accredited organisation and it has the right to negotiate such agreements. I am sure Your Honour will agree with me that the right to negotiate an agreement has to be established between the two parties concerned; and if the two parties concerned agree that they are bodies to conclude an agreement through their principals and whom they represent, the question does not lend itself to a third party - moreover, when the third party or parties are parties outside industrial relation practices.

It is therefore extremely strange to me to find that there is no dispute between the parties concerned with the agreement, and that parties outside of the agreement for some unknown reason are attempting to create a dispute among the parties to the agreement. At this moment, there is no disagreement between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association. I have to be very clear in saying that what the parties have submitted to the Ministry of Finance was an agreement.

3.05 p.m.

I would like to say at the beginning that the authority which the Union has received for this matter is the fact that the Barbados Workers' Union is a general Workers' Union which held its last annual Conference in August of this year. The Executive Committee, the body which controls the Union between the Annual Conference, is an elected body from all of its members; sugar workers, dockers, industrial workers, workers of all kinds, are members of the Barbados Workers' Union, and a member of the Executive Council of the Barbados Workers' Union is a representative of the whole body politic of the Trade Union. These elections are held in a democratic manner, and we have had in the last three consecutive years, the Secretary of the Caribbean Congress of Labour, Mr. Osmond Dyce, acting in the capacity of Sheriff. Speeches have been made by Ministers of Government at the Annual Conference, and those speeches have been recorded, and the encomiums which have been showered on the Union for its responsibility and integrity have already been published in this island.

The Barbados Workers' Union also negotiated an Agreement on behalf of the sugar workers in 1963, and that agreement provided the estate workers with an increase of three per cent in their basic wages; to the factory workers it provided one and a half per cent increase on production. When those increases were made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Union was not challenged to the effect that it had no right to do that, but we are hearing now that the Union has no mandate. I think Your Honour will agree that anybody who knows anything about industrial relations or about a Trade Union will agree that a Trade Union, which is an accredited representative of workers, is in itself a mandate. You have the mandate in negotiations; you do not negotiate in part, but you negotiate as a whole; and the Bar-

badon Workers' Union negotiated an agreement on behalf of the sugar workers in 1963 and that was accepted. For the last 16 years all the agreements which have been made in this island on behalf of the sugar workers have been made between the Barbados workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. I want to say that at this eleventh hour there cannot be any question of the Union being challenged as to its right to have a mandate, because if the Union did not have the right to have a mandate, it could not have been doing this thing for the past sixteen years. This Resolution has nothing to do with what the Union has done for workers; so I will deal specifically with the matter which has been dealt with in this Statement and ask the House to deal with it. The Statement deals with the additional accretion which came to the industry, and no one else in this island had any authority to negotiate anything with the employers. There was no legal obligation, there was nothing to provide the workers with help in getting this money, and the Trade Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation agreed that the accretion which came in 1963 should be shared.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not feel that any person in this island outside the Barbados Workers' Union had any right in saying how this accretion should be divided; there was no one who could determine whether it should be three per cent this year, five per cent, six per cent or twenty per cent. That was the right of the Trade Union because the Union knows that these workers are embodied in their agreement, and this is part and parcel of their movement. Moreover, now we have been hearing that non-members of the Trade Union should indicate what the Trade Union should agree to; but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is as fallacious an argument as telling hon. members who are members of this Chamber now, that when an Election takes place, the persons who did not go to the polls, those who kept away from the polls being more than those who voted for you, you are not an elected member of the House and have no right to speak on behalf of the people. It would be ludicrous for us in this island to sit in here as representatives of the people when those who did not go to the polls, can say to those who were elected by those who went to the polls: "You have no right to represent me because I did not vote for you." There are those who are trotting out this argument that if you make an agreement in the future, these non-members of the organization can say what should happen to the members. As you can very well see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there will be no Trade Union at all on the basis that you are a Trade Union member; you are not a Trade Union because you are a collection of workers outside the Trade Union and there are certain legal rights attributed to a Trade Union. We must comply with the law; we must submit certain things to the Registrar. It is of no use asking a Trade Union to comply with the legal requirements and then those who are not parties to the Trade Union are the ones to say that they are parties to an agreement. It has not happened in the past or in any part of the world where you have a Trade Union like the Barbados Workers' Union and you have members, who are not members of the Union, saying to the organization what it should do. We do not impose conditions that you should not benefit from these things if you are not a member of the Trade Union. It is like the biblical injunction that the sun shines on the just and on the unjust; these agreements are applicable to all persons who are working in the industry in which the agreements apply.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at what stage are you going to determine that the Union has made an agreement in its own right and on a comprehensive basis, as distinct from how the Union will be disposed as to those who feel like contracting out, and then they determine that they should contract in, and stipulate what are the principles of the agreement for those who are parties to the agreement? 3.15 p.m.

Now these may be technical matters, but they are commonsense ones. You cannot contract out and contract in, and in a comprehensive agreement like this it would be ludicrous for anyone to expect the Trade Union to function on the basis of non-members. Some Trade Unions function on the basis of non-members in making what they agree to applicable to non-members. In Jamaica for example, in an agreement such as the one which we now have in Barbados,

none of the persons who are non-members can apply to it unless they join, and one of the conditions in that agreement is that they have to pay to one of the Unions in Jamaica before they can share in it. An agreement was signed in Jamaica on 3rd June, 1963 and this agreement states:

"Condition of Bonus Payment - except as hereinafter provided, payment of bonus will be subject to the worker being a member of a Union which is a participant of this agreement and on the basis of a check-off authority. Where a worker is not a member of one of the participating Unions, payment of bonus will be subject to a written authorisation by the workers that the equivalent of the Union's dues which would be payable by him if he had been a member of any Union from the coming into force of the agreement which shall be paid (a) to one of the participating Unions to the agreement or (b) to the pension authorities or as agreed between the Unions and the Association as specified by the worker in such authorisation."

Now in Jamaica they have this as a stipulation, which means that workers are not permitted to contract out of the Unions and then benefit by the Union's negotiations. One of the conditions in the Agreement signed by them is that they are contracting in: and if they do not contract in, these amounts have to be paid into special funds or into the Union's funds. This agreement of ours on the basis of the windfall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has absolutely nothing to do with any wage agreement that had been made. Wages were concluded for 1963 just as wages would have been concluded in any other agreement, but owing to the special situation in the sugar industry - and I should say, the powerful position which the Union holds in this island - the workers were able by this power to share in the accretions that came this year from the higher prices of sugar, because in normal circumstances, Sir, the employer would have looked upon it in the light that he had already paid wages and he has received this and this is his profit, and the Union would be forced to negotiate in 1964 on the basis of what they had received in 1963. In normal other negotiations, the Union negotiates with a company on the profitability of the company in retrospect. You get what the company has made over the last five years and see that they are in a position to pay more and you negotiate on that basis. You cannot write in a clause in normal negotiations on a futuristic basis; but in the sugar industry, as there are different variables, we were able to show that this accretion came in 1963 and the workers should share in it. May I remind this House that as a matter of comparison in 1957 the Suez Canal crisis gave higher profits to the industry? The Barbados Workers' Union had a two or three year agreement, and when we submitted, subsequent to 1957, in 1958 that factors prevailed in 1957 which were different from the factors included in the agreement, we were demanding that the increases be paid to the workers in 1958 and bear relationship to the profit which had been made in 1957.

There is no secret, Sir, that the same political Party that is going around the country now telling workers to call for all of their money was the Party that was the Government of the day, and when we made a protest, the then Minister of Labour who is now the Assistant Secretary of the proposed Union made a speech even in St. John at Four Cross Roads after a Commission of Enquiry was set up indicating that the Barbados Workers' Union had no claim on the employers for increase in wages. The Union protested and went to the then Governor, Sir Robert Arundell, and wanted to know what kind of conduct that was by a Minister who could set up a Commission of Inquiry and then go on a platform and say something tantamount to prejudicing the work of the Commission which he had set up; and that was on record. In 1958 the same group of people, after a profit equivalent to nearly \$9 million was made, were protesting against the Barbados Workers' Union's stand that an increase in wages in 1958 should bear relationship to what had taken place in 1957. The Commission granted an ad hoc bonus on the wages equivalent to 7%, not an increase. I bring that as a comparison to show what happened some years ago. On this occasion it was not dealt with in retrospect, but it was dealt with currently and the Union had the right to negotiate a contract - which it did; and it is not for an outsider to tell the Union in what way or manner a contract shall be negotiated. The Union has the right to conclude a

contract which includes wages, holiday with pay, supplementary benefits and many other fringe benefits. The Union can also conclude an agreement as it has done on behalf of workers in which some of the wages can be paid in cash and some placed to a fund. The Union has concluded an agreement in the Port of this country in which part of the wages are paid in cash and part paid into a fund. There is a current situation in this island in which a Port worker works for a basic wage from which he pays 5%, and the employer pays 5% which goes into a fund for workers for rehabilitation, and the Union and employee contribute jointly in the setting up of a Provident Fund. On this occasion the Barbados Workers' Union considers that the amount of money available to workers in 1963 was equivalent to new money in the vicinity of \$4 million.

3.25 p.m.

The Union considers that the workers in the sugar industry in this country with an increase in 1963 of \$4 million was in a position for some of the money to be set aside for special purposes and benefits, and that is what has been concluded by the Workers' Union - and the Workers' Union has the right to do it because the Barbados Workers' Union gets its authority from the members of the Union. The Annual Conference of the Barbados Workers' Union was held and the Executive Council was elected. The Executive Council of the Barbados Workers' Union agreed to this unanimously. It was the unanimous decision that these proposals were in the interest of the workers, and the Executive Council of the Union which has the right on behalf of the workers agreed to it and the matter was submitted to a general meeting of the workers at which a Resolution was passed agreeing to the establishment of these funds and the proposals were ratified at the general meeting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Union has taken all of the constitutional steps to do something which it has a right to do, and that is ratified by the workers, when the Union must speak for the workers because workers outside of the Union would be disintegrated and a scattered group - moreover, in a specified matter like this, an employer would have no person to speak to if it were not for the Union; therefore, if the employer decided to present anything to the worker, it would have to be given in the form of a gift. It is in the same manner as employers would do with their maids when they feel like giving them for Christmas a gift, whether it is a week's pay or anything like that. It is nothing which anybody negotiates on her behalf; and in a similar way in the case of all of the business people who provide a bonus to their staff, the staff has no right to say what the bonus should be because that is the prerogative right of the employer. Because of the power of the Union and because they would not have liked a repetition of the situation which had taken place in 1958, therefore, the employers approached the Union because the Union was aware of it and they made it clear that they were willing to negotiate with us. The fact that money was being negotiated for does not mean that the employers have given this money. If that were so, the employers could have said that it could be \$6 million, \$7 million, \$8 million or \$9 million. It is the Union which said how much they wanted to share in this windfall.

I do not like this process to take place in industrial relations: but the reason why this course had to be taken is because of its being a case of the establishment of a fund in the sugar industry, it must have legislative sanction and owing to the fact that it is not a case of one factory or one source from which it was coming. Even if it were one source of employers or producers, the problem would not have been any different either.

Sir, I have here a memorandum of the Employers Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union in the matter of the establishment of a Provident Fund for produce porters and carters, and the Union regards all these as examples of where we have broken through and given new light to the workers. Some years before the war they used to export sugar and there were not enough jobs given to the employees. The Union represented these workers. Sugar was shipped ex-wharf: but that quantity of sugar which was shipped ex-wharf was paid for as if it was handled by the workers: that is to say, if ten cents per ton were handling charges,

whether it was shipped ex-wharf or not, that ten cents per ton was deducted by the employers. I discovered after the war that this practice was continuing. I drew it to the attention of the employers, and I told them that it was a considerable amount of the sugar which was shipped ex-wharf because it was sometimes as much as 25% to 30%. As hon. members know, some of the sugar shipped left the factories and went straight to the lighters. We decided that it was not fair that this charge should be taken off and we said it was unfair to the workers, and today those workers are receiving the benefit of those handling charges although they did not handle the sugar. The employers said that they did not like paying out money when a man did not actually work for it, and we arrived at a formula where you paid out 85% and the maximum deducted was 15%. That meant that you paid a man, whether you shipped 100% or not, 85% in cash and the remaining 15% went to the ex-wharf funds. It is needless for me to say what that meant to this Island when the Deep Water Harbour came into being. That was a fund which accrued to \$1/4 million, and were it not for that fund the pressure on the Government would have been greater.

On this occasion, realising as we do the economic realities which we have to face in this Island, those of us close in the sugar industry would know what the difficulties are. The last independent person in the sugar industry, Mr. Harold Robinson of Trinidad, had been bought over by Tate and Lyle; British Guiana's sugar estates are owned by Bookers, and Barbados is the only sugar producing unit outside of the claws of the bigger sugar owning units. If anything happens to Barbados, the sugar companies are not going to buy Haggatts; they are going to take over; and when they take over, they are going to determine the method by which they are going to run the sugar estates here.

I would give this as an example to reveal the nonsense which you are hearing talked outside of this House and even inside this House. I have heard in this House when they were talking about the wages of sugar workers that we were the least paid. Now, this is an agreement which was signed on the 3rd June, 1963, which provides the minimum rates paid to workers in Jamaica. The minimum daily paid rates in Jamaica is \$2.60 to men and \$2.04 to women. In Barbados, a man receives \$3.60 per day and a woman \$2.50. Now for cutting canes and loading canes, in Jamaica a man receives \$1.08 per ton for cutting canes and 81 cents per ton for loading canes. That added together would mean \$1.89 per ton. In Barbados, it is \$1.59 per ton for each, which multiplied would mean \$3.18 per ton.

3.35 p.m.

When it comes to heading, that is something separate and that must be paid for separately. We must assume even if there is another rate to add up to 1.89 it would not be higher than any of the rates you have stipulated because it would have been there. It is needless for me to draw any comparison with Trinidad because Trinidad has been in a war for many years and the rates are lower than they are in Jamaica. Last year when we had a 10% increase on the basic wage in Barbados, the people in Trinidad received 5%. The reason why I say that is that when you hear the argument about what happened to other places, I think it should be drawn to the attention of the people in Barbados that those who have made a study of the area will understand what I am saying. I have been a member of CADORIT for the last twelve years. We presented a Memorandum to the Sugar Enquiry which was set up by the Government last year, and the same political Party which said that it was interested in the sugar industry and the workers did not even send in two paragraphs to the Sugar Commission indicating what are their views. On the other hand, the Barbados Workers' Union presented a document which has been regarded as a very excellent document. As a matter of fact, I have a request from Uganda to have a copy of the Memorandum sent to them - a copy of that Memorandum which we presented to the Sugar Enquiry. With these economic realities before us, the Union decided that, in the interest of the workers, some of this money in this year should be placed to the credit of the workers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to dispel the fears of some people who like to look for cheap votes. Some of them

are saying that the workers who are not members of the Union are not entitled to any of this money. The Union has been negotiating the rates for the last sixteen years, and now some people say that those members who are not members of the Union are not entitled to any of this money. Of this 2.6 million dollars the workers are receiving one million dollars. How could anyone say that that is not much money? The sum of \$1 million represents more than the 10% which the workers received last year by way of production bonus or as a wage increase. Ten per cent of this money will be paid to the workers in cash. There are people who are trying to play on other people's minds, and they say that we are giving the workers ten per cent and that we are keeping ninety per cent. The calculation gives the workers \$1 million, but nobody was in a position to offer these workers one penny; none of them who now get behind the workers and prompt them could give them one penny. Some of them said that the workers would have received five per cent and the Union had been withholding that 5% from them. I have been subjected to slander, abuse and all types of things for which I have the right to take legal proceedings, but that is not the important part; the important part is to understand what is taking place.

The workers of this country, other than the sugar workers, would not have been in a position today to have received this money without the positive and militant stand which the Union has taken as at all times. What has happened is that our enemies and our opponents cannot swallow the pill of the credit which the Union desires, but they try to discredit the workers' Organization and to discredit me on the basis that this money, which is now coming to the workers, is money which they, in ordinary circumstances, would have received in wages. None of those people who say that has never been in a position to give the workers one penny. Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me give you a classic analysis. In 1950, after the War, sugar was sold to the British Government on an agreed basis and the colonies had no control over that money. Owing to the Canadian exchange, this country received \$3 million as a result of the exchange on the price. With the same factors, the people who were then in power and who are now saying that all the money should have been given to the workers, did not see fit to give one sugar worker one cent out of that \$3 million as a cash payment. (MEMBERS: Shame!) Some of this money went towards the setting up of an Irrigation Board and some if it went into a fund; but not one representative in this Chamber or anywhere else stood on any public platform and said of this \$3 million what any sugar worker should get in cash. Some people are now saying that it is the workers' money; but none of the workers received severance pay until the Barbados Workers' Union made a representation on their behalf. Up to this day the last Government left office before they could work out and implement this severance pay. In your constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there were workers who waited for four years and then they were told that the Union had the money. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am a richer man than Rockefeller, judging by the statements which you hear some people make. You hear that Frank Walcott had the Deep Water Harbour money; you hear that Frank Walcott built the Deep Water Harbour; you hear that he has the sugar workers' money, he has the displaced workers' money and wherever there is money, wherever any money situation is concerned, I am a mighty man. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Government should see you.) Yes, the Government should really see me. The amount of the fund is \$2 million, but somebody says that it is \$62 million which I have of the people's money. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would be all right for people to make this kind of joke around a drink; but when it is made in the context that this is money which was a gift, that is another matter. Somebody said that the Imperial Government sent down this money; somebody else has said that Sir Grantley Adams gave this money, and somebody else was so atrocious as to write that to a newspaper and the newspaper published it.

3.45 p.m.

You can get, in a country, in 1963, the Editor of a newspaper publishing that type of nonsense in addition to other bits of nonsense they publish. It is true, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when we were boys and went into the Park on

24th May, we looked forward longingly to the two-pence they gave us, some beer which we did not know how long it was made and some buns which any marksman could have used as bullets. We said then that the Queen used to send money for us and we jumped up and sang "Land of hope and glory, mother of the free," and "Rule Britannia, Britannia rule the waves!" walking around the Police Band and having a good time. You could not believe that, with the growth of the Trade Union after 23 years of work in this Island, someone could repeat such a nonsensical statement and say that the Union is holding back money that came to the workers from some hidden source, and not give the Union any credit for negotiating this accretion to the workers. To answer that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will say that is a gimmick. The idea that they are holding on now to the fund is only a gimmick. Had there not been a fund, there would have been something else to hold on to. Instead they might have said that the workers should get 60% and the employers 40%, and then they would start the ball rolling on the amount not being rightly divided. They are agreeing to the division because there is a fund, but what does the fund seek to do? Are we withholding money from the workers? Is paying out \$1 million out of \$2.6 million withholding money?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you read what the Union has put in its statement and presented to the Government and to the Minister, I would ask, notwithstanding, what this Government has just had to do. This Government in a Statement on agriculture said that they needed \$1.5 million in order to carry out one project not for all the agricultural sectors, but in saving a section of workers in a situation in which they were in a sorry plight. This money has nothing to do with any general Provident Fund Scheme, and the ones who say that should be ashamed because we are the ones who projected the idea of a Provident Fund Scheme; we are the ones who said that there should be severance pay, and put forward the proposal that the amount should be four weeks of every year of service, but had to compromise on the basis of three weeks, because the Government had already set up a scheme of three weeks as a limit. What we have done for the sugar workers in this country in a severance pay scheme is superior to what the last Government forced us to agree to on behalf of the Deep Water Harbour workers, because they had an escalator scheme; but the scheme which we have put up for the sugar workers now is a straight line scheme of three weeks for every completed year of service to a maximum of 104 weeks, and we have agreed to a maximum because you live a life at a time and we feel that, as time goes on, we will be able to increase this. It would be amazing to know that we were offered one week for every year of service. They used the displaced workers when they went out of power to form a Trade Union to get back into political power, and now they are using the sugar workers whom they feel are my enemies; but I will let the workers and members of this Assembly know where I stand on this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Trade Union is a national organisation and not a national nuisance; the Trade Union is not here to make itself a nuisance in the community. We have established in this community — and by their fruits you shall know them — one of the best commercial buildings. That is not a demonstration of people who fritter away people's money; but we can ask some of the same leaders what they have done with the people's money which was put in the society called the Progressive League Friendly Society. There are shameless people who can walk about this country with no record to show how they have manipulated money, but are going about from place to place with nothing to show after all these years. We have shown that our organisation is not begging the issue of representing workers. We are representing them in what we stand for, and not making ourselves a nuisance to the employer or the community. We are not going to impoverish the workers. They are the ones who are impoverishing the workers today; and when they are no more, they are going to impoverish the employers; and when they are no more, we will become a second Haiti where we will get a civil war with the impoverished eating the impoverished. Haiti is a proper example of the impoverished eating the im-

perished. They are asking us not to be prudent because the sugar industry is going to receive \$27 per ton more every year as a higher price than in 1962! When we got 10%, the world market price of sugar fell below in some instances the cost of production. There was no marginal difference, but I will say that when we got the \$3 million it was put into a fund. The Rehabilitation Fund came along in 1947, and in this Chamber I did not hear that this money should have been given out to the people or distributed among the planters and workers and not put in a fund. Without that today we would be in the hands of Tate and Lyle, and the workers would not be able to see the housing which you have been able to do. These people say that we already have \$3 million, and a lot of nonsense has been given publicity in one national newspaper. You would believe that by now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, writers in national newspapers must know some of the facts. This country is paying \$1.2 million to Old Age Pensioners at a rate of \$2.40 as a maximum. If you had to give the same number of sugar workers a pension, you could not begin to insult them with a pension of \$2.40 a week, and if you had to work a pension on the notional wage that has been set out by Mr. Stockman and you looked at the industry and worked out a figure of \$18 a week as the average wage in the industry and gave a man 50% of that wage, if you now pay \$1.2 million at a rate of \$2.40 a week, you only need ordinary arithmetical deduction to see what you would have to pay if it is going to be four times that amount. The country would have to look for something in the vicinity of \$5 million.

3.55 p.m.

Therefore, you have so much more, giving the workers the impression that so much more is put down for you: therefore, you need not worry because you are living in clover when it is known that they could not begin to reach the answer to that because they feel it would be so small. What is wrong with anybody buttressing their position? You give every man in the industry three weeks severance pay, but would you say that you cannot give any more? The Union is not submitting this as taking the place of what the employers should do: but is there anything wrong, if you are working with an employer and you are entitled to a pension, with your having something in addition to that? If this windfall can offer the workers in the sugar industry the opportunity to plough back something for himself and the opportunity of entering into the economy of this country and participating in its administration, why then should somebody say that you are depriving the workers of getting more money? This scheme projects something new, and any Government or organisation which is worth its salt should not be afraid of projecting new projections. If any one can show us that this is not in the interest of the workers, that this is too much money which you are taking away, I would wish to hear from that person.

There are some people who are saying that this is too vague. Do you think in a scheme of this nature that you can detail the things and write them as you write a little exercise? There are many things which are not done now which we say that this fund can do. We have analysed the situation that when a worker in the industry cannot work, that means less income in that family. We have analysed the situation that wherever there is the need to set up things from which the children of workers can benefit, you are increasing the economy of the country, and the organisation of all that is an indirect way of advancing his income. Do you want us to send for Professor James Maynard Keynes to deliver something to show us the ways and means to increase a man's income not only by giving him a wage in his pocket? Someone has said that you must wear a school tie to justify that you went to school. I have no school tie to borrow; I am going to wear the school tie which is in my head.

We have to promote welfare projects for the benefit of the sugar workers. The Government has welfare schemes for sugar workers: but the Government cannot provide welfare schemes for only sugar workers. What is wrong, therefore, if we find land is being cut up and it is suitable that we provide ourselves with a playing field from it? Is that a projection which the workers should not have? Is it wrong for workers to have within their rights a projection

of a music hall so that a music festival can be given by workers? Or should we say that is above workers? Hymn singing is one of the cultures which Barbadians have. We are not good dramatists because our speech is not the sort of speech which lends itself to drama. Singing and dancing come to us easily. If a man is dismissed from his work and he can only get a limited amount of money, are you suggesting that the limit which you now have should be the limit, and that it is thus far and no further as to the economic gains he should have? Are you suggesting that that is all which you should give him and that he should have nothing more than that?

Now, Sir, you are going to use Haggatts as an example. I am going to use another example. The Government has bought Graeme Hall land. We are not asking you to give it away. What is wrong with the sugar workers having a fund at their disposal and approaching the Government for a lease of 20 acres at a peppercorn rate of an easy sale so that they can put up housing projects for themselves? Our organisation has approached the organisation in Washington, and I can show you where Trade Union money has been used to lend money to countries like ourselves. The American Labour International Organisation has taken money out of their Treasury to assist the Public Fund in order to lend out money to other countries such as trade unionists in Peru, Nicaragua and Central America and they have been recipients of this fund. We too could have been recipients of it, but one of our keepbacks is the fact that we are not independent and therefore their allowances for programmes have given us a lot of difficulties. The Jamaican Workers' Union has been able to get money from that fund for a project. Should we in Barbados deprive the workers of this country from creating a new place so that they can further participate in any of these things which are available to workers' organisations, particularly when they can show that they can save something for themselves? When you get these built-in things, it is a relief for the social services and for the Government. It is a relief for the country when workers can create savings of their own. This Government has just launched a National Savings Movement. What is a better example to demonstrate than that out of the windfall, in addition to your day's pay of \$3.60, in addition to any new wages which you may get in 1964 and which have to be negotiated for, you can say that this is something which you did not expect and you are saving something out of it? What is wrong with a country encouraging a community to do something like this, something which would stabilise workers? Are you going to be cheap and vulgar and say: 'Give them all,' as if a man lives a day at a time or as if all the sugar workers will disappear in 1963? This money is not only for the benefit of the members of the Union. We have never said so.

4.05 p.m.

That is the only country in which the workers have been encouraged, even by those who should not encourage them, not to be organized in a powerful Trade Union, but to believe that they would be better off on the outside.

Now, you have the vulgarity of people suggesting that I have the money. Sir, that part does not worry me and I would not waste the time of this Chamber to answer those things. As a national organization, we are not going into a field of representation where we are not wanted. Our organization is different from a political organization; a political organization may press and press for the purpose of remaining in power, but with us there is the power straightaway; with us there is the struggle for better things. We are not creating any warfare; we are not creating any position as in Jamaica where one camp is bringing somebody to fight against somebody else. I would not be any underwriter of any workers' death as a result of warfare. We are not going in for any vested interest; the only interest we are going in for, the only interest which we have, is to see that the workers get what is theirs. One has to accept the consequences he gets for wise leadership.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, some leaders have been assassinated. Who did more for India than Mahatma Gandhi? Who did more in his day for the United States of America than Abraham Lincoln? We have the slogan: 'Government of

the people, by the people and for the people," but Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. Those who have gone through the records of leadership in the Trade Union will appreciate the work of the Union. There are occasions which, when they arise, you cannot stand up to and you begin to retreat; but my attitude is not one of retreat. I have not been made up in that way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the proposal which the Union has put up for the workers is a sound proposal to the core; it gives the workers a sense of dignity and respect. The position is just as if you had a dog in the yard and you threw all the bones to him, even if you have to pick them up afterwards, because he is trained. You train your dog to eat from your hand; he does not eat from the floor nor does he eat from a stranger.

We have been keeping meetings up and down this country. I remember that somebody asked me what happened in St. Philip. Go and ask what happened at King George V Park. We held a meeting at Ellerton in St. George and at King George V Park, and I may say that tomorrow I have to meet the Manager of Bulkeley's where 18 people have been given notice of dismissal from work in 1964. If people do not know what is taking place in the sugar industry, let them shut up. None of these people has any argument to show whether they should go or not, but when 18 people are sent off their work, must we see that they are given displacement money and that is enough? Must these people at Bulkeley have no job and the situation remain like this? We feel that by experience and necessity we must create something for these workers, but to spread out everything in detail is stupid. Our position is clear for everyone to see. Circumstances which deserve various treatments have to be dealt with as they arise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this had been a matter exposed to legislative sanction, if it had been a matter of the Provident Fund — well, we did not have to come to the Legislature on that occasion. The Provident Fund was started for produce workers and soon after that, somebody died. A man got killed soon after the fund was opened, and if we did not have a fund what would the dependants of this man have done? We have paid out as much as \$2,000 in one case; and what private employer in this country would pay out that money, based on the time during which an employee was working?

If I did not have the experience and knowledge of things for the past nineteen years — I may say that I will celebrate my nineteenth anniversary on the 1st January, 1964 with the Union, and that period of nineteen years represents the greater portion of my working life span. I have spent quite a long time in the industrial field — longer than I have spent anywhere else. Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you think that for all of these years, with all of this experience, I am unaware of what is needed for this country and I have to look over my shoulder to see what this sum of \$3 million can do? I know the amount of money which is required for the carrying out of any scheme of social security as has been recommended in the past.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have asked for this matter to be dealt with because in normal circumstances members of this Chamber would not have to give the sanction which they are being asked to give, and because there is more than one sugar factory and more than one estate, we have to have this legalised. This would not have been necessary in Antigua or St. Kitts where there is one factory, because the factory would make the agreement and that would be the end of it. In the case where we export things, we did not have to come here with an agreement to have a fund. That was done and that was the end of it. We did not have to come here to get the Legislature to sanction the paying of 10% production bonus, but this will be enshrined in the agreement for the future, that if you have a windfall you have to give the workers some and we do not have to go hat in hand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me point out to the Legislature some of the technicalities. In normal circumstances, the

only person I find that could have objected to this would be the Government of Barbados, because in normal circumstances the Government can say that we have already signed an agreement, and this is money they are going to lose because they would be losing income tax. The Government will lose about \$2 million in this, and if the Government had said "no can do" what would we be giving the workers? Do you think the employers would give them anything? If you think the employers would give them any, you have another laugh coming. The Government did not act stupidly, however. The Government is sharing some of the accretions in this, and that is why we compliment Government for not living in antiquity but living in the present day. For that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am forced to take this stand in this matter because it had to be dealt with in this way. We have dealt with this matter above board, and there were no negotiations done under board. What I have to say here now publicly is that the reason why more of this could not have been said before is that, because of the fact that we were dealing with Government and the matter had to come to the Legislature, we did not feel it was proper to make all these things known in detail before we came here, because we regarded it as an insult to the members of this Chamber, and felt that if we wanted them to approve of something, we could not walk about the country and give this information, because now that we come to the Legislature and all the things had been bandied about the country, we would only have been asking members to put the rubber-stamp to some of the wild chat that everybody had given. The idiots say we do not give the people information they require, but I am satisfied, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is one of the issues, as I told the people in my constituency, on which you cannot get cold feet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I represent a constituency where sugar workers sent me back to this Assembly, and I have said to them that if in this matter they consider I have not done the best for them, the choice is theirs not to vote for me again. This was not done on the basis of voting. Any member can take this to St. Peter and say that if this is something we should not do and they have no confidence in me for doing this, I as one of the leaders in the Trade Union movement say not to vote for me, but for someone else. I say to hon. members who are not Trade Unionists, but are representatives of the people that I am aware, from the pressures that have been brought upon some of them in their constituencies that they may get a little bit scared or get cold feet at times. Politicians feel that way because nobody likes to feel dispossessed or that he is coming to the end. You come to the end anyhow; but sometimes you have to make up your mind that if this is going to be the end, it shall be the end and you are not turning back. I am not retreating from this position, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I take this stand with my eyes wide open and with a full knowledge of what I am doing, and I am prepared to pay the consequences for anything that results from this stand.

I therefore have great pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution, and I hope that hon. members will be able to speak on this freely, because it is a matter in which no member of this House need have any fear.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to corroborate all that was said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and to express the feelings of the Government on these issues. We support the stand taken by the Barbados Workers' Union, and that was made manifest in the Statement which was laid in this House by the Honourable Premier. We feel that is the duty of any responsible Government not only to think of constitutional progress, but we should also think of economic and social progress in a community. In these circumstances we feel that the Union has taken a step in the right direction.

I have been a most perturbed and angry person when I heard of the mischief being made by some people who, after they have been swept out of office, became the most unemployables that Barbados could ever produce, and in order to find employment for themselves, they have become public mischiefs. I feel that the time has come when something should be done about these elements in the community. I feel also that it is about time the community itself rise

up against them. They are the people who, being qualified to gain themselves proper employment after they had been totally disregarded by the people whom they had fooled for many years, go about making public mischief. They have not only fooled the people for many a year, but have denied them a lot of their rights, and in due course these things will be dealt with.

Now if we go back as far as 1902, I have here a copy of an Act passed in 1907, and this Act is known as the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, and the preamble to it reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS in 1902 a sum of \$250,000 was granted by the Imperial Parliament in aid of the sugar industry of the British West Indian Colonies and British Guiana, out of which the sum of £80,000 was granted to the sugar industry of Barbados; AND WHEREAS this grant has hitherto been employed under various annual Acts called Plantations-in-Aid Acts passed in 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906, as a fund whereby advances have been annually made to the owners of sugar plantations to enable them to continue the cultivation of such plantations, six pounds per centum per annum interest being paid on such advances; AND WHEREAS by the Imperial Free Grant (Disposition) Act, 1904 this sum with which such interest as may be accrued, and the securities therefor, is vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee in trust for the sugar industry of the Island, to be applied with the sanction of the Legislature for the collective and permanent benefit of the sugar industry; AND WHEREAS the system of making advances for sugar cultivation, which has been in force appears to be best calculated to promote the collective and permanent interest of the sugar industry and it is desired to place that system on a permanent footing by transferring the free grant of £80,000 made to the Barbados Sugar Industry in 1902 with accrued interest, and the securities therefor to a Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to be established for the purpose of continuing such advances to sugar producers;" 4.25 p.m.

Be it therefore enacted by the Governor, Council and Assembly, of this Island, and by the authority of the same, as follows:-"

And it provides therefore for the establishment of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

Sir, this Bank now has a capital of approximately \$40 million, and this Bank was set up in 1907 due to the foresight of a gentleman whose name will live in everlasting memory by the agriculturists in this Island of Barbados, Sir Herbert Greaves, because it was through his instrumentality and his foresight that this Bank was established. Instead of taking this money and dishing it out to the estate and plantation owners, this money was put into a fund of which we are proud today. Today, the plantation owner or the peasant who is interested in agriculture can have the benefit of this fund.

It happened in 1907. What is wrong with some of our nit-wit politicians is that they go around and think of the sort of hand-to-mouth day-to-day business and they do not think of the future. If in 1907 these people were not far-sighted enough as to establish the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank what would have happened today? Where would our sugar industry be today?

I heartily endorse the stand taken by the Barbados Workers Union. I think it is a step in the right direction, and if we were to go down to the annals of history, we would find that the far-sightedness of people in the time of Queen Elizabeth I has led to a system — and I hope the hon. senior member for the City will forgive me — where he is considered to act as a City Father. It is due to the far-sightedness of the people in charge of the Government of England during the time of Queen Elizabeth I that they started the Poor Law, because that started in the latter part of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century. Our progeny or offspring will praise the work of the Barbados Workers Union in its taking this far-sighted step and I have absolutely no apology to make in support-

ing the Union on this stand. I represent a rural constituency, and I think, when you have explained this step to your constituents, they will see the point because I am sure that they have more brains than those unemployables who come to them and tell them things.

In 1957, we had some money which put into a Rural Amenities Fund. Bear in mind, it was done by the same people who are opposing the Union on this stand. They took money which could have been given to the people and they spent it on water and put some in the Rural Amenities Fund. For the benefit of whom did they do it? The workers.

I would like to strengthen the point, if I can, or may, by the hon. senior member for St. Peter on the question of the 40% of the profit. Remember, this \$6.7 million was extra profit which has accrued to the sugar producers in Barbados. The person who is entitled to 40% of this is Government by way of income tax or company tax. Forty percent would have been the quota for the Government; therefore, the person who should have been making the noise about the \$2.6 million should have been the Government. But the Government is quite aware of the fact that we need further rural amenities and we need social advancement in our country. We also know that our housing conditions are not what we would desire and we would like to see improvements in housing. We also would like to see improvements in recreational facilities for our workers. These are things which we are well aware of, and we on our part can do only so much. We feel that the Union which has just as much interest in the workers in Barbados as this Government can use some of these funds to augment the services presently provided for by the Government.

Let us take our bank holidays. The workers in Barbados have found that bank holidays, especially Boxing Day, happen to be the most enjoyable times for them. They go to the beaches and so on, and some of them go as far down as River Bay to enjoy themselves on the beaches; but if you were to look at these beaches, what would you see? There are no sanitary conveniences for the workers; there are no baths where they can rinse when they come from the sea; there is no shelter. Who would say that the Union cannot co-operate with the Government in providing the necessary amenities for these people? It is the intention of this Government to provide amenities at some of these places for the people, but I am sure that some of this fund can be used for the purpose. This fund can be used not only for the general public of Barbados, but for people who spend most of their time at these recreational centres. The average workers of Barbados cannot afford to spend their two weeks' holiday at these seaside spots, but they can go on a bus and spend a day at these places and enjoy the comfort and luxury which are afforded them at these beaches. We feel that the necessary amenities can be provided from this fund for them. The hon. senior member for St. Peter did not refer to the question of day nurseries, but the workers themselves may be strong enough and physically fit for employment — some are better qualified than some of these nitwit politicians who have been walking about making mischief. 4.35 p.m.

I can say that all of these things are the long-term plans of the Barbados Workers' Union. This is not a departure from the policy of the Government and therefore the Government will not oppose it. The Government is constructing a Day Nursery in Grazettes and we have already established one at the Pine. All of this is part of the policy of the Government, but now, the Government is being criticised for taking a stand with the Barbados Workers' Union to provide the necessary amenities for the workers in Barbados.

The hon. member also referred to the question of playing fields. Right now the Government is engaged in carrying out negotiations for the provision of more playing fields, but I do not feel that that is strange because it is something which we expected. When the Leader of that Party was a representative of the people of St. Joseph, he failed to see the need for the establishment of a playing field in that parish: and if he failed to see the need for a

playing field in his own constituency, well then, he would hardly support the policy of the Barbados Workers' Union to provide playing fields for the children of these workers. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas asked a question only today about the provision of a mobile clinic. He did not say what clinic he had in mind, but I think he means a mobile health clinic. Who says or who would say that the Barbados Workers' Union should not use some of this money to provide a mobile health clinic for these workers? What is wrong with that? As I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all of these things are things which come with long-term planning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution, I should like finally to point out that in the not too distant future the workers of this country will inevitably see the vision of the Executive of the Barbados Workers' Union and that of the Government in supporting a policy such as this.

Mr. LOWE and Mr. HUSBANDS rose to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. George caught my eye first.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in supporting this Resolution which has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I do say that I take a very wide outlook of this matter. Let us go down the annals of history to the ninth century when Alfred came to the Throne of England. In his great wisdom he realised that the Germans and the Italians had invaded a small part of England, looted the country and carried away their cattle. He realised that this was not good enough for his people and he decided to do something. The first thing he decided to do was to educate the people and the next thing he did was to build churches; the final thing he did was to build ships so as to protect the coast. Let us think of the time when agricultural workers were working for four cents a day; when an agricultural worker went out of work he was whipped, carried before the Police Magistrate, and fined and confined. He had no representative who could say that that was an atrocious act and he was not in agreement with it. Let us now see the heights to which the worker in general has risen today! He has a Body representing him known as the Barbados Workers' Union. This is a recognized Body not only today, but for the many years during which it has performed yeoman service on behalf of the workers of Barbados. It is most surprising, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you see people who regard themselves as responsible people, but who are doing and continuing to do their best to throw the worker back into the old dispensation of division and rule, of one mortal against the other.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am looking forward to the day when the workers in this island of Barbados will stand up and allow every individual politician, every individual plantation owner, to realise that we are thinking in terms of the betterment of ourselves and of our family. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have people right now within this island who have worked from childhood to old age and there are certain plantation owners in this island who, after people have worked for them for all the years, will tell them; "Not one cent for you; I must pay it in the institution." Let us be factual. No worker knew anything about this windfall, as we have been referring to it. The Barbados Workers' Union has negotiated and has obtained 40% of the profits from the windfall. The hon. senior member for St. Peter, who is the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union has decided or agreed to place some of this money in a fund for the worker and to give him some of the money in cash. I support that policy because I am quite aware of the hardship which the workers in the sugar industry have to undergo or encounter if anything happens to them. For instance, there may be a man who, through no fault of his own, is working at a factory and he collapses as a result of a stroke; he does not carry any insurance and there is no Social Security Act on the Statute Book. This is what people should allow the workers of this country to know; there are those who have had the idea of bringing about a Social Security Scheme for the benefit of the workers ever since, and they have not yet brought it about. When these workers are taken ill, the plantation owner does not see

fit to help them, but they have to go to the Public Assistance Committee.

4.45 p.m.

When they have an organisation which is looking ahead in such great terms, I feel it is a disgrace to every loyal-minded, honest-minded, thinking Barbadian to stand up and tell any kind of worker in this Island that he should get all the money. I would like to ask a few questions on this particular matter. The cane cutters have worked with peasant farmers, and they are going to share in this windfall. Can either cane cutter go to either one of these peasant farmers and ask what is his share? I say he cannot do it. The Union has done that for him. I look forward to the day when every individual worker in this Island will become organised whereby he would be able to throw his share in for the betterment of the Island of Barbados.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like at the outset to make my position crystal clear at the beginning of my contribution on this Resolution. I approach this matter in quite an impartial manner, without any bit of acrimony against any political Party or against any active or even just registered Trade Union. The aims of this Resolution are laudable. I have read the aims of the proposal for a sugar worker's Rehabilitation and Welfare Fund which appears to have emanated from the brain of representatives of the Workers' Union, and the aims and objects herein outlined are also praiseworthy. However, Sir, I always like to get down to fundamentals.

The Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association are two Trade Unions which year after year meet and iron out and reach agreement, the Barbados Producers' Federation on behalf of its membership, and the Barbados Workers' Union on behalf of its membership, although it is obvious that as a result of decisions reached between these two Trade Unions, the sugar workers in this Island should benefit generally. There are three funds that are administered by Government. Certain other allocations are gone into at meetings between representatives of the Union and the Government. These funds are known as the Labour Welfare Fund, the Rehabilitation Fund and the Price Stabilization Fund. Again when the Sugar Producers' Association meets the Government and the Union, it is tripartite; the Union can only be said officially to be bargaining for its membership, the Sugar Producers' Federation, on the other hand is bargaining for its membership, and the Government, of course, is the sort of advisory mediator; and if there are any changes to be made in the allocations up and down to these funds, that matter is agreed upon. The Government's attitude to a Trade Union cannot be partial; the Government's attitude to any Trade Union must be impartial. In Barbados we fortunately have had for a long time for the sake of industrial peace one Trade Union; but as far as the Trade Union law is concerned, no one ever can tell when there might not be more than one Trade Union that can get the ear of the employer; so Government has to look quite impartially on these agreements between a Trade Union and an employing body. If you believe in democracy there may be more than one Trade Union. I am not a member or officer of a Trade Union, and I do not think I will be again; so I am not talking for anybody or for any job. I want that to be expressly stated here and now. I am not grinding any axe for anybody or for any Trade Union even to be. Apart from the fact that I associate myself with the laudable aims expressed in this Agreement which is between the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Workers' Union — and I have no doubt that the aims are workable — if it is that the membership of the Union has agreed to a certain percentage deduction to be transferred to a fund, and if it be that the membership of the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association has agreed similarly, I have no quarrel with anybody; but there are many other workers and many other owners of land who are outside the membership of the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association and many workers who are not members of the Barbados Workers' Union.

4.55 p.m.

Now, the Government has to be real as to how it projects a matter of this sort. There is no doubt about that, I

do not go to any political meetings, nor do I go to any Trade Union meetings either. I understand that there is a Trade Union agreement for the establishment of this fund, and that is why I say that the attitude of the Government is absolutely important, quite apart from however laudable this agreement may be and quite apart from however laudable the proposals of the Workers' Union are. As I was saying a moment ago, I had not been around to any meetings, and I do not intend to do so; but an element of dissension has undoubtedly reached my ears, and I have heard loud enough conversations in the street which prove that there is an element of dissension. Members of the Union know about it and members of the Sugar Producers' Federation know about it. And those whom I have heard very audibly may be non-Unionists or they may be members of another Trade Union. I understand that there is a trade union of Local Government employees which does not concern the Barbados Workers Union. Members of this House know that there are other trade unions besides the Barbados Workers' Union.

The position is this, Sir. The Hon. Minister of Social Services made mention of the history of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and mentioned how much farsightedness it took on the part of its founder, the hon. late gentleman, who was seized with the idea of forming the bank to safeguard the sugar industry. The Hon. Minister compared the far-sightedness of that hon. late gentleman with the far-sightedness of the Barbados Workers' Union in setting up this fund. However, I say that, with the best will in the world, if you are promoting anything and you find persuasion does not do it, you are going on the wrong track if you are trying to enforce it. With the best will in the world, if you are going about the noblest aim, if you are pursuing the loftiest object, if you have to do it by force and not persuasion you are not standing in a happy position. Therefore, that is why I say that the attitude of the Government should be quite impartial and non-partisan.

Sir, I am in agreement with these proposals. There is nothing about them with which anyone can find fault. Nobody is asking for any details as to the measure of what the Resolution states and, as I have said at the beginning, I do not want to be misunderstood: I just want to be frank and to present my ideas to the House in as proper a manner as I am able to do so. I repeat, if the workers are confused, whether they are inside or outside of the Barbados Workers' Union, as to the amount of money which is going to be given to them, it is a regrettable circumstance; but there is so much noise in the air, there is so much loud dissension in the air. I am not responsible for who has fermented it, but I heard it: so I must throw out to hon. members that they must take a very clear and steady view of the matter before they commit themselves to this Resolution. All the acrimony is of no avail to this matter. Mark you, Sir, two Trade Unions have given their approval to that agreement; therefore, the Government has the right to approve of that agreement; but I say that if there is a considerable amount of the element of dissension and it comes from an element which claims no allegiance to either side, it is an element of size and an element which has to be regarded. If there is such an element which runs counter to the established aims of the proposals herein set up, the established aims taken by the Hon. Premier, we as legislators who are asked to commit ourselves to the acceptance and the passing into legislation of the terms set out in the Hon. Premier's statement have got to be very, very careful. No one decries the aims — no one will; as a matter of fact, no one should dare to; but we have to do more than that. If we find in this community a considerable element that sees differently, we have to be very, very careful. I have no allegiance one way or the other.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as regards the administration of these three funds which I mentioned some time ago — the Labour Welfare Fund, the Price Stabilisation Fund and the Rehabilitation Fund — when it comes to the Labour Welfare Fund, the Government by the way of providing certain social amenities disposes of that fund.

5.05 p.m.

Some years ago there was an agreement reached by representatives of the Union to assist in the construction

of the new Hospital by means of the release of certain moneys from the Labour Welfare Fund. The Hospital serves the entire community; it serves Trade Unionists and non-Trade Unionists alike because it is a Government institution. Already I have heard — and I would like hon. members to take note of this fact — that there are those who query where they stand, whether they will get any benefit from what is deducted for welfare purposes or not. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have the right to query that if they are not Trade Unionists. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that there is another Trade Union; as a legislator and an independent member of this House I must be absolutely clear and unfettered in a matter of this sort, because I do not owe any allegiance to anybody but to the people of Barbados, and not a section of the people. I do not have to work harder for one section of the people than for any other section; and what I have said is not in any way to berate anyone who has to be in a position of working for any section of workers.

I want what I say to be taken without bias or without prejudice; any worries which I may have will stem from the fact that this money is for the benefit of sugar workers — and when we say "sugar workers", we mean sugar workers whether they be Unionists or non-Unionists or whether they are in one Union or in another Union. I am not concerned with whether they are members of the Barbados Workers' Union or the Barbados Progressive Union of Workers, as I think it is called. Every progressively minded socialist politician should have the interest of workers at heart and I do not say that only socialist politicians do have the interest of the workers at heart, because the workers have to vote for us if we are to obtain seats in here. This is what I am really worried about; we have got to remember that our charge, our concern, our responsibility is even greater now than it has been said in Parliament that possibly there are people who may foment trouble. Our responsibility here is the more serious now because of the fact that we are told that there is a possibility of certain elements existing, elements which can foment trouble among the workers. If that were not a circumstance of the hour, we could rush even more headlong into the general terms of this Resolution; but through that circumstance being present to us, we have to be very careful in dealing with this matter. The attitude of the Government must be one of impartiality. I respect the approval reached by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. With the best will in the world and possessed of the loftiest aims and objects in the world, we have got to watch if there is any good in sectional interest; we have to watch at this time those who claim allegiance to any Union. I have heard it said that although the Barbados Workers' Union does not represent and cannot represent contractual workers outside of its membership, it generally does. That is true. An employer who is outside the Sugar Producers' Federation may be made to pay if he does not pay, the wages which are bargained for and received through negotiations between the Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Workers' Union. That employer can be put on the spot and he can be forced to pay the rates which are being paid. He has no legal obligation however; it is industrial pressure that makes him do that, and he is a sensible person if he does it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can imagine that another Union became well established in Barbados, and it received recognition from employers to the extent that agreements were signed between that Union and the Sugar Producers Federation. It may be that in Barbados we may see the coming into being of another sizeable Union; I do not know if that will be so; I am not interested in that development. I am not thinking of becoming an officer in the Union; I have my experience for which I am glad. I must tell the House that the attitude of the Government in this matter should be very, very impartial. The Government can meet difficult proposals if it is complacent, but this legislation is something which has to be very deeply pruned. It must be very well considered before it is embarked upon. That has nothing at all whatsoever to do with the lofty aims and objects which are contained in the proposals of the Barbados Workers' Union and in the terms of the Statement made by the Hon. Premier. Who could venture to say that certain facilities would not redound to the workers as a result of these proposals?

You have in the proposed Resolution the terms of an agreement between the Barbados Workers' Union and the representatives of the Sugar Producers' Federation. You have two partners and the Government is the unenviable referee. The Government does not sit at a conference table and agree to terms; it may approve of what has been agreed upon and in a tripartite conference there may emerge laudable suggestions; but the actual agreements are made between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. They are the two contracting bodies. You do not have any third party who is a representative of non-Trade Unionists; and if with this undoubted element which is known to the Trade Union and which is known to many other people of this country, there is the responsibility of opinion which may convince them that the agreement is against their interest, if that is so, there may be trouble afterwards.

5.15 p.m.

If this noisy element which is known to the Union and which is known to many people in this country is the recipient of information that may convince people that the agreement is against their interest, there may be trouble.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I have in a very careful manner outlined my attitude to the Resolution. I had so to discharge my trust in Parliament; I had to let Parliament know of my observations and I had to speak out very clearly as to what I think the position of the Government is in matters of this sort, non-partisan and non-sectional, and I think that we have got to be very careful in spite of the laudable aims and objects contained in both the Hon. Premier's Statement and the proposals of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this Resolution which reads "BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve the Statement made by the Honourable Premier on the 5th November, 1963, relating to the additional profits accruing to the Sugar Industry in respect of the 1963 sugar crop" standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I am going to begin exactly where the last speaker left off. I have one criticism to make in this matter; and before I make that, I should say that within the last four or five weeks, this matter has struck me as one that should be above party politics, and I say that because I have been keeping my ear to the ground and have been listening very carefully. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is such a thing as public opinion, and there is such a thing as enlightened public opinion. There are those of us who are able to convince our constituents from public platforms why we should be sent here, and sometimes that to some of us becomes very easy. I will say at the outset that I spoke to the hon. senior member for St. Peter in whose name this Resolution stands, and I thought this matter so important that I suggested to him that though the speech which he made in here today will be taken by the Reporters and will appear in the Official Gazette, it would possibly be abridged in every newspaper in this country, leaving the 35,000 people or so remaining in the same position where they will still be gullible to those persons who want to lead them, in their opinion, but who want, in our opinion, to mislead them. I feel that this matter is of such importance and borders on such great anxiety among the most important section of workers in this country that not only should the person who is most knowledgeable on this subject have been given an opportunity to speak on this on an island-wide hookup so that the workers employed on sugar estates those employed in or about sugar factories, those employed by Sugar Transport Limited, those employed by Sugar Terminals Limited and those employed at Molasses Terminals Limited might hear through the radio the exact position that has been made out, but so that they will understand that there are those of us in this House who lend support to this scheme because we have faith in his integrity, and I do not think anybody questions his honesty of purpose and sincerity in this matter. I feel myself that he wasted a precious two hours of just making a speech on the floor of this House — he will pardon me for saying this, but I do not mean to

be rude — which will not reach exactly where I feel it should reach. I have been here long enough to understand that in this municipal area there are but few agricultural workers, and if you take the various constituencies outside the municipal area — or St. Michael, for that matter — which some hon. members have the honour to represent, we are all aware — and I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Peter — that there is some sort of unrest among the agricultural workers which needs to be quelled by the leaders not only of the Trade Union, but of the Government, since we are asked to agree to the Statement which the Hon. Premier has made. Not one-third of what has been said here will appear in the Press and less than one-third of the people who are interested will be reading what is said here: and surely enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know as well as I do that it would certainly have done a great deal of good for the speeches to be broadcast and the Government's position to be known in this matter. There is no doubt about the fact that an amount of harm is being done, but politics is a game — and especially at this time of the year, because as soon as people who have not been accustomed to money begin to hear about millions or thousands, they begin to think in terms of what they must have; and as soon as they feel that the amount which is set out for them does not seem sufficient, they will at the first suggestion by anybody who wants to mislead them go ahead and accept all they have said.

5.25 p.m.

Quite frankly, I am going to support the Resolution and I am going to support it for many reasons. I am going to support it because as the Hon. Minister of Social Services has read and rightly said, many years ago when the British Government gave this country a sum of money as well as all of the other Islands, the people in the other Islands took that money and gave it to the owners of plantations to rehabilitate or put their plantations in order, not reckoning with the fact that when you have a drought — you may have a cycle of bad years and you may have a cycle of good years for a certain length of period and then bad years for another period.

We in Barbados, did not do that. We had in Barbados at that time a very distinguished legal luminary as a politician; and besides reading his speeches, I have been told by those who knew him and could have appreciated him — and I refer to the late Sir Herbert Greaves — that his own type ostracized him and considered him the greatest enemy to the plantocracy and merchants of Barbados just because he did not do what some people felt should have been done, and as what some people today feel should be done with this money which has come by way of a windfall. When the late Sir Herbert Greaves said that it should be placed in a fund and a bank should be established to aid the people in the industry, everyone abused him and became annoyed with him; but we have lived to see, after he passed on from this House, after he became Chief Justice of this Island, that that Bank has saved many a plantation, and it is that Bank which has prevented us from having a Tate and Lyle Corporation holding everything possible and owning everything possible in this country. Indeed, there were times when that Bank had to use the term 'lockup' for a period, and had to carry over loans when there were bad years until the Island got a good rainfall and so that the planters could get some money to pay.

I do not think I would be misquoting if I repeated what Sir Winston Churchill himself said to the effect that in those days the British Government lived on the West Indies and they lived primarily on our sugar; so what they gave us was only what they took away from us. Even today with my limited knowledge of the historical background, what they gave us today is what they took from us.

I feel that is a criticism which I should make, after hearing the Minister of Social Services representing the Government saying what I consider to be a creditable thing, and after hearing the hon. senior member for St. Peter putting the case and putting it strongly. He can enlighten

public opinion because there is no sense your attempting to go to enlighten the public. The people are divided upon this matter, but they are divided because there are wicked people who are trying to tell them things. I can say this: if my Government was in power — and this is making a strong statement — we would certainly have to use a portion of this money other than giving every cent to all the workers. I am going to say that the Barbados Labour Party would have done the same thing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know where the hon. member gets his information from, but the history of negotiations in the agricultural sector of this economy discloses that the Barbados Labour Party has never given the workers one cent. The Rural Amenities Fund was established in 1957, and they were even bitterly opposed to providing any kind of increase to the workers. The Cabinet Members went to Government House and asked the Governor to prosecute the hon. senior member for St. Philip and myself for telling the workers that the Sugar Producers' Association had made a profit of \$9 1/2 million when the Barbados Workers Union had agitated for a wage increase. How can the hon. senior member for the City stand there without any kind of a smile on his face and say that the Barbados Labour Party would have done the same thing and have a fund and distribute money to the workers? He could not have been serious when he said that because he knows that they would have never done it. It is only this year that the Sugar Producers' Association has disclosed their books to the Government and the Barbados Workers' Union. And they have only done that because as far back as 1957 they knew that I have been working on the economics of the industry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown will repeat what he said, I will be glad: because from what the Hon. Premier has said, it is something different to what I heard.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can support what I said with accuracy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: From what the Hon. Premier said and what the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown said, I did not understand him to say that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that the Barbados Labour Party would have done the same thing.

He is accusing them of having some kind of conscience for the workers.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier wanted to get that off his chest. I know he realises I did not say that. That is why I say that this debate to me is one of the most important debates in this House for this Session, and I am suggesting to the hon. member that he has not taken it as seriously as I have taken it.

I said that people in enlightened public opinion are those whom you need not worry about. Let us take the average agricultural labourer. He is not what we would consider as enlightened public opinion. If my Party were in power, we certainly would have kept a portion of this money and we certainly would have given the labourers a portion, and then I went on to say that the hon. members on the other side who represent the labourers rather than saying today that they should have all the money, if they were in power they would have kept some of the money.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think the hon. member is misleading the House. They would have kept all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You see, Sir, I have never been a member of the Barbados Labour Party. I know that the Hon. Premier, when he first came back from England, was a member of the Barbados Labour Party; therefore, he would have a greater knowledge of what they would do than I. 5.35 p.m.

I am only saying that looking at it from a statesman's point of view I cannot see how they could say that you should give every cent of this money to the workers.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but it is not a question of inside knowledge. The hon. member has been in this House for all this time, and he knows that on each and every occasion that the sugar industry made extra profits, the Barbados Labour Party, which was identified with the Trade Union Leader, far from giving the workers any bonus, they deliberately concealed from the workers in the sugar industry the knowledge that the industry had made any profits at all. What inside knowledge therefore is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, human beings must be subject to change. What the hon. member says is true, but we have never had any windfall of this nature.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Again I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I do not want to think that he is deliberately misleading the House but I do not think he should make statements which are incorrect and misleading. He has said that we have never had a windfall of this nature. I want to inform the hon. member that we had \$500,000 (Canadian) in 1953-54 and \$9.5 million (West Indian) in 1957 and not one penny was paid out to the agricultural workers. The hon. member knows that and still he says that we have never had a windfall of this nature.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is perfectly all right for the hon. member to get that off his chest. I was saying, Sir, that human beings are subject to change. If they say that all the money should be given to the workers, then they have some different outlook. They could not honestly go to anybody and say: "You should give the workers every cent of this money". As far as the hon. member is concerned, we have had Elections in this country; and I may say that the Hon. Premier anticipated me too early because I was going to refer to the Rehabilitation Fund and the Price Stabilisation Fund. All of these Funds were used, and at no time was anything like this brought out in the way in which it has been brought out. As an economist, the Hon. Premier might want to correct me, but it is my considered opinion that the Government will have to be a party to this matter because if you make money and you choose to give it away, you will still have to pay income tax on it. As a result of a good sugar crop and as a result of the bad winter which they had in Europe which destroyed a part of the beet sugar, and further as a result of the crisis in Cuba, we were left with more sugar to be sold in the open market than what we would normally have had. All of that has resulted in the fact that more money was made for sugar. If this Government had said that it does not matter.....

At this stage, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the hon. member can show us and, in fact, has shown us that we have made more money, what has been termed as a windfall, and that is the reason for this dissension of disagreement as to what people should have and what they should not have. The Hon. Premier has been able to get the matter off his chest, but I was coming to it. The sugar producers made money which they did not expect to make, and normally they would have to pay to the Government 75 cents in every dollar. The Government could have stood out of this matter and the Trade Union would not have been in this position. The Hon. Premier knows that I understand a little bit about the sugar industry in this country. If this present Government had said: "You are making this money and you are going to pay income tax on it", there would not have been any sugar workers getting any of this money and there would not have been any Trade Union coming in. When you hear that money has come in, well, one man told me that the Queen had sent some money for them and the Government does not want to give it to them. As a matter of fact, a woman came into my home and asked me if this windfall came as a result of the hurricane which we were going to have.

This talk about a windfall is so much nonsense. When we make these speeches in here, we are not reaching the people whom we want them to reach; the people want to

know something about this matter. In the circumstances, the Trade Union Leader has put forward a Memorandum and what do you find? The Union must manage the fund which has been suggested; the Government has allowed the Union to manage that fund. Mr. Speaker, it is not like other funds to which the Government would hold on and would not allow the Union to manage. In this Memorandum which has been circulated to hon. members, you will find that the Trade Union has five members, the Government has one and the Sugar Producers have one. That only shows you the goodwill of the Government.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services has referred to some people as "unemployables", but I prefer to call them the "idle rich".
5.45 p.m.

I have my own doubts about certain things and I watch very carefully. I prefer however to call them the idle rich, because when men can drive about and do absolutely nothing for a living or refuse to do anything for a living, but drive about in motor-cars, I do not say they are unemployables; they are idle rich, because with gasoline at the price it is now, they must be getting money from somewhere; so that is where I disagree with the Hon. Minister of Social Services. I express the views of my Party, and I fear that these idle rich are stirring up a certain amount of strife in this country which we have got to quiet now once and for all. That is why I regret most bitterly that the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Hon. Premier and other Ministers were not allowed to make their speech on the radio, and I believe that even the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have made a speech supporting the idea of not giving all this money to the workers but putting some in a fund.

I remember the days, and so can you, Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Leader of the House brought down nearly every cane cutter in Barbados and went to Queens Park. The labourers were armed with bills, hoes, cutlasses and everything, and the hon. member was asking for \$1.00 per hundred for canes. The then Party said it was impossible, it was nonsense and nobody could get \$1.00 a hundred for cutting canes. I should like to say that there were those of us who were very much afraid, because a hungry man can be a very dangerous man. The crop had not started and there was a big row going on, but we found out after that there were some ships outside because the situation was very tense and serious; there was no smile on the face of the hon. member who is now smiling, and I should not like to see that situation arise in Barbados again. Since then there has been the idea of getting a man-of-war outside for your humble servant, but I have never been afraid and I am not afraid now. People are walking and saying they are not going to take this and this or what is going to happen. It would be well not only for these speeches to have been broadcast, but for all three Parties to let it be known that they favour the idea of holding back some of the money for these purposes which have been mentioned by other speakers. I have read and re-read this matter and I agree with it. Speaking for the Municipality, it has been disclosed quite recently on a Board on which I am serving that over 80,000 people live within the Municipality, but that immediately after the crop that number rises to 85,000 or nearly 90,000. Now you are getting this amount of money to be used for the workers of the country. The Government has admitted that there are still 29,000 unemployed; we all admit that there is seasonal employment, and that after the crop has finished, seldom does a worker get more than two or three days' work. We must all admit that there are some die-hard plantation owners who will say to such people who worked on their plantations for years and years until they became sick, "Well, I have been paying my taxes; go to the almshouse." It is good, therefore, to have a Trade Union with people who have initiative and are prepared to set up some sort of fund that will save such people when they come to that age, not necessarily the age for receiving Old Age Pension, because the age for receiving Old Age Pension is still 68; but you will find a number of agricultural labourers or their dependants who must be helped at times, and the age range is 55, 60 or 65. Every year you will find that people migrate to the Municipality after

the crop; they come from St. Thomas, St. George or even Christ Church, because they feel that with the exodus of people to the United Kingdom and with the children left on their hands, they stand a better chance of receiving more money in the municipal area than if they remained in either of the other two Councils.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. senior member for St. Peter made the suggestion that they will build up this fund, I was hoping, and I still hope, that this year there will not be a windfall as far as the sugar industry is concerned, but some sort of gale so that we will have better prospects, and I can see that if our crop reaches anything like what it reached last year and with the situation as it is, we should have more to sell in the open market than we had last year. Some of the young people do not know what their ancestors or some of their grandfathers suffered, and the Hon. Premier and the Trade Union leader should tell them. No one in this country should begrudge anything that is given, allocated to or set aside for agricultural workers. None of the youth of this country or few of them want to go back to the fields to work. I have listened to the Hon. Premier in his suggestions about getting 40 year old people to cut canes, because 25 or 22 year old people are just not going to do it, and that is the reason why America is sending here for people, because their teenagers and 20 year old men are not going to do the job; so they send to the West Indies.
5.55 p.m.

What is the true position and what should be known to those workers is that during the 1914 War all the sugar workers of Barbados were taken advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for saying this. There can be no doubt about that because during the 1914-18 War individual merchants shipped sugar to individuals in England. There was no question of buying sugar in bulk, and it was a question of great competition and the merchants made money. It is true that a few dollars more were paid for canes, but there are those of us living today who remember that people were paid eight cents and ten cents per ton for cutting canes.

The British Government, realising its responsibility at the beginning of the last war, decided that this sort of thing should not be allowed to go on any longer and therefore, all the sugar from these parts was bought in bulk by the British Government and they fixed the three funds — The Price Stabilisation Fund, the Rehabilitation Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund. I remember in 1953 when my Party was campaigning that we suggested that a portion of the Welfare Fund should be used. The Hon. Premier was anticipating me; he did not know what I had in mind. We said that portion of the Welfare Fund should be directed to the workers themselves. We were violently opposed and abused and were told that we were only playing politics. It is on the records and I do not see how I can go back on what we suggested then.

Therefore, today, I agree with the scheme put up by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and with the Statement made by the Hon. Premier relative to the scheme put up by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I do think in the long run that these workers on plantations and in factories and the like should and will benefit. In those days, we said then and we say so now, that they should include other workers. We suggested in those days that those workers who prepared the road for the canes to come out should be included in this fund. I remember that distinctly, and I also remember one of the loudest persons who said that they should be excluded. We said that if those persons did not make those roads, you could not get the canes out. While it is true to say that there is a tremendous lot of bickering and a tremendous lot of misleading statements on this matter, I am going to support it as it stands today because I believe in the interest of the workers that a fund set aside would give them the right to manage that fund — it will not give the Government the right — and I think that on the Committee there are five of them against one of the Government and one of the Sugar Producers' Association.

On the other hand, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that their position should be made abundantly clear. It is not for me to refer it to the hon. member, but it is a question of how far does this matter reach. Does it reach the 35,000 agricultural workers in this country? That is why I say to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that it would be well and good if he can get a hook up over Rediffusion so as to let people sit and listen to him and understand all about this matter, because after the workers have gone to Welchman Hall and other places and have listened to some political demagogue telling them that this windfall which has come is something to all of which they are entitled, and that if they have worked for \$500, they are entitled to \$200 more, he would be the only person who can give them the true facts. As you know, Sir, money causes children to kill parents, it causes husbands and wives to disagree; but if you get people of the Party and people who are trusted, the workers will listen to them and understand. They will say: "I remember all through the years he has fought our battles and he has done this for us now; he has done this now because he thinks this is the best way of doing it; therefore, we will have confidence in him."

I warn the hon. member that if he merely sits by and says to a few people who are agricultural workers what the position is, he is not going to get any where with them. You must be able to convince them that this is no windfall, and if this Government did not agree by way of letting off income tax, it could not have come about and this would not have been in the hands of the Barbados Workers' Union. You must tell them that they are going to give you a portion of it, and set aside a portion of it in a fund so that eventually you will have something of what Sir Herbert Greaves did for plantation and estate owners. I know the hon. senior member for St. Peter has courage; but never mind however much courage he might have, there is always the necessity to be cautious. Go to the people and let them know the true facts. There are those who are so anxious to get back into the House because they have no idea of making a living otherwise, not even by shoving a scavenging broom. All they would do is to play warri all day long. Therefore, hon. members must remember, if a member who has been in here and really got a windfall, one who never expected to get \$700 or \$800 a month and then suddenly like a bolt from the blue found himself outside and not even receiving \$200 a month, what that member would do, or go to the length of doing.

6.05 p.m.

If you remove a Minister from something like \$800 and bring him down to a little \$200 like my friend, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, he would feel bitter about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: To which hon. member for St. Joseph is the hon. member referring?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Both of them are my friends. When we have a windfall and hon. members find that they have lost the windfall, you will find that with the courage of the greatest person, you must be careful to tell the truth; you must represent the workers. I have been in politics for a longer period than the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I decided that he was a courageous man when he was working for a pittance in Swan Street, and when he came before the Chamber of Commerce I thought myself that this man was either a madman or a fool, having regard to the things which he said before the Chamber of Commerce. I believe that the hon. member's integrity cannot be questioned by any man, but with the best of intentions, Mr. Speaker, you must be cautious. Let no man fool you that they really want to start another Union in this country; they just want to get back in here. They do not intend to do any other kind of work. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that for nearly two years members are out of this Chamber and they do no work? In America that would cause an investigation. For a man to be a member of this House and then for two years he is not doing anything, you will have to investigate these things in order to decide how such a person is living. One day a man said to me: "Brother 'Motts'!" I was standing in the Lobby of the House near to the Other Place and one Minister said to me while he was swinging his keys in his

hand: "Look at my limousine down there." That member has been accustomed to a windfall; he would go around telling people that this windfall came your way and you are keeping it. I have asked this question: do you mean to say that you can carry away a million dollars like that?

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this Resolution from the depths of my heart. In the circumstances, we have a shining example of what this situation can mean to the agricultural policy of this island. As to the Labour Welfare Fund, I will show you what the people of St. Michael and the City and I, myself, have suffered. When it was decided to use this fund as a Rural Amenities Fund, we sent in list after list to the last Government. We asked for a toilet and bath in Jackson, and I am saying that during the period in which they established that Fund not one red cent was spent in the Municipality, because they felt that that would have given me some kudos. It may be that they did something in the parish of St. Joseph; in fact, they must have done something in the parish of St. Joseph because the then Premier represented that parish. I just say all of this in order to show you how the City and the parish of St. Michael got through; not one red cent was spent down here and the ex-Minister of Social Services could always find some excuse.

I have watched the hon. senior member for St. Peter in many a battle. I do not share his political views although we are very good friends. I have seen him in battle when he had a forthwith summons to appear in court in connection with a political matter or something like that, and I became very worried because I knew the influence of the ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies; but, thank God, there was a man of courage, integrity and honesty on the Bench who was not playing politics and who had the guts to dismiss the case which was brought against the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I was glad when I saw his supporters raise him shoulder high.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Judge was a man of honesty and integrity but the point is that Sir Granley Adams had made out the complaint wrongly. (Laughter).

Mr. SPEAKER: That was the contention of my hon. and learned friend who appeared in the case in the learned Magistrate's Court.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I believe that I was the first person to tell the hon. senior member for St. Peter what would have happened. Sometimes he seemed to wonder how I knew what would happen. I saw him when he landed back here once and I told him exactly what he would meet with and what would happen about the Ministry. I have seen the hon. member survive and conquer in all of these battles. I do hope that he will take some advice in this matter and go out to the people who are interested in this matter and whom this matter must interest primarily, namely, the agricultural workers, and let them know that there has not been any windfall, or that people have just brought money and given you.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this Resolution and I do hope that all will end well for the benefit and harmony and unity of the people of this country as a whole, because I sense that all is not well.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I heard the last speaker express the wish that some of the speeches made in this House on this Resolution today could be published throughout the whole island of Barbados.

6.15 p.m.

I did not know, Sir, that such long speeches would be made by hon. members, but I am supporting this Bill because wherever I turn throughout the Island people ask me about this windfall, and mention the Barbados Workers' Union and its General Secretary. I tried to convince them as much as I can, but the people of Barbados, especially the working class people do not realise the use of a Union or those who are in charge of it; otherwise they would keep quiet. The Union has to negotiate for the workers,

solve their problems and bring benefits to them, and when the General Secretary goes before anyone to plead a case, they should get on their knees and pray to the Most High to direct the leader to bring words of consolation to those who are under him, and when they see him, they should bow to him. He is playing one of the greatest parts in the community of Barbados; and as far as his ability is concerned, I do not think you would ever find a man in Barbados to stand up to him and to the principle of the General Secretary of the Union, who is the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Mr. Speaker, since we have been fortunate to have a windfall this year, the people should realise that there is plenty of work to be done in Barbados, and if money is taken out of the windfall and put aside for the benefit of these people and their children, they should be thankful to know that there is something being kept in reserve for them, and not go along and use sarcastic remarks against their leaders. If I were the hon. member, I would go around and preach the truth, because it is the truth that sets people free. Why should one demand a person to do something that they refused to do when they had the power? That is the danger of what is existing today, and I am calling on Government to do something about it. These people are going around and will cause an insurrection by preaching false doctrine and lies to people. Any Government should preach the truth to the people because the same words you speak today have to come back on you tomorrow, and anyone who tries to mislead the people and cause any kind of insurrection will fall into the gall of bitterness and into the bottom of iniquity.

I understand from the Union that there is a 10% bonus for the people, and there will be a certain amount kept back to help them with various kinds of facilities which they need. You have to think of latrines in the rural areas and resort houses. You also need more roads and schools throughout the Island; so if the wind has blown in our favour, and we have got a little more money, why should we give it all to them? These people put me in mind of the prodigal son who went to his father and asked him for what was his and let him go away. The father gave what he had to the son and he went to a far city and spent it in riotous living and at the end of that he had to go and feed swine. He came back naked, worn out and destitute, and the father had to support him again; but if the father had the money in his hands he would have been able to clothe him, feed him and protect him. If one of the labourers fell in the street now, whom do you think he would call on? He would ask to bring an ambulance. Do you think an ambulance comes from a crabhole? It is bought out of the same money that they work for. When he gets to the hospital, there is somewhere for him to stay; and who is going to attend to him? The lobsters of the sea? He will be attended by men who are qualified and who are paid by Government, but the Government gets the money from the same people. Those who are going to preach should therefore preach the truth and not mislead the people, because telling lies would not get them in power. There is a time for every man; and if I spend my time this morning and somebody takes over in the evening, it should not matter. I do not expect to be in the House of Assembly all the days of my life, but what should I do? Walk around and tell lies? Each person has to wait on the current, because the current will not stop.

Last week, Sir, I went to St. Joseph and was surrounded by about 40 people who told me that they heard that the Union and the Government were agreeing to hold back money from them. I explained the position to them and they accused me of misleading them, but I told them that the Union and the Government were negotiating and they would get the best. I told them that the General Secretary was negotiating for them and that the present Government was not going to rob them. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have been in this House since 1959 and have been asking the last Government till tears came from my eyes to do the roads in St. Andrew, because the poor people there have to head canes two or three days until they get them to the main road, and I am sure that some of these people's toenails are as long as hooks which will trip them up in trying to get to the road; but the Government went out of power and no roads were done. I am certain that some of this windfall money would help to give them some of these

roads; but if you give the people all, they will still cry for the roads, for more schools, more houses and more facilities.

6.25 p.m.

Sir, what must you do? Give them all and then do what? I believe in fairplay. Preserve some for them. Even, Mr. Speaker, a battery runs on water. The generator carries current to the battery, and if you run your car without the generator motor working, you will run down the battery. You will find yourself pushing that car all about, and it would not start because you would not be getting any current. That current is to keep the motor working.

Sir, I hope that the people of this Island will look at the Workers' Union with a different outlook and that they would recognise that it is their Union, and it is their Union that has caused them today to be receiving the benefits which they are receiving. If the Government did not move to negotiate with the Workers' Union, or the Workers' Union did not negotiate with the Government, the workers would not get a penny. Negotiating one with the other is what has caused them to know that there was a windfall.

I think the workers should be satisfied with what the Union has done and they should pray that we have another windfall in the coming crop season. They should not speak against the Union or against the Government. It is not called for. I will not be satisfied with any man speaking either against a man when he is doing good or against the Government when it is doing good.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, quite seriously I am speaking on this Resolution. I realise that most of the people who work in the sugar industry have been misled as to the money coming here by the rise in price of our selling sugar to the British Government. While in Germany a few weeks ago, I studied this matter quite seriously and an Assistant to the Director of the Co-operative School said to me that the winter had destroyed their beet and, therefore, the price of sugar in England was soaring everyday. I told him that I have seen that; but I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I would not be too sorry if the winter destroyed the beet again next year, because I can only be thinking of the benefit which would again come to the people of Barbados.

If there is one thing which I would say now is that the people have been misled. When the people first saw in the newspapers that 60% of the total profits would go to the Sugar Producers' Association and 40% of the total profits would go to the workers, most of them were led to believe that 40% would be their share and that is what is bringing all the trouble in Barbados. All along those people who have been cast into their coffins have been telling the people things, and nobody wants to hear them. They have taken this as something to carry back to the people and they are telling the people that 40 per cent belongs to them and the Government is joining with the leader of the Union to withhold their money.

It took me great pains to go all around the parish of St. John to tell the people what is really the true position as regards this windfall. Some of them have understanding, but it has been so pushed into the mouths of a few of them by the dead Labour Party members, who have been all around and tried to mislead the people, statements to the contrary, that today I see no reason why legislation should not be drafted to put those people in their correct position where they should have been long ago. (A VOICE: Do you mean in jail?) I speak of no other place. When a country is running as smoothly as this was running two weeks ago, some people who call themselves responsible people in a country were just going around and misleading the people and trying to agitate them. There should be some law to put those agitators in their place. I know that it could not happen in many countries. Honestly, the people of Barbados realise that they have the honour to do that because the people like to hear about money. That is the only reason

why they are listening to those people. This is Christmas time and everybody would like some money to spend.

Any politician who tells the people that some of this money which is sponsored by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government should not be put into a fund, I would really ask that he be banished out of Barbados. I listened on Wednesday night to Mencea Cox speaking at a meeting. This is what he said. He said that in 1962, they had a windfall of \$1 million, and \$500,000 of it, they allocated to the Rural Amenities Fund. With it they laid mains and put up toilets and baths. But the workers never knew one word about it. He was pressed into saying that. At none of their meetings before you ever heard that.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not say anything of this money. He said that he did not know much about it. That is the position. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not commit himself because he realises that in 1957 his party's boss, Sir Grantley Adams, said that this money did not concern the workers at all and not a cent did they give them. That is why the hon. member is trying to play ball. He was not speaking on this issue. He knows the position. In 1957, when it was \$7 million, Sir Grantley Adams did not give them a cent.
6.35 p.m.

Who had to fight for that money for the workers to get that 7% *ad hoc* bonus? The Hon. Premier. I cannot understand what they are saying today because, out of the \$500,000, not one toilet and bath was erected in the parish of St. Joseph so that the people up there could say: "We enjoyed something from the windfall." The first toilet and bath which those people got erected was when this Government came into power. How can a Government sit down and allow people like O. T. Alder and Mencea Cox - of course, Alder will never get out of the business of selling; he is accustomed to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member that this Resolution is a Resolution which asks the House to approve the Statement made by the Hon. Premier on the 5th November, 1963, relating to the additional profits accruing to the Sugar industry in respect of the 1963 sugar crop. These additional profits have nothing to do with what Mr. Alder does.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the last Government had this country to run for the last 17 years and they are now ashamed. I am glad that they are walking about telling the people about this windfall; if this Government was not in power, this windfall would not have been talked about. The plantation owners are very eager to ask the labourers to call for all of this money, but in 1957 they did not tell the labourers to call for any money because there was a co-operation between them and the then Government. The more these people preach to the labourers about this windfall, the more the labourers will learn how dishonest and corrupt they were. However, Sir, instead of this windfall pushing us down, it will push this Government up.

Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add to this Resolution now because I have talked myself hoarse for two or three days in trying to convince people in my parish. I believe, however, that a few of my constituents are yet going on with the nonsense which they have heard from the dead party; but I am sure that I have done sufficient in my constituency to convince them that this Fund which is being established is being established in their interest and that they have nothing to worry about. What worried me a few months ago is that one of my constituents told me that he was working at a plantation for over 25 years and he sustained a stroke at the plantation and the Plantation Manager refused to give him one cent to maintain him. A Government like this cannot allow these conditions to exist; and with a fund like this which is organized for the working classes, I am interested. I will support a fund like this at any time that it comes about. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the voices of those who have already spoken in support of this Resolution. I feel that the aims and objects as set out in this Resolution mean well for the sugar workers of this island. I know that the sugar workers in this island have got the greatest confidence in the Barbados Workers' Union for many years and that is still so now. What has happened, Sir, is that the sugar workers in this island have been misled by these political nuisances who are going around and trying to make mischief. In this 20th century this is what we would call an advancing age, and the amenities of life are essential for one and all. If, in the 16th century, we had people with the foresight and vision of the Leader of the Barbados Workers' Union, we would not have had so many sugar workers today in the Almshouses in the rural areas. As a member of the Poor Law Board for the past fourteen years, I say that it is very distressing to see that all of these sugar workers who have been labouring for so many years on the plantations have not got any place to go except in the Almshouses when they are not able to work.

Mr. Speaker, the move which is made by these political nuisances who are going around is to get more people in the Almshouses. I am one of those who are quite willing to see the Almshouses go out of existence and that is why I will support this Resolution. I feel that the Sugar workers should do what Pharaoh of old did; that is to say, in the years of plenty he looked for a Joseph to provide for them in the years of famine. I feel that the Barbados Workers' Union have found a Joseph in no less a person than the hon. senior member for St. Peter. With those few remarks Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I honestly did not intend to say anything in connection with this Resolution, but other hon. members have strolled so widely and have touched so many points that I have to associate myself with facts about which I know. I think I am voicing the sentiments of hon. members of this House and my own sentiments when I say that we are happy that the sugar industry is benefitting to the tune of about \$6.7 million extra. Mr. Speaker, I feel that that adds favourably to the island's industry. I was definitely surprised to know that \$9.1 million have been knocking around in Barbados. I happened to deal with the Leader of the Barbados Workers' Union for many years; I happened to do work in my line of business for the Barbados Workers' Union and I am sure that I could never reach \$30 in the old days. If I did get \$30 as a burial fee I could only get it in the year after the burial. I would like to let the people of this island know that they are very fortunate in having a man like the Leader of the Barbados Workers' Union. You expect a man to do well in the field of his choice and I can truly say that the hon. member has done well in the field of his choice. I have done work for the Barbados Workers' Union, as I have already said, and it comforting to know that as soon as you send in your application, your fees will be normally and promptly paid whatever they are. Is that not a proper leader?
6.45 p.m.

I only hope that God Almighty will spare his life to lead these people, because those people who are now on the outside looking in are destructive and are like a drowning rat that is catching at a feather. They should remember that they spent \$31 million on building the Deep Water Harbour and put 1,700 hardworking waterfront men out of work. I know a certain gentleman who could have been living today if the East Coast Road had been built ten or twelve years ago, and the Progressive Bank doors would have been opened today. I know, Sir, that this handsome sum will be distributed between the workers who have given of their flesh and blood for many years. They have contributed to the island's wealth; but they should pull off their hats to the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. The workers will get \$1.5 million out of \$2.6 million, which is quite reasonable. In my line of business, Mr. Speaker, I throw myself between all kinds of workers and I know these cane cutters and cane loaders, and I am sure that not one of them can sit down any day and eat a comfortable meal for a dol-

lar and draw \$30 or \$40 at the end of the week; but I feel that any hardworking man who has to do sweat labour from 4 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the evening should be able to sit down and eat a comfortable meal each day and still carry home something. This money will be divided among these workers at Christmas time and I am sure they are going to spend it. Not one of them is going to put this money on the bank, and as a result part of it must come back to the Government. I am therefore supporting this Resolution 100%.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I never expected this Resolution would have taken so much time. My only regret in speaking on this Resolution, Sir, is that the Rules do not permit me to call the hon. junior member for St. John by his real name, but I will do so outside. I respect the Rules, but I have never heard so much nonsense in my political life.

Before going further, Sir, I am going to support this Resolution. (hear! hear!) I will always support a Resolution which seeks to help workers. I cannot shed my skin. I cannot say that I am on the side of the worker today, and then tonight or tomorrow say something else. I have sacrificed myself for workers; but I have heard some speeches here today and my regret is that the Rules debar me from replying to them. Everything is nice today, but anyone who knows me politically or otherwise knows that I am on the side of the workers, honestly and conscientiously, and no promises can move me.

Now, Sir, the Resolution reads as follows!

'BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve the Statement made by the Honourable Premier on the 5th November, 1963, relating to the additional profits accruing to the Sugar Industry in respect of the 1963 sugar crop.'

Paragraph 3 of the Statement states that details of the purposes for which the income and capital of this fund will be appropriated are being worked out, and the Legislature will be requested to enact the necessary legislation to give effect to this part of the agreement.

The Government, I take it, will be coming to this House to set out the purposes, and I have no fear or doubts about the purposes whatsoever. I am not unhappy about the money either, because the money will be there for the benefit of the workers, and no one can take it for himself or carry it elsewhere. The workers may not get the money today, but they will get it tomorrow; so I have no fear at all relative to the money, and the longer it stays, the more interest will accrue to it. I have no fear that the workers will be robbed of anything, and if there was not something at the back of it to benefit the workers, I do not think it would be here at all or that the Government would have taken such a stand. 6.55 p.m.

I am convinced that all is well as far as the money is concerned. I have no fear about that because there are some people who really do not know the set-up; therefore, one would say or may say: 'Well, I would like my money.' Do not tell me that that person for one moment is not right in speaking his mind, but it is that those persons must be convinced and must be told the facts. That is all you have to do, as far as I can see. It is not as bad as I hear some hon. members trying to make it out. All you must do is to try to convince those people, and I am sure that they will be easy to be convinced.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Minister of Social Services referred to the Agricultural Bank and he said that it was through the foresight of Sir Herbert Greaves that the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank was established and the money came from a grant which was made by the British Government at that time. Well, the Hon. Minister was not born yet, and at that time the people who were responsible for the grant were thinking more in terms of the owners and helping them to save their plantations from being sold out and helping them to work them, more so than they were thinking of the workers. They were thinking in terms of helping those particular persons because it is only up to about the

last ten to thirty years that you used to hear plantations going into Chancery and people losing their plantations. It used to be so at that time and the British Government had to step in and save the situation. If they were so much on the side of the worker and had given this grant to help the workers more so than the plantation owners, the workers would not have to live in a one-room rented house, in some cases a trash house, and in some cases nowhere at all.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, if I may just interrupt the hon. junior member for St. Joseph on a point of order, I just want to say that I did not try to make out a case that the establishment of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank was for the benefit of the worker. What I tried to point out was that just as there was farsightedness at that time, in the establishment of that bank for plantation owners, there is farsightedness now in the establishment of this fund for the benefit of the present and future workers in the sugar industry. I did not say that this bank was established for the workers. I said that that bank served its purpose and it was farsightedness in the establishment of that bank.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is duly made.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I did not accuse him of saying that it was for the benefit of the worker. I said that he did not know of it at that time. The Hon. Minister went on to say that housing is not up to expectations. That is a fact because up to now people in this country, some of them, are living in dilapidated houses, more so now than even before. It is to be noted that every time people go to the Housing Authority, they are turned around and the real answer to the problem up there is that the Housing Authority does not have any money. There are people who go up there, with money and with the necessary qualifications, but the Housing Authority today is not in a position to help those people with houses. The Hon. Minister said that the amount of money which the Government has turned over to this fund, 40%, would have gone to the Government by way of income tax.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a point of order. I did not say that 40% of this money would have gone to the Government. I said that the Government was entitled to 40% of the entire profits which would mean that 40% of the \$6.7 million which is about the sum granted to the workers, and I said the only person who would be experiencing a loss would be the same Government in that it did not receive the amount of money in income tax but was generous enough to allow that money to go to the workers.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it means the same thing. The Government is very generous to give up their part. That is very nice of the Government. In other words, he wants to make the workers feel that the whole of that amount did not belong to them, when in truth and in fact, if the Government had taken its share, the amount would be less. What is the use of your giving that amount up to the workers and allowing the Housing Authority to be there and not being able to carry out the projects which it is there to carry out due to the lack of funds? I have been told that. The fund up there belongs to the workers. Rather than your giving it away, so to speak, to the establishment of this fund, the Government should have taken its 40%, or whatever it is, and turned that money over to the Housing Authority, so as to let them start and build the necessary houses for the people. I am sure that there are more than six people whom I know who have the necessary money and who have been to the Housing Authority and the Housing Authority cannot even take an instalment of their money because they cannot supply the houses. I know of a man in St. Joseph whose house got burnt down and he tried and accumulated an amount of money, \$200, to get himself a house; and when he went to the Housing Authority they told him that they were receiving no more money. However, they did help him otherwise with a second-hand house because, literally speaking, he was at the door. If the Housing Authority is so pressed, you would not be harming the workers and would not be interfering with the fund if you had taken your 40% and given it to the Housing Authority; you will be only taking yours. It would not be the workers' own, and you would not be

accused of taking money and helping the workers by building houses because you will be taking money which belongs to the Government by way of income tax. Now, you have given it away and the Housing Authority cannot function. I do not know what they are going to do with that Department. All that they are doing up there is paying salaries. Nothing is being done as regards the real work which should be done by that Authority because there is nothing in the till.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said that all that is being done by the Housing Authority is paying salaries. I beg to disagree. That is not so. Even now the Housing Authority is still building houses and maintaining houses and they are still advancing loans.
7.05 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Minister is true, they are telling lies up there and they have told me lies also. There is some lying somewhere. I went there with a person who had the money to buy a house, and they could not take the money because they did not have the amount of money to lend for the purchase of the house and now, the hon. member is telling me that they are still lending money! They are still functioning, but they are not functioning with the speed with which they should function.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. If I may interrupt the hon. member again, I should like to say that even last Wednesday morning the Housing Authority took on painters. If they were not doing anything, would they be employing masons, carpenters and painters?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to inform the Hon. Minister that the matter of a point of order does not really arise in that way.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if you would rule on the Minister because every minute he is getting up on a point of order and he is completely out of order. I am saying what I know. There are people who went to the Housing Authority and had to leave the yard; they had the cash money to make the necessary deposit and they could not get a house because the Housing Authority did not have the necessary amount. Mr. Speaker, if they are taking on painters, it may be that they are using too much paint.
(Laughter).

Mr. BATSON: On a point of order. What the hon. member is mixed up with is that the Housing Authority is working on those applications which were sent in for over three years. The instance which the hon. member is giving may be that of someone who is now going in to the Housing Authority for the first time.

Mr. SMITH: That is not a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the subject-matter of a speech. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has not yet spoken on this Resolution and, of course, he is fully entitled to speak on it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not lying or fooling anybody; I am saying that if this Government is so generous as to give up a certain amount of money, the Housing Authority can do with it. You will not thereby be harming the workers because the Barbados Workers' Union is there for them; you want to put up some money and help those people who want houses. A woman from Cane Garden went to me and she was crying; she wanted a house. Another one went to me from St. Thomas and she told me: "I am not going back to the Housing Authority because they are turning me around so much and you have to wait for so long." I took up the telephone to ring up the Housing Authority but she told me not to worry to do that. This woman said that she went to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas about ten months ago; I do not know if he took any action because I sent her to him first. I told her that if the hon. member failed to help her, I would try my best for her. That is what I do with all of these people. If a matter does not concern my constituency, I do not take the first step. I do not mind

the hanky-panky excuses which the hon. member is making; we must go about this matter in the right way. It is a good thing to build up this fund.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want hon. members to feel that I am not in favour of this Resolution; I am supporting the Resolution; but a part of it is the Government, and if a Government Department cannot find the necessary funds to help these same workers, by all means you should take that amount and start them off with it. The hon. member has referred to the fact that there are houses which are not up to standard, and it does seem to me that there are more persons who are in need of houses than when they first started to assist in providing them, because everybody wants to get into his own home. In order to get into the good books of the Barbados Workers' Union and make the Union feel that they like them so much, they have turned in their part and they have kept the Housing Authority up there lacking. Mr. Speaker, I am on the side of the workers; let them look for more money and vest it in the Housing Authority and do not expect the Housing Authority to help itself; let them see that the money is being repaid so that the fund will be revolving. When people have to wait until others come in with money so that they can be helped, then things will be very slow. It will take a lot of people paying at \$5 a month to help a hundred persons.

Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the Manager; as a matter of fact, I could not be so rude as to ask him; but they should apply to the Government for more money so as to help this fund. If I am running a business today, I cannot wait until my customers come in to pay me so that I can pay for goods because at the same time when I am waiting for this money from the customers, the rain may be falling and I may not be able to get out of my business premises. The Housing Authority should be put in a financial position again so that it will be able to carry out its work and not retard progress because the people are suffering for the want of their houses.
7.15 p.m.

As I said, Sir, I am entirely in agreement with the principle of this Resolution. It is stated that legislation is not ready, and it is possible that the Bill may come down in such a nice way that I may not have to say a word. On the other hand, it may come in such a way that I may have to talk. Any Labourite should be in favour of anything that is for the benefit of the workers. This is not a Party issue at all; this is not for vote catching; this is representing the poor people and trying to help them. Mr. Speaker, neither one of the Ministers nor anybody else can accuse me of being an unemployable; but the Hon. Minister must remember that he is a Minister of the Queen and must set an example in replying and should not refer to people as unemployables or nitwit politicians. He must leave that for a backbencher. The name of Minister is sufficient and he must respect the title.

Mr. SPEAKER: It implies that he should be in the pulpit.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Resolution, I feel as happy and comfortable as when I defended a Resolution of a similar nature when I became a Vestryman. I am wondering, however, about some of the remarks I heard from the different speakers on this Resolution. This Resolution deals with the money which has come from the windfall, and I have heard members trying to describe what is a windfall. I suppose this has only been said tonight because the figure is very high, \$6.7 million. When the Labour Welfare Fund was opened and the details came to the Vestry, the Vestrymen then were very much against it. They felt that the money should be shared among the people, but another Vestryman and myself supported the idea of forming a Housing Board and establishing a Housing Authority; therefore tonight I could do no other than support this Resolution. What has got me beaten is the different speeches I have heard about roads and things of that sort; but as far as I understand it, this money will be controlled by five members nominated by the Barbados Workers' Union, and a sum of approximately \$1.6 million

will be paid into this Fund for the use and benefit of the workers in the industry, and those set out in the Statement are workers employed on Sugar Estates, workers employed in or about Sugar Factories, workers employed by Sugar Transport Limited, workers employed by Sugar Terminals Limited and workers employed by Molasses Terminals Limited, and legislation will come down as to how it will be controlled for the good of the workers. I personally will wait and see how that money will be allocated, but hon. members have been talking about doing roads. I do not expect this money will be used to do public roads or build baths or things of that nature, and I wonder if I have read it correctly. If this money is for the purposes set out in the Statement, I am very glad to see it. I cannot understand why hon. members went off into such a channel about roads and such things, because those things come from other sources like the Labour Welfare Fund, the Price Stabilization Fund and the Rehabilitation Fund; so I am waiting to see exactly what will be proposed for using this money for the sugar workers.

Now there are lots of people who are employed in the sugar industry seasonally and then retire; there are field workers who remain field workers all the days of their lives, and there are people who migrate from the rural districts and go into the urban districts; so it is a very wide thing. I do hope that everything will be done properly and in such a nice manner that in future that particular fund will be built up and such interest accrue to it that all the people employed in the sugar industry will profit by it. Now I have heard a whole lot about people going around and saying this, that and the other, but I was taught that if you hear a statement and do not want to say anything about it, just go on as you are, therefore, I am touching none of those things I have heard here tonight. There is one thing I want to say and it is this: I really know that some of the workers moving around in my parish and other places have got a mind that they should get a greater portion and the rest should go to the Fund. That is to say, if you are taking four and giving them two, they feel that you should be taking two and giving them four; but I just use that number as an example to explain what I have heard. This idea is permeating the minds of many workers in my area, but I have not travelled around very much to know what is the general feeling. I am supporting this Resolution, but I want to make it clear that some of the speeches I have heard here tonight make me believe that this money is going to do what the other Funds are doing. I never understood it that way. With \$1.7 million going to that Fund and it is properly handled, I know in years to come what it will mean. I do not think there is anyone around this Table who can talk about plantation workers more than I can. I knew them from the early days when the highest pay was 1/- for a man and 20 cents for a female to cut canes. I know how the sugar industry has risen, and it has done so under the leadership of a very noble gentleman who is still living in the Island of Barbados. I have watched it carefully through my life and I know it. When this production bonus first came about, I can tell you what some planters did. 7.25 p.m.

There was no established law, and if the labourers did anything, when it came to Christmas time, they would say that it was going towards the Red Cross and the labourers never got it. You thought that it went into that Fund. Therefore, when I hear hon. members speaking of the agriculture workers it was with much pleasure that I sat and listened to them. I, Sir, can talk on this matter until two or three o'clock tomorrow morning, but I want this point clearly understood. As regards the speeches which I have heard, the people were talking as if this money is for rural amenities, for the rehabilitation of housing and all of those things. In the parish of St. James, we have got one bath and toilets from the Rural Amenities Fund in each of the districts of Halls Village, Thorpes and Weston, and now Paynes Bay is getting one. All have come from the Rural Amenities Fund. I am surprised to hear hon. members saying that they do not know about this and that.

Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, I am going to support this Resolution and I am going to wait and see how this money is going to be spent. I am not going to speak

as some Barbadians and say that so many Canadian dollars have come and where have they gone. It was not given to the labourers: but things were so bad in those days - housing and playing fields, but to take something out of the context and stop there is not right. With these few remarks, I beg to support this Resolution. (Cheers).

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Sir, in as much as I had the honour for a greater part of this debate to be in your position, it was not my intention to say anything on this Resolution. However, I am forced to say something although it will be very short. I would almost say irresistibly forced, bearing in mind all that I heard being said throughout this country on this matter. I would say that with all the malice which has been imputed to the Government and to the Barbados Workers' Union over this fund, it is extremely gratifying that this Chamber as a whole with uncompromising frankness has supported this Resolution. I am hoping and expecting what is going to be the reaction throughout the country after this House rises tonight.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I think it is unnecessary for me to speak much on this Resolution in that all hon. members of this Chamber have exercised their democratic right; but I am very much surprised tonight, to some extent, to see some hon. members of this Chamber speaking in the vein in which they have spoken after having received reports from various public meetings where some members on public platforms have gone beyond the limit of understanding and have interpreted to the workers of the Island that they should call for all of the money.

Several workers approached me in connection with this money, and I have been able in some measure to convince them that it would be impracticable for them to have all this money at one time. I have told them that in the process of time workers would be eligible and ready and fit for the remainder of the money which is given them, and that they in the future would yet be deriving benefit from the remainder of the money which they would not be given at the outset.

I am told that some speakers on public platforms are trying to arouse a mass demonstration of workers against the Barbados Workers' Union. Some workers have told me that there is a plan afoot where a mass demonstration would be held and those workers will be marching to the Barbados Workers' Union and demanding all of this money. I hope some hon. members would be able to convince members of this Party that it has come to the knowledge of the Government that this plot is being organised.

I am happy tonight to see that all hon. members of this Chamber are going to vote unanimously in favour of this Resolution; therefore, the hon. senior member for St. Peter would have to be commended very highly for having introduced this Resolution on this important occasion. I also hope that all the representatives of the people in this Chamber would go into their various constituencies and try to enlighten the people on this matter because they are being misled. I feel that the Barbados Workers' Union has been working wholeheartedly in the interest of the workers of this Island and the Union has a capable General Secretary; therefore, it has nothing to fear. I cannot see how some members of this House can really go on public platforms and try to give a different interpretation to the workers as to the true establishment of this fund. I am sure that when the workers hear the truth, they would appreciate what is being done on their behalf and they would come to realise that some of these politicians have misled them, and only did so in order to find work for themselves, as one hon. member who spoke reminded hon. members. I am in sympathy with those politicians and I am sorry that I cannot employ some of them. I think that they are very great propagandists; and if they appropriated their time to teaching, with proper tuition, they may be able to help some of the workers who seem not so disposed to become convinced on things pertaining to their welfare. 7.35 p.m.

Again, Sir, I notice that there is a division in the ranks of the Barbados Labour Party and it is a commendable

division in that it is now going to reform the thinking of the party completely. I now believe that all the members of the Barbados Labour Party are thinking in terms of the.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is not speaking on the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was just giving the hon. member a little more latitude in order to see where he would go. I do not differ from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BATSON: All I am saying, Sir, is that the Barbados Labour Party is saying one thing on the platform and members of that Party in this Chamber are saying something else. What this Resolution expresses is what the workers are mostly in need of. If we are advancing, and advance we must, we will have to let the workers know what we stand for. I was very much impressed with the speech of the hon. member; he was very firm in his deliberations; and I am sure that if that speech could have been recorded and relayed throughout the island, then much of the damage which is being devised now would not have any root. I also feel that the members of the Barbados Labour Party who are now present in this House will be able to return to their Headquarters and convey the deep sentiments of hon. members of this Chamber for the attitude which has been taken tonight by some members of that Party. I feel that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is a very strong speaker on public platforms, and therefore from tonight the workers will know which Union they should join. They will know which Union to join because some members of the community are about to establish a Union and they are going around the island trying to select members on the pretext that they are working on behalf of the workers. The workers will now know which is the right Labour Party to listen to and rely on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for St. Thomas keep to the Resolution which is before us? It is a Resolution asking the House to approve the Statement made by the Hon. Premier on the 5th November, 1963, relating to the additional profits accruing to the sugar industry in respect of the 1963 sugar crop.

Mr. BATSON: I think that hon. members of this Chamber have touched all the salient points of this Resolution, and I would just like to say finally that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has done a wonderful job in here tonight; he has done quite a different job from that of his Leader on the soap box. He has tonight, convinced the gallery.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, No! No!

Mr. BATSON: He has convinced the House that of the two Labour Parties the public will know which one to listen to. What I do know is that the people will listen to the party which is really representing them, and not the one which is trying to mislead them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who has not spoken on this Resolution so far and who desires to make his contribution to this discussion? (After a pause). There does not seem to be any such member and now the hon. senior member for St. Peter can exercise his right of reply, if he desires to do so.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I must thank Your Honour and his Honour the Deputy Speaker for the courtesy which has been given to me in permitting me to deal with this matter at comparatively short notice. I also want to thank all hon. members for the support which they have given to this Resolution and I must thank them for some of the kind things which they have said about me and about my organization. I would, however, like to state that I do not regard this matter as a personal matter, as I said before, because it is a matter which has the whole support of the Barbados Workers' Union, its Executive and its branches. I was at pains to point out the Constitution of the Union so that hon. members will be aware of what the Constitution is. I am very sorry that I could not hear all the speeches of hon. members so that I could clear up any misconceptions which they might have had about this mat-

ter. I have endeavoured to distribute a copy of the Union's preparation of this matter and also a copy of the scheme so that hon. members would see that it is not a scheme which is aimed at any members of the Barbados Workers' Union only. I am sorry that my colleague is not here, because I do not like to reply behind anybody's back.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to the hon. junior member for St. Peter?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir. The hon. member spoke about persuasion and dissension, and he said that persuasion does not work by force, thereby insinuating that this is a matter which was done by force. I do not think that the hon. member was in the Chamber early because he would not have made any speech about dissension and persuasion. It is not the duty of the Barbados Workers' Union to persuade people as to what the Union has done. The Barbados Workers' Union or a Trade Union as a constituted body, has not got to be cautious, as the hon. senior member for the City has asked me to be. If we had to depend on people who are not members of the Union there would not be any agreement at all, because the employers do not discuss matters with non-Union members. The folly of my colleague's remarks has been shown up in his speech when he made certain remarks about the Hospital. He referred to the fact that the Government had used some of the Labour Welfare Fund for the erection of the Hospital; but he has forgotten that when money is to be used in this way, the Barbados Workers' Union has to be consulted. We have to reply to the Government now in relation to some of the money which is going to be used from one of the Funds. 7.45 p.m.

We do not have to go around. Why is it that the Barbados Workers' Union can be expected to speak for the workers in certain matters and in other you say the workers are going to speak for themselves? When there is an I.L.O. Conference, do you think I have to walk around the Island and ask workers whether they think I should go? The fact is that we are operating in a functional Trade Union, and Barbados has a functional division for agricultural and sugar workers in this Island: so we do not have to go and ask the workers. What we are doing is what we have authority to do. If members are misled into believing that the Barbados Workers' Union is a nebulous and amorphous body that only speaks for the workers on occasions, I will say that this is not so and we have the right to decide what is best to do. If we do not have the right to represent workers, then we do not have the right to negotiate; and therefore I should emphasise that the fact that you are negotiating an agreement means you cannot negotiate in part. There cannot be a part in which we can act on behalf of workers, and then a part in which the workers have the right to say they do not want that part. If we have the right to negotiate, we have it to negotiate thoroughly. If I have to meet the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the workers, they could not expect me to negotiate in part; that is to say that we negotiate for wages, but leave them to decide holiday with pay, or we negotiate holiday with pay and they decide what should be the Provident Fund. The fact that one hon. member mentioned the Hospital shows that we are in a position to speak on behalf of the sugar workers in a national matter, and we did not have to hold a referendum to decide whether you could use \$2 1/2 million to help construct the Hospital. We felt it was in the interest of workers, and we used it. That has been used by the members of the last Government who requested us to do it, and now they are using that as some arm against us.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that we should let the people know. I would say that in these matters you have to let people know what you propose, no matter how laudable the scheme is, so that they are satisfied.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the hon. member has taken what I said out of the context. He must have written down what I said before when I said that there was a tremendous lot of mischief going around, and I made it clear that he should be cautious. I say too that I deprecated the idea that the speech which he made was not broadcast throughout the Island so that every-

body could know the real facts rather than let them listen to what was being told to them about the situation. I do not want you to take it out of the context that I was saying to let the people know as if you did not allow them to know, but that was what was happening was that people were being told throughout the Island a story that would be gullible.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid if that is a point of order, it is not being very concisely made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I just wanted the hon. member to get what I said clearly.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not trying to take what he said out of the context, Mr. Speaker, but I want to remove the misconception if there is any doubt that the workers of this country are not aware of the situation. I believe what hon. members of this House are aware of is that they have read the newspaper, but the Trade Union does not regard it as a necessary point to publish in a newspaper whenever it is going to hold meetings; and the fact that the others who hold meetings are published in the paper and hon. members can read the Reports gives the impression that more is being said about this matter than what is actually said. We have kept meetings on this matter in every parish in this island since this matter has been aired, but we have reached the stage in our own thinking where we are not running behind anyone. We are aware of the philosophy of the persons doing this. They are waiting until the Government makes a mistake, because that is their philosophy, and they had the idea that this was a mistake, and therefore as such they should come and ride on that mistake. No mistake was made, but we were not afraid of facing this matter when the time came. As a Trade Union we met the Government, and the Government agreed that what we were proposing was nothing under-hand. We were not going to the Government with any political gimmick; we were not going to them with anything with a view to bring down the Government; we went to the Government because we could not implement this without legislative sanction. If it could have been implemented without legislative sanction, not a word would have been heard about this, because it would have been done in the Union; but they are using this now as a means of getting votes. I should like hon. members who spoke on this to erase from their minds any question that the workers were not fully informed. I would say to hon. members of this Chamber that fortunately for the Union we have a very efficient administration both at Headquarters and throughout this country, and without boasting, I would say that it takes more than getting on a platform to defeat the Union in an issue like this. We are aware that anyone who says he wants more or all of the money would only have a temporary appeal, but we have to negotiate for the workers; we have to negotiate next year and we know what plans we have and what our proposals are, and we have met people and discussed them. We have kept meetings and we have regional councils all over the Island, and we have met workers on a much different basis from all points. We are meeting workers with a positive programme; we have organisers in the field, and we would not be worth our salt if we at this stage of our existence had to be following someone around keeping meetings.

What hon. members do not know, Mr. Speaker, is the reaction which has been coming from some of the meetings they have been holding and relying on the propaganda in the newspaper. I can tell you that in certain areas where they have been, they have positively been rejected; but they still persist in these things. I left here last Tuesday night and went to Ellerton, St. George, but the viciousness of this campaign is not the viciousness of the people, but the viciousness of the public organs that can in Barbados vilify people and slander them to the highest, and people are afraid of some of them on the guise that there is nothing to sue for. My organisation is not a member of that school, nor am I. We are prepared to take all the forces of law to deal with any person who offends or slanders us, because that is the only way you can put people in their places.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I want to tell the hon. member that some of the employers wanted to indicate to the Union how we

were to distribute this money, but we said it was gross impertinence on the part of the employers to tell us how to distribute any money we negotiate for. We do not tell them how to distribute their profits. I would say here that the leadership of the sugar people has been excellent, but there have been people as employers in the sugar industry who have been trying to undermine the unity of the workers and have been encouraging this thing.

7.55 p.m.

Sir, if my colleagues and I were people in for positive industrial dislocation, we, today, could be the easiest ones to do it. The easiest thing for us to do is to create industrial dislocation. There is no organisation with more facilities for doing it than ours. We could have done it last September if we wanted. The Sugar Producers' Association broke off negotiations with us asking us to wait until the Commission of Enquiry in the sugar industry which had been set up had reported. They wanted to keep us waiting until the Commission of Enquiry had reported. What would have happened to this country if they were allowed to get away with that? Even sometimes, members of the Government are not aware that there were concerted efforts both of the Government and the Barbados Workers' Union to create an atmosphere for which the Trade Union showed in no unmistakable form that we were going to support the Government; and where the conceit of the Party which was in power was defeated was when they said that I was asking to be a Minister in the present Government — which meant that I could only be a Minister if this Government had won the elections.

Sir, I am very glad that some of the members of that Party have realised what is the situation. What is in this country today is a rear-guard action by those politicals rejects to create an atmosphere now whereby they can come in under the guise of the sugar industry and they feel that this is the best point for them to come in.

Sir, I would say that this matter has done one thing. It is going to consolidate the forces of progress more in this country and it is going to make the people more aware of firm and sound things. I would say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should not confuse what we are doing with what the Housing Authority is doing. I would say that if you regard this as a windfall which has been negotiated by the Barbados Workers' Union, then you should not regard it as something for anybody to dictate to us how we can deal with it. It is for us to say that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It appears as if the hon. member has mistaken what I said. I never advocated that the Union should give anything to the Housing Authority.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thought the hon. member was saying that it would be a good thing if some of this money is to be used for housing. (A VOICE: That is exactly what he said).

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, just let me put the hon. member right. The two of them are trying to confuse things. I said that the 40% which the Hon. Minister said belonged to the Government, that is to say, which was coming to the Government by way of income tax, out of that money the Government should take it to help get housing for the people. I meant the one which belonged to the Government, not the workers.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like to correct any wrong impression. At the beginning I explained that in normal circumstances, had it not been in the sugar industry where we were negotiating the windfall, the Government might have said to us that you cannot now at this stage have fresh negotiations on these matters. I believe this as a Trade Unionist. The Government would have to watch the action of a Trade Union in trade negotiations; for example, the sugar group being what it is, you cannot have the Trade Union coming along, and, when the negotiation is over, just before you declare your taxation for income tax, re-negotiating again because that is likely to offset the Government's finance. I said that in normal circumstances you will not be able to negotiate this, and the employers would have

given the money if they felt so to the Government and the Government will get the money, which is approximately 40%. It is going to be cash money, and why it is going to be put into a fund is that it would have been subjected to income tax.

I feel that I should satisfy hon. members about the scheme. I have distributed a copy of the scheme for which there will be final legislation coming down to the House, but the purpose of this scheme is not to replace existing schemes. The purpose of this fund is not to take the place of an employers' scheme: it is a working scheme for which the workers would project new things. The whole purpose of this fund is to enhance anything which would enhance workers.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should thank all hon. members of this House for the support which they have given to this matter. I feel sure in my mind that history is going to regard our action today as something remarkable because what has been done is not done on any individual basis. It has not been done by any single person: it is something which has been done for nearly 20,000 people.

I am very pleased indeed to thank the hon. junior member for St. Joseph for supporting this Resolution, because I feel satisfied that they are aware that there is nothing wrong in this scheme, and I feel sure that the stand which they have taken here today would help to convince workers. The workers at one stage thought that this was something to deprive them of something to which they had entitlement. I am very pleased indeed of this responsible attitude taken by those hon. members, notwithstanding that some of their colleagues have taken the opposite stand. It shows that if you are firm and truthful about the matter, even those people whom you least expect will support you. 8.05 p.m.

I thank all hon. members very much for the stand which they have taken, and I am sure that the workers gen-

erally will support the stand which they have taken. I regard it as a national duty, not only of my organization, but of this House; and I would not close my reply without saying to the Government and to the Hon. Premier, who is the Minister of Finance, that the Union was very fortunate in that he has taken this responsible view. If the Hon. Premier had not taken that view in this matter, then the whole scheme would have been abandoned as far as reinforcing the workers' income is concerned, because it could not have been done unless it had the legislative sanction. Although it has not had legislative approval when the House has agreed to the scheme, it is safer for us to work out the economics of this scheme. Mr. Speaker, again, I beg to thank hon. members for the support which they have given to this scheme.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I now declare this Resolution duly passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 26th November, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 26th November, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.10 p.m.