

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th October, 1965.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker); Mr. K.N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (premier); Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Agriculture and fisheries); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Trade and Labour).

Prayers were read.

Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. GODDARD and the Hon. C. E. TALMA entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of the meeting of this Chamber held on 5th October this year have been circulated, and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed.

There being no objection, I declare those Minutes duly to be confirmed.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter dated 12th October, from the Deputy Marshal Messenger and Library Attendant, asking for three months' leave of absence from his

duties with effect from 15th October, 1965.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to lay the following document which is Message No. 2/1965 to the Honourable the House of Assembly from His Excellency the Acting Governor. Message No. 2/1965 reads as follows-

HIS EXCELLENCY THE ACTING GOVERNOR

to THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh will visit Barbados on the 14th and 15th February 1966, during the course of a tour of the Caribbean.

The Royal Party will be travelling on Her Majesty's Yacht "Britannia" and will live on board the yacht during the visit.

W. R. Douglas

Acting Governor, Government House, Barbados. 12th October, 1965.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following-

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to the 31st July, 1965.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$32,473 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates

1965-66, Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1965-66 No. 18 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled \"The Warehousing of Rum in Bond (Amendment) Regulations, 1965.\"

Resolution to place the sum of \$241 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1965-66 No. 19 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66 No. 21 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

Resolution requesting Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to convene, at the earliest opportunity, a Conference to arrange the constitutional financial, defence and other details incidental to, and arising from, the assumption, by the People of Barbados of Sovereign Nationhood within the Commonwealth in 1966.

The Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the pre-election Manifesto of this Government, issued in November, 1961, stated inter alia,

\"The road to destiny is the road to independence. Towards this goal the country must press on.

As the island has never been a grant-aided territory there is no reason why within or without a Federation Bar-bados should not attain the full stature of independence now within the British Commonwealth.\"

AND WHEREAS a Federation of ten British Caribbean territories then existed, and continued to exist until its dissolution on 31st May, 1962;

AND WHEREAS this Government has, from January, 1962, to April, 1965, engaged in discussions with the Governments of the Windward and Leeward Islands on the establishment of a new Federation;

AND WHEREAS these discussions were carried on without hindrance to the constitutional and economic development of Barbados, which attained full internal self-government in May, 1964;

AND WHEREAS these discussions have proved fruitless for several reasons, among which are -

(a)the failure of the Government of the United Kingdom to indicate the quantum of Develop ment

Finance which would be available to the new Federation;

(b) the withdrawal of the Governments of Grenada and Antigua from the discussions;

(c) the stated unwillingness of the Government of Montserrat to join a Federation which did not include Antigua;

(d) the unsatisfactory proposals made by the Gov-

ernment of St. Lucia, supported by the Government of Dominica, for the disposal of Federal Surplus Revenues;

(e) the rejection of the Draft Federal Scheme by

the Government and Legislature of St. Lucia before the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers;

AND WHEREAS these matters have been fully set out in the White Paper which was laid before this Honourable House by order of the Cabinet on 17th August, 1965;

AND WHEREAS the Eastern Caribbean Federation contemplated by the Report of the London Conference 1962 is not immediately possible in the changed circumstances;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, will continue after Independence to work in close cooperation with the Governments and Peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political, social and economic emancipation of all classes in all territories;

AND WHEREAS the present Constitution of Barbados makes no provision for the management, by its citizens, of their external relations;

AND WHEREAS the General Assembly of the United Nations, in its resolution of December 14th, 1960 proclaimed the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations; and adopted a Declaration

(a) that the subjection of peoples to alien domination constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights;

(b) that such is contrary to the charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation;

(c) that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence;

(d) that all armed action or repressive measures directed against dependent peoples should cease in

order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence;

(e)

(f) that their national territory should be respected;

(g)

(h) that in trust and non-self-governing territories or other territories which have not yet attained independence, immediate steps should be taken to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories without any distinctions as to race, creed, or colour;

(i)

AND WHEREAS paragraph 124 of the White Paper states:

"The House of Assembly will be asked to agree to a Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to fix an early date for a Conference on Independence; and if agreed to, the Senate will be invited to concur therein."

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House requests Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to convene, at the earliest opportunity, a Conference to arrange the constitutional, financial, defence and other details incidental to, and arising from the assumption, by the People of Barbados, of Sovereign Nationhood within the Commonwealth in 1966.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate be invited to concur herein." 2.55 p.m.

Hon. A. Da C. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$2,231 at the disposal of the Government to Supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part 1 - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66 No. 20 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the Money Resolution of which notice has been given today.

As regards the Resolution of which notice has just been given by the Hon. and Learned Premier relating to the Independence of this Island of Barbados, a special date will be set aside for the debate on it.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. WEEKES:

I beg to give notice of the following Resolution-

WHEREAS the sum of two dollars and forty cents (\$2.40) a week for old age pensioners is totally inadequate;

AND WHEREAS these people are compelled to exist on this meagre amount which can decrease their life span;

AND WHEREAS these people have contributed by their sweat to the economy of this Island;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Government consider the possibility of including in the Estimates 1966/67 a sufficient sum of money to ensure that they will receive not less than three dollars (\$3.00) a week.

And of the following:-

WHEREAS the children of the parish of St. Philip have to travel long distances to reach any Government Secondary Grammar School in the City of Bridgetown;

AND WHEREAS great inconvenience to the children and hardship to the parents are experienced daily;

AND WHEREAS the erection of a Secondary Grammar School in the parish of St. Philip would increase the number of places for children in the Grammar Schools in the Municipality and its surroundings;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government consider erecting a Secondary Grammar School in the parish of St. Philip with-out delay.

QUESTIONS Mr. BATSON:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware that in many parts of the world, celebrations depicting many aspects of human endeavour - such as Tourism or a Week of the Poor -are being patronised by Governments?

2. Is Government also aware that a week of the Poor Celebrations will initiate a spirit of giving to the poor and at the same time make the poor conscious that they are not a forgotten people?

3. If the answers to the above are in the affirmative, will the Minister approach the appropriate quarters with a view to implementing a week of the Poor Celebration in the not too distant future?

Mr. WEEKES:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister

Will the appropriate Minister state when the programme for erecting public baths in each of the parishes served by the Southern District Council will be implemented?

Mr. HOLDER:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is the Government aware that there is great dissatisfaction among stamp vendors over the regulations governing the conditions of sale of Postage Stamps to them for sale to the general public?

2. Will the Government take the necessary steps to ensure that (a) Commissions on all stamps to be placed at 5%, instead of 5% commission up to stamps of five cents denomination, and 2 1/2 on all other denominations?

(b) in order to accommodate the general public, stamps vendors be allowed to sell all stamps up to the value of twenty-five cents?

Mr. SEALEY:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware that the residents who live adjacent to the following roads in the parish of St. Michael Viz.:

1st Avenue, Green Hill;

2nd Avenue, Green Hill;

3rd Avenue, Green Hill;

4th Avenue, Green Hill;

Baycroft New Road;

School Road; and Glendairy Road;

experience great hardship owing to the fact that there is no water supply easily available to them for domestic use?

2. Will Government see to it that water mains are placed in each of the above roads for the use of the inhabitants thereof ?

Mr. SEALEY:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-Is Government aware that Skeete\'s Road, Howell\'s Cross Road in the parish of Saint Michael is well-nigh impassable to vehicular traffic at all times, and even to pedestrian traffic after heavy rainfall?

2. Will Government treat as a priority the repairs of the
said road?

Mr. SEALEY:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware that because of the lack of proper drainage, the residents of School Road, Baycroft New Road - all in the parish of St. Michael suffer grave inconvenience owing to (a) the deposit of refuse from other districts on their lands; (b) the flooding of their premises after a heavy rainfall; and (c) the prevalence of mosquitoes as a direct result thereof?

2. Will Government take steps as speedily as possible to lay a proper system of drainage in the said districts and so remove the nuisances above complained of? 3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Again the same hon. member, his Question relative to Glendairy Road,

Mr. SEALEY:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Will Government as soon as possible repair and extend Glendairy Road, St. Michael, to the gully which separates the same road from Glendairy Prison?

DEPUTY MARSHAL: MESSENGER & LIBRARY ATTENDANT GRANTED LEAVE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the request of the Deputy Marshal, Library Attendant & Messenger for three month\'s leave of absence as from 15th October, 1965, be granted, and that Mr. Orville Best be appointed to act in his place.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today\'s sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 6) ORDER 1965

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now time for Government Business. The first | Order of the Day under that Head stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned senior member for St. John-

To move the passing of the following Resolution:-Resolution to approve \"The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order 1965.\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which is now before us, (deals with increases in staff in the Registration Office, the Economic Planning Unit, the Ministry of Finance, the Customs Department and the Prisons. If I may explain the position, the first part of the Resolution deals with the Registration Office and there will be the creation of the following additional posts; one Deputy Registrar, one Executive Officer for the Courts, one Accountant, three senior Clerks, six Clerical Assistants, one Secretary and one Copy Typist. In the Economic planning Unit, which is

ter of Agriculture and Fisheries, and that is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled \"The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Order, 1965.\"

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the Order made by the Cabinet on 16th September, 1965, under the provisions of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, by an agreement made in 1956 the levies on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in the Island authorised under the Act were allocated between the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund, the Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund. The allocation to the Labour Welfare Fund includes provision at the rate of fifty cents per ton sugar and per 290 gallons fancy molasses for the credit of the Sugar Factory Workers Severance Payments Fund and at the rate of one dollar per ton sugar and per 290 gallons fancy molasses for the credit of the Provident Fund for workers in the Sugar Industry.

I beg to move that the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Order, 1965, do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENTS) ACT, 1965

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, and it is the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Act,

1962.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The purpose of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to amend the Customs Act, 1962, to make it possible for the refund of monies overpaid by way of customs duties to be given back, provided the claims were presented to the Comptroller of Customs within two years after the overpayment may have been made.

Under Section 131 of the Act as it stands, the refund has to be made within two years of the date of overpayment. As long as the claim was made within two years of overpayment, it would be possible for the Accountant General to repay the money at any time after the expiration of two years, provided the statement was presented within the statutory time. It is not a very complicated provision; it is not anything that will deprive the Treasury of the Island of money to which it is justly entitled. We have many instances in which money is overpaid either under protest or under the state of law, and you will remember that in 1962 I removed about \$1/2 million of drawbacks out of the Estimates, and another \$1/2 million from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue for refund of overpaid taxes and matters of that kind, thereby decreasing theoretically the total on both sides of the ledger by \$1 million, and it is not now done by a vote of the Legislature, but this is a right which the Comptroller of Customs and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue have to exercise. There must be some legal authority for the Accountant General to pay out these refunds because although the drawbacks and refunds are authorised by these two Heads of Department, the money has to come out of the Treasury and has to be paid under the state of law. 3.25 p.m.

The simple provision made is that people must lodge their claim. Under the Statute of Limitations, I think it is known that so long as you file your claim, you are not entitled to Judgment just because the statutory time has elapsed.

This is only one short amendment to Section 131 of the Customs Act and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

under my Portfolio, we need an additional permanent post of Long Grade Clerk. In the Ministry of Finance, there is the necessity of two Assistant Secretaries and three Stenographers. When we come to the Customs Department, there has been a long history of understaffing and we propose to rectify that by making the additional post of Office Superintendent, three posts of Assistant Supervisors, and twelve

Long Grade Clerks. The office of six of the nineteen posts of Assistant Supervisor will be upgraded as senior Assistant Supervisor. There will be twenty-five posts of Customs Guards with increased emoluments in the upper brackets; there will be five Senior Customs Guards in the salary scale of \$1,872 - \$2,352. This was actually recommended by the Salaries Commissioner in 1961, so that there will be some incentive for these Customs Guards. The lower ranks of Customs Guards will go from \$1,128 - \$1,896 which is a considerable improvement in the salaries of all these officers.

Some time ago, in connection with the Prisons, I expressed my concern as to the employment of uniformed Warders in the office of Superintendent which led to a certain amount of jealousy, dissatisfaction and lack of discipline in the Institution. We have now decided to remove all the uniformed Officers from the office of the Prison where they came to be regarded as a privileged branch of the Prison Service, and to move in three Long Grade Clerks and one Typist in the office to perform the duties concerning the government of the Prison. The other point is that in putting out the advertisement for the post of Superintendent to be living in the precincts of the prison. There will therefore be additional accommodation for the Warders, for office staff and for the interviewing of guardians and inmates of that Institution. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1965 which was made by the Cabinet on the 16th September, 1965, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, do now pass. 3.15 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ST. SIMONS, ST. ANDREW

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education, Leader of the House, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land at St. Simon's in the parish of Saint Andrew.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think the members of the House will see clearly from the Addendum that this concerns a small bit of land adjacent to St. Simon's School in the parish of St. Andrew. The owner cannot give good and marketable title in accordance with the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, and we are seeking therefore the approval of the Legislature for the compulsory acquisition in order that the purpose set out in the Resolution may be effected and the Government may acquire an indefeasible

Hon. members may also wish to know that this bit of land is very small and, as I said, is adjacent to the school and there are many ways in which it can be used especially for extending the school garden.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

**THE SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION,
PRICE STABILIZATION AND LABOUR
WELFARE) ORDER, 1965**

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael, the Minis-

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Batson in the Chair. Clauses 1 and 2 were called separately and passed. On motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by C. E. Talma, in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (VESTING OF
PROPERTY AND TRANSFER OF
FUNCTIONS) (AMENDMENT)
BILL; 1965.**

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to Order No. 5 which deals with a Bill to make provision for the orderly and progressive development of land in both Urban and Rural areas, it has not yet been printed; therefore, it will not be proceeded with at this stage.

I beg to move that Order No. 6 be taken as the next item of Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 6 stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for St. John Second reading of a Bill to amend the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act. 1964.

Hon., E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Barbados has now become a very substantial property owner in this island, We have had several leases for a long period of time over property, even of Government

premises to Government officers and other persons for the purpose of residential use, without coming before the Legislature or this House for approval of such leases or disposal, although under the old Executive Committee Act of 1891 which has been amended between 1945 and 1963 no less than ten or eleven times, you will find that all properties belonging to Government and vested in the Executive Committee, and their successors in office for an estate in fee simple in possession in trust for the public of tills, island, and in the case of the personal property in trust for the public of this Island - under the constitutional arrangements by which we are governed - no grant, or disposal of Government! lands, or existing property should be undertaken without the approval of the Legislature.

I, myself, have queried the legality of the letting of houses of Government to a Government servant without the approval of the Legislature.

This matter has been gone into for the past two years

under the guidance of a professor at Law at Sheffield Uni-versity who is now in Nigeria and the Law Revision Committee, and they both have recommend that it would be rather cumbersome if every time. say, that a Civil Servant or anybody was to have the letting of a house, we, should have to come to the House of Assembly to ask that it should be done.

I should like to make it clear that any disposal of Government land by way of sale, lease, exchange, grant, assign-ment or surrender will continue to be made only with the approval of the Legislature and that approval will have to

be ex ante and nat ax post facto so there is no danger in the provisions of this Bill that any Government land will be alienated without the approval of the legislature, as we have seen within recent time within the last four years, that is to say, shortly before this Goverment assumed office. 3.35 p.m.

When we come to a licence to cross high water mark, that is not a lease or disposal of Government land. In the question of the right to drive cane-carts across Govern- -ment land, recently we have had to come to the Legislature in order to facilitate certain tenants in the parish of St. John; we had to lease a right of way to Clifton Hall Plantation in order that the peasants could get out their canes. Although the work was not being undertaken by any Government department, before they could put a bulldozer on that land, we had to come to the Legislature and get a lease to do what was to be done at the expense of the owners of the plantation. Under the provisions of this Bill, which is an amendment to the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964, we are making it possible for the Minister, who is for the time being charged with the responsibility for lands, to grant licenses for the purpose of erecting groynes, and we have several applications of this sort, to grant the right of way for the use of Government lands or even to execute an agreement for profits a prendre. You can grant a person a licence to take away benefit from lands. I can give a man permission to take soft stone from my land without necessarily leasing him the land other than giving him the right of way to and from the land.

The people at Bagatelle had a lease of our land, and when we wanted to remove the high explosive substances from Powder Road because of the danger of explosion which existed at the time, we had to go and ask the lessees of Bagatelle Quarry to give us permission to place the explosive substances in the quarry. If we had profits a prendre if we had the right of access to the easement ourselves, we would

have been in full control of the land, and we would not have had to ask for permission to go there. The justification for this Bill, however, arose out of the necessity to construct, groynes without any undue delay and to lease facilities in the Harbour, let us say, and the necessity for the disposing of high explosives which would have to be stowed away.

Mr. Speaker, I have explained all that, not for your benefit but for the benefit of those who are not fully initiated in the mysteries of this matter.. You cannot use a man's land without his permission; there was no such thing up to the last time that I had knowledge of the law, and in this case, there is no danger of any person being selected for any special privilege as such. I think I have fully elucidated the necessity and the reason for this Bill. and I give the assurance that the purpose of this Bill is not to take away any person's property, but merely to facilitate the construction of groynes and things of that sort so that the work will be more expeditiously done than is the case at present. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few remarks in connection with this Bill. I recollect quite clearly that at the Constitutional Conference when we were seeking internal self-government, we sought to retain the functions of the Executive Committee. It is a question of what should be done with Government land I think that the only function for which that Committee existed was to re-

tain control of the land. Although the Hon. Premier was at some pains to explain the purpose of this amendment, I would be glad if he would give us a little further enlighten-

ment on Section 2 of this Bill This is what the Section

says:-

2. Subsection (1) of section 5 of the Executive, Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964 is hereby repealed and replaced as follows:-

5. (1) The Minister may -

(a) grant a licence to use any land vested in the Crown, in right of its Government of this island for any purpose or for such purpose as are mentioned in the licence; or

(b) grant by way of licence or letting any easement, profit or right in respect of such lands; or

(c) with the approval of the Legislature of this Island sell, lease exchange, grant, assign or surrender any such land.

This really robs the Executive Committee of its main functions and purposes. There is nothing wrong in the changeover, but because of internal self-government, you would like to feel that that is run by a Minister or a Ministry under the Cabinet System. I do not see why it is necessary to make the change

at all. 3.45 p.m.

It is not clear to me why it is necessary to make the change at all, because the Executive Committee was subject to the control of Parliament, and the Cabinet is under similar control. The reason why we have retained this August body is because it has been with us all these years. I am not saying it is wrong, but there would have to be some reason to change. If the hon. senior member for St. John would favour us with anything further to what he has said, it would at least give us a simple reason why under the Cabinet system these matters would have to be brought by one of the Ministers. This is really taking the teeth, if not the vital fluid in the blood, out of the existence of the Executive Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Section 2 may be more properly explained when the House goes into Committee.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am in some considerable difficulty, Mr. Speaker, because in the first instance I did not hear what the hon. member had to say, what I did hear I did not understand, and what I did understand I did not appreciate, because the hon. member should be in a position to read the provisions of the Bill, as he himself has been a member of the Executive Committee and should be aware of the functions.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I must apologise to the House for not having enquired before the hon. member replied, if there was any other hon. member who desired to contribute to this debate.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Maybe there will be an interpreter among hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Possibly a linguist, but not an interpreter as such. It appears that there is no other hon. member who seeks to contribute to this debate. Let the hon. member for St. John continue.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

This is not a question of delegation of the functions of the Executive Committee which no longer exists anyhow. There is no Executive Committee in Barbados at the moment; we abolished the Executive Committee last year and we substituted a full Cabinet system of Government. No papers now go to the Financial Secretary or the Attorney General or anybody like that. The purpose of amending the Executive Committee Act is to transfer to the Cabinet all the powers and functions formerly vested in the Executive Committee by the Act of 1891 which is hereby repealed. This is not a question of transferring from the Cabinet to the Minister in charge the authority to do these things. This is vesting the Minister in charge of lands with power to do something which is not done at all - and I will explain that in a moment ~ and secondly to remove certain trivial dispensations from the grant of leases in the first instance. I explained in detail what such grants were; from licences for the construction of groynes, to giving somebody the right to pass over Government land.

What I want to state categorically right now is that the better legal opinion, which always resides only in this Party, is that all these leases of Government premises to Government servants were strictly not done in accordance with the Executive Committee Act and should have been done by the House of

Assembly, because they did not follow the law. When I say \"They\", I mean that the former administration did not adhere to strict letter of the law because it was the disposal of Government land in some form or the other, and therefore what I am trying to do now is to make sure that there is some authority other than the Legislature which apparently does not want to be concerned and bothered with Government rentals - some authority other than the Chief Personnel Officer or the Director of ;

the Public Works Department - who will exercise this function on behalf of the Legislature and will lay a statement showing the disposals so effected during the year on the table of the House and the Senate. We are not removing from the Cabinet and transferring to the Minister certain powers, because if the Cabinet had that authority, we would not come to the Legislature because we have permission under the Constitution of this Country to delegate any function vested by law in the Cabinet of the Island to any individual Minister, and that is done every single week.

I have been reminded that the Cabinet delegated to the Minister of Health for very obvious reasons only this morning when we had two emergency cases the right to authorise expenditure for the treatment of Barbadians abroad. If somebody had a brain tumor; the procedure now is that we would have to carry out an investigation, and then the matter has to be submitted in the form of a Cabinet Paper, and the Cabinet normally meets only once a week on Thursday mornings and prepares its business for the Legislature for the following week. This morning we delegated authority to the making of such expenditure, and authorising the expenditure of such sums and plane passages and hospital accommodation to the Minister, which means that the Senior Medical Officer, whoever he may be, whether he is a surgeon or Physician, can get directly in touch with the Ministry and say \"there is an emergency case here; there is no treatment available in Barbados; there is a plane leaving the island this evening;\" and the Minister without any elaborate paraphernalia of Government Papers will authorise the money and let the person leave. In this way we can save at least five days of Government procedure and probably a lot of lives as well. This is what we mean by delegation, this is not a transfer of authority at all Except in so far as approving of this Bill, the House will not be so delegating but transferring to the Minister in charge of lands something which the House has failed to do, has not been concerned about and should have been doing, but which we think ought to come under some regular procedure; and we are merely saying that licences, easements and profits a,prendre should be under the jurisdiction of the Minister, and he should now make a statement once per annum, disclosing to the Legislature all the transactions that had taken place in this respect during the past year.

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

3.55 p.m.

On motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Batson in the Chair.

Clauses 2, 2, and 3 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chat and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

FISHERIES REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL; 1965.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries Second reading of a Bill to amend the Fisheries Regulation

Hon. G. .G FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years between the months of June and November chiefly, the entire coast of tills Island has been subjected to the dynamiting of fish; and in recent years, with the greater demand for fish and higher prices paid for this commodity this bad practice has increased.

The using of dynamite not only kills the fish which can be used for consumption, but it also kills small fish spawn which will eventually provide us with fish in future years. This bad practice of dynamiting fish is even worse. than that. All marine life ceases to exist fora number of years in the area around which dynamite is thrown, and fish will not spawn in this area.

It is therefore necessary to make a very tight check and to bring the law into force to stop this very bad practice if the inhabitants of this Island are to be able to pur-. chase or have any fish during the months of July to November.

The purpose of this Bill therefore is to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act, 1904 as to make it unnecessary for the prosecution in a case brought under subsection (3) of section 19 thereof to prove that the fish which the accused is alleged to have brought, attempted to buy or to have in his possession was taken or destroyed within the territorial waters of this Island by the use of dynamite or any other explosive substance.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill which we have before us, I must say, is a very good one, I remember a few years ago when the Gulf Oil Company was operating here that they went around the whole Island digging holes, using depth chargesand it is true to say that million of tons of fish were destroyed as a result. 1 consider that was one of the greatest hindrances to the Island of Barbados. They said that they were checking oil lines.

I am rather glad to see that the Hon. Minister of Fisheries has brought to this House a Bill of this nature because I agree that people should cease to dynamite fish. These people do not think that not only

do they destroy the fish used for human consumption, but they also destroy the young. To have a protection like this, I think it will bring fishermen to their senses, I congratulate the Government for bringing a Bill of this nature into force.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. Tudor, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Batson in the Chair,

4.05 p.m.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

On motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

WAGES COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade and Labour To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, in 1961 re-presentation was made by the Wages Council for an amendment to the Shops Act so as to make provision for attendants, to be given sick leave with pay. After some negotiations, the Cabinet on the 29th August, 1962, approved the

making of the necessary regulations after an amendment was made to the Wages Council Act, 1955. I do not know who in the Ministry of Trade owned shops or who had affiliations with the people who owned shops; but what I do know is that it has taken from 1962 up to the present time for this amendment to be dealt with here. However, Sir, recent alliances between certain people who claim to represent labour and people who represent employers have shown quite clearly who was the person or the persons in the Ministry responsible for this delay. I am not saying that the Civil Servants were responsible for the delay, but I would like to make my position quite clear. I am just saying that there

was this delay, this unwarranted delay, in dealing with this matter, which is a burning shame. I would like to get the record straight.

This bit of legislation is one of the most important bits of legislation for the working classes of this country, and anyone who denies a worker of the social benefits which he should have from the organization in which he is work-ing, could only be looked upon as an unfaithful person. These negotiations to which I have referred included the matter of the granting of sick leave for three months, the first two weeks on full pay and the next four weeks on half pay and then without pay. This privilege was denied the workers of this country for over three years. It is true that we are currently considering the question of social security and this was one of the provisions of social security; but at the me time, while the grass is growing the horse is starving. The provisions of social security would be even more attractive than what we are dealing with now, but that does not stand to reason that this provision relating to the grant of sick leave with pay to workers, should have been delayed

or three years. Under this Bill the workers will have to produce a doctor's certificate to the employer within three days from the beginning of their illness, and the employers, according to the representation which was made by the Wages Council, are free to have a verification of the certificate by a medical practitioner of their own choice. Under these proposals, an employer cannot dismiss a person who is enjoying the benefits of sick leave during the time that he is receiving these benefits. Mr. Speaker, this

is a very simple Bill and I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have some strong views about Wages Councils. In the middle of the 20th century where Trade Unions become to be understood, I do not like the passing of legislation in order to assist people who contract out of their responsibility. 4.15 p.m.

I have always been opposed to Wages Councils where you have Trade Unions existing. Wages Councils suit the beginning of the century when Trade Unions were weak and could not do an effective job for the workers. In an age like this it assists workers to be lazy and indifferent about their own affairs, because you get some legislation passed and politicians now and then would look at a little bit of labour legislation and fool the workers off that something is being done. In this country we have Wages Councils that operate in Bridgetown, but all you see is that the merchants are making their stores bigger. One has Just been opened out here, and you get the Legislature underwriting the Wage structure that exists. The Model Store, Manning's & Company Limited and DaCosta's have been expanding, but the ignorant, idiotic workers are labouring under this idea of \$18 a week as a minimum, and you get members of the Legislature at election time raising frills and noises about other things, and they let the basic things in the community go by the board. Many of the stores in Bridgetown have been renovated not for the sake of making them look better, but on the basis that they are making money, and you get pictures in the papers of one hundred people applying for twenty jobs; but when you look at the value of the Jobs for which they apply, you realise what the situation is. If the Wages Council is going to have anything in this age, it should be like the American system where you show the minimum wage that anybody is going to pay in an industrial undertaking shall be \$X per hour or per week, because only

yes-

terday I was engaged in a long exercise with the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and if there was legisla-tion dealing with the sector with which we were dealing, though it is a sector that was in the doldrums for many years, such would not be the case. We had to sit down round a table for three hours, but maybe the workers should negotiate their wages for themselves; but sooner or later the persons underwriting these things are going to come to their senses.

I have no objection to this amendment for leave con-ditions. We have an Act on the Statute Book giving two weeks' annual holiday with pay, but we have in one or two instances got some employers to agree to three weeks and to four weeks. In some instances some employers have agreed to two weeks' sick leave with pay, but some employers do not care anything about investing in the workers. I will give a simple example. When we went on the docks, we were able to demonstrate to the people in the docks that if you put 2% of the workers. wages into a sick fund, you would be able to provide the workers with lots of bene-fits. We have done that for four years, and it has shown that there is a surplus in the sick fund with which you can improve the benefits given to the workers. If it is done this way, the employers in Barbados will wake up; and if they do now wake up, there is going to be legislation to make them wake up. I find that employers here do not put aside money for the workers; they put aside money for machines and for buildings, but they believe that when they pay a worker a wage, thought it is low, that they have supplied him with all the needs.

The wages in Bridgetown are still shameful, and in a way I am glad that they are. That is the only thing that will make the clerks and the shop assistants come to their senses. Everybody gives you the excuse about the number of people they employ. There is not legislation in Barbados which says how many people any man must employ in any business, and the threat that they always use against the workers is that when they increase the wages they would have to employ less people, which means that they are philanthropic now in employing more people than they want, because they are employing people for the sake of employ-ing them. You do not tell a sensible man that. You employ the people you require. Some of these people in Bridgetown are working for less than a maid at the Barbados Workers Union is getting, because she gets \$25 a week, while they are working in stores for \$18 a week or \$75 or \$80 a month. I regard that as shameful. and in the process of time we hope to deal with the people who are supporting it, because they are the same people to which some members of this Chamber are appealing to return them to this Chamber, but when it comes to the basic requirements, they forget.

I feel that Wages Councils days are over. If the workers take the bull by the horn and realise that the power lies in their own hands, they will bring these people to their senses. I have no doubt about what the Minister said about labour legislation. I have said to the Premier and I will say in this House that the whole construction of the Portfolio in this Island is unscientific. No man in labour has any right dealing with trade at the same time, because they are incongruous. A man who sees after trade is going to find it difficult to be pursuing the militant line for labour as he should, because all the traders want him to introduce legislation with the-profit motive. The Minister who looks after trade thinks in terms of getting trade, not in terms of protecting labour. He thinks in terms of trade in the first instance, and that is understandable; but a man who is Minister of Labour, may be together with another portfolio that is more consonant with labour, maybe something like agriculture where there would be no conflict because one is the growing of crops, would not have conflict in dealing with them. As soon as you mix trade with labour in these parts, you have a milk and water situation.

I have lived in this country from the beginning of Ministerial Government and this situation has existed all the while with the Minister of Labour coming down here with the effrontery talking about labour legislation. like in the last Government, as if he was a member of the

Conservative Government, saying that peaceful picketing was obnoxious legislation, because he was totally ignorant of what peaceful picketing within the context of the Trade Union law really meant. Similarly in each Government I have seen this using of labour legislation to say that he is the person who is responsible for the workers getting this kind of legislation, but he is only using labour as a means of buttressing his own political prestige when it suits him, to say that he is the great godfather, and had it not been for him they would not have had this law on the Statute Book. 4.25 p.m.

I feel that the provision of Wages Councils is a mediaeval kind of legislation. I do not believe in legislation to help people contract out of their responsibility. We live in an age of progress and workers should be made to understand. I realise that this kind of legislation will suit politicians. They like to have a lot of floating votes of those people who are not in the Trade Union and who would appeal to a lot of hash and with some nebulous bogus argument that they have in relationship to these things. These people should now join a strong organisation which has to sit down around table and negotiate for better wages and conditions for them. No matter what legislation you are going to pass, you cannot give them the right to do that. Wages Councils militate against people seeing after their rights, and these Councils perpetuate these low standards of wages in some of the trades where Wages Councils are set up.

Some dissatisfaction at present exists in the garment, industry and we intend to put an end to that. You have this low type of wages in existence at the expense of good, basic wages. You have Indians and other foreign people coming here and doing trade and making a handsome profit but paying out a very low wage to the workers. I was very pleased to see one of these stores opened in more commodious quarters, but the wages which they are paying in these stores are not commensurate with the success which you see accruing to the owners of these stores. I heard the speeches made in respect of the last store which opened in new quarters and I hope wages would be in keeping with higher standards and that the workers would also receive better conditions.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with what the hon. member who has just sat down has said and I fully appreciate his stand as a trade unionist. On the other hand, I do not agree with him in all aspects of his speech. I must say this. We have a Trade Union Act and we also have freedom of association. I would be the last person to criticise any awakening on the part of the workers, but at the same time I do not think that Government really would be said to be responsible if it did not provide this sort of legislation. I believe that workers in an organisation are in a better position to demand better wages and conditions of service, but workers who benefit by the proposal of Wage Councils, they too have to be protected and I think that this is a case of protection.

I for myself am very glad to see that there is some improvement being made in this matter by providing some measure of sick allowances for these people. I was under the impression that certain laws already existed in this respect; therefore, I do not know if this is to improve the matter or if this initiates. I am not very sure of that. However, I certainly view this matter, by reason of the fact that many workers have not yet been organised, by reason of the fact that many workers have not yet been

organised in the very militant trade Union or other Trade Union in Barbados, that we as such cannot tell workers which Trade Union to join because that is not our policy, that those work-ers who work in stores in the City area who do not have sufficient guts to stand up and ask for better conditions for themselves and who are lacking in the spirit to combine should also be represented by some organisation to see after better conditions of service for them. Therefor, I commend the Government for trying its best as far as possible to ameliorate conditions in this matter. Naturally, workers who are not organised cannot hope to be able to obtain conditions of service similar to those who are organ. ised. They cannot hope to obtain all the known benefits to

the workers who belong to a militant and active Trade union; but there is still to be found in all places workers with re-sponsibility who have not yet decided to join a trade union, and Government is responsible for every man, woman and child in this country. Therefore,are we going to brand those workers and say because they do not belong to a Trade Union that they are lazy and indifferent?

I commend the present Government for making any improvement whatsoever in the conditions of workers in this country who are not in a militant trade union. It is the function of the Secretaries of Trade Unions to bring these workers into their fold; but in spite of all the known and proclaimed benefits that organised workers can achieve for themselves, there are still to be found in the City and in the country, workers whose responsibility is still the Gov-ernment\'s to see to it that their conditions are improved. Therefore, my slant is a little different from that of the hon. member who has just sat down. Naturally, I would ex-pect him to make the speech he has because he is a militant trade unionist; but, as a member of this House, I must say that until the time comes when these people become more conscious, more knowledgeable, and more determined that they should form themselves into organisations where they can demand better Conditions for themselves, the Govern-ment cannot afford to let those people suffer. 4.35 p.m.

1 am aware of that. As members of this House, we cannot advise persons against joining a Trade Union. I do not think that any of us would dare to do so, not in the open, at any rate, we cannot afford to do so in this day and age. However, there are some people who will always make themselves the responsibilities of people who have more vision than they have. Therefore, if this measure seeks to improve the working conditions of an organized lot of workers in this country, if these workers are now to benefit by an improved condition of service, then we welcome that. There is a section of this Bill which makes some provision as to the security of workers; under that section no notice of dismissal may be given during the time when a worker is ill. I do not think that that is really a problem; the problem is that the dismissal may come when the worker returns|to work from illness or when he returns from his holiday.

Sir, from my experience in this matter, I do not think that there is much trouble coming from any notice of dismissal being given during the time when the worker is ill or when he is on holiday, but I think that the Labour Depart-ment and the Trade Union Officials are aware of the fact that dismissals are given after the workers return to their work. I think that that is where the necessary provision should be made. Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this Meas-ure and I hope that as time goes on I will be able to give my assent to a greater measure of improvement for these workers even through arrangements made by Wages Coun-cils.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew caught my eye soon after the hon. junior member for St. Peter rose to speak.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill. The reason why I have risen to say something on it is because I am Chairman of the Guardians Committee for St. Andrew and I know that there are people who work in the various categories and when they are taken ill they have to come to the Board in order to be given a crumb. I should like to say that if a Bill of this nature were in existence before, these people would have been able to obtain something from their employers which would help them until the time comes when they are able to go back out to their work. It is not a good thing after a man has been working for ten years or twenty years for an employer and then he becomes ill, he has to remain at home without being granted any relief. According to this Bill, if a worker becomes ill on his work or at home, he will be granted sick leave with pay and that will ease the public. In my parish, a poor man who is unable to work is getting 50 cents a week

when he is granted relief by the Board. Mr. Speaker, you will know how much is fifty cents for an employee who has been working for ten or fifteen years with an employer. He cannot even pay house rent with that. I am very pleased that this Bill has been brought forward and will be put into existence. I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, any one who has the interest of the worker at heart will completely support an amendment of this nature. The "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill state this:-

"The object of this Bill is to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955, to provide for the making and enforcement of wages regulation proposals and orders relating to the grant to workers of sick leave with pay."

Sir, I do not think that you would find an employer who has people working for him today and who would be so hard that if any one of them was taken ill, he would not support him. What an employer would he be to have people working for him and if any one of them becomes ill he refuses to pay him his allowance? I do that and I feel that most employers do it too. Although I am glad to see an amendment of this nature, I am sorry to know that since 1962 this particular amendment was hanging fire by the Government, and only today or a few days ago, the present Government could see fit to bring it down. The Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill has said that this amendment should have been brought before this Chamber long ago or words to that effect, but that makes me believe that someone is responsible for holding it up or holding back. I was never a Minister, but I am thinking that the Government is a collective one and that the responsibility is shared among the Ministers. I do not feel that one particular Minister could hold up a progressive Measure of this nature, and that the others would just drag their feet and only be watching and peeping and not doing anything about the matter. If I were a Minister, I would not have said what the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill has said at all. I would be ashamed to allow this House to know that one Minister was responsible for holding up a Measure of this nature. We do not know how many people might have suffered from that delay. As a

matter of fact, quite a number of people might have suffered from that. 4.45 p.m.

It appears to me that each Minister thinks he is a Government unto himself and not part of a collective Government, because if you did not have a reshuffle, walkout or whatever it is, you might still have this Bill hanging fire, and this House would not know it was in the making. It is a disgrace to hear remarks or explanations of this sort. I would have to call this Government a very weak one. I think the undertaker should step in and stand by to do some burying of this Government. Here is an amendment to provide the workers with sick leave with pay, and a Minister is telling us this afternoon that this was shelved from 1962, and it is only now since he has taken up the portfolio - patting himself on the back one way I do not know what he is doing the other-that this is being brought. There may be employers who would not give their employees sick pay, but the Minister must be sure there are some, and that from 1962 they were trying to bring this legislation here to protect these poor, defenceless, but instead of doing that now, they are fighting head and heels to bring a Resolution for these same workers to go it alone.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I must ask the hon. member to stick to the object of this Bill which is to amend the Wages Council Act. On another occasion of course the hon. member may deal with any other subject.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, I am going to stick to it, but I believe that if you were in my place now you would stray a little.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sure that if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph were in my place, he would hold me up.

Mr. SMITH:

That is true, Sir. There is very little more I have to say other than that I am to see what for a Government we have to tolerate in this day of grace.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it that there is no other hon. member willing to take part in this debate. Let the Hon. Minister reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Peter who is not now in his place did query the initiation of sick allowances for these shop attendants. There is no provision in the Wages Act of 1955 for sick allowance. The provision in the Act is for holiday with pay, and that is why we are making this amendment to make provision for sick leave. We do not say that some employers do not allow their shop attendants to have sick leave; there are some who allow it, though they may not allow it to the extent to which the amendment is seeking to make it.

On the question of low wages raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I quite agree with him, but what he said on that score is that if these workers would get organised, they would be able to demand respectable wages and proper working conditions. There have been rumours of shop assistants having to sign for one salary and receive another, but all these things would be rectified if the shop attendants were well organised, and I would advise that they get organised as soon as possible so that they would enjoy proper conditions of service.

Now to answer the hon. junior. member for St. Joseph, it is strange to hear coming from his mouth the question of collective responsibility. He goes to sleep in St. Joseph and finds himself awake in St. Michael without having got up and got into a motor car. When I say that, I am speaking figuratively. On one occasion he joins other people who should have a knowledge of what collective responsibility in Cabinet is and he does not see the necessity for collective responsibility on that particular issue. On this issue he sees the necessity for collective responsibility. How in one breath can he talk about collective responsibility and in another he cannot even dare to mention collective responsibility, because he would be kicked out of his Party and would lose the support of the people who are now fighting against Independence alone?

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is nothing alone now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARD:

I said, Mr. Speaker, that it is strange that we hear this collective responsibility talk from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He asks how it is possible for a Minister to delay action on any proposal which falls in his Ministry. His colleague next to him would tell him that a Minister can do it. His colleague can tell him of the delays which were occasioned through his not taking action in the Ministry for which he was responsible when he was a Minister of Government. 4.55 p.m.

His colleague is an expert at this.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister seems to be making sport. You have this silly aside about a Minister's responsibility. I wonder if he would explain the reason why it is that the entire staff in his school does not get a cent at all when the school is on vacation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is definitely not a point of order. It does not arise at all.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I ignore what the hon. mem-ber has said because I do not run a schol. I was saying that people of this country, because of the fact that they do not want to offend Mr. X or Mr. Y, they refuse to do the job which the people of this country are looking forward to them to do, and people like hon. members on that side agree with them. I would like to hear hon. members on that side opposing this bit of legislation. They have been able to get it delayed and perhaps if there were not certain changes recently, it would not have been here before the House today.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I rese on a point of order. I wonder if the Hon. Minister has stated that the former

Minister delayed this piece of legislation. I consider this a reckless misstatement being made by the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That has not been stated; so the reck-less misstatement would not arise.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I wonder if the hon. junior member of St. Philip is sailing on the right boat. I think he is sailing on the wrong boat.

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of order, I am glad that the Hon. Minister is sailing on the right boat, but time will tell.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That, I am afraid, is not a point of order. Will the Hon. Minister continue to deal exclusively with the reply to the speeches relating to the Wages Council Act?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, it seems as if when people become hostile to the Democratic Labour Par-ty that they forget all about the constitutional proprieties of this country, all about the proper administration of Justice, all about the proper functioning of Government and all that should take place in Cabinet. People do not know anything of what takes place in Cabinet unless they are told by members of the Cabinet. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Philip is the member for Foul Bay because some people get on just as if they are fowls, just jumping all around.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am asking the Hon. Minister to withdraw those remarks because if he is talking about fowls, I shall be talking about

dogs.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would ask the hon. junior member for St. Philip to rise on a point of order only if he is satisfied that it is a point of order in conformity with the Standing Orders of this Chamber. I would remind the hon. junior member for St. Philip that when we go into Committee on the Bill - which I hope we will soon - there will be no limit to the number of speeches which he or any hon. member may make.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am glad Your Honour tried to teach the hon. member what is a point of order. He does not understand else he would not be jumping up every minute. I do not have to withdraw any remarks because I had not said anything which was unparliamentary. The hon. junior member for St. Philip does not know what took place on this matter, but because he wants to fly off the handle, he gets up. If he has got fire within him, he better bring it out on the occasion that warrants it. Let him do all this talk on Independence.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask the Hon. Minister to please set a good example by dealing with the Wages Council Act.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the conditions of the workers who benefits by that Bill which was

delayed since 1962. I make no apology for doing so. The Cabinet met in 1962 on this matter, and if the legislation was dealt with in the appropriate Ministry, it would have been brought here before. I am saying that it is the duty of any Minister, if he sees that anything has been delayed, to ask for it. If the Minister concerned saw that the Bill had not been drafted, that is not the fault of a Civil Servant; it is the fault of the person who has ultimate responsibility for it. I am saying that that person is responsible for the initiation of the action on the particular measure, If I have to criticise other people, I criticise them. If I have to criticise myself, I would criticise myself.

Now, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph also spoke of undertakers, but the undertakers would be coming to bury all those traitors and all those people who delayed the Wages Council Act. They are singing their swan song now, but the undertakers would be coming to bury that type of person and their associates. Sir, that is all I have to say on the second reading.

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

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. Edwards, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Bats on in the Chair.

5.05 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

2. Section 11 of the Wages Council Act, 1955 (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the principal Act) is amended as follows -

(a) by inserting immediately after subsection (20) the following subsections as subsections (2A) and (2B) -

“(2A) Wages regulation proposals for prescribing the conditions of employment to be provided by their employers to all or any of the workers in relation to whom a wages council operates may contain provisions for requiring a worker to be allowed sick leave and for fixing the remuneration to be paid in respect of any period of sick leave.

(2B) Wages regulation proposals for requiring a worker to be allowed sick leave and for fixing sick leave remuneration -

(i) shall not be made unless both sick leave

remuneration in respect of sick leave and remuneration other than sick leave remuneration have been or are being fixed under this Part of this Act.

(ii) Shall provide for the duration of sick leave be related to the duration of the period for which the worker has been employed or engaged to be employed by the employer who is to allow the sick leave;

(iii) may make provisions as to the times at which and the circumstances in which sick leave shall be allowed;

(iv) may make provisions as to the times at which sick leave remuneration shall accrue and become payable and for securing the payment of any such remuneration which has accrued due to a worker;

(v) may provide that an employer by whom sick leave is granted to a worker shall not, during the period of such leave, dismiss or give notice of dismissal to the worker;"

(b)by inserting the words \"and sick leave\" immediate ly after the word \"holiday\" in subsection (8)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that,

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few things to say on this Bill. I think it is rather unkind and unsympathetic for the Hon. Minister to criticise one of his colleagues. I do not know that the Hon. Minister would have seen the files in the Ministry of Trade since he was there. This is really getting at the hon. senior member for St. Philip. The Hon. Minister says that since 1962 this matter was lying in the Ministry and he is now criticising somebody. I really do not believe that a man with a civilised heart would refuse to give benefits to sick people who were working for him; on the other hand, I know that there are some employers who would not grant their employees leave for any period of sickness. (ASIDES) I am not thinking of the milk in the Tobago Cays.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

In what section of this Bill would you find that?

Mr. MILLER:

I am dealing with sick leave. This is what can happen. The Hon. Minister attempted to accuse somebody of telling my colleague what goes on in the Minis-try. I can romp with him and I can also exchange some language with him for a little time. This Bill is allied to the legislation dealing with Holidays with pay. This is one of the powerful allies to the Holidays with Pay Bill, I am not thinking of sick leave now, but it is selfish and boy-like to criticise the hon. senior member for St. Philip. There is nothing in this where you would want to do something with a former Minister who is not here to defend himself. The Hon. Minister who is in charge of this Bill has served as Minister of Social Services and now he has been transferred to the Ministry of Trade. They had to kick him out or up. (Laughter).

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

What section of the Bill is that?

Mr. MILLER:

This is dealing with sick leave. When the Annual Conference was going on.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I do not see anything about any Annual Conference in this Bill.

Mr. MILLER:

He was at Lado's in a state of insobriety. We are now in Committee and I want to make some fun too. only two weeks ago he failed to attend the Annual Conference

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

This is nothing to do with the Annual Conference.

Mr. MILLER:

If my friend

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am appealing to the hon. member to stick to this Bill; it is a very important Bill-Mr. MILLER Although we have tragedy, there are occasions when we have comedy. Since we are in Committee, Mr. Chairman, you will grant me a little latitude. I sat here like a bear in the cage without saying a word, but unpleasant and foul statements were made, I did not think that that cowardly honourable member would have attacked somebody who was not here to defend himself. I think there is time and we should have some fun.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I do not think that this is any fun.

Mr. MILLER:

We have had some tragedy and we can also have some comedy. I am told Sir, that you are going to displace May's Parliamentary Procedure. (Laughter).

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I do not see that in this Bill. I think that the hon. member is straying from this Bill, 5.15 p.m.

Mr. MILLER:

Now, Mr. Chairman, you are in my period and era, and I understand that you are writing a book on Parliamentary Procedure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am not acquainted with your state-ment.

Mr. MILLER:

It has gone all over the West Indies, and the local Press has stated that you are writing a book to replace May's Parliamentary Procedure,

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not knowledgeable to me. I would like the hon. member to stick to this Bill.

Mr. MILLER:

Since you will not admit it. Sir, and with your sweet and kind permission, Mr. Chairman, and my unswerving respect to this august Chamber, I seek your kind permission to sit and with the right to speak again.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I must commend the Government for introducing this piece of legislature on be-half of the workers. Having heard the Minister say that it was delayed by someone for a period, I must let the Minis-

ter know now that in the office which he has left, the Southern District Council recommend approximately a year ago that a man be given a pension and gratuity, and up to the present time he has not dealt with it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to reply to the hon. junior member for St. George because he has said nothing. I would like to say to the hon. junior mem-ber for St. Philip in reply to the question he has raised about the recommendation made by the Southern District Council for a pension for a man, that it is on the Order Paper and the matter is in Select Committee otherwise he would not have mentioned the question of my sitting on it. The Select Committee has to meet to deal with an issue like this. But it is people like him and people who associate with him who go around fooling the people of this country, and that is why he came here to mislead this Committee this evening. He is so much accustomed to living by fooling people that he is trying to get over this Committee with it; but if they want a fight, I am prepared to fight with them, not here, elsewhere.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. Edwards, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed. ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. I wish to thank the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and hon. members opposite for having decided to waive their claims to have Private Members. Business today. I wish to assure them that if they wish to do Private Members. Business next week, they may do so.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 19th October, at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

5.24 p.m.