

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27th February, 1968

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (*Speaker*)
Mr. L. E. SMITH J.P.; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Leader of the House*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries*); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance*); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (*Hon.*), (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P., and Mr. L.S. CRAIG.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform the House that there are no Minutes available for confirmation, but I understand that there are three sets in the hands of the Government Printer.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL entered the Chamber and took his seat.

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE FROM THE
REV. F. A. CAYLESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from our Chaplain, the Rev. F. A. Cayless, which reads as follows:

"I have applied for two months leave from my substantive post as Rector of St. George, in order to proceed to the United Kingdom to consult the Urologist at the Radcliffe Infirmary and possible treatment there. Would Your Honour kindly recommend the grant of a similar period of leave from my duties as Chaplain of the Honourable House of Assembly with effect from the 8th March 1968?

Fr. Andrew Hatch, Vicar of St. Mary's Church, has agreed to act as Chaplain in my absence if this should meet with the approval of Your Honour and the Honourable House.

I remain, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) F. A. Cayless
Chaplain, House of Assembly."

I would say that, so far as I am concerned, I would recommend the grant of leave to the Rector.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker I beg to move that Rev. F. A. Cayless, Chaplain of this Honourable House, be granted two months' leave of absence as from the 8th March. In moving the motion I would like to say, if I may, how very sorry - and I am sure hon. members will join me in this - I am to hear that our Chaplain is not well, and I wish him a speedy recovery.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that. We are very glad on this side of the House not only to agree to that, but to agree to the substitute suggested.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The leave is granted, and I also take this opportunity of expressing my hope and desire that our Rev. Cayless will be restored to us in full health in May of this year.

APPOINTMENT OF FR. ANDREW HATCH
AS ACTING CHAPLAIN

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that Fr. Andrew Hatch be appointed to act as Chaplain of this Honourable House as from the 8th March, 1968.

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

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

ACCOUNTS AND STATEMENTS BY THE
ACCOUNTANT GENERAL FOR THE
MONTH OF MARCH, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received from the Accountant General Accounts and Statements for the month of March, 1967, as prepared by that officer.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. and learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Customs Duties (Materials for use in the Manufacture of Paper-bags and Exercise Books) Order, 1968.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1968.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1968.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Eleventh Annual Report of the Housing Authority for the period 1st April, 1966, to 31st March, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to place the sum of \$73,947 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 55 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$664 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 56 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$10,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 57 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$53,694 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 58 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1968.

And now on my own behalf I am giving notice, Mr. Speaker, of my intention to move the House into

Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the prescribing of minimum wages and guaranteed employment for workers employed in the sugar industry and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith I should like to ask for leave of the House to deal with this Bill in all its stages today.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that members on this side of the House object to its being dealt with in all its stages today, for reasons which we will give when we are dealing with the objects and principles of the Bill. We are not objecting to the Bill. The Bill was handed to most of us at a quarter past seven last night, and it should not be dealt with through all its stages today. Most of us having received it at a quarter past seven last night from the hands of the policeman who usually takes these things around, we have not been able to get together since then to go through it. Nothing can harm the sugar workers at the moment; there is no reason why the reaping of the crop should not go on; there is no reason why the money suggested should not be paid; but there are other things in this Bill that need to be considered.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I, too, like my colleague, received this Bill last night. As far as I am concerned, nobody is more pleased than I am to see the crop being reaped. I am very happy to see, from the pictures in the newspapers, that the crop has started. When the hon. member says that certain points in the Bill need careful consideration, I agree with him, I support the payment of 7¢ and so on. I think the Prime Minister has done a very able job in this matter. The Union has agreed to it.

The Leader of the House said that he wishes to take this Bill through all its stages. However, there is another part of this Bill which may operate in just the opposite direction to which the Government anticipates it will operate and, therefore, I would suggest - I do not know what the Leader of the House will do. The Leader of the Opposition said that he agreed with the principle and the policy of going on with the crop. As far as that is concerned, we are 100% behind it, and we hope that a settlement has been reached. May I suggest to the Leader of the House - I am not making a speech, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have decided that the hon. member is proceeding to make a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If I am raising objection, can't I make a speech?
12.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that, in principle, the House pass the second reading of the Bill today. As to the part of the Bill which deals primarily with the seven cents increase and so on, there can be no question

of anybody disagreeing with that. As to the other part, I have got to have time to study it. I suggest that we agree in principle to the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House is not dealing with the Bill. I am dealing with it today and we are going to do this Bill today.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This attitude which the hon. member.....

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am surprised at the hon. member. I thought that the Hon. Leader of the House was dealing with the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the moment all that has been said by the Hon. Leader of the House is that he proposes to seek the leave of the House.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Minister has said that he is going to deal with the Bill today. That is not the attitude to adopt. Can he explain to us any particular reason why he is going to deal with it today? (ASIDES) Don't adopt that attitude. We agree with the principle of the Bill, but do not tell me that you are going to do it today. (Mr. SMITH: He is a bully.).

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed with the Notices.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Bill to make provision for the postponement of the coming into force of the third valuation lists under Section 147(3) of the Local Government Act, 1958 in respect of the rating areas of the City of Bridgetown and the Southern District.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 46, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter is ready.

Also, the Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 30, 38, 39, 61 and 114, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, are ready.

Also, the Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 76 and 90, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 77, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is ready, and also to remind you that at a previous meeting I had given notice that.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is it in order for an hon. member to address the House with a tooth pick in his mouth? (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us have proper behaviour in this House today, and from today onwards.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I am always willing to have proper behaviour, but they cannot be any better. Power corrupts, and the loss of power also corrupts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a notice?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Sir. I said that I was giving notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 77, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is ready, and I also gave notice previously of the Replies to Parliamentary Questions which were laid.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 95, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James is ready.

Also the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 107, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a motion affecting a breach of privilege of this House, a copy of which I handed to the Clerk of the House during the sitting of the House. I regret that I have not got the copy before me, I have spoken to the Clerk about it, and he has made an explanation to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been informed by the Clerk that such a notice has been handed in and has been most unfortunately mislaid by a member of the Staff of the House. For that I apologise to the hon. member. I just do not understand how these things can happen.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I thank Your Honour.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Was it mislaid by the same member of the Staff whose account of affairs was preferred to that of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, at the last sitting of this House?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, even indirectly or remotely.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James re Prospect Tenantry Road.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Question is as follows:-

Is the Minister aware that the road known as Prospect Tenantry Road - or Prospect Crusher Site Road - in the parish of Saint James is in dire need of repair?

2. Will the Minister see to it that the said road is repaired as quickly as possible?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is another Question standing in the name of the same hon. member re the public convenience adjacent to the Trafalgar Hotel in Palmetto Square.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Question is as follows:-

Is Government aware that the public convenience adjacent to the Trafalgar Hotel in Palmetto Square is in a most insanitary state?

2. Will Government take steps to remedy this state of affairs immediately?
12.35 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that the Bill to provide the prescribing of minimum wages and guaranteed employment for workers employed in the sugar industry and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that the Bill to make provision for the postponement of the coming into force of the third valuation lists under Section 147 (3) of the Local Government Act, 1958 in respect of the rating areas of the City of Bridgetown and the Southern District, be now read a first time.

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 Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 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.

MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is a continuation of a debate on a Motion of Privilege standing in the name of the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way for a moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has given way.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am grateful to the hon. member. I wonder whether the hon. member, without prejudice to the House's right as laid down by the Standing Orders but in the interest of the nation, would care to agree to re-arranging the priority so that we may deal with the Agricultural (Minimum Wage and Guaranteed Employment) Act first and then return, if he wishes, to the Motion of Privilege. I am putting it to him as an appeal from this side of the House in the national interest and on behalf of sugar workers.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member really thinks that we are not only children, but mentally retarded children, on this side of the House. He talks about: "in the interest of the nation." Why did the Government members walk out when we were present dealing with a motion with respect to the investigation and solution of the deadlock in the sugar industry? Why did they walk out? Why did they fail to ask a question in the interest of the nation? Just political propaganda. That falls on deaf ears when members of the other side speak like that. The member talks about "in the interest of the nation." This deadlock could have been finished long ago in the interest of the nation. That could have been done when members on this side of the House were speaking about it.

The rules of the House say that questions of privileges must be done first. I propose to consider the debate on the nasty episode on the part of some members on the other side of the House which has taken place.

Snatching food! It is disgraceful behaviour, but very true.

The hon. member drew attention to the fact that I had made a mistake on the last occasion. I misunderstood what he said about the letter which was sent by him to the President of the Other Place and I am pleased to correct it. In the course of time an amendment will be made putting that in order.

My motion reads like this:-

"This House having heard Mr. Speaker read a letter sent by a member of the House to Mr. Speaker, for transmission to the Hon. President....."

That was wrong, as the hon. member pointed out.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member pointed out that that was not so and that he, the Leader of the House, had sent a letter direct to the President

of the Senate. Therefore, that portion of my motion reflecting on His Honour the Speaker would have to be deleted. The way how I looked at it was this. If the Leader of the House sent to the Speaker a letter about the breach of privilege, the Speaker ought not to have sent it on; but if as a matter of fact it was not done that way, obviously, I apologise.

12.45 p.m.

"The House therefore places on record its gravest displeasure at the conduct of the Leader of the House" - I have in the original "and of the Speaker" and that will have to be eliminated now - "as being contemptuous of the House, as lowering the dignity of Parliamentary democracy and as conducive of complete disrespect of the holding of the office of Speaker" - that would have to be deleted - "and of the Leader of the House."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will repeat very briefly because I have said it before and hon. members ought to remember. An insult by a single member of this House is an insult by the whole House, and an insult to a single member of this House is a breach of privilege of the whole House, and breaches of privileges are raised. Even the Speaker of the House of Commons has been known to raise a question of a breach of privilege because of some insulting behaviour to an officer of the House of Commons. That is the position. There can be no doubt whatever that we as a House act on questions of breach of privilege. We either commit them as a House - although one member does it - or they are committed to us because it has been done to one member. Daylight could not be clearer than that. If there are some members of the Government who feel that the Jews should not sit down to eat with the Samaritans, or feel that the Government members should not be friendly with members of the Opposition, that is a matter for them personally; but when it comes to the House of Assembly and their refusing to come into the dining room of the House because the Opposition are sitting in that room, and choose to invade - what else is it but an invasion, a trespass - the ante-room of the Senate, then it is a grave commission by the House of Assembly of Barbados and not by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the plate-toting gentleman. It is an insult by all of us. It is as if all of us had gone into the Senate Chamber and invaded it in order to have our meals over there.

I therefore ask this House to say - we know what the result will be, but it is our duty to raise the question - it is a gross breach of privilege by the Leader of the House then to apologise. Of course, we should apologise. It is a breach of privilege of the Senate. It is insulting the Senate just to walk into their ante-room with plates in our hands and say we are going to eat in there, just as it would be an insult to a neighbour if one of us says our dining room is not big enough and we are going to invade our neighbour's whether he knows of it or not. That would be the analogy. The Senate did not know of it; the President did not know of it; the President was not asked to give leave. It is an insult by all of us as

a House, and the Leader of the House purports to apologise for the majority Party. He did not even say in his letter "the members of the Government". He has apologised for the Democratic Labour Party. Could you have a cruder or more blatant breach of privilege and insult? "We are nothing to do with the fact that the House ought to apologise. We for the Dems, we for the majority Party are apologising we for Roebuck Street are apologising." Cruel!

The hon. member makes these eloquent flowery speeches that have not got an infinitesimal portion of commonsense in them, and when he makes his quotations, I would not worry with that; that is everyday. He always makes these historical quotations, and when you examine them they are ludicrous. He has the wrong man or the wrong period and so on. The Barbados Labour Party had a sort of demonstration when the hon. senior member for St. James and myself came back in the House after that very illegal suspension - triple illegal suspension, a suspension that followed no Standing Order, but just tore up the Standing Orders - but unfortunately we could not go in the Law Courts and get the Chief Justice to give us an injunction; and what did the hon. member do in his usual style? I have heard several people thank God that we no longer hear him over the radio with these long-winded eloquent Oxford Union - I notice he has been praised for that - type of debate, pleasant but meaning nothing. What did he say? He said that 150 spectators saw the Labour Party demonstration. Those of you who may have read what I am going to say now will forgive me as I have already put it in the Press. The hon. member counted 150 persons following this demonstration. This is only an example of his usual style. Now as I read that it reminded me of two things. A farmer going in a train in the country and passing a number of cattle in a field, and a neighbour in the train turned to him and said "How many cattle do you think are there?" And he said 438. The neighbour said "What! How do you get them to be that?" And he said "Well, I counted the legs and divided by four." His 150 would be that. He must have counted 600 legs of people and divided by four and got them out to be 150. Apart from that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Louis XVI, he said had 160 people by his death bed. Every school boy knows that Louis XVI was guillotined in the presence of thousands of people. I have never read anywhere that they allowed his family and friends to bring a death bed and put under the guillotine to catch the head. That would have to be done. That is what the hon. member constantly does. He makes historical references to show his intelligence. He did not manage to get more than a fourth Class Degree at Oxford, but to show his historical learning and his intellectual ability, he trots out these things which mean nothing, and if investigated just are only ridiculous. I spared him. I only just published in the *Beacon* Newspaper what I have just told the House, but I spared him even raising it on the floor of the House; but when he goes along still persisting in that sort of thing, how can we remain silent when, above all, over and over again on this side of the House we preach co-operation and friendliness, and you get the Prime Minister

getting up and saying "Friends what! There are no reasons why Government members should be friendly with the Opposition. We do not eat with them."

Well, if you choose to declare war, you will have it from this side of the House. We are trying to co-operate in this House. All members are not like this. Immediately after that abortive meeting, the hon. member junior for St. Andrew came over to some of us on this side and preached as we expected him to do and said "Let us have co-operation; let us stop this nonsense." We on this side of the House welcome that sort of attitude. Often when we try to do something, the Welchman Hall gullyite's views are thrown at us. Mr. Deputy Speaker, my point on this is strong. The House has as a whole insulted the Senate by some of its members doing what they did. It is a breach of privilege for a single member, even if he is Leader of the House, to purport to act on behalf of the whole House, and that is the subject and the object of my motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, although it is not in order, somehow mysteriously my motion dealing with a further aspect of this matter cannot be found. In all my parliamentary life - and it goes back to forty years - I have never heard of that happening before, where a member gives notice of a motion and it cannot be found. I say it not because of myself; it is an accident, so to speak, that I am Leader of the Opposition; but imagine the Leader of the Opposition giving notice of a motion and it cannot be found when it should be before the House that I could give notice of it this morning!

12.55 p.m.

It cannot be found and therefore I claim the right, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to refer to it. The Leader of the House has written to the President of the Senate asking permission to use their ante-room to the end of March! The Leader of the House; not a Resolution of the House!

If the President of the Senate is so silly - he sent the matter to the Committee of Privileges, and I can see why. He does not want the onus of deciding for himself. If the Senate are going to tell us: "Some of your members can come into our quarters," that is a breach of privilege by the Senate on us. The hon. member has numbers, and he thinks he can get away with murder. That is a crude, crude, breach of privilege by us, and a cruder breach of privilege if the Senate says: "Yes, you can come and sit in our room." It is not for the Senate to tell us where our members should sit, and it is not for us to tell the Senate where their members should sit. Even if it were a Resolution of the House, it would be a breach of the privileges of the Senate. I do not know what is going to happen in the end, but I hope they will give careful thought before listening to anything that should come from only some members of the House of Assembly, and not as a Resolution from the whole House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is due from us to say to the House what we feel about breaches of privileges

and rights. I have been asked about a year or so ago: Why does the Leader of the Opposition raise these points? How is it possible for anybody, who feels that this House should have the same reputation and be accorded the same dignity, and people speak of it with the same respect as they spoke about it one hundred years ago when every single Chamber in the rest of the West Indies used to look up to the House of Assembly of Barbados; when it could reasonably be said, without boasting, that the House of Assembly in its procedure, in its practice, in its conduct - you have disorder in the House of Commons, in the French Chamber and all over the world; but only on specific occasions, when tempers of necessity run high, if a Bill comes before the House of Commons or the French Parliament, say, in which religious leaders rise and there is strong feeling - then you may get disorder.

In the House of Assembly of Barbados that type of disorder is few and far between. Today, does anyone doubt the position? If hon. members were to keep their ears opened when what we called the "Downalongers" from St. Lucia, Grenada and Dominica - (Interruption) Today they do not respect us. We have fallen and fallen in the opinion of the West Indian Territories - the man in the street as well as those in the Legislative Councils.

We, therefore, owe it to ourselves to keep the Standing Orders, to keep to proper procedure, and not to let it be said - I say this now not with any reference to colour - as sometimes it is thrown at us. What do you expect? In the old days the Piles, the Chandlers and the Austins were gentleman and they stuck to the Rules; they played the game. But what do you expect from the present House? Do not let us give an opportunity to people to say that.

We have, on this side of the House, at least, sufficient ability and sufficient consciousness to our duty as regards our personal conduct and our conduct in this House to be worthy of the dignity, to be worthy of the respect which previous Houses of Barbados have enjoyed, and we on this side are prepared to maintain it. If we see things like these arising which are clearly breaches of privilege and clearly something of which we should be ashamed, then it is our duty to say - no man is a man if he cannot say: "I am sorry; I have made a mistake, and I apologise." Let us as a House apologise to the Senate, because that is our duty. It is our duty to ourselves as well as it is our duty to the Senate. Let us apologise and say that we are sorry for the breach of privilege. Do not let us fail to do that, and make the further mistake of sending and asking the Senate to let us rest on their doorsteps until the end of March. That is a crude, crude, crude letter and a crude idea.

Now when my motion has, at last, I hope, been found by the Clerk, I shall deal with that specially. I hope it will be found so that we can deal with it at the next meeting of the House. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I have spoken at greater length than I had intended it is because it is too important a matter to let slip.

Somebody made a mistake. Somebody wanted to go and have what was called a private discussion, although there were outsiders or an outsider present. But we know it to be, going by the words of the Prime Minister, a refusal to allow certain members to sit with members of the Opposition.

Before I sit down, I hesitated, but after hesitation, I find that I will say it. Back benchers who are dictated to against their conscience are not men. Some hon. members have always come into the Dining Room as they should, and mixed freely. I remember being told when I was called to the Bar: "Fight sturdily in Court, but eat and drink as friends."

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding this motion, I do not intend to travel upon the same ground that the hon. and learned introducer of the Resolution travelled upon. But I do want to place upon the records of this House our profound protest and consternation at the surrounding circumstances which can be seen from a perusal of the documents which were circulated at the direction of His Honour the Speaker.

It goes to show what we have been saying in this House for a long time. We have been saying that the veracity of responsible people in this Chamber can be questioned. I say that this privilege motion gives us an opportunity to prove completely and absolutely that this is so. The other side had every opportunity to remove this matter from the records. We protested to His Honour the Speaker that what he was doing was wrong, but we have it now on this evidence that either His Honour was a liar, or the Leader of the House is a liar.
1.05 p.m.

That is the position. His Honour, you will remember, said that he did not tell the Hon. Leader of the House or inform him, directly or indirectly, of the contents of any letter that he had received; but here we have the Hon. Leader of the House's own letter. I will read it slowly because when these occasions come and mistakes are made, people must be men enough to get up and say "I have made a mistake," and not try to mislead the House by telling pure lies. This is the letter. It is dated the 9th February, 1968, it is addressed to His Honour the President of the Senate, and a copy is to the Speaker of this House and it is written by Cameron Tudor, Leader of the House.

"Dear Mr. President,

"Mr. Speaker has informed me that he has received a letter from Your Honour protesting against the use without previous permission of the ante-room of the Senate Chamber 'by certain members of the House of Assembly' on Tuesday, 30th January, 1968."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the House said in his letter that the Speaker has informed him and the Speaker said that that is not true. That is what we get in here. Obviously, this letter was shown

or the contents of this letter were divulged before they were divulged to this House, and they have got the audacity to say that we are wasting the time of the House with a motion of privilege. Could we have anything more disgraceful and shocking than that? How can we have confidence in anything that is said by people when the evidence shows that it is a blatant and unadulterated lie? There is a God in Heaven. These facts were produced so that we can prove conclusively and nail them to the hilt. After this, the integrity of the two gentlemen in fault must be questioned by anybody who has any idea of commonsense. The only decent thing to do in this is to have a full disclosure of the facts to this House and tender their profound and sincere apologies to this House for this gross breach of privilege. *(Cheers from the Opposition)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the two hon. members who have already spoken on this motion have undoubtedly outlined all the salient points which the House should consider. Evidently, however, this motion is not being analysed on its merits, and it is not being considered on the basis of privilege. It is being approached solely on the basis of numbers; in fact, it may not be unreasonable to sum up the attitude of the Government in this motion as that "We can be wrong and strong." The Government has spent the last few months proving to its own satisfaction, even if to the disgust of the inhabitants of Barbados as a whole, that you can suspend persons from the service of the Hon. House without following the Rules, that you can have one set of Rules for speeches made by the Prime Minister, and another set of Rules for speeches made by the Opposition; and they are now setting out an entirely new departure in parliamentary life to bring down the unity which every Parliament cast in the Westminster image and certainly in other parts of the world, has always presented. There can be no doubt whatsoever, not an iota of doubt, that it is a breach of privilege for one political Party in an elected House to take it upon itself to apologise to the other House of Parliament. There are certain members opposite, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas springs immediately to mind, who are totally and completely ignorant of the history of Parliament, ignorant of the Rules that govern the procedures of different Parliaments, ignorant of the canons of good Parliamentary behaviour and ignorant indeed of the canons of good parliamentary manners. This, so to speak, is the 'tooth pick' school of parliamentary behaviour which I am attacking. We would not expect that the 'tooth pick' school of M.P.s would understand what is meant by a breach of privilege. Therefore we will not waste our time casting the things which cannot even be described as pearls in Parliamentary knowledge because they are the sort of things which we should know. It is nothing which needs research to know that the Hon. Leader of the House cannot read a letter apologising for one half of the House. He is the Leader of the whole House, not the majority Party Leader, but we know that we are wasting our time with the hon.

junior member for St. Thomas. However, we hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the 'tooth-pick' school of M.P.s - we think that the 'tooth pickers' are confined to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas - we hope that other hon. members on that side of the House who have some knowledge of parliamentary procedure and some of the mental equipment which will enable them to grasp our arguments - we hope that our arguments will perhaps find some fertile ground in their minds.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, two hundred years ago parliamentary procedure and behaviour in the United States began to take a divergent line from parliamentary behaviour at Westminster. It was appreciated in those days in the United States that it was difficult for a Speaker to be impartial and it was regarded as a wonderful thing that at Westminster the Speaker could be impartial. Therefore in the American House of Representatives, human frailty was recognized. They had, no doubt, persons such as the Chairman of Committees in the American House of Representatives even then, and with that sort of example before them, the American House allowed the Speaker to become a Party official and circumscribed within limits a code which combines impartiality and partiality. Notwithstanding it is a code, you always know where you are with the Speaker of the American House of Representatives because, although he acts at certain times as a Party official in speeding up the business of his Party, he does that within Rules. Similarly at Washington it was recognized that the unity in the House of Representatives - in the sense that the House as a whole could be insulted, and the House as a whole was guilty of insults by its members - it was recognized that this was a principle which was not in best keeping with the Congress of the United States, as it then was, and therefore the offices of the Majority Party Leader and the Minority Party Leader were instituted, and the Majority Party Leader is entitled to speak for the Majority Party and the Minority Party Leader is entitled to speak for the Minority Party. 1.15 p.m.

But you do not have that in Barbados. In the United States of America there is the Majority Party Committee room and the Minority Party Committee room and if the Majority Party cares, it can go and eat in its own dining room and the Minority Party can go and do the same. But this is not the pattern in Barbados. There is no Majority Party Leader here. We have tried to maintain the privileges of the House as a whole. There is a perfectly straightforward and obvious situation obtaining here, and the Leader of the House knows it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to suggest that this motion might never have come on for debate at all were it not for two people. The first was Mr. Speaker because the point raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church is very obvious. The discomfiture of Mr. Speaker after he had said that the letter was shown to no one and read by no one and then it was pointed out to him - I think by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown - that the letter

contained the words "I am informed by His Honour the Speaker" was very obvious on that occasion.

The other person whom I blame for this motion having to come off is not the Leader of the House because I think he is sorry for his letter. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that he recognizes that it should not have been sent in the circumstances and that it was a breach of privilege. I blame the Prime Minister for telling him not to withdraw it. Let that be borne in mind by the laddy-fodder which the Prime Minister hopes to mobilise on this motion. I know that when the thunderbolts are shaken the lands must tremble, but on this occasion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that you ought to be in the Chair so that you will not have to vote against your conscience in this matter. I am only sorry for those members of the Democratic Labour Party who are sitting down knowing that this is a breach of privilege and who yet still find themselves forced to vote against it.

I am just trying to assign the blame, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where it should be. Were it not for the discomfiture of Mr. Speaker, the motion would not have been on the Order Paper and were it not for other persons it would not be debated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to support this motion, and I urge on all hon. members to give a lead at this stage in the direction of restoring the dignity of the Hon. House of Assembly to the position in which it was, not thirty or forty years ago, but the position it was in even in 1960. I cannot remember the years before 1960, but at the time when the said Leader of the House took it upon himself to snatch the Mace off the Table of the House.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS made an aside,

It has just been drawn to my attention that the Democratic Labour Party is a party of snatchers, and it is not the Mace alone that they are snatching. They snatch plates of food. But at that time, all hon. members were horrified; these days anything goes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. However, I would urge on members of the House that those things should stop. I beg to support this Resolution.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not intend to speak for very long, because I think that the substantiating of this as a breach of privilege has been already done, and most ably, by hon. members on my immediate right and left. But on occasions such as this when the privileges of Parliament are at stake, I still must contribute my quota to this debate.

From time immemorial in Barbados, we have observed very closely and guarded our privileges in this Chamber. Our Standing Orders are based on the United Kingdom House of Commons' Standing Orders. Our methods of procedure are very much akin and very closely based on those of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom.

I, just like those members who have spoken before me, can easily see, and I believe that every

hon. member in this Parliament can easily see, that a breach of privilege has been committed when it comes to the Leader of the House writing to Mr. President of the Senate and apologising. The Leader of the House writes as the Leader of the House and apologises for the conduct of certain members who are known to be members of one party, that is the Government party. This is certainly a breach of privilege.

The Leader of the House has undertaken to speak for one section of the House to the Presiding Officer of the Other Place. I am sure that the Leader of the House is not so dense as not to realise, when he did that, that he committed a breach of privilege. If he could not realise that there and then, he had the utmost cheek that is unpardonable. In other words, the Leader of the House of Assembly is Leader in this House, but the Speaker - and the Speaker alone of this House of Assembly - is the Leader in this Parliament and the Speaker, and the Speaker alone, can speak for Parliament. As a matter of fact, there was a copy of this letter directed to His Hon. the Speaker. I do not know if that is an afterthought; I do not know if it is really true. There are paragraphs in this letter and I am not going into that right now; I will do so a little later on - but I am wondering if they are, in fact, exactly the truth. With that I will be later concerned.

The Speaker himself has no right to read letters to him - only those letters which come within the ambit of public business. His Honour the Speaker can commit a breach of privilege. I am very doubtful myself if he did not commit one, may be, unwittingly. Mr. Speaker and I got into a big row over a copy of this letter in his Chambers.
1.25 p.m.

I want to know what is the next possible step from here. Where are we going now? When we can allow the Leader of the House to speak for the House outside of the House to another body outside this House, we are making mock sport; we are making fun. We are making Mr. Speaker look ridiculous. I am speaking for everyone in here now. Mr. Speaker speaks and answers for Parliament, and not the hon. junior member for the parish of St. Lucy. Whenever the Leader of the House ascends the Chair, then he may; not until then. When he is allowed to act as Deputy for Mr. Speaker, then again he may. As the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said, our parliamentary institution here is not based on the American pattern; it is based on the pattern of the House of Commons. Wherever our Standing Orders are silent, we have recourse to May's Parliamentary Usage, and even in our last Standing Order, I think that can be found. But here today we are now debating this breach of privilege and we are contending that the Hon. Leader of the House had absolutely no right to make representation, as he thought, only for a part of the House, because it is only as he thought, not as he knew, because he is not in here regarded as just Leader of a majority party. That is why I say 'as he thought'. He did not even know he was speaking for the entire House. He

did not even know whether he had committed a breach of privilege as certain members of his Party made use of the precincts of the Senate Chamber; but we know and we are telling the House here today that it is not just a question of numbers; it is a question of principle. Was the Hon. Leader of the House right or wrong? Did he or did he not commit a breach of privilege when he directed a letter to Mr. President of the Senate regarding the behaviour, as he put it, of certain members of the House? I think he could have made his apologies privately to Mr. President, but not in a letter, a copy of which was directed to Mr. Speaker, because the moment you send copies to Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker is not Mr. Speaker of the majority party only, but Mr. Speaker is Mr. Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly comprised of twenty-four members, and if Mr. Speaker showed his letter or a letter to the Hon. Leader of the House, Mr. Speaker fell into an error at the moment which he will live long to regret. I am perfectly sure of that.

As far as this letter written to Mr. President, a copy of which I now have in my hand is concerned, paragraph 2 reads as follows:-

"The fact is that the majority Party in the Assembly found it desirable to hold discussions during the luncheon recess which, according to our Standing Orders, is only thirty minutes, on certain matters affecting the public business of the House on that day. For the sake of convenience the room used appeared the most suitable, but through an oversight prior intimation of this desire was not given to Your Honour."

It is absolutely fantastic and dishonest to say that with a guest, a foreigner, an alien present, they were going to hold discussions on matters affecting the public welfare on that particular occasion. Remember that lunch time is thirty minutes, and there would have been discussions, eating and of course entertaining their guest at the same time. That was written to Mr. President in the name of the Leader of this House speaking, as he thinks, on behalf of certain members of the House, and of course he makes his apology for them. We say, Your Honour, that this is a breach of privilege. Of course there is more to follow and more fantastic too, and if it cannot be seen in all honesty, with all clarity that the Hon. Leader of the House, and I stress 'of the House', and not of the majority party, did commit himself to a breach of privilege when he undertook what properly belonged to Mr. Speaker in writing to Mr. President as Leader of the House on behalf of, as he thought, certain members of the House, when disgraceful behaviour takes place in this Place, it is a reflection on all members of this Place; and when any representation has got to be made outside of this House on behalf of one single member of this House, it is a reflection on this entire House; hence a breach of privilege we can see. That is the substance of it. That is the core of it; it cannot be gainsaid; it cannot be denied.

It is going to be said to us today that we have engaged on this for the sake of being obstructionists.

Without order you can do nothing. Let us clarify this position here and now. Don't forget that all we say we are for, we have got to be examined in the light of our actions, to ourselves, to what we stand for in this Place. We cannot tear up the Standing Orders; we cannot destroy and disclaim the ancient usages that we have been accustomed to in this Place, and therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to sit. Anyone reading this letter, Mr. Deputy Speaker can easily see that a breach of privilege has been committed, and we on this side of the Chamber have backed that note in our speeches, and it is now left for us as a House to appreciate that a breach of privilege has been committed, to deny that one has been committed, or to condone the fact that one has been committed. For my part and speaking as one of those who feel the opposite view that a breach of privilege has been committed, we strongly advocate and stress that a breach of privilege has been committed, and we hope no further breaches will again be committed. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a matter for this House to decide.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the records of this House will disclose that I was the person who, after hearing about the letter written by the Leader of the House, drew His Honour's attention to the fact that I thought it was out of order to read a letter from a member to the House, as I recalled that members could only deal with Petitions and so on.

I rise primarily to give my reasons, at this stage, why I am going to vote for the breach of privilege. The situation was a very tight one. I told the Leader of the House and the Speaker, in the presence of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, that I thought the letter should be withdrawn. I thought so after I asked that the letter be re-read and it was not re-read, and then I insisted that a copy should be given to members. In the first paragraph of the letter it did not agree in detail with what His Honour the Speaker had said, and I tried very hard to persuade them both to withdraw this letter. I made it quite clear that if the letter was withdrawn, I would have appealed to the Opposition not to press it as I saw it was rather embarrassing, and if the Opposition pressed it I would not vote for it and would even stay out of the House.

It seems to me for some unknown reason that the facts as set out by the hon. senior member for Christ Church are so clear - I do not want to go through them; I do not want to re-read any letters or anything of the sort. It seems to me that the facts as set out by him were concise, clearly put, and so on. If that letter had been withdrawn, then none of this would have come out. It is not a matter of what we think in here. It is a matter of the high office which is held by His Honour the Speaker. The Speaker of the House of Assembly is an office which the youth of this country holds in high regard - not only the youth, but the elders of this country.

You will recall, Sir, the plea which I made on the floor of this House, and then the plea which I

made in Chambers to take back these letters and remove them from the Order Paper altogether. Let us forget this food row, because you might be surprised, Sir, how the ordinary man in the street views this food row. There might be a few persons, slavish to patriotism, whom it does not effect one way or the other, but we have to think of the general public, the school children, the teenagers and so on. I feel it is very unfortunate - not only the food row now - that a letter from the Leader of the House should be contradicting the Speaker, and the Speaker should be contradicting the Leader of the House.

The office of Speaker in this House of Assembly is a very high office. I feel that it is an unfortunate matter. I did my best to get it withdrawn. I would say this, and I believe he meant it, that while I was making a plea the hon. senior member for St. Thomas actually said in the presence of His Honour and the Leader of the House that if this is done he, too, would use his persuasion to have this matter not debated because it brought the Speaker into some sort of disrepute or disrespect.

The hon. member for Christ Church says that the public must judge whom they believe. The letters are there. All of this might not go to the public and the Press, but the Hansard is bound to record it, and posterity will see that the Leader of the House and the Speaker seemed to have contradicted each other on a very salient point, and one which led to this motion before the House.

Having said that, Sir, and having done all I could last week to persuade the withdrawal of the documents, because I always felt that despite whatever one's Party allegiance might be, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you are in the Chair you are supposed to be impartial. I hate to have to offer such criticisms of the Speaker as might let it appear that we are reducing him purely to a Party member.

On the other hand, a Speaker must never descend into this arena; he must hold himself aloof as Speaker, similar to a Judge. I, therefore, feel that having been unable to persuade either the Speaker or the Leader of the House to withdraw the documents, I am now compelled to vote for the Resolution in respect of a breach of privilege of the House. It is not that I had any doubt in my mind as to whether or not it was a breach of privilege, but what I never wanted to happen was that it should come here at all.

Although the Leader of the Opposition might have been able to persuade some of his members, I am nearly sure that with strong argument they would have been able to see that it would not have served any useful purpose discussing the matter. Had they withdrawn the letter, as I said, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was present and I got his pledge that if it was withdrawn, he would have used his influence on his Party members. Although he had no doubt that there was a breach of privilege, we know that there are some things you can let pass. But the Speaker was so involved in this matter with the

Leader of the House that I thought the letter should be withdrawn. Having failed to withdraw it, it is now my solemn duty to vote for the motion.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is there any other member who wants to speak before I reply? *(A pause)*

1.45 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the silence of hon. members shows that they are prepared, especially the Hon. Leader of the House, to have these accusations made and give no reply or explanation. The Hon. Leader of the House has been told in blunt language that either he is a liar or the Speaker is a liar and he keeps quiet. Hon. members on the other side love the word "nation". It sounds big - the nation of Barbados. In the Assembly which makes laws for the nation of Barbados, the Leader of the Assembly is accused of being a liar, and nobody gets up to defend it or say it is wrong! the newspapers publish practically nothing, but, as the hon. member reminds us, the *Official Gazette* is there and people will read it. It will go out to the world that in the clearest possible proof and language, either the Speaker of the House is a liar, or the Hon. Leader of the House is a liar. The Hon. Leader of the House is yet to go into the Law Courts and bring an action of slander against me. I would not believe the Hon. Leader of the House on oath. If I were a jurymen and the Leader of the House swore on evidence, unless there was corroboration by a witness of what he said, I would not believe him. I have not got the beginning of animus against the Leader of the House. He is to me like a part of the furniture. God made him and He made the rest of us. He is just another person. I would not believe him just as I would cross the road if I saw a centipede or kill it. I have no personal feeling against him; but, on this occasion, it is as clear as daylight that the Speaker lied, and the time has come when we, in this House, have got to pull back Barbados from the mud and mire and disrespect into which it has sunk. If the Speaker is a liar, we must say he is a liar and he ought to resign or come in here and apologise. On this occasion I will accept the Hon. Leader of the House's word because otherwise he could not possibly have written to the President of the Senate: "I have been informed by Mr. Speaker," therefore the Speaker is lying and he owes us a duty to come in here and apologise. They have not got the gumption to get together and say that it was a misunderstanding or something of the sort. Just as the Speaker dodged the hypocrisy debate, so he dodged: "I have not read it to anybody, I have not shown it to anybody." He need not show it, he could read it over the telephone. That is what used to be called "English pettifogging Solicitors." "I have not shown it to him", but he does not say: "nor have I read it to him, nor have I given it to a messenger to give to him for me." a stupid dodge, a nasty, slimy dodge. I think hon. members will agree that the word "slimy" is the proper word to use when sometimes you are dealing with the Speaker of this House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise only to ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark which he himself must know to be most offensive and unparliamentary.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have not used it to the hon. member. I would use another word for him. If Your Honour did not think that I was using an offensive word and call me to order, it is not for somebody else to object whether the Speaker is present or not. It is not for the hon. member.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has used these remarks in respect of the Speaker of this House, "that the word "slimy" is the proper word to use when you are referring to the Speaker of this House."

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I gave the reason why I used it - a man who would dodge the question of hypocrisy. You came near, but you did not crush the crease. If you say that a man steals, you must not call him a thief.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph please sit?

The hon. member took his seat. (After a pause)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker I will withdraw the word "slimy" if that is what you are looking up to see whether it is offensive or not. I merely say this: If it had occurred to Your Honour, at the time when I used the word, that it was offensive, without waiting on any hon. member to object, it was Your Honour's duty to call me to order. However, that is by the way. Is it not remarkable? You call a man "slimy" and you object; you call him an emphatic liar and you do not object! Imagine my being able to say what I am saying on the floor of any Parliament, that we have no confidence in the truthfulness of the Speaker! Imagine any Parliament reaching that stage, and we have not got the Speaker withdrawing what he said or apologising for what he said. When we reach the stage of saying - Mr. Bradshaw in St. Kitts - we have no confidence in the administration of justice, we do not believe in the Judge or General Secretary of the Workers' Union or any confidence in the Minister of Agriculture, not sitting down in the same place with him - the Prime Minister is still supporting his Minister, but that is for another debate. Here is the Opposition saying and proving that the Speaker is a liar, and we have no explanation, no withdrawing. The chief witness to prove that he is a liar is the Leader of the House, and in writing for all posterity to read!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you think that I am getting any pleasure in saying what I am saying? Do you think when my friends outside ask me what stage we have reached that you can get up in this House and call the Speaker a liar and prove that he is a liar - how do you think we feel? Here is an accusation made by this side of the House and every member of the Government sits quietly! And they are

going to do worse. They are not going to have the common decency to vote according to their conscience. Here is the Leader of the House purporting to apologise for certain portions of the House, the majority, for a breach of privilege to the Senate. Obviously, a breach of privilege having been committed, they themselves say so, they apologise for their part; but it has to go forward to the world that the whole House did not apologise. Hon. members will remember how in the different manipulations in here, it is unfortunate that the Press reports so little of what happens in here, they try to avoid this debate continually, forgetting at least or trying to dodge the fact that I have on the Order Paper a Notice, an appropriate Notice, that the House as a House apologises to the Senate.

1.55 p.m.

It is unfortunate that the Press reports so little of what happens here. I have on the Order Paper the appropriate notice "that the House as a House apologises to the Senate" instead of really only an apology of the Leader of the House for the Majority Party - for the Dems.

In view of the time, I just want to say, as the hon. senior member for the City had said, "have that letter withdrawn and we would not now have all of this." Had the Leader of the House sat down and said "I am sorry; I did wrong", this debate would not have taken place today. He came around by me and he suggested that and obviously if that had been done, this debate would never have taken place. If the Leader of the House had got up and said that "I did wrong and I withdraw the letter; this is a disgraceful act," we would not have had all of this. I hope hon. members would not forget that they must not necessarily crack at the crack of the whip of the Prime Minister and vote against their consciences.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members who are in favour will please say "Aye" and hon. members who are not in favour, will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was called for.

NOES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. The Prime Minister, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES, Mr. HOPPIN.

AYES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I understand that on the question of a vote of the House, the address to the hon. senior member for St. John as the Prime Minister is out of order by the proceedings of this House.

The vote was re-taken.

The question was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. HINDS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. HUSBANDS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. ST. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 10.

NOES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN - 11.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

SUGAR WORKERS (MINIMUM WAGES AND GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT) BILL, 1968

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Agricultural (Minimum Wages and Guaranteed, Employment) Bill be the next Order of the Day.

I beg your pardon, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it should be that the Sugar Workers (Minimum Wages and Guaranteed Employment) Bill, 1968, be taken as the First Order under Government Business.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I said before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we do not object to it being the First Order of the Day; but if the Leader of the House does what he said he would do and asks for leave to deal with it in all its stages, we are going to object to that.

We will agree to the second reading; we agree to the principle. We agree to the money being paid. We agree to the crop being started; but we object on the ground that having got a copy of the Bill at 7.15 last night after the Prime Minister broadcast last Friday night gave us the impression that it was ready, lawyers looking at it - at least I am speaking for myself; I have not asked the other two - see signs of hasty drafting.

It speaks for itself. Even a layman can see that it is hasty drafting. Some portions of it have been corrected; I have not even seen those. I have not seen a copy of those corrections which have since been circulated. I am just looking at it. It would be utterly wrong to go on with this in all its stages.

Let us have the second reading, therefore approving of the principle, and let the workers go on working. Let the employers go on paying and make the same appeal that has been made to workers to go on working. Make the appeal to the employers that when they pay these workers on Friday that

they pay this week's wages and the retrospective wages.

Members on this side think that you have not gone far enough, far from being opposed to the increase of wages. Therefore, let it be no misunderstanding, to use the words of the Prime Minister, that we are creating an obstruction. But any lawyer even with a half-eye would see that this Bill is badly and hastily drafted.

Our only reference in this Bill is to out-of-crop wages. We can meet on Friday, Test Match or no Test Match. We do not go to Jamaica to watch Test Matches; we do not go to Kensington to watch Test Matches if we have national business to transact. We are perfectly prepared to come back here on Friday and let the Test Match scores be told us later on rather than to rush this Bill through today when it is badly drafted, and apart from that, the very principle too. It is not easing a deadlock now; it is also a principle for all times. This would be the law. That is what this Act amounts to.
2.05 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I take it that leave is being asked for to make this matter the First Order of the Day and to deal with it in all its stages. I understand that the Leader of the House informed this House that it was his intention to ask leave to proceed with this Bill through all its stages today. His Honour the Speaker was in the Chair at that time when the Hon. Leader of the House gave us to know that he would be asking leave to proceed with this Bill through all its stages today. Is that still the position? I never knew, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you could railroad the House to move things on the Order Paper at will, emergency or no emergency. You have to ask for leave of the House. For time immemorial that has been the procedure in this place; so what innovation in procedure are we now witnessing? I am waiting on Your Honour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Peter that there is a motion before the House that this be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. HUSBANDS: That motion is contrary to the intimation given by the Hon. Minister and is out of order. You cannot railroad things up and down on the Agenda of the House as you like without leave of the House. That has never been known to happen. The Hon. Leader of the House told this House that he would be seeking its permission to deal with this Bill in all its stages, and now he is making a motion to deal with the Bill. What confidence can we have in the Leader of the House when at one time he tells us that he is going to seek leave later to deal with this Bill in all its stages, and now he initiates a motion which says that this Bill be now proceeded with? Judge for yourself, Your Honour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, but there is a motion before the House.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the point I am raising is that the motion before the House is out of order on the grounds that the motion seeks to have as the First Order of the Day a Bill on which five days have not elapsed between the first and second readings thereof in accordance with Standing Order No. 38(5), and a proper motion not having been put to ask the House to agree to that being done.

Standing Order No. 38 (5) reads as follows:-

"An interval of not less than five days shall elapse between the first and second readings of a Bill, unless the House on motion made and question put agree to proceed with the Bill at an earlier date or forthwith."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I submit that this motion is out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. senior member for Christ Church the words in Standing Order No. 38(5) "unless the House on motion made and question put agree to proceed with the Bill at an earlier date or forthwith". And I said there is a motion before the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the Hon. Leader of the House moved that the next Order of the Day be - and he got the name wrong the first time and reached out to the Minister of Agriculture to try to get a copy of the Bill - a Bill to do so-and-so. That motion could never be the motion of the Day, and that is why it is out of order. He has to say whether he wants the Bill to be dealt with in the first reading, second or do now pass. There is no such thing as dealing with a Bill. If you read the Order Paper, you will see that there is the second reading of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1964. The hon. member said he was going to ask leave of the House. There is no procedure known to the House as dealing with a Bill. What exactly does he want? The next thing he is going to tell us is that the Bill is passed because he put it on the Order Paper. Let him make a proper motion. Let the Clerks do their duty and take down the proper motion. I see the Clerks are writing now, but if a minute ago you had asked the chief Clerk to read out this motion, I do not believe he would appreciate this point. Let a proper motion be made so that we can see what we are dealing with. If the Hon. Leader of the House wants to move that the second reading be taken now, let him have an item put on the Order Paper to move the second reading.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, if Your Honour will now - I am going to flatter Your Honour by saying - refresh your memory. If I were speaking to some hon. members on the other side I would not say "refresh your memory", I would draw to their attention for the first time the Standing Orders; but in Your Honour's case, I take it that Your Honour has read the Standing Orders from

time to time and need only refresh your memory. Standing Order No. 38 has not been suspended. It reads as follows:

"1. Except as provided in paragraph 7 of this Order, any Member may move for leave to introduce a Bill of which he has given notice.

2. The first reading of every Bill shall be proposed immediately after the same shall have been called.

3. The first reading of any Bill may be proposed immediately after notice thereof has been given.

4. When any Bill shall be presented by a Member or shall be brought from the Senate, the question "That this Bill be now read a first time" shall be decided without amendment or debate."

I will not read the next paragraph, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the hon. senior member for Christ Church has read it.

"6. No Bill shall be read a second time until it has been printed and circulated to Members."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Standing Order No. 38 has not been suspended; therefore if this Bill is to be read a second time, it must be printed and circulated unless the House otherwise agrees and unless leave has been granted and except on the recommendation of the Cabinet, to be signified by a Minister and recorded in the Minutes, the House shall not receive any Bill and shall not proceed upon any motion for leave to introduce a Bill dealing with money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the Rules of the House, in spite of what the Clerk of the House may officiously interrupt and tell you - the Clerk of the House is to be called on by the Speaker or the Chairman if they want his advice and not be continually bobbing up and given advice which so often is wrong. I have put up with a lot, but after years and years of seeing this House run on proper lines, don't think I am going to sit silent and see wrongs being done without referring to them! The Clerk and I could not be more friendly socially, but if he does wrong in this House, I am going to say he is doing wrong.
2.15 p.m.

I have drawn attention to the fact that Standing Order 38 has not been suspended. The Hon. Leader of the House said he was going to ask the leave of the House to proceed with this Bill. He has not asked for that leave, and it is his duty to ask for that leave.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I submit to you, on a point of order, that the only motion Your Honour can entertain is a motion which follows the wording of the authority contained in the Rule. The motion must be either that this House agree to proceed with this Bill notwithstanding that five days have not elapsed, or that this House agree to pro-

ceed with this Bill forthwith. Those are the only motions that can be entertained, because the authority for doing this comes within Standing order 38 (5).

The motion now before the House is bad because of the order of Government Business. The motion is that this Bill is to be the item immediately. This presupposed that this is valid Government Business of today, but the point at issue is that it cannot become valid Government Business for today until Standing Order 38(5) had been complied with. There is a difference between these things, and I ask Your Honour to recognise the distinction.

If the Bill was properly on the Order Paper and five days had elapsed between its First and Second reading, then you could say that it is within the context of the Bill on the Order Paper which is properly before the House. Do not let any specious Ruling persuade Your Honour to give any false Ruling in this matter. You must have it properly on the Order Paper first. It is not on the Order Paper, and five days have not elapsed.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I have the impression that certain persons who are responsible for this Bill are not far away. The copy of the Bill which has been circulated to members is not complete, because the penalties that should appear in Clause 11 (3) are blank. The circulated copies of the Bill even with the amendments are incomplete. Even at this stage the amendments are incomplete, and so the Bill has not been circulated to members within the meaning of the relevant Rule. I do not believe you could ask us to pass a Bill with blank spaces in it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If you do not repeat things very often - sometimes the Chair no matter who is there; the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, or Chairman - it is likely that they will be forgotten. Mr. Deputy Speaker, how in the name of heaven can anybody honestly ignore Standing Order 38(1), which states:

"Except as provided in paragraph 7 of this Order....."

which means that you cannot bring in a money Bill -
".....any Member may move for leave to introduce a Bill of which he has given notice."

The Leader of the House has given notice of a Bill, and he told us that he is going to ask for leave to deal with it in all of its stages. Suppose he had not said 'in all of its stages'. Suppose he had said "it is not on the Order Paper, but I am asking leave to deal with it today." Surely, Standing Order 38 is not suspended. How can any human being get over that? Mr. Deputy Speaker, are you not going to rule?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not shout at me.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Do not shout at me; maintain the dignity of the Chair. (*Asides*)

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. A document has been circulated to us that contains blank spaces. Do you want to send this to the Senate and have the matter delayed? Call for it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and, if you can read, read Section II. Are you asking the House to deal with a section with blanks? I would like to know what is the motion you propose to put to the House. I am a member of the House, and I am entitled to know. We have only heard something about dealing with a Bill. What is the motion? I would like the Clerk to read out the motion.

The CLERK: It has been moved and seconded that the Bill intituled the Sugar Workers (Minimum Wage and Guaranteed Employment) Bill be now dealt with as the First Order of the Day under Government Business.

Mr. St. JOHN: Now that the motion is before the House, I reiterate my objection that the motion is out of order on the ground that this Bill is a Bill which has been introduced today; five days have not elapsed, and the motion does not ask for leave in accordance with Standing Order 38(5).

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not speaking on a point of order now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member will give way, I think I can explain the matter. The motion which Your Honour put was not a motion moving the Second Reading of the Bill, because in that respect I would agree with the hon. member for Christ Church that such a motion without the prior motion that the Bill be dealt with forthwith would be an improper motion. But the motion is to get the Bill on the Order Paper. As I understand it, Sir, in order to facilitate matters, it would then be for the Leader or the Mover of the Bill himself to ask, under Standing Order 38(5), that the Bill be dealt with forthwith. But first, as the hon. member for Christ Church himself has pointed out, it would have to be elevated to the Order Paper by this motion. This is not a motion for the Second Reading of the Bill. The third motion will be that the Bill be read a second time. If hon. members object to either of the two stages, they can vote against it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You will have to get it on the Order Paper for First Reading, and then you have to ask for leave to deal with it. If the hon. member in charge of the Bill gives the assurance that, when this motion passes, he will ask for leave to deal with it through all its stages, as promised by the Leader of the House, we will have nothing to say.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What the hon. member has to do under Rule 38(5) is to ask to deal with it. Now whether he wants to go further and deal with it in the First Reading and Second Reading, he will have to get permission to deal with the Second Reading. If he wants to go further and deal with the Third Reading of the Bill as well, it will be a matter for the hon. member. I cannot speak for him, contrary to the popular superstition on the other side. I do not have to crack any whip over here. My Ministers ex-

ercise their independent judgment. I just wanted to point out that I think they are a bit previous in anticipating the motion to be put by the hon. member for St. Andrew.

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

2.35 p.m.

SUGAR WORKERS MINIMUM AND GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT BILL

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the prescribing of minimum wages and guaranteed employment for workers employed in the sugar industry and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith, be dealt with forthwith.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the hon. member stops at the word "forthwith", there can be no objection; but the hon. member must realise that he must also ask the leave of the House to deal with the Bill in all of its stages. If we are asked only to deal with the Bill immediately, we on this side would say "yes"; but it does not necessarily mean that we will agree to deal with it in all its stages.

The question that this Bill be dealt with forthwith was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the past three or four weeks.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. I made it quite plain what the position on this side of the House is. Before the hon. member goes any further, he must tell us whether he is asking for leave to deal with the first, second or third reading of the Bill today. We will vote for its going on the Order Paper, and its being dealt with forthwith, but we will have to be assured of the other things.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I am aware, the House has given me permission to deal with the Bill, and that is exactly what I am doing. I would like to know what Rule the hon. member is dealing with or quoting when he says that I must ask for their permission to deal with this Bill. The House has already given permission to deal with the Bill in all of its stages, and that is what I am doing. (MEMBERS: No, No.)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. We have just been complaining about people telling lies. The hon. member is not telling lies, but is the hon. member suggesting that dealing with the Bill forthwith is dealing with it in all of its stages? The Hon. Leader of the House said: "I propose to ask leave to deal with the Bill in all of its stages today." If the youngest and most mentally retarded child in his school said: "You told me forthwith and therefore I can deal with the whole thing," what would he

think of it? He would think that that child should not be in the school; he should be in the Mental Asylum.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Standing Order 38(5) envisages the second reading and he has got leave to deal with that. If you want to deal with the Bill in all of its stages, you have to put that in the motion. All that you have permission to do now is to move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: As far as I am aware, the motion which I made was to deal with the Bill forthwith. I did not make a motion for the second reading. My motion was for permission to deal with the Bill and that is what the House has already agreed to.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. May I point out that the hon. member's motion in order to be a valid motion could only be within the terms of the authority granted by Standing Order 38(5). If you read that Standing Order, this is what it says:-

"An interval of not less than five days shall elapse between the first and second readings of a Bill, unless the House on motion made and question put agree to proceed with the Bill at any earlier date, or forthwith."

So what are we doing? The authority which this gives you is to move the second reading of the Bill, notwithstanding that five days have not elapsed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I always have to try to placate the hon. senior member for Christ Church, because he runs off the handle sometimes.

The problem is that there is no Rule stipulating an interval of time between the second and third reading of a Bill or the second reading and in Committee. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew has quite rightly asked for permission to deal with the Bill forthwith and that obviates the necessity for the interval of five days stipulated under Standing Order 38(5) to be complied with to the letter. If you go down the Rules, there is no interval of time which must intervene before the second reading of a Bill and the Committee stage, or the third reading of the Bill and the passing of the Bill. Consequently, the hon. member is entitled to move the second reading of the Bill which will be debated and, in the normal course of events, the Bill goes to a Committee of the whole House, or any member can ask that it be sent to a Select Committee. How can the hon. junior member for St. Andrew be anticipatory of these procedures when the hon. member has been given leave or permission not to comply with the Rule asking for a five day interval of time and to proceed to deal with the Bill? The hon. member cannot fetter the right of any hon. member, even if he is outvoted - I am not saying this in any ominous sense - it is merely an exercise of Parliamentary discretion. Even if he is outvoted, the hon. member can say that this is

the kind of Bill which we want to go to a Select Committee. Automatically, it should go to a Committee of the whole House; therefore what are you asking the hon. member to do now? To say what any of the twenty-three members present may do in future? There is no interval of time between the second and third reading of the Bill and I think that the hon. member should be allowed to proceed. I am only assisting.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Was the statement made by the Hon. Leader of the House, "I intend to ask the leave of the House to proceed with this Bill in all of its stages" just verbiage? Or did he not envisage that he would have to ask for leave to deal with the Bill in all its stages?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand what the hon. member has said. In the first place.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I thought that the hon. member was having difficulty in sitting, sir.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the sort of joke which passes muster, as it is funny, in the "Dem" ranks. Tell that - I am using a phrase again which I used already - to the mentally retarded children. The Hon. Leader of the House told us: "I am asking the leave of the House to proceed with this Bill in all its stages". Is that just verbiage?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order,.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy has risen on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: And I am on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order. (ASIDES).

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Are you making a Ruling for all time? What is the good? (ASIDES)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.
2.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rose on a point of order to say that I have sat here and heard about nine times the Hon. Leader of the Opposition say that earlier in today's sitting I intimated that I would ask leave to deal with this Bill. At no time, either just now or recently, have I spoken anything about this Bill except when I moved the motion to get it on the Order Paper.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does the hon. member deny that he said he would ask for leave of the House to deal with it in all its stages? In that case, I should ask you, Sir, to call on the Reporters. The hon. member spoke, or one of them spoke.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: A lot of laughs do take the vacant mind. I have not finished my sentence. One of them said that the hon. member for St. Andrew would deal with the Bill. The Hyena laughs before I finish my sentence. I prefer to say "hyena" before I say "jackass". Either the Leader of the House or somebody said that the hon. member for St. Andrew would deal with the Bill. I think that it is the Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I categorically deny that I made any such mention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is on a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am on a point of order. It must be the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House said that leave would be asked to deal with the Bill in all its stages. All our speeches since that question of his motion as put to the House were hanging on that. Whether I am mixing up something or whether it is a fact that we were told that leave of the House would be asked to deal with this Bill in all its stages, probably, since that was said, we over here have got together the necessary authorities for what was to be done on such an occasion.

Are you telling us that all of us over here were dreaming? Or that we dreamt that that was said when it was not said? The stupid laughter only means that people do not have the good manners of waiting until when a person finishes a sentence before trying to laugh at it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member should accept in good grace that he was wrong. I was not here; therefore, I am not identifying the Hon. Leader of the House as the person who made any such statements. I do not have to be ashamed of what I say. I am going to say it now, and if I am wrong I would say that I am wrong; but one does not have to try to cover it up and then twist it and all of that in order to justify or vindicate the stand which one took before. But let us leave that aside and he has forgiveness because of his seniority. Let us get to the main facts. Let us deal with the strictly political position that confronts Your Honour.

The hon. member for St. Andrew had made a motion that the Bill be read a second time, or is about to make such a motion. He has got leave to deal with this Bill forthwith. We were expecting obstruction, but not this kind of innate obstruction. Even if the hon. member for St. Andrew or any other member does get permission, as a parliamentarian,

you could not prevent any hon. member here when the Bill comes to the Committee stage, asking that it be sent to a Select Committee, and spending until midnight so that it might not be concluded today. Therefore, what is all this debate about now - just to obstruct?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, how can the hon. member say that I made a mistake? However it was - I accept that it was not the Leader of the House - the hon. member have this stupidity of laughing at this. Do not hon. members have intelligence enough to see that I am not stupid and that they are laughing at themselves?

However it was, a Minister over there said that he was going to ask leave of the House to deal with this Bill in all its stages. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask you to summon the Speaker to resume his seat. It was done when he was in the Chair and he heard the talk that leave was going to be asked to deal with it in all its stages today.

I then got up and said that the principle had to be discussed and we do not have time to discuss it. I got up and said that the Bill was hastily drafted and we should not hurry through it today. I got up and said that as far as we were concerned, if anything, we did not think the increases were enough. We were not trying to stop people from getting their increases. I said all of that. I said: "Do not pass the Bill hastily when it has mistakes in it." I said that any lawyer looking at it would see very many mistakes in it.

Some of this Bill covers the crop season but not the out-of-crop wages. I made all of those points. I said that we could forget the Test Match on Friday and come back inside here and finish it, but do not hurry it through. Tell the people to go back to work. Tell the planters to pay what you say - 12 per cent and so - next Friday. All that was said and then the hon. member got over there and laughed when I said "one hon. member." If it was not the Leader of the House, I now say the member for St. Andrew.

They now try to laugh and say that I did not hear. The point was that we were asked to deal with it in all its stages. It is either true or not true.

(ASIDES)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you had called the hon. member for St. Thomas to order when he interrupted in that rude, uncouth manner

(MORE ASIDES)

Can that go on? Some hon. members are so surprised at being elected to this House. I say again that Mr. Speaker was in the Chair when it was announced that leave would be asked to deal with this Bill in all its stages.

I repeat for the last time: the fact that the Opposition was asking to "let us finish it on Friday; let us forget the Test Match", was because there are things in it that you cannot do off-handed. It was

hastily drafted. Then I got the assurance of hon. members on the other side - if they do not care to remember that, it is a matter for them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just would like to draw to the attention of all hon. members Order No. 29, Rule 6. "While a member is speaking all hon. members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I begin by saying that in recent weeks there was some unrest in this country which emanated from the fact that the Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Workers' Union could not reach a satisfactory agreement on the wage negotiations. 2.45 p.m.

These negotiations started from 16th September. As a matter of fact, it was on the 16th September that the negotiations started and they could not reach agreement at domestic level, and representation was made to the Chief Labour Officer who had a meeting with both parties on 5th October which resulted in no conclusion being reached. Another was held by him on 13th December and this matter was then referred to the Ministry of Labour on the 15th, and it was dealt with on the 15th and 19th December, at which meetings the Minister tried to get the parties back together. There was another meeting on 22nd December held under the Chairmanship of the Chief Labour Officer at which a 3 per cent increase was offered by the Sugar Producers' Federation which was not satisfactory to the Workers' Union. A further meeting was held on 28th December when a 5 per cent increase was offered, but this too was not satisfactory to the Workers' Union. Since then the Chief Labour Officer has been trying to get both parties to compromise on this issue, and his final attempt made on 13th February failed to get them together, and it was only on 14th February that an official deadlock in the agreement was arrived at.

On the morning of the 14th February, a Resolution was brought into this Legislature by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the Opposition, asking for ad hoc legislation to put the matter to arbitration. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph brought this Resolution to the House, there was no deadlock. It was not reported to the Ministry of Labour or to the Minister that there was a deadlock up to the time the hon. member brought this Resolution to the House. I am referring to the new negotiations which started on 22nd December after the matter was referred to me and I referred the matter back to the Chief Labour Officer. Between the resumption of the negotiations on 22nd December and 14th February, there was no official notification of a deadlock. As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am in possession on this file of a letter written on the 14th February and signed by Mr. R. G. F. Mandeville, Secretary and Industrial Relations Advisor of the Sugar Producers' Federation which reads as follows. It is addressed to

the Acting Chief Labour Officer, Labour Department, Herbert House, Fontabelle, St. Michael.

"Dear Sir,

Discussions have been taking place between the Barbados Workers' Union and this Federation on out of crop wages from 9th August, 1967, on until 16th September, 1967, when as a result of a deadlock at domestic level the Union referred the matter to you.

Since then the matter has engaged your attention until now without any settlement being reached. In our letter of 5th February, 1968 to the Union, a copy of which was forwarded to you, and our letter to you of 12th February, 1968, we indicated that the workers of the twelve sugar factories were unwilling to work, although the factories were willing to start grinding operations.

In the circumstances we are of the considered opinion that a deadlock has been reached, and we ask that the matter be now referred officially to the Minister of Labour as a Trade Dispute.

Yours faithfully,
Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados
R. G. F. Mandeville."

This letter was dated 14th February, the same date.....

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the hon. member would permit me to interrupt, when did the deadlock at domestic level take place? Not what he has just said. The hon. member said 'a deadlock at domestic level', but I did not catch the date he had preceded those words with.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: There was a deadlock at domestic level on 16th September, I said this earlier, and it was referred then to the Chief Labour Officer who began his discussions with the two parties, and we had meetings with them on 5th October and on 13th December. Then when there was no offer made of an increase in wages by the Sugar Producers, the matter was referred to my Ministry. I got both parties, and I held five separate meetings with them in two days, and the matter was then referred by me to the Chief Labour Officer to resume his negotiations, because I was satisfied then that an offer was going to be made. Two offers were made which were not satisfactory to the Barbados Workers' Union and it was because of the fact that the offers were not satisfactory that they then reached a deadlock which the Chief Labour Officer was advised on by a letter dated 14th February, 1968, by the Secretary and Industrial Relations Officer of the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados. 2.55 p.m.

Now, we have been accused of walking out on a Resolution brought into this House by the hon. junior

member for St. Joseph. We could not take part in a debate on this matter to implement or bring in ad hoc legislation, or a Resolution to implement ad hoc legislation to establish a tribunal, or to do what the hon. member wanted, or to have the matter sent to arbitration, because, for the matter to be sent to arbitration under the present Trade Dispute Act, both parties would have to agree to it. Neither of the parties up to the 14th February, when the hon. member brought in this Resolution, and even up to now, has agreed to have the matter put before an arbitration tribunal.

As a matter of fact, on the 13th February I instructed the Chief Labour Officer, after we saw that nothing would come out of it, to ascertain from both sides whether they would be willing to go to arbitration, and neither side agreed to arbitration. In the face of this letter, which I had not received, but which the Chief Labour Officer only received on the 14th February - this letter was received a day after the House met. The House met on the 13th February. We had not received any official notification of a deadlock, but yet a Resolution was brought to the Legislature and we, as a responsible Government, would have been expected to debate a Resolution which called for the enactment of ad hoc legislation to establish an arbitration to look into this matter, when there was not, up to that date, a deadlock at the Chief Labour Officer's level. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Therefore if you did not receive official notification of a deadlock, there would have been no deadlock!)

Sir, the position is that the deadlock which arose at a domestic level was represented to the Chief Labour Officer whose duty it was then to find a settlement between the two parties. That failed. What I am saying is that after there was no offer, the matter was referred to me. After having discussions with the two parties they agreed to go back and negotiate; therefore the negotiations at the Chief Labour Officer's level continued and they continued until the 13th February. On the 13th February when the hon. member brought in his Resolution there was not a deadlock. (Asides) I am dealing with a deadlock at the level of the Chief Labour Officer. I said that there was an initial deadlock at domestic level, and any fool can understand what I am trying to say.

Now this is the position. It is said that the Government is not shouldering its responsibility. But, immediately after the deadlock was reported to the Ministry, action was taken on the matter. The 14th February was a Wednesday; the 15th was a Thursday. By Wednesday afternoon the Cabinet Order was prepared, and the Government was actively engaged on the issue as on that date.

We considered it very urgent, and that is why we brought the matter here today. The position is that we on this side of the House have always been interested in and shall always be interested in the improvements in the conditions of service for all workers in our country. We started way back in 1963 by amending legislation which made provision for

better conditions of service for workers in this country. I can remember the amendment to the Trades Dispute Act of 1963 where the worker had the right to peaceful picketing, which Act was turned down when representation was made to the Government prior to the Government run by the Democratic Labour Party. When representation was made by the Barbados Labour Party Government to give the workers of this country the right to peaceful picketing, it was denied them. It was in 1963 that the Democratic Labour Party gave the workers of this country the right to peaceful picketing. As a matter of fact, when representation was made to the last Government, it was said that this was obnoxious legislation.

Now, we went further and amended the Workmen's Compensation Act increasing it from \$2,500 to \$10,000. All of this was in the interest of the workers of this country. I am sorry, Sir, it was from \$1,800 to \$10,000 in some cases, and \$12,000 in other cases. In 1966 we amended the Holiday with Pay Act, giving every worker in this country who has worked with an establishment for five years or more the right to three weeks holiday with pay instead of two weeks. We have implemented a system of National Insurance and Social Security in the interest of the workers of this country. No Government before the D.L.P. have ever done as much for the working-class man, or will ever be in a position to do more for the working-class man in this country than the Democratic Labour Party.

We have gone further and we have just established a Committee to go into the possibility of enacting legislation providing for severance payment for all categories of workers in this country - not only agricultural workers - which will be implemented in the near future. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have come to a very important bit of legislation in the interest of the workers of this country. Some people may object to doing this Bill today because they have not been advised what to do. The only objection they can have to doing this Bill today is that lobbying has to be done by the employers of this country. Nobody is against the 7¢ increase. But what are some of them against? Some of them are against the fact that there is provision for a minimum guaranteed week's wage for the workers of this country, which we are dedicated to give them as a result of our Manifesto.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill now before us makes provision for minimum wages for workers in the sugar industry, and it also makes provision for a minimum of three days' work for agricultural workers in the sugar industry, and they are protected. Even if one would say: "Well, you are not a worker of mine," there is provision in the Act to determine whether a person is entitled to be employed by a particular plantation or not. There is no question of a plantation telling a worker: "You were not a regular worker of mine," or "You are not an employee of mine", because this will be determined by what has taken place over the past three years.

In the past three years if a worker worked on a plantation - if you look at the Second Schedule - for an average of 480 hours per year for the past three years, that worker is considered a bona fide employee of that plantation or of that particular factory. 3.05 p.m.

As long as that worker turns up to work, he or she must be given a minimum of three days' work, an average of 8 hours per day for any week between 1st July and 31st January in any year after this year or after this Bill has been passed. It is said that we are only providing a minimum guaranteed week's work for people for six months of the year. The position is that this is for out-of-crop wage work. The average agricultural worker down to the end of June is normally in full employment, and it is after the end of June or between the end of June and the end of January, that he is not usually in full employment. Some people even say that we are limiting the period of employment for a worker to three days a week, that the worker is not supposed to get more than three days a week. That is a big joke. It would appear that some of us do not know what is meant by the word "minimum". What we are doing for the workers of this country is providing bread for them and for their children every week, because the practice has been that when the month of November came - even in October - many agricultural workers in this country are only given, at some plantations, one day's work, some are given two days' work and during those months they never reach three days unless the plantations grow some sort of vegetable crop or food crop. They are limited to one or two days work, and in some weeks they do not get any work at all. We are saying that immediately after this legislation is passed, they must have a minimum of three days' work per week. If that is what has people worried, I should like to let them know that this Bill will be done today if we wait in here until tomorrow morning. The Standing Orders have been suspended. Mr. Speaker, if we keep you here until tomorrow morning, this Bill is going to be passed. Those who do not like it can lump it. The point is that agricultural workers in this country will have a minimum of three days' work, and they will have their increased pay, and they are going to have back pay too.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said: "All right, let us come back on Friday and do this Bill. Do not let us rush this Bill." But two weeks ago we were expected to rush into something which was not necessary at the time. We were expected to come in here and sit down and listen to nonsense, to debate an issue which was technically sub judice. The position is that if he considers his own matter urgent when it made absolutely no provision for the workers of this country - to set up arbitration, what would it mean? Arbitration could say that the workers do not deserve anything and it would be binding; but what are we saying? We are saying that the agricultural workers deserve an increase in their pay. We are saying that what we have decided upon meets with the approval of the Barbados Workers' Union the authorised representatives of the workers in this country. It did not mean that if we set up arbitra-

tion, the Barbados Workers' Union would be satisfied. Why do you think that the Barbados Workers' Union did not agree to arbitration? Because the research of arbitration would not have been satisfactory to the Union. But we were expected to come in here and debate a motion which could do the situation no good, no better and perhaps it could have done worse, and now we are being criticised for not coming in here and wasting our time debating stupidity. I can assure you that every agricultural worker in this country today is satisfied with the action which has been taken by the Government. We do not believe in going left, right, in front and behind in the country just talking. We are not a Party of talkers; we are a Party of actors, of knowledge; we are a Party of performers; and from our record over the past 6 1/2 years, it can be seen that we do not believe in just talking. We believe in action, especially when it comes to the working-class people in this Island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has also been said, in fact there have been editorials in the Press saying that the action of this Government will make it hard for the peasants of this country. The majority of the peasants in this country are squatters on plantations. The majority of them were workers on plantations and they were given some of the rab land; some 4,000 acres of rab land on the plantations have been passed on in return for small rentals to people who have been accustomed to work on the plantations, and they pay a small rent. Those are the majority of them. The most of them work the land themselves at any rate. So where does the hardship come? Most of them work the land themselves, and those who do not work the land themselves are not necessarily dependent on the acre of land for a living. This is only subsidiary to their livelihood, and therefore if we are going to increase wages, it means that some of the very landowners are already enjoying increased wages. Some of them are in the Government Service. They have been receiving increased wages. We have just had to call on the taxpayers of this country to pay in the region of \$6 million a year more in salaries to Civil Servants. 3.15 p.m.

Some of these Civil Servants own land. Some of these work land. Some of them do some of the work in their spare time. Some of them may have to employ agricultural workers to assist them, but at the same time they are enjoying increased wages; therefore, how are we bringing hardship to bear on them by telling them to pay the agricultural workers a little bit more?

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to see the one who has come here this afternoon to oppose this Bill. As I said, it is going to pass, and in all its stages, today. The final point which I would like to mention here is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that "you can go and tell the people to pay the money on Friday, do not do the Bill;" but yet the people are now hungry, some have not worked for weeks, some of whom are waiting for this money to pay their shop bills - I represent an agricultural

community of this country - some of the shopkeepers are not in a position to offer credit to the same agricultural workers because they could not pay for their supplies over the past two or three weeks.

The position is that this is urgent. The stage of affairs cannot continue. The people must get their money and they will only get their money until after the legislation making it legally binding on the employment to pay the money is passed. Now, why should we delay the passing of this Bill? Why should we delay when the people are hungry; when the people are suffering? We have dealt with it as urgently as possible. The people are waiting on it. We say that we would like to see them get it on Friday, but we cannot come in here and do the Bill on Friday and expect them to get it, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is saying; "come and do it on Friday and tell the people to pay the money on Friday." How can you do that? If it is passed today, they know that it is law, they know that it is binding on them and they have the obligation to pay the workers the money to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we today are discussing a Bill which has for its Objects and Reasons to empower this Cabinet

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I wonder if the hon. member would just give way for a bit.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member give way?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, I would give way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: While I was on my feet it was my intention to move the suspension of the House for lunch because some of the other hon. members did not get same. Some might have been able to go out and get lunch. We would continue after lunch.

If the hon. member is in agreement, I would like him to move the suspension for forty-five minutes.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, what has been obtaining for members who have to go out because the Standing Orders had to be waived, that can still obtain. The hon. member tripped back in and enjoyed his lunch as I have had to do, the suspension having not been given to anybody yet. I do not see why the suspension needs to be given now.

Mr. Speaker, the only person who needs to be considered now is Your Honour and I think Your Honour may have had your lunch. Your Deputy may now be having his lunch.

Mr. Speaker: Speaking for myself, I have not.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Oh no! Your Honour! I would not hold you up, Sir. I thought Your Honour had your

lunch. For the purpose of Your Honour only, I bow, I still maintain my right to speak.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. HUSBANDS: If I sit, will I still have the right to speak?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: You cannot lose your right to speak. How can you?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Therefore, I am moving the suspension. I move that this House be now suspended for (A VOICE: Forty-five minutes) Forty-five minutes is too long. I would say thirty minutes.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the words "thirty minutes".

Mr. HUSBANDS: Do I still maintain the right to speak? If I move the suspension and it is defeated, do I lose the right to speak? I hope no gymnastics will go on outside because if I suspect hon. members on that side would wish to stop me from debating this, Your Honour, I will continue to speak and will not stop at all for a long time from now.

Your Honour, this is a test case because I am going to put the Leader of the House on the spot today. If the Leader of the House gives me the assurance that the motion for the suspension would not be defeated-

(ASIDES)

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the words "thirty minutes" and in their place, I ask to insert "forty-five minutes."

Mr. Speaker: The question is that this sitting be now suspended for forty-five minutes. Hon. members who are of that opinion will please say "Aye", but hon. members who are of a contrary opinion would please say "No". Methinks the "Ayes" have it.

On resumption, the hon. senior member for St. Peter will under all circumstances catch my eyes first.

The sitting was suspended accordingly.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair. He is entitled to resume.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, today we are being asked to give our support to a Bill which has for its Objects and Reasons to empower the Cabinet, from time to time, by order published in the Official Gazette, to prescribe minimum rates of wages for any occupation in the sugar industry or to require employers and so on. During the past two weeks, Mr. Speaker, everyone of us in this country has been very upset and very worried as to the beginning of the 1968 reaping time as far as the harvesting of sugar is concerned, and the grinding of canes in the factories. Undoubtedly, Sir, there was a crisis, and this crisis

took place because of the failure between the representatives of the Sugar Producers' Federation and of the Workers to come to an agreement regarding out-of-crop wages. It appears that for some long time now these two bodies - the Barbados Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union - had been negotiating an agreement for out-of-crop wages for field and factory workers.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that this year 1968 is not the first year that a deadlock has been threatened between these two Trade Unions, and I remember not so long ago speaking in my constituency and telling my hearers that it is not a good thing, and it could not or should not go on every year when we expect the crop should normally begin, that there is a threat of a refusal to work on behalf of the workers because of failure to reach an agreement on out-of-crop wages. 1968 is not the first time this crisis has been looming; 1968 got to a rather dangerous level or dangerous height. Normally in the processes of Trade Unionism - that is, the bargaining processes that go on first at domestic level between representatives of the employers and the representatives of labour, when negotiations break down, either side may seek conciliation or they might agree to arbitration. The employers told the public their stand and the reason for taking their stand. Compromises had been offered apparently on both sides, and then there was no further yielding; so the crisis came.

Everyone of us knows that, in this country which is predominantly agriculture and with sugar the Chief industry, if no solution could be found by the end of this month, things would be looking rather brown in Barbados. Sugar affects everybody in this island, every man, woman and child. It was rather disheartening when the public heard that the chief negotiator of the workers was unwilling to meet the Minister of Labour anymore. That was very disheartening and not a very comforting thought, and we wondered what would happen next. Indeed, Sir, you will remember that the Leader of the Opposition tabled a Resolution suggesting that a Board of Arbitration should be appointed. Now the award that a Board of Arbitration makes is binding, but I am still worried today. I am glad that the Government has come down with this Bill which is *ad hoc*. This Bill settles the matter in a way. In other words, owing to the terms of this Bill, as far as the Schedule for wages is concerned, the workers are likely to resume work and the owners are likely to open their doors to the workers, open their fields and their factories, and so we take some comfort that it does appear as if we will yet be grinding the 1968 crop; but that is not all.

This Bill goes further than that. What I am worried about is, as far as the introduction of this Bill is concerned, whether or not the forces of Trade Unionism are not being weakened or undermined. Legislation does one thing; but you know - and of course the Hon Prime Minister knows - running through the beginning of his television speech when he made a telecast, he went through certain aspects of the Trade Union Act, and as a matter of fact he had to see to it that in bringing down this Bill certain clauses would

be inserted to let it be crystal clear that there is no intention herein to preclude the employer on the one side and the workers on the other side from negotiating and bargaining in the ordinary manner for improved conditions of work. But this is a precedent, and what happens today can happen tomorrow. As a matter of fact, when you read the text of certain clauses of this Bill, you can see that it is not *ad hoc*; it is more than *ad hoc*. Again it can happen. In the very beginning it says "from time to time"; that means 'again'; but if a Bill of this nature is introduced in this Assembly next year and the next year and the next year, Trade Unionism has gone to pot in sugar. 4.20 p.m.

As a matter of fact, I have heard the Chief negotiating officer of the Barbados Workers' Union when he was a member of this House, resist a Minimum Wage Bill because, as he said, the introduction and presence of such a Bill discouraged the workers from being organised. You will see, Sir, that only in certain avenues of work where difficulty has been found to get labour organised, that Minimum Wage Orders come into effect. We cannot be shortsighted in this matter.

The Government cannot clap itself on its back no more than we can clap it on its back, because the Government had to come to the rescue. The Government has the responsibility, and it had to come to the rescue. It could not sit idly by and watch canes burn, the crops dwindle, no work to be done, and the workers remain dissatisfied. No Government could afford to do that; but that is not all. The Bill goes further than that.

A House of Assembly can make laws, but you cannot make a law to improve relations. Get that straight. Let me repeat that: You cannot ever make any laws to improve relationships. That is what the trade union is there to do - the trade unions, the workers, the employers and associations. These two bodies: one of them representing capital, and the other labour, when they meet together there must be no ill-will; there must be no animus left. If a man has to work with another man, there is a certain sort of human relation that must exist and must continue to exist.

What we are doing in here today is not improving such relationships; but only intelligent trade union leadership - with emphasis on "intelligent" - intelligent and capable, with emphasis on "intelligent and capable" - only enlightened management, with emphasis on "enlightened management and capable management" working together and facing each other around the Conference table can bring about the sort of relationship which should exist in any country, Barbados being no exception. This Bill does not do that; this Bill cannot do that, and no Bill whatever can do that.

We want the crop to start. We are not going to oppose the Bill. We are going to pass this Bill as readily and eagerly as the Government, but we are not going to pass it with dumb voices, because not only physical fire can make a blaze. Other things can

cause a blaze, too, metaphorically speaking. The worker still has to face the employer, and there must be proper and harmonious relationship existing in order to enable this crop to be reaped without any further hitch. We have to go beyond this. As I said, it is not good enough.

I am sure that it is within the memory of hon. members of this House that 1968 is not the first year that we have been threatened with this situation. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, we are threatened with it at the beginning of the reaping season, and the out-of-crop conditions of work are involved. That is not good enough. The sort of formula we want is a formula which will prevent that sort of thing from recurring again.

I see here in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill that -

"Provision is also included in the Bill for the appointment by the Cabinet of Advisory Boards to consider the conditions of employment of sugar workers and for enforcing the provisions of any Orders made by the Cabinet under Clause 3. The Bill would also empower the Cabinet to make regulations with respect to the constitution, appointment and functions of Advisory Boards, for prescribing anything required to be prescribed and generally for carrying into effect the provisions of the Bill."

With regard to the setting up of Advisory Boards, there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. There is a Minister of Agriculture, and there is nothing wrong for the Minister of Agriculture to have competent advisers to assist him in his Ministry. It states here for the purpose of "enforcing the provisions of any Orders made...." Of course, if you make an Order, you should have some machinery to have it enforced. I wonder, if, again, this does not second-rate the machinery for bargaining. Again, I wonder if this is not giving the trade union one hard slap bang in the face, because if you have to enforce these things, you are taking it upon yourself to do so. There is nobody else to do so. You say that it is your responsibility and yours alone; therefore, in some way or other you will look down upon the existing instruments of machinery which, of course, relate to bargaining and, of course, at once you think of the trade union.

This Bill is intituled: "An Act to provide for the prescribing of minimum wages and guaranteed employment for workers employed in the sugar industry,...." etc. This reads in a way that does not seem to be an ad hoc measure. It seems as if it is the intention of the authors of this Bill to make certain arrangements on behalf of and in the interest of the sugar workers that will go beyond the 1968 crop and the 1968 out-of-crop.

4.30 p.m.

The Interpretation Clause, Clause 2, defines the employment period; it defines what is meant by 'guaranteed employment Order,' 'minimum wages Order' and it took a long time before it defined "sugar

worker". It does tell us what a sugar worker is supposed to be, and what - I do not know if it did it just accidentally, is not a sugar worker; because it says here:-

"Sugar worker" means any person employed under a contract of service with an employer whether the contract is written or oral, expressed or implied or is a contract of service or apprenticeship being a person employed -

(a) in the cultivation, reaping or transportation of sugar canes, - and now, this is important - 'by the management of any plantation exceeding twenty-five acres;'"

That not only tells us what a sugar worker is, but it tells us who is not a sugar worker. Now, many sugar workers work on plots of less than twenty-five acres in area. There are many peasant holdings, and not the sort of peasant as I heard the Minister of Labour refer to not so long ago - peasants who have an acre; it may be as much as three acres who are already artisans or businessmen in some way. There are sugar workers who work on plots owned by people whose acreage is less than twenty-five acres. Are these people sugar workers under the terms of this Bill? I want to know whom I am talking for today. It does not appear so to me, so I feel that this Bill not only tells us who is a sugar worker, but it also tells us who is not a sugar worker. In my humble opinion, those people referred to, who work on areas of land of less than twenty-five acres - there are still plenty of them in Barbados. Again it says here, and this is on page two of this Bill:-

"For the purposes of this Act where any person, body corporate, partnership or co-operative society manages two or more parcels of land the total area of which exceeds twenty-five acres, then these parcels of land shall be deemed to be a plantation."

And, of course, those who work on them, are those regarded as sugar workers? It does not mean that these people only work on smaller lots of land, but when they do work on smaller lots of land, what rates of pay are they to get? Let me repeat that. When they do work on areas of land under twenty-five acres jointly or otherwise, will they get the wages which will operate in the Schedule of this Bill? Let me repeat that; let me get it crystal clear so that the Minister can answer well when the time comes. Such sugar workers as operate on areas of land under twenty-five acres in area, when they do so, such workers will probably also be working for plantations at times; but when they work for a man whose area of land comprises less than twenty-five acres, at what rates will they be paid? Will they be paid according to the rates operating or intended to operate in the Schedule of this Bill? That is my concern. So you will see, Mr. Speaker that although we do not object to having the dispute settled in this way, we will still have a lot to say in this matter for the purpose of being constructive.

This Bill has been drafted by the Legal Department. The Minister of course, has a lot of informa-

to a sugar worker on account of the payment to him of wages less than the minimum wage, institute and conduct on behalf of and in the name of that worker civil proceedings for the recovery of that sum in a magistrate's court notwithstanding that such sum may exceed two hundred and fifty dollars."

I wonder if "shall" should not be there.
5.00 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We are now dealing with the principle of the Bill. We are dealing with the Second Reading of the Bill. As I see it, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is going into the Bill Clause by Clause, and dealing with the merits of the Clauses of the Bill and the provisions of the Bill. That is done in committee and not in a Second Reading speech. The hon member should know better because he.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now going beyond a point of order, and making a comment or criticism. I was about to point out to the hon senior member for St. Peter that, much as I appreciated the careful and detailed analysis of the Bill of which he was giving the House the benefit, it did seem to me that he tended rather to do more than cover the principle and general merits of the Bill as provided in Standing Order 42.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I was very careful. The principle of this Bill runs in every section of it. The principle of this Bill is not just contained in its Objects and Reasons. I have already dealt with the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, and I now come to a section which includes a principle in which I am interested.

I have been an active trade unionist for a period of not less than 13 years, and I have had to consult officers of the Labour Department during that entire period. I know that complaints have been made on that score. Now the word "may" here, I humbly suggest, should be "shall". I am not a lawyer, and I was certainly giving a hint to the hon. member with the long robe in Parliament.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Again, when the hon. member says that "may" should be "shall", he is commenting on the Clauses of the Bill. I am saying that we are doing the Second Reading of the Bill and any amendments, or suggested amendments, to the Clauses or any corrections can be done in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not disagree with the hon. member who has just risen on a point of order, but in that particular case I thought the hon. senior member for St. Peter was making a general statement as to "may" and "shall".

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Sir. I know my limitations, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, all of my Parliamentary colleagues do not know their limitations. We are dealing here with the principle of the recovery of sums, possibly, due to the worker. This is a principle and not just a detail. Within my trade union experience

as a negotiating officer and an officer settling disputes in field, factory and office, many a time I have come up against snags when I felt the officers of the Labour Department should have made prosecutions. "Should" and not "might". The workers suffered. The trade union cannot make prosecutions. Only the Labour Officer or his deputies under the Trade Union Act are given the power to make prosecutions. If the hon. member would remain silent he might learn a lot.

Now, Sir, the time has come—let me say, hopefully, that the time has come when the Labour Department not "may" but "shall" make these prosecutions to enable the worker to redeem his dues. We have gone a long way, and we have to go a longer way. That is why to aid us, Sir, I am invoking the assistance of hon. members with the long robe on both sides of this House when we go into Committee. From my own experience, I know the hesitancy in which officers of the Labour Department indulge before they make a prosecution against an employer. I know that. The time is now ripe, and that is why I say it should be incumbent and not permissive. What I have said I have said as a result of my experience, and I have said it in the interest of the working-class people.

The other Sections we all agree with. The Labour Officer should not be obstructed in his duty. Now Clause 19. I think I should read this, Sir. It is on page 10. I have made a note in the early hours of this morning between two and three. I had to keep awake, Sir, because I had to study the Bill through the wee hours of this morning, having received it during the hours of last night. I suppose many a Parliamentarian on this side and that side had to carry out the same exercise. Clause 19 states:

"Nothing in this Act shall prevent organisations of sugar workers to whom a minimum wages order or a guaranteed employment order applies and organisations of employers of such workers from settling by agreement in respect of those workers wages higher than the minimum wages prescribed by such minimum wages order or specified in the First Schedule or a number of hours or days of employment in excess of that prescribed by such guaranteed employment order or specified in the Second Schedule".

This is a principle involved here, Sir. Here we are legislating for the minimum wage, but here we are fearing at the same time that the employer will make the minimum the general. Let me repeat myself. Here we are legislating for the minimum; here we are at the same time fearing that the employer is going to make the minimum not only the general, but the maximum. So we come right back to the principle I have enunciated at first.

We know employers. No matter what complexion they have it does not matter. If you tell a man you will pay X dollars a week to your shop assistants, that man, or a lot of such men, will wait until you say you will pay X plus \$ 1.00 per week before he pays more. I am not so stupid, or ignorant, to know that that does

not apply to every employer in Barbados. I know better than that; but there is a strong temptation, and that is why we have to put it in the Bill. Nothing shall prevent the employer from paying more. You are right, but at the same time you see now that you have to leave it open for trade unionism to take its part.

5.10 p.m.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, try as you might to gloss it over, you have got to leave it over. As I told my constituents in St. Peter, there must be a formula found sometime by somebody that will prevent us from every year, at the beginning of the crop, having that threat holding over our heads like the sword of Damocles, that there will be that crisis over out-of-crop wages. That will prevent the new crop from beginning to be harvested. In so far as this Bill is concerned, we agree with the seven cents or the twelve and a half per cent - I understood that the employers were willing to give as high as twelve per cent. That is what I heard, they have not told me so; but, be that as it may, you come down and, of course, we all hope for the time being. However, I had to point out these little snags as they occur, and I have to let this House know that it will be a very bad day for Barbados when we enact legislation that may prevent the smooth working of industrial relationships between employer and employee.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have spoken at some length and I think that there will be more for me to say in Committee. I have nothing to say about the Schedule as such. I agree with the rates therein contained and I do hope that now that the crop is likely to begin, the forces of trade unionism will be encouraged to heighten their efforts and that there will be that feeling between employer and employee, that good relationship, because you cannot legislate for good relationships. Let that be foremost in our minds as politicians and legislators. You cannot do that. Coming for more money is all well and good. Have more if it were known to be possible; but sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, in the short time available to us, we have read this Bill and I was a little amazed at the Hon. Minister of Agriculture when he was introducing this Bill that he could think, or that anyone could think, that this Bill contains anything which was Revolutionary or anything which would bring about a drastic change in the standard of living for the workers in the sugar industry. Now, we expected and we anticipated that the Hon. Minister would try to make political capital out of this Bill; but lest he feels that he has made political capital out of it, I would crystallise in a very short sentence the full impact of this Bill. All this Bill means is \$403.20 between the 1st July and the 31st January for an "A" class agricultural worker. That is all it means, and I challenge the Hon. Minister to deny that fact. All it means is \$403.20. Mr. Speaker, give them the benefit of the doubt; round off the figures and call it \$405. What they are doing is guaranteeing twenty-four hours in the thirty-week period which is 720 hours, and you multiply that by 56 and see if you do

not get around \$405. That is all; so what is the object of trying to make political capital out of \$405? The position is that a national emergency had arisen in Barbados. Sugar, as I said in my speech on the Resolution which was tabled here, is of importance; it is so important to the national economy that at some time - and you can play back the tape recorder - the Minister of Finance would have to be interested because the taxation which is raised in this country is, to a large extent, dependent upon the prosperity of the sugar industry. So that when the Government have intervened, they have not intervened because only they look after the agricultural workers. They intervened because, if they did not intervene, and the crop did not start in Barbados, the whole island would have suffered and if you are a Government in power, it is your duty to protect the whole national interest.

Having laboured and having tried to make political capital, I am going to cut you down to size straight away. There is no political capital to be made out of this. The Bill is important in one respect. Any trade unionist who allows any Employers' Association or who allows negotiations to drag on for seven months is not acting in the best interests of his organisation. For seven months the respective sides have been arguing and trying to reach a solution. It is obvious that something went wrong with the negotiations. Not sufficient interest was paid, and, as a result, in an important industry of this kind, the Government has got to come in and take matters out of the hands of the respective and recognized and historical industrial machinery and prescribe a Minimum Wages Order. That is an insult to trade unionists and it is an insult to free collective bargaining. I am sorry that the Kiaki King of trade unionism is not in here today to hear the onslaught which he deserves in this matter. If you look at when the Labour Government in England brought in the Prices and Incomes Board and they tried to restrict the freedom of the respective trade unionists to bargain with the employees for wage scales, what happened? A member of the Trade Union Council, who was a Cabinet Minister in the Labour Government, resigned and he said that it was an insult to the integrity of free trade unions in a democratic society. But the trade union king down here says that he agrees with the Government intervening. The Government baled them out. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said that, not in his speech today, but in the previous speech; not in the broadcast but previously when he was speaking. Anybody who, in this country has to shoulder responsibility - and I am sorry for those who have more than one household to support now - would know that the cost of living in this country has risen tremendously within the last year.

5.20 p.m.

Here more so, and then when you consider that since 1964, if you look at the rise in the cost of living, you would have seen that it has risen more than 17 per cent. Anybody can see that. There was bound to be a wage rise. So when you talk the stupidity - when the employers, the Sugar Producers, sat down in September - that there was no necessity for any wage rise, then was the time that it should have come down

because that was rank hypocrisy and insincerity. The Government workers had had an increase; everybody had had an increase.

The only criterion for the determination of an increase is the cost of living. It is bound to be the material factor and it had risen at that point. Therefore it is nonsense for your saying here, that this is a big revolutionary step by the Government. It is utter and complete nonsense. Any Government faced in the position in which this Government was placed would have to take action. The only question is this, therefore, whether the action taken by the Government is the best action that could have been taken under the circumstances.

Now, they pooh-poohed our Resolution; but if I were a Trade Unionist and if you took a count of trade unionists' opinion, they would prefer in any part of the world the machinery of the Trade Union Act buttressed by the fact that the award is going to have limited effect. I would prefer that, so to speak.

I am going to answer this talk about no arbitrator would have granted an increase. At the stage when our action was suggested, everybody agreed that there should have been an increase of at least - according to what the Hon. Minister said - of at least eight per cent or five per cent or whatever it was. The Prime Minister's speech over the radio said that they were putting up a suggestion of an increase of eight per cent - they pay five per cent and the remaining three per cent to come from the Price Stabilisation Fund.

So that as a trade unionist, would you follow the pattern of the Trade Disputes Act which is the recognized machinery, or would you prefer a minimum wage legislation. I defy anybody even on that side to deny this fact. You have minimum wage legislation in industries where two conditions exists. One is that the industry is such that there is no trade union organisation, or (2) the industry is such that where there is a trade union organisation, it is ineffective in relation to the power of the employers. Check that. Go to your text books on industrial relations and see if this is not so.

In the U.S.A., they have minimum wage legislation in agriculture. Here in Barbados in shops we have minimum wage legislation because for one reason or the other, it is an industry where you cannot get the workers to use the trade union machinery; therefore, workers are at a disadvantage *vis-a-vis* the employers. But if you have a trade union which boasts and brags that it represents the sugar workers, then they are not going to accept Government's intervention.

Mr. Kiaki King would have to face the trade union opinion all over the place. Do you forget that in Trinidad when the Government provided permanent machinery by way of an Industrial Court what was the reaction of the Trade Unions, particularly those in the South? You are cutting across the involved rights of trade unions in a free democratic society to take

such steps as it finds necessary to force an employer into accepting their demands. The Kiaki King says it is hypocrisy. The real trouble is that the Kiaki king cannot separate his political character from his trade union interest. That is the crux of the matter. He is a politician in the light of his trade union activities.

It is a good thing that this Bill does not go farther. It says in Section 19 - and I am dealing with the principle of the Bill - that it still allows the trade unions to do their bargaining. But when we look at it in that way, we see that the full ambit of this Bill is only \$403. That is all I see. That is all that is being guaranteed. When you add a twelve per cent wage rise to the workers as a whole, they are not going to be in a better position than if they had got an increase which was in consonance with the cost of living.

The Government still has got to go further. It is true that the worker is better off than before he got the increase because he has got twelve per cent; but I would argue that if you take his position in regard to the purchasing power of his wage rate in 1964, then he is not better off now even with this increase because the cost of living has increased more than twelve per cent.

Now, Sir, there are a number of other matters that have got to be taken into consideration. You cannot make political capital out of the sugar industry for the reason that it is in relation to the national economy of the country. Secondly, it needs a whole rationalisation. There are a lot of things going wrong in it because if you look at the situation at the peak period of earning in the sugar industry in the crop season - and if my statistics are wrong, I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would correct them - as I understand, there are 12,000 sugar workers in the out-of-crop season and 19,000 people working in reaping and harvesting in the crop season.

Now, this Bill has got nothing at all to do with this additional 7,000 people. Let them deny that. Therefore, in the crop season when the rate of earnings is the highest, 12,000 people now have to face competition from an additional 7,000 people; therefore, the earnings which they could earn additionally have got to be shared among 19,000 people, because agriculture would die in this country unless you can offer to the permanent agricultural workers a standard of living equal to other comparable occupations, particularly the skilled occupations, because working in agriculture is a skill like anything else. That is one of the problems which have got to be rationalised.

I ask the Hon. Minister to consider this. Whom are you going to attract? The Sugar Producers should think of this too. Whom are you going to attract? What young man are you going to attract in the industry where for its "A" class workers according to this wage scale - the rate per hour - all he can get is 56 cents per hour, and if you compare him with a junior mechanic in the factory, the lowest rate of pay for him is going to be 59 cents; therefore, an "A" class

agricultural worker is graded below a junior mechanic in a sugar factory. That is the position. 5.30 p.m.

What you are doing in your legislation is pitching your criterion of the minimum for a junior mechanic at a higher rate than your minimum for the A class man. Now I know the Hon. Minister is going to say that it was so before, but when you point out these things, it shows that there is need for some kind of rationalisation and job evaluation in the industry as to the respective worth of each person and his job in relation to the total output of the industry. You need a manpower survey because this Bill is not going to cure everything. It is an ad hoc solution. It will get the people back to work; but every time the cost of living rises you will get the same problem. The Government's duty also is to see to it that the cost of living for the whole country does not rise out of proportion. They have got to have a proper agricultural policy. I know they are going to say they have diversification plans; but even the Hon. Minister would admit that you cannot get diversification properly unless you have proper markets for the products you produce. I will say this: we are all agreed in here that the Marketing Corporation was a failure; we hope now that the re-organisation which was prodded by this side - but we do not want to make any political capital out of that - will make it succeed, because if that succeeds, all of us around here can look forward to buying food locally, produced at a price which is better than the one we can import. So do not try to make politics out of every little thing. You do not have to try to get votes out of a Bill where you had to do it. This Bill gives us the opportunity to look at that.

Now the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would be the first to agree that more effort and more time have got to be devoted to this matter. More money has got to be devoted to this matter. We have got \$403 out-of-crop; we have got to see that the national average income of the agricultural worker is increased. Let the Minister tell me that I am telling lies. I see many Probation Officers' reports when people do not pay their taxes as Your Honour will understand; child ones, I mean; but there is machinery here.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand as Counsel.

Mr. St. JOHN: I was not suggesting that Your Honour does not pay yours. But the position is that when you get an investigation done by a Probation Officer, you will see, as I have seen, that the reports vary from District "C" which is supposed to be a relatively dry area to those people who work on estates in the high rainfall areas from \$1,100 for a male to \$1,000 or \$980 for a female. These are out-of-crop wages. According to the Prime Minister they have an Agricultural Economic Sugar Unit. Let him deny the fact that the national average for an A class male working in crop and out-of-crop is more than \$1,000 or \$1,200. I doubt it would reach \$1,200 as a national average.

Mr. Speaker, anybody who heard me speak on the last political platform would have heard me say that if you did not have a community in which a minimum standard of living is prescribed and people could attain it, you are not going to have contentment. If you give them cheap food, cheap housing and cheap clothing, the rest a man must compete for. We want cheaper food in this country. We have to grow more. The Government has got to have proper fiscal policies to encourage it. In this country you have ten year tax-free holidays.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us look at this thing, because I am sure that hon. members on the other side like hon. members on this side want to see that the agricultural worker who is the backbone of this country gets a proper standard of living. He can only get a proper standard of living if the industry is so properly organised that he gets a proper wage. The profits of the industry must be such that he get a proper wage. The position is, Sir, that just as we have in this country tax holidays to encourage tourism and industrial development, we have got to devise a system of fiscal incentives to see that more food is produced in Barbados at a cheaper price. We have here a grade of fish that is called "Bim", and if you look in the schedule you will see that it is 45 cents and 60 cents a pound. That fish is the lowest grade of fish that comes down here. The Hon. Minister of Fisheries would know this. I believe that the West Indies is the only market that eats it. Tell me this: isn't it better that we here encourage fishermen, even if we have to get the big boats that the Hon. Minister talked about, to bring in fish from off the coast of Guyana and sell it at 40 cents a pound? It is better than importing fourth grade salt fish after the farmers use it for manure. It is the lowest grade and is cut so close to the backbone that you have to cook it and over-cook it and then shake it to get out the little meat between it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a serious matter which has got to engage the attention of Government. That is not politics. It is better for us to have an expansion of our local fishing industry and you have to give incentives. I will tell you that had it not been for eddoes, yams and potatoes and cheap flying fish, there would have been a food riot in this country ever since. You know, one of the fallacies under which the other side operates is that when they look across this table they figure that when it comes to rock bottom politicking they know more about how the ordinary people in this country lives than this side. That is a joke. I would match myself in any kind of top class politics or rock bottom politics with any member on the other side and he could not make political capital out of me. The Minister came in here today and I saw him getting into form. He said that the D.L.P. did this and did that. They thought we would have come in here and opposed this Bill. Good Lord, for \$404 or \$405! Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not enough. We have to urge the Government to get going with their

diversification plans and devise a system as a case of national emergency. You cannot produce unless you have processing markets. Let us get going with the fishing industry.

When people talk about flying fish, three flying fish weigh about a pound. Many people do not know that, and when you talk about paying 12 cents for one, that is 36 cents a pound; but it is superior to any cheap grade, fourth class salt fish that is marked "Bim" because it is sold mostly in the West Indies. Pork snout, backs and necks are things that are thrown away in Canada. Only the people down here use them. Why can't we have our own pork processing down here? I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that now that the Marketing Corporation has been reorganised it will get going on this, because I was reading only the other night that Guyana is producing its own bacon and sausages. The more money we keep in here, the higher the standard of living, and the more money we can get in food which is grown in the out-of-crop period; so that instead of having this minimum of \$400, I would like to see them get more work.

This is only a minimum; this is not a maximum. This is a starvation ordinary existence. If the agricultural worker in this country did not keep his pigs, fowls and so on in crop time, and could not get an excess of yams, potatoes and eddoes at first cost, there would have been a riot in this country ever since. These are hard, cold facts. Now this Bill does not deal with people who have under twenty-five acres. One of the effects of this Bill may well be that certain areas may go out of sugar and I challenge the Minister to deny this. He made a statement in here which I dispute. He said that they only used to get two days' work in October/November. I dispute that.
5.40 p.m.

My understanding is that the average over the country is more than three days. I may be wrong; I am referring to out-of-crop. (ASIDES) You say it is not true. I would not take anything from any member on that side other than a Minister, because the rest do not know what they are talking about. I do not know why he used the months of October and November, because that is a period of time when-.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, or on a point of elucidation. I did not isolate October and November. What I meant was that as from the month of October the incidence of agricultural labour is cut back. During the months of July, August and early September, whilst the sugar canes are growing, there is more weeding and so on to be done. From the month of October the incidence of work is reduced, and the workers are then given two days' work a week; some weeks one day's work and some weeks none.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point has been made, but I am afraid that is not a point of order.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I accept that, Sir. There is no politics in this. As I understand it, October and

November is the time when people start planting canes. It may be true to say that the people are not hired by the day, but by the task. This is where your diversification comes in. At that time it also coincides with the reaping of early potatoes planted in May, the reaping of yams, eddoes and so on. Instead of working with sugar the people work with other agriculture produce.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. When it comes to the question of reaping early potatoes, the majority of the potatoes are sold to hucksters who buy them in the land. At some plantations agriculture workers are employed in reaping yams, but not potatoes. Let us get things straight.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point has been made. Again, that is not a point of order, but a point of explanation.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I am not trying to make political capital out of this. The Hon. Minister would know that potatoes are sold to the Marketing Corporation, and the reaping is done by the estates, because the potatoes are boxed and sent there.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Marketing Corporation sends out people to reap potatoes also.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I accept that, but we want to see proper markets developed for these crops. They should be reaped and boxed at the plantation so that the genuine agriculture worker would get income out of that, too. That is simple. When we go into Committee I will deal with it. I disagree with the definition of "sugar worker", because it seems to me that if you say that this Bill is only aimed at those who are engaged on a plantation in reaping, cultivating, harvesting, or in the transportation of sugar cane, then what are you going to do for the stockman? What about the yardman? (ASIDES) I see you have just thrown in a new amendment which may cover it.

The point is that if you are prescribing agriculture wages, the Bill should include people who are occupied in agricultural pursuits on a plantation. You will then embrace the genuine agricultural workers. They do not want to do that, and they limit it to canes. It will have beneficial effect in some areas and to the country as a whole, but some people who have marginal estates will go out of sugar. They will go out of sugar until the Government has provided adequate markets for other things.

I agree with the Hon. Minister that in those areas where vegetables are grown by plantations - he cannot deny this fact, and I can challenge him on it - out-of-crop, they get an average of more than \$400 today on existing scales. Let him deny that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not hear him. I should like the hon. member to repeat what he said, if he wants a reply from me when the time comes for me to reply.

Mr. ST. JOHN: I said that in the areas where the production of vegetables forms an important part in plantation activities, you can get more than three days a week on those estates. It seems to me that in St. Andrew you can only get one day. That may be so in St. Andrew where the people do not get a lot of wage rates, and that is why they voted for the Hon. Minister. I hope that the little \$400 extra in this Bill will improve the standard of living of those people.

Basically, when we look at this Bill as a whole we see that it was produced by an emergency caused, in my opinion, and I will state it here or anywhere - I will say that if the people who were responsible for the negotiations on both sides allowed things to drag on from July to February without having the matter crystallised in some form or the other, then something was wrong with the negotiations, and there was insincerity on both sides.

I say that the Government has to help in reducing the cost of food. Let us have more incentives for agriculture. Let us guarantee to the agricultural worker that anybody going in for agriculture will know that his wage will be such that he has a standard of living comparable to other occupations in this country. You cannot encourage that by giving an A class worker a smaller minimum wage than a junior mechanic in a factory.

I hope that the workers do not regard this as an opportunity to say, "To hell with trade unionism in Barbados", because of the fact that the Government has intervened. I am sure everybody will agree that it is better that wage rates in industries are fixed by way of collective bargaining rather than by having Government intervention. Government must deal with long-term planning. Government is not geared to deal with every bit of an industrial dispute, and that is one of the fundamental things about this legislation. It was necessary, in the circumstances, but I feel, and we still feel, that the method of compulsory arbitration would have done less injustice to the principle of collective bargaining.

5.50 p. m.

Let us not attempt to use this for any great political gain, but let us see and understand the stark facts that they are. All this Bill means is that you are guaranteeing \$403 between the 1st July and the 31st January. There is nothing revolutionary in this. This is nothing which one can use for any political campaigning.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to the hon. member who has just sat down, when one has to speak after him, you really have to look for something else to say. Now, sir, the first thing which I am going to take up the hon. member on the other end of the table with is this. They pooh-pooh the idea of the hon. senior member for Christ Church that the workers do not average more than three days per week during the out-of-crop season. I am going to take them up on this, all and everyone of them. No. 1, they are not in a position to know it nor they have not put themselves in the position that they will learn it. I am

saying here and now on the floor of this House that for the workers at present out-of-crop, the average is more than three days. They can go and take up their plantation books or whatever they like; the average is more than three days.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point elucidation. I think that hon. members on the other side misunderstand the idea that we want to get over. I got up on a point of order to explain what we really mean. It is not that the workers do not average over the seven months of out-of-crop work more than three days. The position is that in the early months, in June, July, August and September, they may get five and a half days' work a week, depending upon the amount of work then. What I am trying to point out is that after September, you have October, November, December and January, and it is in those months that in some weeks the workers do not get any work at all. In other weeks they get one day at some of the plantations and in some weeks they get two days and if they are lucky they will get three days. So what we are doing here is to make sure that throughout those months they will get a minimum of three days in the months when they were only getting one day and, in some instances, none. This does not mean that they will not be getting four and a half days, or five days or even five and a half days in the months of July, August and September. The position is that that time is the time when one has got to prepare.

(Asides) I am on a point of elucidation. If you misunderstand what I was saying in my address, I am entitled to rise on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am still on a point of elucidation. I was trying to point out for the benefit of hon. members on the other side that this Minimum Wage Bill does not mean that the workers will not average under the Act.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a speech. I draw that to your attention that that is a speech and you are sitting there ignoring me.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew is addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was on my feet and the hon. member rose on a point of elucidation and he is making a speech. If you are ruling him out of order, then do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hearing the hon. member for St. Andrew.

HON. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was pointing out that with this bit of legislation, it is possible for the agricultural worker to have four or even five days' work for the entire period of the out-of-crop season because in the first.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is what I would call repetition now. The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thought that I would have to deal with one monumental idiot today, but it seems to me that I will have to deal with more. (Laughter) Now, sir, what is the difference? An average of more than three days. The Hon. Minister agreed that it is an average of more than three days. He said that some workers get five days or six days during some months. What is the difference? If I employ a worker for five or six days to three weeks and did not let him work for three days or for a week but on the overall he averaged more than three days, who would lose? A monumental idiot cannot answer that, I am sure. I am averaging a thousand dollars a month and some months I do not work for one month what is the difference? If you are going to pin me off at \$500 per month, I will be losing \$500 each month because my average is \$1,000 a month; and if you are pinning me down to \$500 every month where I can blow a comb for a whole month and spree, is that any argument? I want to draw to the Minister's attention in the first place that I am not against this Bill. I would never, for one moment oppose it.

6.00 p. m.

The Government in its wisdom tried to save the Island and it is a first-class way in doing so; but, at the same time, do not let them pat themselves on the back and believe that they are doing so much for the workers in this particular Bill. They did a lot for everybody by breaking the deadlock, and I am ever so happy to hear and to know that the crop has started.

Therefore, this is a first-class way of getting it off the ground: but the workers will still lose by this Bill. If you encourage, or in other words, if you cause the employers to get tough, that is where the workers will stand to lose. When I say "to get tough" I mean it this way. In the first place, at the present moment, you have workers over the age of 65 years still working and, as the Minister knows better than I, National Insurance does not provide for that worker any more. In other words, the employer can call upon that type of worker to leave or to stop working.

But there are still a lot of those people who are on the plantations who have a family and are working, and the managers and the owners are allowing them to work because they are not going to get any National Insurance. Now look at it in this light. You have about 25 per cent of the workers over age and now you are compelling the employers to employ those workers who are under the age. What do you expect? Do you think that the owners are going to sit by and allow the 65 year-olds to work when they are compelled now to find work for the ones that this Bill is providing for? Well, those workers will have to go off. They will have to leave the plantation and neither the Minister, nor this Bill, nor anybody can ask the employer one word, because no provision is made for them in the Bill, nor any provision is made for them in the National Insurance Bill.

Well, that is the number one thing that is liable to cause a hardship by this Bill, but I do not think that the employers are as tough today as they were yesterday. I doubt they will do that. They are more sympathetic to the workers today. But, if they do it, who will be responsible for those people to be put out of work and to go home and nurse their fingers? Who will be responsible for it? In this Bill, as I have said, the Government tried to help; but they have now opened up their hands for a lot of trouble and they have to stand by now and face it. We cannot get away from it. Sir, please remember my last word. I said that the Government tried to do something.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Minister said that he knew nothing about a deadlock until about the 14th February or something of the sort. When he was calling out these dates, I missed some things. Of course, I am not a shorthand writer. He was a bit too fast for me and I could not catch up with him. He said that negotiations started around the 16th September, speaking under correction. The Chief Labour Officer had a meeting on the 5th October or the matter was referred to the Labour Officer on that date. The Minister now held two meetings - the 13th December and the 19th December.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Will the hon. member permit me to correct him on that point? I said that I held five meetings on those two days.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said, on a point of order. I said that I held five meetings on those two days.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that I was correcting the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: If I have misquoted you, it was not intended. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Hon. Minister was listening carefully, I have admitted that I am not a shorthand writer and I tried to catch up.

Correct me when you are replying. I am still right as regards the meetings. You said 'the 13th December' and 'the 19th December.' The Minister said that he was trying to get both parties together. He also said another meeting was held on the 22nd December, another meeting on the 28th December and it was then that the Federation agreed to a five per cent increase.

There was another one at which the Chief Labour Officer got both parties to come together and try to reach a compromise and that was around the 13th February. But they failed to reach a compromise at that meeting.

Now, Sir, I read in the newspaper that the big boss of the Union, the Leader of the Union, Mr. Frank

Walcott, His Excellency or the Kiaki King, whatever you care to call him, make a threat that he is going to shut down everything. He is going to call an island-wide strike. I drew the Hon. Minister's attention on the floor of this House to the threat that was made. He did not ignore me nor did he say that he did not know anything about the threat. He did not say that he knew nothing or that any deadlock was reported to him, but he began in my opinion to speak the truth about what he knew about the Union and its boss. He said that the Union could not call a strike. Firstly, it would have to have money to feed the people. 6.10 p.m.

The Hon. Minister said that the Union could not call a strike because firstly you have to have money to feed the people, and secondly he said that the big boss of the Union was looking for a scapegoat to get himself out of difficulties, but he would not find a scapegoat in him. This is what the Minister said on the Tuesday, and at the Thursday or Friday night, the big boss called a meeting and said that the Minister of Labour was a monumental idiot and he would not be talking to him as he would not find himself around a table with him, and if the executive of his Union wanted him to talk to the Minister, they could take the job.

Now, Sir, there was the threat of a strike, the Minister said what he did, the big boss of the Union said what he did, and yet the Minister some Sunday night ago said that no deadlock had been reported to him. Now, Sir, several meetings were held, nobody could get together and the big boss of the Union refused to speak to the Minister. All of us in here know a monument. A monument is something standing without light, and he has gone and added more to it. He has tied on the word "idiot" to it. That is how he termed a Minister of the Crown. Now I want to know if this Minister has any sense of dignity or respect for himself. And the big boss did not stop there. He called some solidarity meeting and invited people to come down because he had an important announcement to make. I was not there, but I understand that that important announcement was that the Government has nothing to do with the issue and that the Prime Minister cannot be blamed. Now you can clearly see that the big boss felt himself more than the Federation, more than the Government and more than the people whom he represents. Who has brought this Bill now since he does not want the Government to come in? Who tried to shield him? I agree with the Minister that he was in difficulties and the Government has brought him out, because he told the Federation that he is not talking to them anymore until they come to him with something tangible and that he is going to call a strike. The Minister is a member of the Democratic Labour Party Government, and the big boss of the Union is a member of the same Party. One was calling a strike, and one said he could not call it. The Federation said: "let us wait for the strike" and they were waiting for it, and during that time the Island was burning down. The big boss stopped the people from working and did know how to start them back. The Government had to do it. I want to know if these workers have any more faith in that

man. I would not say 'the Union' because he could not get too far without the Union. Here it is: he is not speaking with the Minister, he is not speaking with the Federation. With whom must he speak? Must he speak to me? I do not have a Government. I cannot employ the entire industry. But now he says he is quite satisfied with what the Government has done. Remember that the Government had nothing to do with it? Imagine him making those demands and then had to come down off the high horse from \$4.80 to \$4.48, thirty-two cents less than he wanted, and he is satisfied! \$4.80 a day is no money for a worker. If you are going to compare the cost of living and how things are soaring, he has not done anything for the workers, and they stand to lose because so many thousands of acres have been burnt and they will not get production bonus or back-pay on it. In other words, they are losing and the little nay-nay increase cannot pay them for it.

The Hon. Minister got up here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and really set me up when he said we were going to deal with this Bill today. He thought he was doing ever so much and he referred to what his Government has done. He knows my stand on that matter. I have told him and his Government already that they are elected to do the people's business, and do all that they can for the people; so if they just score a little thing, they should not pat themselves on the back. I pay my cook to give me good meals, and when I eat all, I am not going to get up from the table and go and pat her on the back and tell her she gave me good food. I pay her for good food. Well, the people are paying you to do your duty. While campaigning in 1961 the people were promised a six day week by the same Government. I heard it myself. They told the people that if they elected them to power and they worked for one day, they would see that they got paid for six days, and they have waited until almost ten years after to come with a guarantee for a nay-nay three days. Why didn't you bring it before if you are so much to do with the people? The last Government hated them and did nothing for them compared with what you have done. If you love them, why wait until now the crop has been practically burnt down to bring this? If we did not get these fires and so on, the Government did not intend to move either. After the Barbados Labour Party launched some campaign and dropped all the weight on the shoulders of the Government, they had to get up and work and bring this Bill. It was wisely done. We wanted you to do something because we are not in power. It was your duty to do it and you have done it; but do not pat yourself on the back to make the workers feel that you did so much for them. You did your duty and I would have done anything to get the crop started. If I had the assurance from any person that I could get the crop started, and they told me that if I left my wife they would start the crop, I would have to leave her to get the crop started. The Government did something to get the crop started, but they should not stop there and sit back.

6.20 p.m.

Now, you have to think about the commodities of life. My colleague, the hon. senior member for Christ

Church, talked about cheap food, cheap locally grown food and everything. We also have to think of diversification, B.M.C., and everything. Diversification may come, but I may die and go to heaven before it comes into force.

Let us talk about regional co-operation, federation, or whatever you want to call it. If we do not do that at once, all of what the hon. member said will fall to the ground. We cannot do everything on our own. No little country can do everything on its own, and the countries will have to come together one way or the other. They are talking about one CARIFTA, and that remains to be seen. I was told that in Trinidad the Dunlop people are manufacturing tyres there and since that has been done the Trinidad Government stopped the importation of tyres. It is now costing the Trinidadians something like eleven dollars and some thing cents more per tyre. Now you are going to encourage industries, and after the industries are started the people will have to pay more; so you will have to be careful.

If Trinidad should join us, she will have her reasons. She has seen the writing on the wall. If we let her in through CARIFTA, then we will not be able to allow the importation of other tyres to this country and the people of Barbados will have to pay more for tyres manufactured in Trinidad. If you let in Trinidad it will be just like the Federation again.

I am saying here and now that of all the countries Trinidad should be left out, because one from ten leaves nine. Trinidad thought she was a big shot and would be able to do everything on her own all the time. She did not know that one from ten leaves nine, and that nine were more than one. She did not think about that at the time, but she now realises the position. These leaders, Lord have mercy upon them. Until you make them pay for their mistakes, the others will come along and do the same thing. Trinidad should be left out, and the other countries should work together.

Every time the gentleman in Guyana opens his mouth, he says that we cannot get anywhere unless we come together. His country is just as big as Trinidad but he realises the position. But for big fashion, he wants to keep company with the big shot in Trinidad and he wants to let him in. Trinidad could stay out, as far as I am concerned. If I had a vote to vote him out, I would keep him out, because he has no use for the small people.

What the hon. member for Christ Church has said will not have much effect yet. We cannot do it on a commercial basis and use it ourselves. We would have to export some to other countries. Mention was made of the B.M.C., and the hon. senior member for Christ Church said he hopes the organisation will win now. It looks to me that it is winning by increasing salaries and paying big shots. It looks to me as though it is spending a dollar and only getting five cents, but that is a matter for the Hon. Minister.

With reference to the Bill, I do not want to take up much time. We have already agreed to it in prin-

ciple, but we must point out to the Government and the people that members will want to make their side right and make the people believe that they have done ever so much for them. We have to think in terms of the peasants. Only this morning an old man from Chalky Mount came to my place, and I asked him how this would affect him. He told me that \$4.80 a day would not affect him yet, as he was paying \$5.00 ever since. The workers are not going to stay at \$5.00 now, and they will want an increase in wages plus the fact that they will expect food and something to drink. The poor peasant has to do all of that in order to get his canes reaped. As a result of this Bill, he is thrown outside. He could just as well bring the land and give it to the Government. He will not be able to pay the increased expenditure. I am asking the Government to think in terms of those people and to do something for them. You will have to subsidise certain things and do something to help them, especially the people who have to head canes from so far down and it is very near impossible for them to make two ends meet. When you think about one, you will have to think about the other.

I am dealing in terms of the workers. I am not saying that the workers are getting too much. They are not getting sufficient. It surprises me that the big boss of the Union has agreed to such a small increase. I do not know whether he was frightened and was so glad to get relieved that he forget his duties. I cannot see why he did not keep to the \$4.80, at least, that he was asking for. He says he is satisfied. As I understand it, the Federation is also satisfied.

Well, that is what happens to one who knows too much. We have to blame the Leader of the Union; he went about matters too clumsily; his approach was bad; and by making such a bad approach the Government had to come in. The Government should have intervened long, long ago. I can only blame the Government now for all of those acres of canes that have been destroyed. The Government could have brought this Bill here since January. The Government knew that the people were not doing anything. The Government knew that the Leader of the Union refused to talk to the Federation or to the Minister. The Government should have brought this Bill here since January, and, if we did get some canes burnt, we would have been able to reap them before they were spoilt. The Government has to be blamed for these things, because it has the power and it could have broken the deadlock long ago, although the Hon. Minister did not know that there was a deadlock. If it were not a deadlock, then the lock was dead.

Why wait until the last minute? Why wait until so many acres of canes were destroyed? Why wait until we lose so many tons of sugar to bring this Bill before the House? We were looking for this long ago, but it hurts me to see that the Government has to play the role of a Trade Union Leader. I do not know how the Trade Union Leader is looking at it. I think this is really a big slap to him. He opened his big mouth and bragged to the people. He said: "Do not work; I am not speaking to the Minister; the Government has nothing to do with it; the Prime Minister cannot have

anything to do with this; I am not talking to the Federation unless they come with an offer." Now what has he done?

6.30 p.m.

They will tell you that the bigger the words, the less their value - and misleading the people. The people are hungry. I do not know who is responsible for this, but it is the Prime Minister - well, it would be the Government. If one man over there does something wrong, it is the Government, and if one does it right, it is the Government; so the Government had to come in at a very late hour. I hope that the Government will come through now and see about the subsidisation of certain commodities, price fixing and things of that sort. You have given an increase of a little pittance a day, suppose I say 30 cents or 32 cents a day: but do you know that the increase in my commodities can amount to \$3.00 a day according to the size of the family? Therefore the Government cannot sit back any more. Look for you competent Authority and do some subsidising, some price-fixing and try to hold things together and keep down the cost of living as much as you possibly can; otherwise you have not done anything for these people. I am not saying that you have not done something; you have done a lot because you have managed to get the thing to move off. I daresay that tomorrow you may see sugar coming down to the boat; therefore you have done a lot. Yesterday you could not see any sugar coming down, but you still have to subsidise and fix your prices; otherwise we are still in trouble. Of course we will not be in for any trouble because the people are going to work now; but you have children who are going to school. You will be surprised to know that even the workers in Bridgetown when they have to pay bus fares to go to work and get back home, they get very little. It is hard with them; there is no getting away from the fact that it is very hard with them. I am looking for more increases. The Government will have to go east about increasing taxation; but if you have to do it, you will have to do it. All of that will have to be considered now. Therefore, do not let them sit back like the Minister bragging on the little "nay-nay" things which he has done, and saying that the last Government did nothing and that this is sufficient. The people are still alive, and we can still draw to their attention what they know already.

Sir, I am not going any further. I had a lot of notes on this Bill, but I will not go any further now. I just want to point out to the Government their duties what they have to do now to carry on from here. They have done a very good job, they have taken the wind out of the Trade Union Leader's sails. I do not know how the workers will be looking at him now, because if it had not been for the Government, they would have been in trouble; so they will have to respect the Government and, I suppose, ignore the Trade Union Leader because he has done nothing in this matter. I have read a book, I was a little boy at the time - that there was a little mill belonging to a fairy, and a man took it, or stole it, away in a boat. He succeeded in getting it to start, but he could not get it to stop. (Laughter) . It began to grind salt until it sank the boat and that is why the sea is so salt. (Laughter) . I

believe that the Minister is grinding under there. So the Trade Union Leader stopped these people and could not get them to start. That is a serious thing. He stopped them from working and then says that the Government is nothing to do with it. As to the Minister who has to deal with it, he is not talking with him; he is a monumental idiot. If we are comparing now whom would he call a monumental idiot? The Minister is up top of that. I have caught him up in a few fibs. (Laughter) . I cannot call the name because it would be unparliamentary, but everybody knows what I mean. He told a few fibs today. He said that he did not know that a deadlock was on. How did he know that a deadlock was on? Then the Labour Commissioner is not doing his job? He is doing his job because he is a "Smith" and I have never met a foolish "Smith" yet. (Laughter) . I believe that the Labour Officer was tired of making a Minister of him and telling him that they could not get through. The Minister is saying that he did not know that there was a deadlock, but it looks to me he would have waited until the entire Island had been burnt out and he would still be waiting for a deadlock, but the fire would be burning off the lock and he would still be waiting for the deadlock. He made himself look very ridiculous here today. The Prime Minister came out last Friday night and said that from December the Hon. Minister and himself were keeping a close watch on the situation and still the Minister does not know anything about a deadlock. Do you mean to say that I do not know of anybody stealing and still I am watching? (Laughter) . Who is telling the lies? He knows nothing about it, but still the Prime Minister says that from December they were keeping a close watch on the situation. But, Sir, on the next occasion that I catch him with these things, I will move a motion of "no confidence" in the Minister and call upon him to resign. I will not get it passed, but the country will still know that I am doing my job. It does not look good for a member of the Party who is a Senator, an Ambassador, to be calling his colleague a monumental idiot and the Prime Minister would not call on him to make an apology. That makes me feel that the Prime Minister feels that he is that in truth. Both of them are members and it is an insult to the one. He is a Minister of the Crown and a member is calling another member in public, may I say by his name, and nothing has been done about it. The Prime Minister has to come to the assistance of that gentleman, and the Minister thought that he was a monumental idiot. The Minister let him out because he told the Sugar Producers' Federation that he could not call a strike and that is true. He could not call a strike because he has not called it. He was in difficulties, he was looking for a scapegoat, and he did find one and now we are here tonight trying to get things to move off. They have moved off this morning, but we are now trying to settle it.

6.40 p.m.

I am in the Opposition today and I hope that this Government will keep its eyes open and its ears on the ground and do not allow the Labour Leader to put them in trouble. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you hear that, you must let us know. That is what you have to protect me from. You have to protect me from villains vagabonds, monumental idiots and all those things.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are glad to know that the workers in the sugar industry have come off to something; but we on this side of the House want to make it known that in fairness to, let us say, the "A" class agricultural workers, the Government could well have decided to let them have their \$4.80 a day rather than \$4.14. The Government could have given them the round figures of \$4.80. I am coming back to that a little later on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we well recall the Prime Minister made a broadcast on Friday night last on this matter. What struck me most forcibly is this. There were 196 cane fires, 1313 acres of canes were burnt. Included in that were canes belonging to 32 peasants. The Prime Minister got on the radio and before television and at no time did he even make it appear that he regretted in any respect the incidence of the burning of the canes.

We all very well remember his attitude, expressed as regards not seeing a cane blade in Barbados again; but, nevertheless, we on this side of the House can only charge him with what we call serious dereliction of duty in this respect.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while on this point of what cane fires there were, I am happy to be able to report that of the 196 cane fires throughout the Island of Barbados, the parish of St. Peter which I have the honour to represent, did not have more than three cane fires and the acreage destroyed were 6 1/4 acres. Thank God for that. That is very good for the parish of St. Peter to my mind in an hour such as this.

But the Prime Minister made it appear that the Government had come and had wrought wonders. This Bill has been brought down by the Government, but what did it bring with it? There is one point which must engage Your Honour's attention. The Bill sets out to deal with sugar workers. It is intitled an Act to provide for the minimum wages and guaranteed employment for workers in the sugar industry.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the strange thing about it is that in the period which this Bill seeks to cater, that is between July in any one year and the end of January in the succeeding year, there is really not the type of activity in the true sense that this Bill seeks to cater to. I must admit that on page 2, Clause 2, subclause (a) it is not in itself clear evidence of the Government going down a dark alley and ending up in bad syntax. You will find that it makes reference to persons being employed in the cultivation, reaping or transportation of sugar canes.

If I were to pause here for a moment, Sir, what sugar canes are transported between the months of July in any one year and the end of January in the following year, except you were transporting cane plants? This Bill which deals with transporting also makes provision for persons reaping sugar canes. What sugar cane is being reaped in Barbados between July in any one year and the January in the following year?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill also makes provision for out-of-crop wages, but there is no wage to be earned out-of-crop in reaping canes or transporting canes. This is evidence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of hasty and faulty draftsmanship. There is just too much that is wrong in this little Bill.
6.50 p.m.

The Bill goes on to give us the definition of a sugar worker, not agricultural workers or factory workers, mechanics, carpenters, masons or such as we know are employed on the estates during out-of-crop. It does not seek to make that type of provision at all. But what do we find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, That even in the principle of this Bill it is here being established that those lorry drivers whom we see and know during the crop harvesting period drive the lorries to the factories and receive the sugar and transport it to the sugar terminals at the Port, are not even under this Bill termed as sugar workers. Exactly whom does this Bill set out to make provision for? It is certainly not as clear to us as it ought to be, especially having been told ever since Friday night that it was drafted somewhere between Barbados and Jamaica, probably in the air or at sea. Undoubtedly it is evidence that the draughtsmen were at sea at this stage.

This Bill caters to plantations of twenty-five acres and over. For a Bill of this sort to do justice to all who have been making their contribution to the sugar industry throughout the years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government even in this hour of crisis owed itself a duty to have carried out a survey of the holdings of the peasant proprietorship, and to have something in this Bill to assist these poor people, who have less than twenty-five acres, to be able to pay the wages that are being recommended in a Bill of this sort, and to help them to be able to get their canes reaped. What these peasants have contributed to the industry over the years ought not now to be brushed aside, and the peasants ought not to be left by the wayside, so to speak, with their holdings in their hands, not knowing how to get their canes reaped. That is the situation that faces us, and we on this side want the sugar workers to get the money. As a matter of fact, I said earlier that we would much prefer to have seen the "A" class agricultural worker getting instead of \$4.14 the higher figure of \$4.80; but even then, what do we find? The figures trotted out have been arrived at not as the economists do. They have been arrived at haphazardly without the type of investigation or the economics of the industry that the Prime Minister led us to believe he had done.

Now, Sir, there is a seven cents per hour increase for the A class worker who gets \$3.92. That is a 14 per cent increase, but on the same estate the B class worker is given a 16 per cent increase, and at the estate it is the A class worker who has got to bear the brunt of the battle in out-of-crop. What does this Bill open the plantation owners to do? For all of those workers who are now 65 years, those old men, so to speak, who were employed on forking the hedge rows, there is nothing. The estate owners will

no longer be employing them. They have now been cast aside under this Bill. It is not fair to those people. We have been told that all the worker need do is to present himself at the estate door and say he is ready for work.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill does not say how many workers the plantation owner must employ to each arable acre. It makes no provision for that, but whatever the percentage might be, we do not anticipate that Government would have in mind that if a plantation employs 100 workers during in-crop that the plantation would be expected to find employment for the same 100 workers in out-of-crop during the months of July in one year and the end of January in the following year. But even in such a case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would it not be in the interest of the plantation manager or one of the employers, so to speak, to see to it that he employs the worker who is best able to give him service in return for the money he is going to spend? That is the type of thing that this Bill exposes the workers to. It is not altogether fair to the workers. In out-of-crop there is the distribution of fertiliser; there is the cutting and heading of stake manure, that is, cutting the dung, so to speak, on the estate.

7.00 p.m.

The plantations and the managers have to employ the strongest-looking and most sturdily built worker. If that is the attitude that the employers are now forced to adopt, what is going to become of the farmers on the estates - people who weed the farm lands, the old men who are given bits of road building and asked to repair cart roads? What will become of them?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a certain measure of haste associated with this whole exercise, and it need not have been. In my view, the broadcast which the Prime Minister made last Friday night, he could have made the same broadcast about six weeks ago. We would have saved many acres of canes from being burnt. The only regrettable feature is that even today, with some of the factories working, all of the workers, much to my regret, have not thrown in their whole weight, or have not gone back to the fields wholeheartedly. It is a sad reflection on the Government of this country.

If you find, in a country such as this, that the Prime Minister goes on the radio and on television and makes a broadcast to the nation, the sugar workers, the people involved, seeing and hearing the Prime Minister making a point to let them know they are going to get increased wages, and the workers are still saying they want their money first - they are still saying today that they want their money in their hands first - it is evidence tantamount that the workers have no confidence in the Prime Minister even when he promises them money.

When we are being asked to be parties to rail-roading this Bill through the House, it is not to give the workers money. It must be remembered that every estate owner, who knows that the worker on his estate must have retroactive pay from July last year,

could have been asked through the Sugar Producers to prepare his books and have them in readiness to let the worker get his few pennies that are due to him as from Saturday of this week. We would like to see the workers get their back pay by Saturday of this week, if possible. They have been suffering for it for a long time. We are sorry that it is not more money for them to get.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will understand that all of this delay, this dilly-dallying, this deadlock today and no deadlock yesterday, have caused trouble. For instance, the Minister of Agriculture told this House how confused the workers were. I heard him. I heard the Minister say lots of other things that convinced us that the Government was well aware that something more than crisis point had been reached; so that when the Prime Minister in his broadcast told us that the Minister of Agriculture had been trying to resolve the deadlock between the 15th and 19th December, 1967, we knew quite well that the Government knew, whether it was reported by the Chief Labour Officer or one of his clerks - it was within the knowledge of the Minister of Agriculture, a member of the Cabinet and a member of the Government, that he was at that time trying to resolve a deadlock.

What you will find is this, Sir. Taking his speech then and the broadcast that the Minister of Agriculture made and putting it alongside the Prime Minister's speech, you must come to the conclusion that the Government never moved, or never had any intention of taking any action in this matter until the second deadlock had occurred. By the time of the second deadlock, as they would have us believe, the Leader of the Opposition had tabled a motion in this Honourable House that caused Government members to run out, or to absent themselves. They just could not stand it.

I would not like to go now into the question of the disappointment and the shock that the Minister of Agriculture's broadcast caused the nation and the sugar workers. As he will recall, the time at which he should have addressed the sugar workers was very carefully chosen. It was 9.40 at night when most of them would have been asleep. He knew at that time that what he was going to say was not as the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, his colleague, would say: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." There was no such thing. No. Sir.

If the Hon. Minister had really and truly broadcast what he meant to have broadcast, then this entire situation would have been different. There might not have been any need for this Bill before us at the moment. The entire situation would have been different. In any case, the fire services are still at work.

7.10 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government has set about through this Bill to arrange minimum wages in the out-of-crop period in the sugar industry. That is all right on one side of the fence, but, on the other hand, the cost of living is rising by leaps and bounds.

When I say that the cost of living is rising by leaps and bounds, I am taking into consideration those commodities the cost of which are of immediate concern - the minimum necessities, the bare necessities of the very same people in the sugar industry whom this Bill is supposed to cater to today. I mean the people who now have to buy a pound of yams grown locally. I am not saying if they buy them over the counter or behind the cart or under the bag, but they have to pay fourteen cents a pound for them. The same thing applies to sweet potatoes - ten cents and twelve cents a pound. They have got to buy a pint of rice for fourteen cents and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the price of the cheapest loaf of bread, I think is now four cents or five cents. We have a situation here where the working-class people, the people in the sugar industry, eat pork; they live on pork and they see to it and try, wherever possible, to get a piece of pork at least for their Sunday dinner. It is not that they would not like it more often, but they try wherever possible to get a piece of pork to eat on Sundays. The price of pork is eighty cents a pound, so that when the Government looks back and makes comparisons with the increases as they claim they have given these workers in the sugar industry in out-of-crop - they have done absolutely nothing for the sugar worker in truth and in fact, when you make comparisons with the high rise in the cost of living.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what think you of these agricultural workers, these sugar workers and milk? There is a term much used in the years past when the peasant kept a cow or two cows in his backyard and sold milk in small quantities to neighbours. There were some neighbours who had to take their coffee without milk. They were not even able to buy the milk and they made reference to having to milk the black cow; it was black coffee without milk. Mr. Deputy Speaker, up to today the price of milk is such that I want to tell you now, Sir, that some Civil Servants in this country are milking the black cow just as the agricultural workers because they cannot afford to buy the milk. That is the situation, and these are the things which the Government must adjust itself to. It is all right to say that we gave agricultural workers this, and that we are the first people to have done this and to have done that: but they are the first people to have done what? The Minister sets out to tell you what they did about Workmen's Compensation, what they did not do about this and every sort of thing. What the Minister has got to do is what the hon. senior member for Christ Church has warned, that is, to make provision to let the people have as cheap food as possible, somewhere to live as cheaply as possible - and there are certain necessities which every person, be he worker or non-worker, must have; and if provision can be made for these things for the worker, he will truly battle his way to get the rest.

Getting down to this Bill, I sat and listened to the Hon. Minister, and it would appear to me that he has in mind using the Government's plantations to set an example. I am wondering if the Minister would be in a position to tell us now exactly when those sugar workers who are to get backpay, those sugar workers who are employed on the Government's

plantations - when has the Government laid down or decided what is the earliest date that these workers should get their back pay? Evidently, the Government has it in their own hands to set an example and to make the lead so that the sugar workers and others will follow. I doubt that the Minister has given any thought whatsoever to any such thing. They run here before the House and would like the House to pass something so that they can say: "Oh, we have got this on the Statute Book." But in truth and in fact, we would like to know whether they are studying or not or paying attention to the finer points, that is, making for better relationships between management and workers on their own estates. I doubt that any such thing has crossed the mind of the Hon. Minister. 7.20 p.m.

We cannot but regret, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that with all that has happened, the Government did not deem it fit to have appointed somebody to sit or to recommend what the Prime Minister has recommended or what the Government has recommended in respect of the increases to these workers because it has been said, and we know it, that the moment Government has to enter upon the scene in the way it did, in a matter of this sort, it has reduced the status of trade unionism to a new low.

It has taken bargaining out of trade unionism; and while it said that both the Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Worker's Union are free to continue negotiations, I am to wonder if the Sugar Producers' Association would want to continue negotiations with the very Union after the said Union had signed an agreement with the Sugar Producers' association and had decided to honour the agreement but because of something which in truth and in fact appeared absolutely in relation with the terms of the agreement which they had honoured, they have broken off negotiations.

I remember what the Minister had to say over the radio about this same agreement. He made reference to the agreement and said - I am quoting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the broadcast speech of the Minister of Agriculture - that the Sugar Producers' Federation pointed out that there is a current in-crop agreement between themselves and the Barbados Workers' Union which does not expire until 30th June, 1968, and this agreement has not been waived.

He goes on:

"My only comment on this is that the servicing or honouring of the agreement depend solely on the dignity, reliability and integrity of the signatories to it when there is no legislation to make such agreement binding."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if that is the situation which has been reached, is there any point then in the Worker's Union entering into an agreement further with the Sugar Producers' Federation? You only honour an agreement when it suits you to honour it? These things have got to be maintained because we want to make sure that the workers of the country

do not suffer any hardships through the hasty actions of any one man. That is all.

There can be no doubt that any suggestion for the continuing of bargaining between these two bodies is not really something which should be lightly looked over. It would have to be examined most carefully on all sides. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is little doubt that the Government has found itself caught up in what we would call a surge of emotions which had not much basis in the common understanding, in the functions of the Trade Union.

This is a case where, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said, we find that the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union has had to be saved again by the Prime Minister and, in our view, he has demonstrated that he is incapable of determining what is milk from what is poison so long as it comes from the hands of the Prime Minister.

What this House was asked to do was not necessary, but we have to take the interest of the workers and put it first. In doing so, we have not acted like the Democratic Labour Party because all of the workers, or some of them, whom we now decide that we are going to guarantee three days' work to them, everyone of them were told that if they work for one day, it was going to be seen to that the plantations owners paid them for a full week. It turns out now that they have to work three days.

The workers are still remembering that you are only guaranteeing them with work for three days a week, but they still have to eat seven days a week. The workers should not forget that. That is the situation.

7.30 p.m.

Perhaps the other side might say half a loaf is better than no bread. It might suit them to say so, but the thing is this: in the not too distant future the same workers will show that they know how to reward the man who promises him a full loaf and more, and only gives him the crumbs that fall from somebody's table. They are not asleep anymore, and if you were to read this whole Bill, you will see that it has enough in it not merely to cause it to be sent to a Select Committee, but in fairness to the draughtmen who work so hard doing so little in so short a space of time, it would be much better if Government or if the Leader of the House would take second thought on the matter and let something be really and truly done for which this Government could feel proud.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will not as we have promised, vote against the Bill. We want the sugar or agricultural worker mentioned in the Bill to get their money - and as quickly as possible; but we would like to know, and we hope that the Minister of Agriculture is impressing upon the Cabinet the necessity for the Government estates to set the example in paying out the workers on the Government estates the back-pay that is due to them as quickly as possible.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I, like my colleagues, wish to assure this House that we will give this Bill our full support, because we know in some measure it is in the interest of the people of this country, and has come also as a rescue to what could have safely been described as an economic disaster. For four long weeks this country looked like a fairy-land at night out of dissatisfaction, out of torment, and more so, Sir, out of bad negotiations for which I can firmly throw the blame on the Trade Union boss in this country.

I have one or two observations to make, however Mr. Deputy Speaker. As they say, this Bill which provides a minimum wage for sugar workers and guaranteed employment is really no big thing, and I will prove to you why. The Government is recommending that an "A" class worker on whose sweat this country depends mainly for its national income can only get \$4.48 per day and the Government is guaranteeing three days work, making a minimum wage of \$13.44 when you work it out. The Government is one of the biggest plantation owners in this country. They own eleven plantations; they own Haggatts Factory and they have the majority of shares in Searles Factory; so they have as much interest as the Producers Federation in this country. They should have taken the lead. They should never have allowed these discussions to drag on for four whole weeks, but what have they done? Unlike the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, I am not in a position to bring in the groceries, but I am going to give you a run down of what that agricultural worker has to eat. Listen carefully! One pint of rice - 14 cents; a pound of salt beef - 68 cents; a pint of lard oil - 38 cents; a tin of cooking butter - \$1.22; a large package of tea - \$1.08; a pound of coffee - \$1.52; milk which they cannot use sometimes, 31 cents per tin; salt fish, the one they call "Bim" which the hon. senior member for Christ Church drew to the attention of this Parliament. There are about five grades. There is the one which the Canadians use in Newfoundland or New Brunswick which is rather expensive. You will not see that at all in Barbados, and between Grade one and Grade four the farmer uses the fourth Grade salt fish in Canada for fertiliser, and then when he is tired with that, he ships it to Barbados. That is what the agricultural worker is eating at 61 cents a pound. Kerosine oil - 42 cents per gallon; meal - 16 cents per pound; corn beef - 66 cents for one tin; a quarter cake of soap, not Lux - Lux does not pass by them at all - 15 cents; onions - 16 cents per pound; biscuits - 40 cents per pound and a tin of sardines for 20 cents.

Now Mr. Deputy Speaker, unlike some of us if not all of us, and unlike the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who can snatch food from the lunch room in this House, they are not in a position at some times to even see carrots, cabbage, tomatoes, lettuce, beets eggs and milk. I say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because in this Bill in which the Government provides a guaranteed wage of \$13.44 per week at a rate of \$4.48 per day for three days, it works out to \$403.20, but for the sake of round figures I would say \$405 over that period. The average agricultural worker's pay in Barbados is approximately \$1,200 per year. 7.40 p.m.

It will take that man, with a wife and children, 14 years to earn what the present Prime Minister of this country is earning in one year, and that has nothing to do with the perquisites. \$16,800 in one year my Prime Minister earns, but the agricultural worker must go into the field and till the soil to provide that \$16,800. Only this Government can say that they have brought down a Bill that will always be remembered by the people of this country. Yes. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they never intended bringing this Bill here. I will explain why, Sir. In their own Manifesto of 1961 this is what they said about agriculture:

"The Party commits itself to the implementation of the Agricultural Workers Act to secure *inter alia* a guaranteed minimum weekly wage for all agricultural workers."

Yet, the Prime Minister in his broadcast said that he regretted it, and it was a last minute resort to bring this Bill before the House. Yet, they said in their Manifesto that they were committed to the implementation of the Agricultural Workers Act. It took all of the struggle and the battle, with the workers tightening their belts day after day, for the Government to bring down this Bill.

The people of Barbados are really pacifists; they are quiet by nature; otherwise some of them would have met the Minister of Agriculture after he made that speech in here and then went on the radio and made a waterwashed speech appealing for light. Yet, I heard the Prime Minister say today that he has no whip to crack over the Ministers' heads!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this country is to go forward, then its people must have their social and economic rights like any other country in the world. They must have food, clothing and housing. From 1961 until now the Government have been unable to control the cost of living in this country. This is a big problem, as I see it. It is not the Minimum Wages Bill; it is not the three days which they have guaranteed the workers; it is not the \$1,200 per year which the worker earns on an average; it is a question of lowering the cost of living.

Let the Government subsidise some of the food-stuffs; let them turn Haggatts Factory into a food-processing plant, whereby they can grow and can their own food there. They would also be able to ship out food. We would then be able to buy food crops which are locally grown much cheaper. The people cannot pay school fees for their children. First of all, let us think of rent, bus fare, clothes. Some of them have to pay school fees, taxes, fees to the doctor, national insurance, water rates, electric bills and sometimes the Rediffusion bill. Then the Prime Minister comes in here and says that only barefooted people with patches in their pants support us. They have to support us, because they know that we are the defenders of their fate. It is virtually impossible for a man to support his wife and children on \$1,200 a year.

I recall that Archdeacon Shankland, whilst giving evidence before the Royal Commission as a result of the 1937 disturbances, said that he could not see how an agricultural worker could live on \$13.00 a month - that was 31 years ago. Now we have a Trade Union boss disrespecting a Minister of the Government by calling him some sort of nonsense. That is the type of behaviour we are having.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to express my views on one aspect of this Bill. This Bill will not solve the problem. It is Government's duty to this country to lower the cost of living, and then we are confident that the people will have a better way of life. It is foolish for some of us to go around shouting that they have done this and that. The most important thing for Government members over there to do is to reduce the rising cost of living which is strangling not only the agricultural workers, but even some of the so-called middle class people and those in even better positions.

I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture - and I must confess, Sir, that he has my sympathy. I do not like to throw bricks where they are not necessary. It is not fair to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I know he did express his feelings on this matter. He said in a newspaper clipping: "THE STRIKE IS NON-SENSE." I will read the newspaper clipping. This is what the Minister said. He explained that he listened to the views of both the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is not reading from a newspaper clipping. I should like to draw his attention to Standing Order 26(1):

"A Member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers....."

Mr. CRAIG: I thank you for your guidance, Sir. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have great sympathy for the Minister of Agriculture, as I said just now. I must confess that I feel deep within my heart of hearts that when he made his speech in here that Tuesday he was defending his Ministry of which confidence his Cabinet members and his Prime Minister would have had in him. It was his duty to defend his Ministry, and he ably did that. But how sad it is that, after making such a speech, the Minister should come back here and appeal for light for no reason at all! One can appreciate that circumstances alter cases.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I conclude, I can assure hon. members on the other side that along with my colleagues we are going to give this Bill our support. You must also remember that this is not the answer to the crisis which we had only four weeks ago. Maybe in another two years or so, when your Government, I hope, will be still in power, you will have the answer at your disposal.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in making a few comments on this Bill, it is quite known and understood.....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. James proceed.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot on this Bill this evening, but I am saying that it will get the support of all members on this side. Why it was sought to railroad it hurriedly I cannot say, but when one takes this Bill and goes through it carefully, one sees that it is supposed to deal with the sugar workers of this Island. I have only received it last night, as it is known. I do not think you will find the words "agricultural workers" in it.

7.50 p.m.

This Bill deals chiefly with the sugar workers for wages out-of-crop. It is most surprising to think that with all the fuss and commotion, and last but not least, the sad incidence of cane fires, as to what the Leader of the Trade Union was asking for, he has accepted such a low figure. To study it carefully and to know the background of the agricultural workers and the sugar workers of our island, and as set out in the Bill, the factory workers, one does know that the scale of the agricultural labourer is very low. If you take the statistics of the agricultural labourer down the ages, the factory workers proceeded with their high wage and that, for one, threw the machinery out of gear, and it will be a big task, because we cannot reduce one to suit the other; one has to come to the other. With this Bill which seeks the minimum wage for three days a week, when one studies it carefully, when go into Committee, there are certain points in it that one has to take stock of very carefully. I heard a lot here tonight that some plantations are not employing but for one day, or two or three days. That may be so in some instances, but generally I know that today there are some estates which are still trying to give the labourers three or four days' work, and one has to be very, very careful with these laws. It is not that we are going to vote against this Bill; we are going to vote for it; but we do hope that when this law comes down as a minimum law, it will not retaliate in another direction.

The cost of living is known by everyone in Barbados. Every one of us has to foot his own bill. It is not just the man in the field who is meeting the cost of living; everyone of us has to foot his own bill, so that when one gets up here and says what the poor man has to buy, the Government has to take the thing on the over-all outlook. The Government has to see what good they can do to subsidise and help the cost of living for the community. If I sent today to buy fish, I have to buy it in the same way as the man who is working for me or the man who is working in the next plantation; but when you hammer upon the cost of living for the poor man and you do not keep that raised, I think you should look at it the other way around and see what subsidisation can take place to help the community of Barbados. The time is coming soon when this crop will be over. Thank God, as far

as I know I have not heard today, but I learned by the newspaper that the factories were starting, and when I passed through my parish this morning I saw the central factory of St. James steaming up. That is a very good thing; but when one throws his thoughts back to see the loss which has hit the island between the last three or four weeks, and now this has come down, what is the result? I do hope that the results of this Bill and the wages will be the beginning of the future.

There is a big disparity between the factory workers and the agricultural workers. I used the term "agricultural workers" because the agricultural workers are the sugar workers. Great stress is placed on the term "sugar workers", and the sugar workers are those who are reaping the crop and they are the ones who till the soil and plant the crop, so that they are all agricultural workers in my opinion. When this Bill goes into the Committee stage, I hope that certain matters which will be pointed out will be taken into consideration, because by what I have read from it, I can see what is likely to be called a smattering knowledge of the working of land in the country, if I may put it as simply as that, and living in the plantation belt for all of my years.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that great benefit will come and that this will be a stepping-stone in the industry; but it shows one that the Leader of the Trade Union has done nothing to help the sugar workers. In my opinion, he has done absolutely nothing because if the Government had not come in and brought down this Bill, what would be taking place now in this country? I do hope that the different points in this Bill which would appear to me on reading it - it has snags here and there and I hope that these will all be ironed out amicably for the good of the workers in Barbados.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is much that I would have said if other hon. members on this side had not previously said it; but I still think it; but I still think that this debate should be adjourned and further time given so that some obvious errors in drafting could be corrected, and that we could come back on Friday and do it. There is no plantation or factory which would refuse now to pay backpay if they were told by the Government; "When you pay on Friday or whenever you pay, pay also the back-pay as from July last year." On the other hand, if we were to continue tonight, we would be making some work for lawyers. Certainly one point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter hits you in the eyes as soon as you read it, because as you speak of what is set out there to be a sugar worker, you are really making it possible for an in-crop worker to say: "I am in that in-crop", although the question of in-crop wages, crop-time wages, is not before the island.

8.00 p.m.

I therefore suggest that it is clear to a lawyer reading this Bill that this is hurried work. This is just a hotch-potch of what exists here in the Island today with the addition of the guaranteed time. Some hon. members may not be aware, the general public may not be aware, that thirty years ago there was a

Minimum Wages Act put on the Statute Book. If this has been stated by previous speakers, I wish somebody would stop me because I do not want to read something which may be said when I was outside and I did not hear.

Portions of this Bill are just repetitions of that Act which is still on the Statute Book except, of course, that the word "Cabinet" takes the place of the word "Government" or "Executive Committee." There was no Trade Union in those days; we had only just started. His Excellency Ambassador Walcott - I am not using that sarcastically, but every Ambassador that I have ever met, and I have met a fairish number - retains the title of Ambassador even after he retires; so I suppose we would see in the course of time His Excellency, Senator, Ambassador Frank Walcott.

We were not even associated with the Trade Union movement. We started soon after in 1939 and in the following year we had the Trade Disputes Act which is still on the Statute Book and which provides for all trade disputes. A longish Trade Union Act, copied from what we would call nowadays the Commonwealth Acts and Practices, provides for arbitration: but the Trade Union in those days - and hon. members would see why - did not accept the view that arbitration should be compulsory and we never amended the Act to make arbitration compulsory.

We were always afraid that if you made arbitration compulsory, you may get a wrong arbitration. You may get an arbitration which was not satisfactory to the Union and you would get dissatisfaction - and not only dissatisfaction, but you would get trouble in the sugar industry. So, what has happened here is nothing new.

It is on that basis that Walcott with the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture or the Cabinet suddenly devised clever ways of solving it. I repeat: whatever has been done except guaranteeing the time is on the Statute Book already. There was only one thing which has happened more than once of not agreeing with arbitration which is necessary under the Statute for the purpose conceived; but the wording of the Act is the same, as far as I remember.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Government being faced with the situation as it is faced now. I would not go in for any recrimination against the Minister now because I disagree with what was said about him. There is only one thing which I would add. I did not hear him state if he was told by the Leader of the Trade Union movement that he had no confidence in him and would not meet him around a table. As my colleague for St. Joseph has said, out of sheer self-respect, he should resign. It is the only self-respecting thing to do.

It is general knowledge that he did it already. It is also general knowledge that he was forced to withdraw his letter of resignation. I more than respect him for having sent in his resignation; but I do not - respect him for the attitude which he has adopted

today in defending the principle behind this Bill. I do not agree with him at all. We all would think more of him if he had stuck to his guns and repeated what he said about Frank Walcott, making it clear.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has mentioned the name, Frank Walcott, The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition is well aware of Standing Order 26 (9) wherein is stated that the conduct of hon. members of this House shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion. The hon. member may not have been referring to a member?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am referring to the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union whose name is Frank Walcott.

Mr. SPEAKER: But can the hon. member tell me as Speaker whether that person is a member of the Other House of the Legislature?

Sir. GRANTLEY ADAMS: He may be a Roman Catholic; he may be a member of the Legislature; he may be a doctor; he may be anything else.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not concerned with his religious belief or disbelief. The hon. member would assure me whether he is referring to a member of either House of Parliament?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am referring not in a way which would conflict with that Standing Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, actually that is a matter for my opinion, however humble it may be.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If he has been referred to and rightly so, how can we possibly have this debate without bringing him in? How can it come within that Standing Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Nobody can question me. You attacked me personally and said that I heard.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Your Honour, I have not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard during today references to one Kiaki King.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will Your Honour permit me to continue?

Mr. SPEAKER: So long as the hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition assures me that he is not referring or he is not attempting, however remotely, to contravene Standing Order 26 (9) : -

"The conduct of members of either House of the Legislature shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion."

If I have the assurance of the hon. and learned member. I accept unreservedly the assurance of the hon. and learned member.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I understand Your Honour's condition. You must not under your order refer to a person in the execution of their functions in regard to the House or the Senate. But I am not referring to the conduct of a member of this House. If somebody catches him stealing does Your Honour means that he can not say that he was going down Broad Street stealing? He is guilty of utter misconduct.

Your Honour is lowering the dignity of the House by persisting in the way which you are persisting now. Will Your Honour read it again?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get this straight. The hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition said that the Speaker is lowering the dignity of the House. I would ask the hon. and learned member to withdraw forthwith that remark.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If Your Honour wished me to withdraw anything, I withdraw it as long as Your Honour is what Your Honour is now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am Speaker now and remain so unless I die or resign, whoever likes it or dislikes it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I like the way Your Honour puts it - unless you die or resign.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only the Almighty decides on death. I decide on resignation. I believe in the Almighty.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is Your Honour continuing this? Is Your Honour saying that I cannot refer to the General Secretary of the Trade Union merely because he is a Senator after everybody has been discussing him tonight? It would be impossible to have this debate without discussing him. Will Your Honour stop it?
8.10 p. m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get this perfectly straight. I hope all hon. members of the House on both sides, the Government and the Opposition, will realise that the Chair is not concerned with either of those Parties but with seeing that the Standing Orders are observed so long as I am in the Chair, and I have an abundant confidence in His Honour the Deputy Speaker. There was no reference at all other than some one vaguely referred to as one "Kiaki King", but when mention is made of someone whose name is not unfamiliar to me as a member of Parliament, and the name is so far as I understand, that of a member of the Other Chamber, Standing Order No. 26 (9) says that the conduct of members of the Other House of Parliament shall not be referred to. If the hon. member is referring to the conduct of a member of the Senate or of this Chamber, the Standing Order says it may not be referred to except upon a substantive motion. That is all I am saying.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Therefore everybody is out of order in referring to the Minister of Agriculture tonight. He is a member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: If anyone referred to his conduct as distinct from disagreeing with what he may have said, that would be out of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Will Your Honour put it to a vote of the House as to whether or not Frank Walcott's name should be called?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Frank Walcott is a member of the other House of Parliament and his conduct is being referred to, it is prohibited according to Standing Order No. 26 (9).

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am referring to Frank Walcott as General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. I am not referring to him as a Senator or to anything he may have done as a Senator.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can take no judicial notice of whether the Secretary of a Union also has an appointment in Parliament; but if the hon. member is referring to a member of the other House of Parliament, his conduct may not be referred to except upon a substantive motion.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is Your Honour serious about that?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair is always serious.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is Your Honour making everything a ridiculous farce?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will only concede that because of the attitude and comments of certain hon. members.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Is Your Honour going to say that all the debate earlier this evening in which Frank Walcott was mentioned was out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: No mention was made when I was in the Chair of the name of anyone which happens also to be the name of a member of the other branch of Parliament, and I know that His Honour the Deputy Speaker is even more careful than I am.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am going to continue my debate as I began it until Your Honour recovers. You are compelling me to do what every instinct in me to refrain from doing as a Barbadian, and that is letting the world know what has happened or what happens sometimes in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: When one speaks of recovering, I would like to suggest that the last person to speak deprecatingly of recovery should be the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am sure the tribute Your Honour has paid to the Deputy Speaker could be shown and practised now by Your Honour retiring and letting him resume his position in the Chair. Is Your Honour just going to stop debate? That is what you are doing. How can I speak about a Trade Union matter without referring to the Secretary of the Trade Union? I am not going to stop.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I am presiding, and not the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition; and if the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition is referring to a member of the other House of Parliament, he may not do so in relation to that member's conduct according to Standing Order No. 26 (9).

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: According to my reading of Standing Order No. 26 (9), you must not refer to any of these persons in their capacity as Queen, Judges, members of the Royal Family, Governor-General and so on; but if the Governor-General were playing cricket, could you not refer to the Governor-General playing cricket badly or well? If you referred to the Governor-General in his capacity as Governor-General and said he has done something right or wrong offend the Standing Order; but to suggest that the Governor-General or the Queen could not be referred to except on a substantive motion has nothing to do with Her as Queen. It is just sheer nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate the point of view as expressed by the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition. I would not, even though I so think it, describe it as sheer nonsense. That would be in very bad taste and form, so far as I look at things; but if the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition has in mind reference to the behaviour of the Trade Union, all he has to do is to refer to the Trade Union and its Executive. But if he calls the name of a member of Parliament and in reference to his conduct, I am bound to take notice. I have no alternative under Standing Order No. 26(9).

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Trade Disputes Act was passed soon after Trade Unionism began to rear its head. It was soon after the riots in 1937 that the Unions were formed, and we had on the Statute Book a Wages Act before that. The Trade Disputes Act was passed in 1939; so that, I repeat, this is nothing coming cleverly out of the head of any Minister of the Cabinet. Some sections in this are now on the Statute Book in the Minimum Wages Act of 1938; therefore the position as it existed for some months recently was that all the legislation necessary was already on the Statute Book, but you were up against what you would of necessity come up against sometimes, the fact that the two sides did not agree on an arbitration. What was the Government to do? What was the Opposition to do? What was any person in this Island who regarded the present condition of Barbados, who regarded the seriousness as we would have to regard it as seriousness - the threat of a general strike, the threat of dislocation of everything - to do? As I am told, some bus drivers stopped working because they saw a chance and attended some meeting held by the General Secretary, because they saw a chance of getting time off. Every hon. member of this House must have heard some complaints about people finding difficulty to get home and so on. That alone should indicate to the Government what a real general strike would mean, especially if transport were disrupted. Faced with that, one would expect that the Government would have moved straight away.

I repeat, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has not been sufficiently attacked. I am not going to repeat - at any rate at any greater length - I do not want to use the word "twisting" because it has an offensive connotation and implication, but I will say this - strong vigorous leonine in here as regards the Union and its General Secretary, doing the right thing when he is attacked - and nobody can even attempt to try to fool anybody else but that the speeches and the broadcast of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was the policy of the Cabinet. We know, and several people in this Island know that at that time the Government did not move because it was divided. Part of the Cabinet was on Walcott's side and part was not, and that is why the Government did not move. There is the Nancy story about no deadlock; it was more than a deadlock. The Government did not move for that reason, but the Prime Minister should have supported through thick and thin, his Minister of Agriculture. He put him in the awkward and embarrassing position as to make him look pitiable on television. Everyone of us who knew would know the reason for it, and others who had seen him on T.V. before would wonder why he was a different man that night, feeling his way to say something and saying nothing. 8.20 p.m.

He was feeling his way to say something and saying nothing. You could pity him, with the expression on his face, forced to make a speech other than he would have made if he had been left alone.

Now, I came into this House really determined to say nothing whatever against him, because I felt that he had been badly treated by his boss. I cannot say that, as he spoke today, I am not now prepared to say anything against him, chiefly because when I made the mistake in saying that the Leader of the House had said he would ask the leave of the House to deal with this matter in all its stages, and there was that general laughter over there, the mistake was that it was the Minister of Agriculture who had said that he was going to ask leave of the House to deal with this matter in all its stages. His conduct then made me feel that I am no longer going to be soft with him. He still owes the House a duty to ask leave to deal with this Bill in all its stages.

He must not follow the Leader of the House in promising something which he is not going to carry out. I refer to the fact that he got the Rules suspended to change the lunch hour from one o'clock to two o'clock, and then went on beyond two o'clock. If these things go on we would not be able to accept any promise, however solemnly made, when it comes from the other side.

Do not hon. members see; do not the Ministers see for themselves how they are pulling themselves down in the people's estimation? You come into the House and make a solemn promise to do something affecting the keeping or suspension of a Standing Order and then break your word? It does not hurt us, but it hurts such reputation as you may have and you ought to see it for yourselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. and learned member still speaking on the substantive motion before the House, the Second Reading of this Bill?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does Your Honour want to reply?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would expect a respectful answer; otherwise I would know how to deal with any hon. member who does not appear to respect the Chair. (*Asides*) The asides are somewhat loud. It maybe that they are between father and son. Let the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition proceed.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Job was not the only man God made with patience, Mr. Speaker. I was mentioning, when His Honour intervened, that I still expect the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill to keep his word that he is going to ask the leave of the House to deal with the Bill in all its stages. I repeat the point that has been made by others that this is a hurriedly drafted Bill. It is picking out a little bit of something from the Minimum Wages Act of 1938 and so on.

With regard to that point made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter about the definition of "sugar worker", the very fact that you talk about cultivation and reaping of canes - who reaps canes in the out-of-crop season? It was badly drafted; otherwise that could not appear here. Therefore it is far better - even those of us who like to watch cricket and admit that we go to cricket would prefer to leave cricket and come here, but before that let us get together and make the necessary amendments. It would then take us not more than a few minutes to pass the Bill.

But it goes further than it intends. I, in common with my colleagues on this side of the House, do not intend to vote against this Bill, because the deadlock has to be settled. This Bill is something more than settling the deadlock, and in attempting two things together, this hotch-potch has appeared here. It should be hammered out. It is clearly not drafted properly and with due consideration to the actual wording.

Finally, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to say what has not been emphasized before. While we vote for this because it is a solution to the deadlock, we are utterly opposed to the principle of the Executive taking over. That suits the people who listen to Calvin Alleyne: "We do not want Government by Party; we want executive Government; we want a Russian method of Government." (Mr. St. JOHN: Do not advertise him.) It is not advertising him. If you say: "Down with Communism", you are advertising Communism; but at the same time you are saying: "Down with it". If I mention Calvin Alleyne, it shows how absurd and dangerous are the views given out by him.

We are utterly opposed to the principle whereby, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter who, as he told you, has been a Trade Union Leader and a Trade Union Secretary for a long time - we are utterly opposed to the erosion of Trade Unionism. If two people

in Trade find difficulty in coming to an agreement, the Government is then going to intervene, and instead of doing what is the Government's duty to do and appoint an arbitrator or an arbitration tribunal - you can appoint three men and not necessarily one. In the Trades Disputes Act you will find that. An arbitrator may be a single person, or it may be an arbitration tribunal. That is the Government's duty.

I am not apologising, Sir, for reading the motion that I made. This is one thing that made me change my mind about not attacking the Minister of Agriculture whom, I repeat, I came in here not to attack. When the Hon. Minister speaks of dates, does he convince anybody, even himself, that it was not until the 14th February that there was a report of a deadlock? When a hurricane is blowing round your house, do you wait for a member of the family to tell you that there is a hurricane outside? He said that there was no official report of a deadlock. The mere fact that the Labour Officer was dealing with it shows that there was a deadlock. You do not call him in until there is a deadlock. You do not call him in until the two parties cannot settle matters themselves; therefore, there was a deadlock.

Let me remind the Hon. Minister that I handed this motion in; I made a note on my manuscript and I even noted the time because of possible rulings that you must not go by the public Building clock. I wrote Handed in at 11.57, three minutes before the Public Buildings' clock was due to chime, and my watch and the Clerk's watch on that occasion, at any rate, agreed. On the 10th, the Friday. It came in on Tuesday the 13th, the following Tuesday. According to what the hon. member said, the day after that it was reported to him that there was a deadlock.

Let me remind hon. member of what the motion says:

"This House being deeply concerned at the present grave crisis that has arisen in this Island as a result of the breakdown in negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and Sugar Producers' Federation on the question of out-of-crop wages in the sugar industry, call on the Government to take immediate steps to forestall the threatened dislocation of the everyday life of the community and to the very economy of Barbados which will inevitably result if the General Strike threatened by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union takes place; 8.30 p. m.

"The House draw to the attention of the Government that, apart from the questionable legality of a General Strike the existence of prolonged disorder and undisciplined conditions envisaged by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union in his reported public utterances are matters of such profound significance as not to brook further delay on the part of the Government in declaring its policy in this national crisis and any action it proposes to take to anticipate island-wide disruption of the national life;

"This House calls on the Government, in the absence of agreement by the contending parties to

have their dispute settled by arbitration, to send down to the Legislature a Bill, with ad hoc effect, to secure a settlement of this impasse by arbitration having among its sections provision for safeguarding the interests of those persons who are willing to work in the coming sugar-crop reaping season by *inter alia* guaranteeing retrospective payment of any sum of money that may be awarded them by the findings of an arbitration Tribunal."

Now, Sir, would not any sane-thinking, sober person conclude that here was a chance for the Government to act on a motion of that sort? They have subsequently acted on it. I noted that even my phrase about persons willing to act was not only in the Prime Minister's broadcast, but it is in the Bill today. The Government were too childish to act on this motion because it came from the Opposition, and because it came from me. But so as not to give the impression that they are following what the Leader of the Opposition has put up, instead of coming down to appoint an arbitrator, they themselves arbitrarily have fixed this increase because, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church and others have pointed out, they have not really done anything. When we first, earlier in this debate, pointed out that some of us feel that the increases were not enough, I noticed the titter around there as if they thought that we were making some political point. That is why I used the word "arbitrarily." As we can see now, if it is a question of an increase, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has pointed out, \$400 for seven months is nothing; but because it came from the Opposition, and because it came from me, the Government walks out. Here am I asking in this, and the whole island is waiting to see the Government do something: "Declare its policy in this national crisis and any action it proposes to take to anticipate island-wide disruption of the national life." Here was the Government offered an opportunity of telling us what they are doing. Free the outside world from the feeling of this threat of a General Strike, and they turn their tails and walk out! Why? Because you must not give the other side the credit for anything that will help the people, thinking that we are playing politics. Who would play politics with this? Nero was supposed to be fiddling while Rome was burning, but this Government is walking out while the canes are burning. (Asides) Some day the Chair will be able to tame the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I hope all hon. members. (Laughter) .

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: All twenty-four hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair always contains itself.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister goes to the "mike" and says (Asides) An enquiry? All that is in the Statute Book already. And the Governor, now it would be the Governor-General or the Cabinet, need not wait to be asked by either side; he may appoint an arbitration or an inquiry. The Prime Minister seemed to make fun; he has even

accused the Sugar Producers' Federation for whom I hold no brief, and nobody on this side holds any brief for the Sugar Producers' Federation. He sneers at the Sugar Producers' Federation and he says that they are insincere. I repeat; the Government, the Prime Minister and the Minister who were working so much in harmony and watching so much what was happening closely, but when the time came that they had a motion before the House to say what action they were taking, they walked out. Imagine the nonsense, the sheer undiluted nonsense, of saying that an inquiry meant nothing because it would have no binding force. What did the motion ask for? - to bring down a Bill and give binding force to the findings of an arbitrator. That is commonsense. What is he doing now but asking this House to give binding force to the question of safeguarding the rights of the people? But this, I repeat, is the same phrase as mine, willing to work. No, we must not get praise for anything or we must not do anything which will bring any praise to us.

It has been said over and over again, and it speaks for itself. There is no political issue, and the Government, in thinking that they are playing it off on us, merely shows to the country that they will do or not do anything according as they think it will bring political glory to themselves. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we are not opposed to this Bill as a solution to the deadlock. Far from being opposed, we do not think that the increases are enough; but we are opposed to abandoning the principle of settlement by arbitration. If the two parties in a dispute cannot agree, then and only then should the Government intervene and appoint an arbitration tribunal which is already provided for by law since 1939. The Prime Minister, in his release, speaks about a last resort. How can it be a last resort when he could have had an arbitrator?

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that this was a very feeble attempt at excusing the Government to say that a Board of Enquiry would have no validity, at least its findings would not have any binding effect. For the last time I say that we are opposed to eroding trade unionism, and we hope that never again will we have to deal with the Government fixing a wage rate because the two parties cannot agree. Let an independent arbitrator, as I said in the motion, preferably one from outside, a judicial or ex-judicial man, be appointed and then you cannot claim that the arbitration came down on one side or the other through friendship or fear.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been a great number of speeches of considerable length on this Bill and it would be very difficult for anyone who rises at this stage to add anything that has not been said before, and I certainly think that members on the opposite side of the House would agree that the Opposition has shown no lack of thought or consideration in its support of this problem. It was not my intention to speak at this stage

after the speech by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who in fact wound up, in effect, on our side of the debate.

But I must draw to the attention of the Chair, as I have already intimated to Mr. Speaker himself personally, what we in the Opposition are forced to regard as a very great abuse of the privilege which is given under Rule 70 of the Standing Orders of this House to the Press in allowing them to enter and report our debates.

It has been reliably reported to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker - and I have checked this with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation - that a broadcast was made at half past seven over their television service by a member of their staff - Mr. Simpson - who was present in this House earlier today to the effect that this Bill has received strong opposition from us. I took the precaution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of having it read back to me by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation - the bulletin and the entire piece which dealt with this debate.

The whole thing is not more than normally slanted. That is to say, it reported that the Minister of Agriculture said that he did not ask for the Bill to be passed through all its stages, but said that the Bill would pass through all its stages today. That is a slight breach of privilege, but we can put that down to ignorance.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: But may I point out to the hon. and learned member for St. Thomas that he is raising the point with the second reading speeches in respect of this Bill. There is no question about it; the hon. member is entitled to raise his point of the particular matter, but not when he is making a second reading speech on this Bill.

I am grateful to the hon. member for informing me what according to him transpired which in his view may have contravened Standing Order 70 - Press.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am obliged to Your Honour, but I am speaking on the Bill. I was just trying to say that the Opposition is not giving strong opposition to this Bill.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, if I was raising a Motion of Privilege, I would seek to interrupt the proceedings of the House by a motion, etcetera, based on it. I can read the rules, but I am not at this stage raising the matter as a motion of privilege.

What I said was that a member of the Press had been guilty of a gross abuse of the privilege which we accorded to him. My words can be called for, Mr. Speaker; you did not hear them clearly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, apparently what happened was this. There was a written bulletin and it was a Mr. Simpson who was reading it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, may I say that this does not arise in a speech on the second reading, but the hon. member is perfectly entitled to draw - in fact, he has drawn it to my attention - but he may not deal with it at length after having drawn it to my attention in his speech on the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, what apparently happened was this. I want to make it quite clear in view of something which I understand has been misreported about the House, what is my attitude and, I believe, the attitude of all hon. members of the Opposition on this side. I have not heard any member of the Opposition oppose the principle of this Bill today. I have not heard any member say that he was not going to vote against this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: "That he was not going to vote"?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That he was going to vote. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: There is unnecessary noise.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Small things amuse small minds, Mr. Speaker. Let them have their moments of amusement.

Mr. SPEAKER: A double negative is typical of any Barbadian.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think you better put it in simpler terms if you want the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to understand. Explain it differently and he would laugh again. Mr. Speaker, I am only surprised to see the hon. junior member for St. Lucy laugh. He must have had a very boring evening that he is forced to laugh.

I have not heard any member say that he was going to vote against this Bill, and if any member of the Press departs from a prepared script and look up at the television camera and says that this Bill has received strong opposition from the Parliamentary Opposition, he should be disciplined by this House. Rule 70 permits the possibility of such discipline.

We suffer a lot in here, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want anything which I say now to be misrepresented by the Press. We suffer a very great deal in here from the Press, and this is too important a matter for the speeches of members on the other side, or members of this side, to be misrepresented. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas may laugh; but the hon. member, although he may not understand it, is himself one of the sufferers from the Press. There is nobody in here, Mr. Speaker, who at some time or the other has not been misrepresented in the columns of the Press.

The Press used to give the Hon. Leader of the House justice on occasions; but there is undoubtedly

a certain view of reporting which is taken by the Reporters who attend these Chambers by such persons as Mr. Hoyte of the "Daily News" - I am going to call names - and Mr. Vanterpool of the "Advocate". During an election campaign in the final week, Mr. Vanterpool gave 455 inches to the Democratic Labour Party and reported the speeches of them too. Twenty-five inches were reported of one of our meetings. 8.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, you are very fortunate. The Press did not report what was the cause of the disorder the last time the House had to break up in disorder; so perhaps you have no complaint. For Your Honour's sake, I was glad the Press did not say that noises emerging from the office behind the Speaker's Chair were the cause of the House having to be suspended in disorder, because I still have some respect for the dignity of the House; but nevertheless if we do not stand on this at an earlier stage, we will be complaining year in and year out. This Bill is too important, Mr. Speaker, for callous youths to come in here and misrepresent. If they cannot understand what the Minister of Agriculture, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the other speakers who have made such significant contributions to this debate are saying, they should not be allowed in here at all. Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the House has Rules dealing with unfair reporting. Standing Order No. 70 makes Your Honour's powers quite clear. I can also tell Your Honour this: if Your Honour enquires from C.B.C., they are going to give you a slight; they are going to say that he script said so-and-so. When Your Honour is making an investigation of this matter, I will be prepared to make available to Your Honour privately an account taken down in writing by a member of the other House, - and I do not believe if you cannot reflect on the conduct of the members of the Other Place that you can doubt their words - of the impromptu remarks made by Mr. Simpson that did not appear on the script.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise in the hon. member's second reading speech on this Bill. I would be very happy to meet the hon. member to discuss this matter very fully.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to outline it to Your Honour very fully privately, but Your Honour will remember that you preferred to discuss the interpretation of Rule No. 26(9) at that stage. I never want to interrupt Your Honour in Your Honour's amusements; therefore I am forced in the circumstances.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It must not be regarded as an amusement when the Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas was having a chat with me. I did not regard it as amusing. I took it very seriously.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The amusement to which I was referring was Your Honour's original interpretation of the particular Standing Order in the exchange which Your Honour had with the Leader of the Opposition. I only take it to be an amusement; I could not take it seriously.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nothing I respect more than filial pride.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Your Honour, even if it had been the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I would still have regarded it as one of Your Honour's amusements, and believe me, I have little pride in my junior colleague.

At committee stage, if we reach it today, I will make reference to certain things in the Bill along the lines indicated by the Leader of the Opposition. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I must say this on the second reading because this is to my mind principle rather than detail; there is an attitude of the Government that once something has come out of the Crown Law Officers' office, it is sacrosanct and they cannot re-open it because they have this absolute trust perhaps in over-worked harassed draughtmen, and the ultimate result of it is that you find Government has to come back down at some future stage with an amendment. In this Bill - although I am voting for the principle - I will ask whoever is the Minister in charge of it to take note that "employer" is not defined. That is point No. 1 and that is a serious omission. Point No. 2 I have already draw to Mr. Deputy Speaker's attention that my copy of the Bill has a blank on page 7. No doubt there will be an amendment at some stage, because we cannot pass a Bill that has a blank in it, and this occurs in section 11.

Mr. Speaker, I am also going to say that an important principle of the Bill is the arrangement for guaranteed employment. There is some doubt to my mind at least, and I have not given it the benefit of a full lawyer's study, whether this Bill protects task workers adequately in respect of guaranteed employment. There is definitely some doubt whether section 2 of the Second Schedule in fact carries out the purpose of section 3 of the Bill, but that is something for the Minister to look at. I know perfectly well that having made one's mind up that the Bill is going to pass through all its stages today, unless the Bill was so badly draw that even, for example, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas could see that something was wrong with it, I know quite well that the Government is not going to relent, and is going to insist on its pound of flesh in respect of its draft. As a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, you will know that no lawyer is ever satisfied with every word, comma, sentence, or paragraph of an opinion or a pleading which he has turned out.

Mr. SPEAKER: By another lawyer.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Indeed, Mr. Speaker! In fact, I have another example to draw on page 10 in section 16, but this is really a matter for Committee. To say "Notwithstanding Section 114 of the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act" is not the way that such a proviso is drawn. That is clearly something written in a hurry by a lawyer who has not been reading many Acts recently. You say "Notwithstanding anything contained in" or "notwithstanding the provisions of". That is a small thing, but there are good reasons for not doing it that way. The point I am making in respect of this - members have made

it, but it will bear repetition - is that this Act was not ready on Friday night. This Act was ready at 6 o'clock last night.

It would make no difference, Mr. Speaker, if it is passed today or Friday, and despite C.B.C., and despite what the Press will publish, the Opposition knows that it has done its duty in respect of this Bill. Some members have made it clear what their attitude is, and I do not mind repeating that as well. It is the duty of the Government to find solutions for problems. We believe that this might not be the best solution and we might have found another, but nevertheless it is not any part of the Opposition's duty to oppose the Government merely for the sake of opposing. This is a solution and we will therefore have to support it for that reason. And, Mr. Speaker, I only hope that the Press will make an effort for just once, having descended to the depth in the middle of our debate, that now the end has come the rest of the Press can prove it has a bit more responsibility and not misrepresent the attitude of the Opposition to this Bill.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, the sugar industry in this Island has been for years its main upkeep. This Bill brought here this afternoon is really dealing with out-of-crop wages, and as we know, there seems to be or there has been some difference of opinion between the negotiators, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation. 9.00 p.m.

I think the Government has done a wise thing in trying to get the economy of the Island, which is based on the sugar industry, stable and back on a level keel. There have been, throughout the Island, many meetings held by various parties. Some suggested that the Government has failed in its duty to its people. Even members of the Opposition have accused us of not doing our duty in debating their motion, but I think the Government has acted wisely and has made its point.

In the Bill this, as stipulated, is only a Minimum Wages Bill. There is room for improvement either by the Sugar Producers' Federation, or through the negotiations by the Barbados Workers' Union. There are people who do not realise the difficulties that the people who work in the sugar industry face. I live in the country in one of the agricultural areas, and I know that only last week some of the workers were faced with one day's work. They had to accept it. This Government has come here with a Bill which is seeking for them, when it is passed, a minimum of three days.

Let us, for instance, think of the rainy season, or of people going to work on a Monday morning; the rain sets in for the remainder of the week, and there is no Bill of this sort to protect them. The plantation owners would only pay for the work done on the Monday, but, as soon as a Bill of this nature has been put on the Statute Book, even if the rain continues for weeks after that first day, each worker has a guaranteed wage of three days, as long as he reports for work.

The members of the Opposition have been asking for back pay to be paid, but this has only been brought in, or we only gained knowledge of it from our Prime Minister last Friday. It would take some time for the wages or the back pay for which they are asking to be paid. This afternoon there was some noise when the Minister said he would like to deal with this Bill in all its stages. They were saying that we are trying to rush things through. If they do not allow us to get this Bill through, how can we make it compulsory for the back pay to be paid?

There is another point which I am worried about, as far as wages are concerned. Some people claim that the wages are not high enough, but I think the Government has done a very good job. There are people who must be considered, especially the peasant proprietors who have to pay the same wages as the plantations. The wages that the Government has introduced - in some cases these peasant proprietors have to pay more.

Presently an "A" class worker is paid \$3.92 by the plantation, but when he works for a peasant proprietor he demands \$4.00 and in some cases \$5.00. He does not give the quality of work to the peasant proprietor as he gives to the plantations; he does not give the proper amount of work, because he does not turn out to work at the punctual hour. Still the peasant proprietor has to pay a wage higher than the plantations are paying. Therefore, the point at which the Government has put the wage, I feel, is a very reasonable one; so that the peasant proprietor, who has canes to reap, would not be so heavily burdened and would receive something from his crops.

Most of the speeches by the members on the other side were merely generalising some of the points made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I feel that this Bill is a very useful one, and we hope that the members on the other side, when it comes to the final stages, would not obstruct us, or cause it to be delayed, as we want the sugar workers to get all that is coming to them at an early hour, and the whole Island would be somewhat satisfied to see that the Government has been considering their plight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. senior member for St. Andrew exercises his right of final reply, is there any other member who wants to speak? Apparently, there is none; I will let the hon. member exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, apparently this Bill seems to have been given the wrong title. This appears to be a very terrible Bill. It is a Bill with which a lot of people do not agree. They do not agree with this principle and that principle. They do not agree with this part and that part of the Bill, and yet they cannot vote against it. They support it, but every time they get up to speak they say they do not agree with this part and that part.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member at first spoke of people, I did not know to whom he referred, but when the hon. member speaks about voting for or against.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was referring to hon. members, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear that phrase.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have listened to what the hon. members of the Opposition has to say. Some of the points I took down, and some of the points raised by hon. members I will be replying to. There was a lot of repetition. The essence of all the speeches made on the other side could have been contained in one speech.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated that he came in here with the intention not to attack me on this Bill, but he was forced to do so. I have not heard any attacks from him. The position is that there is nothing in the Bill on which he could attack me. He is aware that if a stone is cast, one will be thrown back.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does "he" refer to an hon. member?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Well, there is something in the English language called a pronoun, and they use it in place of a noun. That is how I was taught English at school.

Mr. SPEAKER: In Parliamentary schools one cannot repeat 'the hon. member' too often.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I should like to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the observations made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter first. He referred to the rates of pay for these workers on plots of land of less than 25 acres, and he wants to know what would be the rates of pay. What were the rates of pay for people working on those same plots, some of which plots have not been in sugar cane but were in other forms of agriculture?
9.10 p.m.

It is accepted practice in this country that the Wages Agreement made between the Sugar Producers and the Workers' Union for sugar workers are the Wage Agreements accepted for all forms of agriculture in the country. There is no point in raising this question as to what would have been the plight of workers working for people with less than twenty-five acres of land, or for the remainder of agricultural workers who are not sugar workers. Whatever is decided on for the sugar workers has always been accepted, and will always be accepted, by all agricultural workers according to their grades.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation. The Hon. Minister thinks futile my inquiry into the plight of the sugar workers who work on areas of less than twenty-five acres. When I was speaking about the Bill, I was speaking in the light of a Bill. As a matter of fact, when it comes to the Agreements at domestic level between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union, these Agreements are honoured and they do not have the force of law. This Bill will have the

force of law and therefore, I had risen to enquire as to what, under the terms of this Bill, is the plight of the sugar worker occupied, as he is entitled to be, on areas of less than twenty-five acres of land within the terms of this Bill. That is where I pinned my enquiry and I think I have the right to do so.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not criticising the hon. member for raising the point; I am just trying to explain to the hon. member that the pay of all agricultural workers in this country is conditioned on the Agreements made between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Workers' Union, and the pay of all agricultural workers bear some relation to that, except that when peasants are engaging the service of agricultural workers, they usually have to pay a little more than what is paid as a result of the Agreement between the sugar Producers' Federation and the Workers' Union because the workers who work for the peasant say: "Look, you do not have to pay any production bonus", and so on. Owing to the fact that the peasant is not committed to pay the worker production bonus, he is expected to pay the worker more than he receives by the Agreement. He does not only pay him more, but he also provides breakfast, a grog, a berry, (Laughter) in other words. I think that that was the most important question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. When it comes to the question of cutting across the functions of the Barbados Workers' Union, I cannot see how, in one breath, it could be advocated by the other side that we should take action, and now the action has been taken, it could be said that we are acting or cutting across the functions of the Barbados Workers' Union. The position is that we are doing what we think is in the interest of the people of this country. When we take action in favour of the workers, it is immaterial whose functions we cut across, so long as we satisfy the wills and wishes of the workers of this country.

I should like to reply now to the point raised by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. The hon. member says that all the Bill means to the sugar workers - it means nothing and we could have done without it where a minimum guaranteed week's wage is concerned. All it means is four hundred and five dollars in seven months, and this is absolute nonsense. What we are doing in this Bill is guaranteeing the worker at a time when he would normally receive one or two days' work and in some cases none, a minimum of three days. This does not mean that in the months of July, August and September when there is almost full employment for the out-of-crop worker, that he will not be receiving five days or five and a half days. If he receives five days or five and a half days a week for the first three months and then he is given a guaranteed three days at a time when some of them were laid off without being employed or when they were given no work this week or one day this week and two days next week or two or three weeks passed before some of them got any form of employment in the sugar industry, how can the hon. member say that we are guaranteeing him only four hundred and five dollars in seven months? The position is that the hon. member should be fair; he should know

that the worker generally has full employment for the first three months in the out-of-crop season. If he calculates this period of five days a week at \$4.48 per day for the three months - he is good at figures because he took the time off to make these calculations. I would only advise him that if he can make these calculations and see what the worker gets for those three months and then for the other months when normally, he would only be receiving one or two days' work and we are giving him a minimum of three days and over the seven month period, how, in the name of all that is good, can the hon. member say that the worker is only receiving \$405, that what we are guaranteeing is \$405? That is not so.

9.20 p. m.

The position is that the plantations must take regular care of the ratoons or the young canes between the month of July and September. That is a time when regular employment is provided. If the canes are not given the amount of care, the fertiliser is not administered, and so on, the next year's crop would not be as good as it ought to be normally and no employer can afford to allow his crop of sugar canes to go unattended for these first three months with the hope of getting a good production from them. After all, what they need is production.

The employer needs maximum production from the sugar canes. Those first three or four months are the important months. That is when the canes are growing. By October the canes are fairly tall. As a matter of fact, I remember as a boy we used to start eating them in the country in November. By the time you began to eat them, there was no more need for weeding them, and so on. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph can tell you that this is what we used to do in the country.

In November, when they started to cut the cane plants, we started using the butts, and after we started on the butts and the cane plant cutting season was over, we then started on the canes; so by November they were up in the air and you began to see what we call arrows coming out of them. So I would say that the time when the sugar cane needs really the care is the first three months when there is almost full employment.

Therefore, I would like to inform the hon. member to do some recollection, and the hon. member would see that the time when you have full employment is the first three months, and it is only a question of four more months when you are not guaranteed any employment at all. If you turn up at a plantation for work and they like your head, they will give you a day's work or two; but if you are not a nice boy, a nice good worker and that sort of thing, they say that "I do not have any work for you."

What we are doing is making sure that every worker who in the past three years has worked on any sugar plantation for the minimum of 480 hours in any one year previous to 1968, he is guaranteed employment at that plantation at a minimum of three days, whether the plantation owner likes him or not. That is what we are doing.

Now, the hon. member also refers to the 12,000 sugar workers in the out-of-crop season as against the 19,000 who work in the sugar industry in the reaping season. He feels there should be - that is the impression I have got - condensed employment rather than scattering on 19,000 in the reaping season. Emphasis should be placed on the 12,000 the year round.

The position is this. The hon. senior member for Christ Church who raised this question represents a constituency where there are two guaranteed fishing villages - one at Oistin and one at Silver Sands. He knows as well as anybody else that during the reaping season some of the fishermen do not go out to sea to catch fish, but they haul up their boats and go to work in the sugar industry.

Mr. St. JOHN: I do not think.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. St. JOHN: A point of elucidation of the misrepresentation of the state of affairs.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen to elucidate some matter raised by him in the course of his speech.

Mr. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let him so elucidate succinctly and concisely.

Mr. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. I did talk about fish and the price of flying fish. No fisherman hauls up his boat at that time. That is the flying fish season, man. That is the time that fishermen make money.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair as "man"?

Mr. St. JOHN: My friend, Sir. I am only trying to educate my friend into the facts of fishing. If he asks the hon. member next to him, he will know that between January and June is the height of the flying fish season.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right. The hon. member said that no fisherman works in the crop season.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, only this morning a particular fisherman set out alone in a boat and he went to get a cut in the reaping season. What do they do? Instead of two or three of them going out in a boat, one will stop inside and make a bigger dollar.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. The Minister is willing to give way. That one fisherman that goes out alone in the boat is only a smart Bajan.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not talking about Barbados and Bajans.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member also referred to the fact that the Trade Union Leader has

brought politics into his Trade Union negotiations and into these trade disputes.

(A VOICE: Look what he called you? He called you a monumental idiot.)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not care what he calls me. Anybody can call me whatever he likes; that does not mean that I am what he called me, and it is only through their monumental ignorance.

Now, the position is this, Mr. Speaker. It is accepted not only in the West Indies, but world wide that most Trade Union leaders are politicians. So what is wrong with that?

(A VOICE: Absolutely the other way around.)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: In the past, the Barbados Workers' Union was established by political considerations.

(ANOTHER VOICE: Nowhere else in the world.)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Look at the situation in Antigua today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 29 - Behaviour of Hon. Members not speaking. That Standing Order should not be overlooked. Let the Hon. Minister proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Take the situation in Jamaica.

(ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 29 - Behaviour of Hon. Members not speaking. If I have to draw that to the attention of any other hon. member, I would unhesitatingly name that hon. member.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What, Mr. Speaker, is the position in Jamaica? Therefore, I consider it nonsense to talk about a Trade Union Leader being a politician because this is the pattern in the West Indies, especially.
9.30 p.m.

I mentioned fishermen. The hon. member knows that masons, carpenters, joiners and such set aside their trade when these sugar factories start and go and work in the sugar industry because there is a quicker and a bigger dollar. The hon. member must also consider the fact that imported labour is brought into the industry. I think I can appreciate what the hon. member is trying to get at, and it is that it is people who reap the greater benefits from the industry. The position is that this is inevitable. We must have the crop reaped in a matter of sixteen weeks, because the longer the sugar canes remain on the land after they are ripe, the less they weigh and the owner lose money. The canes lose the sucrose content and you do not get the amount of sugar from them; the rats take care of some and some of them begin to dry, especially those in the same parish

which the hon. senior member for Christ Church happens to represent. In the shallow soil these canes begin to deteriorate before the ones in the deep soil. Therefore if the crop is to be harvested in sixteen weeks, - it is the aim of the sugar producers and the people who have to do with sugar in this country to have it finished in sixteen weeks, though it sometimes runs to eighteen weeks- you must increase your labour.

The other thing the hon. member must understand is that it would not be economic for a sugar factory to operate unless it operates at maximum, and if we depended on the 12,000 workers alone to do the reaping, it would mean that instead of working for twenty or twenty-four hours at an average, a sugar factory would only work for twelve hours a day; so you must have enough people to reap the canes in order to keep the sugar factories going for at least twenty-hours a day. If a sugar factory operates for less than twenty hours a day, it must be throwing away money.

Now the hon. member referred to the wages paid to A class workers as against the wages paid to a junior mechanic. Now for years there were wage agreements in the sugar industry, and the workers agreed and accepted this sort of scale. "A" class workers have for years since the negotiations have been going on between the Sugar Workers Federation and the Barbados Workers Union accepted this. If they did not accept this, they would not work. The position is that the junior mechanic is not necessarily an apprentice. He is a tradesman and it is accepted that a tradesman is normally paid more for his profession. He is always paid more than an unskilled man, and therefore his pay bears some sort of relationship to what the skilled mechanic or the senior mechanic receives; and if the senior mechanic's scale of wages is much higher or far in excess of the "A" class agriculture worker, it is to be appreciated that the junior mechanic would paid more than an "A" class worker because he is a skilled worker as against an unskilled worker. A lawyer is paid more than a teacher just leaving Erdiston College; and if you bring a lawyer to work in the Crown Law Office, he begins at a higher salary than a teacher who goes to the elementary school after having just left the Fifth Form at school, because they are two different categories. The teacher is paid as a different category of worker from the domestic servant. There may be two sisters from the same house, one is a domestic servant and one is a senior teacher, but because of the category in which the person is placed he is paid in accordance with that. So that the hon. member should not say that in this exercise the Government should look at this and say that an "A" class worker receives more than a junior mechanic. You cannot look at it in that light.

On the other hand, hon. members of the Opposition were the people who expressed an urgency and who came here to try to get a Resolution pushed through the Legislature asking that this matter be dealt with urgently when, as I said before and wish to repeat, there was no deadlock. They came to push a Resolution asking us to bring down a Bill because it was urgent; but now that we have taken urgent action, we are told

that we should have spent more time to have a survey carried out so as to evaluate between the wages which should be paid to an "A" class man and the wages which should be paid to a junior mechanic.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation of another misrepresentation, if the hon. member does not understand what I said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of elucidation must be on a matter raised by the hon. member.

Mr. St. JOHN: I was the person who talked about job evaluation. I said that this alone was not going to solve the problems, and that what was really needed was a man power survey and a job evaluation of the respective values to the industry of the "A" class worker and people in relation to a junior mechanic, because we regard an "A" class worker as a skilled worker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point duly.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said exactly what I said, but he did not allow me to finish what I was saying. There may be need for an enquiry, but because of the urgency of this matter, you could not expect the Government to go into a job evaluation between that of a junior mechanic and that of an "A" class worker.

Now the hon. member raised some important points which I think do not directly concern the Bill but bear some indirect relation to the Bill, and this was in reference to the cost of living. He pointed out that cheap food is what is needed, that there should be some sort of fiscal incentive, that there should be a pork processing plant and so on. Now the hon. member knows that these things are currently engaging the attention of the Government. The hon. member spoke of incentives in agriculture. He knows that the average peasant proprietor is provided with incentives to grow more food and more vegetables by means of the implementation of the farm incentive scheme by this Government.

9.40 p.m.

The legislation for agriculture in the past bore all its relations to sugar. There has been no provision in the past for diversification of agriculture. If you look at the Agriculture Credit Bank Act, you will find that there are certain forms of agriculture which cannot be assisted by the Agriculture Credit Bank today. Of course, we are going to amend that Act, but the whole system of agriculture in Barbados hinges on sugar.

The hon. member knows - when he was speaking about the provisions of more and more local food, so that the price of local food would be cheaper instead of importing some of the food which we can produce here - only too well that it is only recently that the plantocracy of the country, the big farmers, and even some of the small farmers, have decided to accept agricultural diversification. Everybody pins his hope

on sugar. It is only due to the Government itself taking steps to carry out its Experimental Research Programme and to show the farmers what could be done by way of agriculture diversification that the farmers are now interested in it.

I would like to refer to this, because the hon. member is representing a parish which is rapidly taking on agricultural diversification as a result of the initiative of the Government. Look at that area right around Sayes Court where - and he told me so today - Mr. Maloney is doing very well in agricultural diversification. He planted onions and did very well; he has some now doing very well. I want to tell the same hon. member that Mr. Maloney got the incentive from the Government Diversification Programme. As a matter of fact, the onions which Mr. Maloney has planted were passed on to him by the Ministry of Agriculture from their Research Programme at Sayes Court.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, again. The hon. member has not said what I said. The hon. member should remember that Mr. Maloney had to do this because they would not give him any more work in the Public Works Department. So far Sayes Court Experimental Station is concerned the Hon. Minister will know that they came and found that. The hon. junior member for Christ Church's brother used to be the man in charge and he was a pioneer all around there. At that time he was a Minister during the Labour Party's regime.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member purporting to elucidate some matter raised by the hon. member in the course of his speech? If so, what?

Mr. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. It is just the misrepresentation of my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should have risen on a point of explanation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Before this Government was in power, where has he ever heard of any onions being planted in this country?

Mr. St. JOHN: Under the directorship of Mr. Harcourt, the same Mr. Maloney told me that he planted onions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen to a point of nothing. The hon. Minister, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, should not be asking questions other than rhetorical. The hon. and Learned senior member for Christ Church thinks that when a rhetorical question is addressed to the Chair, he should take it upon himself to answer. He may not do so. Let him not do it again.

Mr. St. JOHN: I was only giving a rhetorical reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when one hears the hon. member and other members of the Opposition standing there and pontificating on matters

of agriculture and saying that some thing should be done to enable us to produce more of our local food, one realises that they are not aware of what is happening in this country. Whenever you go through this country, you can see more and more of the finer vegetables and food crops planted in this country today than was the case even 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 years ago. We never had English potatoes planted in this country before, and we have them now. We are planning that in another two years we will be producing all the onions we want in this country. As a matter of fact, I have to make representations to the Minister of Trade to stop him from importing or allowing onions to come into this country as soon as ours are ready. There will only be occasional licences given for the importation of onions. The position is that we produce better onions than we import. Our only difficulty so far as onions are concerned, is that we are not sure how long the onions will last. We are now experimenting with this crop to see how long they will last. The only thing that has us worried is that lasting quality of our onions. We can produce all the onions we need in this country and we can export some also.

When hon. members come here and talk about what we are doing about food crops, I want to let them know that the Government is giving incentives. (Mr. St. JOHN: What are the incentives?) Irrigation is an important factor in the growing of food crops. We give a free grant and a loan amounting to 70% of the cost of the installation of any irrigation equipment on any farm in this country for the production of vegetables and food crops. We give a grant and a loan, with an interest rate of 3%, amounting to 70% of the cost of installation and acquisition of the equipment. Could you want more than that? It was not done by the other people. (Mr. St. JOHN: Look at the C.D. & W Scheme).

Mr. Speaker, I would not even mention what is done for the dairy industry so far as the question of fencing and so on is concerned. We are encouraging diversification not only by talking about it, but by action. I said earlier today that we are a Government not of talk, but a Government of action. (ASIDES).

Now, mention was made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph about workers over the age of 65. The answer to his query is simple. In the Act it is clearly stated that any sugar worker, as long as he is able to work, and as long as he has been employed by a plantation for 480 hours in the last three years in any one year, is considered an employee of that plantation. The hon. member says that the man who is 65 will be sent home, because the plantation owners will want to cut down on the number of people employed. If he were working at a plantation, how is he going to be sent home unless the owner of the plantation can prove that he is medically unfit for work? There is no legislation on the Statute Book which says that an agricultural worker must retire at the age of 65. There is provision for a Civil Servant to retire at 60, or a local Government employee to retire at 65, but there is no legislation which makes it obligatory for an agricultural worker to retire at 65. I know that some of them are working at the age of 70 and getting children, too.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is a very important point, because the Minister may, by what he has just said, give the impression to people that this Act prevents agricultural workers from being dismissed. Is he suggesting that there is anything in this Act that prevents an agricultural worker from being dismissed with a week's notice or whatever notice the law allows? Is there anything in this Act that prevents an agricultural worker of any age from being dismissed?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I never said so. If the plantation want to dismiss the workers, then that is a matter for the Union and themselves. The Union, I think, has the weapon. (Mr. SMITH: The Union is no more use now.)
9.50 p. m.

The hon. member said that this Bill should have come since January. I have never heard greater nonsense. How could this have come since January? I have pointed out that there has only been a deadlock, and I shall continue to point out that there has been a deadlock in the industry over and above the deadlock at domestic level in September. That is what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: In so far as this phrase "since January" is concerned, I understand: "since" to mean "after".

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, they are contending that the Government should have done something in January. There was a deadlock at domestic level, and as I explained in my introductory remarks, the matter was referred to the Chief Labour Officer, and if they knew anything about industrial relations, they would appreciate the fact that after the two parties had failed.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Is the Minister telling us that when the Prime Minister said in his broadcast; "The Hon. Minister of Labour and National Insurance, the Hon. DaC. Edwards, held talks with both sides between the 15th and 19th December in an effort to resolve the deadlock, "the Prime Minister was speaking an untruth?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that was neither a point of order nor a point of elucidation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: My answer to that is this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member not answer that which is not deemed to be a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am saying that there was a domestic deadlock which was referred to in introductory remarks. These things are in my file. There was a domestic deadlock in September. After that, those who know something about industrial relations, would know that the matter would be referred to the Chief Labour Officer. Because there was this deadlock at domestic level, does it mean that there was a deadlock at industrial level, and the matter remains there, or you wait for arbitration or arbitration tribunal or a commission of enquiry because

there is a deadlock at domestic level? This could only be nonsense. The position is that after there is a deadlock at domestic level, the matter must be referred to the Chief Labour Officer who then tries to get the parties to come to an agreement. Failing to do this, the matter is referred to the Minister stating that there is a dispute and the Minister tries to use his good officers to do what the Chief Labour Officer has failed to do. That is what happened in December and, as I pointed out earlier, when the matter was referred to me in December, I held five meetings in two days with the parties and I was able to get them together with the Chief Labour Officer. Since then no representation was made to me or to any Ministry that there was a deadlock until the 14th February. Therefore, the contention of the hon. member carries no weight.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I should waste any more time in this matter any longer. I think the runs are already knocked off and everybody has been struck to the boundary for six and that is all I have to say.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour.

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

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

10.00 p. m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I draw to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as

2. (1) For the purposes of this Act the expression -

"conditions of employment" includes wages and other remuneration;

"employment period" means the period from the first day of July in each year until the last day of January in the year next following, both days included;

"guaranteed employment order" means an order made under section 3 prescribing the number of days or hours of employment to be provided or guaranteed by employers in the sugar industry for sugar workers;

"minimum wage" means the minimum rate of wages prescribed by a minimum wages order in respect of the particular sugar worker or category of sugar workers concerned;

"minimum wages order" means an order made under section 3 prescribing minimum wages;

"sugar industry" includes the business of managing or cultivating any plantation on which sugar cane is grown and the business of managing any sugar factory or cane syrup plant;

"sugar worker" means any person employed under a contract of service with an employer whether the contract is written or oral, expressed or implies or is a contract of service or apprenticeship being a person employed -

- (a) in the cultivation, reaping or transportation of sugar canes by the management of any plantation exceeding twenty-five acres in area; or
- (b) in or about any sugar factory or cane syrup plant in the operation or maintenance thereof or in work for any purposes connected therewith or incidental thereto.

(2) For the purposes of this Act where any person, body corporate, partnership or co-operative society manages two or more parcels of land the total area of which exceeds twenty-five acres then these parcels of land shall be deemed to be a plantation exceeding twenty-five acres in area.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, on page 2 of this Bill, paragraph (b) the fourth line, instead of "incidentals" it should be incidentals."

I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to second that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, you will know that members on this side do not agree to the point of dealing with this in its entirety tonight; but if we can get it through, we can get it through. But any lawyer worth his salt will see that this Bill is unworkable at the present. It obviously has not been done by the Legal Draftsmen. Some of its sections, I will deal with specifically. Some of its sections stand side by side similar sections in the Minimum Wages Act of 1938. Well, that is not draftsmanship at all.

As I have said, we will carry on; but it is not to be said that we on this side of the House think that this Bill should pass as it is. We will carry on rather than have confusion. Anyhow, it is coming back to the House. I am not a prophet, but I prophesy that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if the hon. member would just give way, I would like to assure the hon. member that we want the Bill passed tonight. I assure the hon. member that I would make note of any point raised while in Committee and after having discussed them with the legal advisers of the Government, if an amendment has to be made, it will be made.

I do not think that questions of these amendments from the points which the hon. members are making now should delay it. The position is that I would make a note of the points. They can raise the points; they need not necessarily be a long debate on the points, but the points can be raised and I will take note of them, and even if it means making an amendment in the Senate tomorrow after having discussed them with the Crown Law Officers, I shall assure hon. members that this will be done.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I appreciate that. Well, obviously (a) is absurd. We are dealing with out-of-crop wages and (a) says:—"in the cultivation, reaping or transportation of sugar canes."

There cannot be any reaping. We might say that planting canes is cultivation. There can be no reaping or transportation of canes in the out-of-crop season; so, obviously, that is a mistake.

As regards Paragraph 2 (b) "operation" is wrong. "Maintenance" is all right because of course you maintain a factory; you clean up the factory and all that; but operation of the factory is hardly necessary, except for testing. You are not operating a factory in the out-of-crop time.

Something should clearly be said about whether this 25 acres is to be arable or not. You can get 25 acres of land, as some hon. member pointed out, it may be land of all sour grass as in St. Philip, or of pure rock or most of it rock, but it may be 25 acres none-the-less. Obviously, the draftsman did this in a hurry. In fact, if we understand rightly from the Prime Minister's broadcast, may be, he and the Attorney General did it while watching what the cricket score was as they were not watching the match.

Those are the two chief things: (1) whether the 25 acres should be arable or not, or how much, and (2) what I have said already today.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it must not be thought that the Opposition is divided, but I do say that I have some reservations about the first point made by the hon. member who has just sat down. It just shows that lawyers can disagree over many things.

Perhaps, the Minister would like to know that it is possible since the term "sugarworkers" is used in the Act for purposes other than the purpose of the Act, a definitive term of "sugarworker" in the Third Schedule might be necessary to indicate in the interpretative section that a sugar worker has a wider category than sugar workers to whom an out-of-crop wage is to be paid.

I do not know if the Minister has grasped what I mean. But "employer" should surely be defined in this section because - I have to turn to another section unfortunately. I do not like to do this - Section 7 of the Bill is obviously drafted under a misapprehension.

10.55 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Could we deal with section 7 when we come to it?

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: You will have to read section 7 to understand what I am going to say about section 2. Section 7 is drafted under the misapprehension that a manager is not a fellow employee of the canecutter, that is that a manager is an employer. If you want a manager to stand as an employer, you will have to say that in section 2. If you want to make a manager the person responsible for registering the worker, producing the wage book and so on, and the person against whom a case could be brought, you will have to make it clear in the Act that for some purpose the manager, although in law only a fellow employee of the canecutter, is also his employer. When we come to deal with section 7, I believe the hon. senior member for Christ Church probably will have something to say about that; but as it stands, a manager does not employ the canecutters; he directs their labour. The owner employs them both. They are servants in common employment. The manager is as much a servant as the canecutter, and section 7 speaks about "immediate employer". Evidently it envisages that a manager is going to be regarded as an immediate employer. Well, the Act will have to say that, and I suggest to the Minister that he refers this point to the Crown Law Officer - the question of defining what is meant by "employer" just as you define what is meant by "sugar worker".

Mr. St JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I think the point taken by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is a valid one, and if you look at the Wages Board Act, 1943-25, you will see that the draughtsmen at that stage found it necessary to put in a definition of "employer" in the definition section, and it says "employer" means "any person employing one or more

workers whether on behalf of himself or any other person". It just shows you that in 1943 the draughtsmen in the definition section found it necessary to put in the definition of "employer". In this one they have not got any definition of "employer" anywhere at all in the Interpretation section.

The other point on this is this: I would still ask that, if one wants this Bill to have the widest ambit possible, the definition of "sugar worker" be expanded to include people who are employed in or about a plantation in any agricultural pursuit, because there will be categories of workers in that period of time who cannot make the sixty days which is the eligibility period - that is 480 hours - and when it comes to registration, it can be proved that they were not in the cultivation, reaping and transportation. They may be employed, say, fifty days on that; the other ten days they work they may be employed on mending roads, they may be employed in harvesting provisions or something like that; so that you would be excluding a category of people who partly were employed under this definition for a certain period of time, and partly were employed in another agricultural pursuit, but still on the same plantation.

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

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:-

3. (1) The Cabinet may by order -

- (a) prescribe minimum rates of wages for any occupation in the sugar industry, either generally or in any case in which the Cabinet is satisfied that the wages being paid to any particular sugar worker are unreasonably low;
- (b) prescribe the number of days or hours of employment in any employment period which shall be provided for or guaranteed by such employers in the sugar industry for such sugar workers as may be so prescribed.

(2) Until a minimum wage order is made under subsection (1) (a) in respect of the sugar workers specified in the First Schedule, the minimum rates of wages set out therein shall be payable with effect from 1st July, 1967 to those sugar workers and a reference in this Act to a sugar worker to whom a minimum wages order applies shall be construed as a reference to a sugar worker specified in the First Schedule

(3) Until a guaranteed employment order is made under subsection (1) (b) in respect of the sugar workers to whom the Second Schedule applies, the number of hours or days of employment to be provided or guaranteed by employment in the sugar industry for sugar worker to whom that Schedule applies shall, with effect from 1st July, 1968, be as specified in the said Schedule and a reference in this Act to a sugar worker to whom a guaranteed employment order applies shall be construed as a reference to a sugar worker to whom the Second Schedule applies.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, from one narrow point to a very wide one. The Cabinet may by order prescribe minimum rates of wages for any occupation in the sugar industry, either generally or in any case in which the Cabinet is satisfied that the wages being paid to any particular sugar worker are unreasonably low; etc., but the spirit of this Act other than this section is obviously directed only to out-of-crop activities. We are entitled, for example, to know if the Cabinet envisages that when we have the promised negotiations for a new in-crop agreement that the Cabinet will use this section to solve that, because certainly this section where it says generally prescribe any rates of wages for occupation, does it restrict it to what it defines as "employment period"? That is section 3(1) (9a), subsection 2 and subsection 3.

Mr. Chairman, I have my doubts whether subsection 3 really does give authority for such an order as has been made in the Second Schedule for task workers. I cannot say I am certain because I have not studied it. This is the kind of thing that lawyers' opinions might take a long time to prepare on, but what it says is that a certain number of hours or days of employment shall be guaranteed by employers; and its application to task workers is that such hours and days as would produce an income. I just wonder, Mr. Chairman, if in fact the two things are reconcilable, and I would certainly like the Minister's draughtsmen to have another look at it and see if they could improve subsection 3 of this section to make it clear that task workers can be protected by some means other than a specified number of hours or days. Where you say "to specify a certain number of hours or days", in fact are you really specifying something by saying not twenty-four hours or whatever days, but just saying such number of hours as would produce the same rate of pay as a person for whom hours can be specified? That is in fact what you are saying; so I really think that subsection 3 may very well need some amendment to make the position of task workers clearer.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What is intended here is that a task worker normally works at a faster rate than the hourly paid worker, and he can work for the equivalent of three working days in less than three working days. What we really want to get at here is that the employer cannot tell him "I gave you task work today in which you could have made the amount you could have made in three days, and I am not going to offer you anything tomorrow". What we are really trying to get at here is to make sure that the task worker does not receive at the end of the week less than the equivalent of the twenty-four hours at the normal hourly rate of pay. Do you follow what I mean?

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: It would be more than he was getting. If you guaranteed three days of work to a task worker, he is going to make a very great amount of money more than three days of work of an

hourly paid worker. In fact, all the principles have been applied. You are in fact applying the minimum guaranteed wage to a task worker, but a minimum guaranteed working period to an hourly paid worker.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not want to be misunderstood. The Government's view is that no sugar worker should receive less than a certain pay in any one week. Now if the plantation gives that worker task work for three days, obviously he is going to work for more. We have nothing against that, but we do not want the plantation to say it is giving him two hours task work today, an hour's task work tomorrow and three hours task work the next day, and at the end of three days he has not made enough to be equivalent to twenty-four hours of work at the normal hourly rate.

11.05 p. m.

The point is that his take-home pay is not to be less. Let us put it this way. His take-home pay at the end of the week is not to be less than what he would receive were he working at the ordinary rate. It can be more. If the employer wants to put him on three days of task for the full pay, and he made six times what he would have made, that is all right with us. What we do not want is that on any pay day, as long as he was eligible for work, he would not be paid less than the equivalent to three days pay.

Mr. St. JOHN: I agree with that. The objective is that whether you work by the hour or by the day, you must get a minimum weekly sum. But you should take it upon yourself to prescribe not only days and hours, but task of employment and the rates to be paid for such tasks.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: To put it another way, if you just read "the number of hours or days", you should take that out and so frame it that it would be made clear that you are referring to task, and not necessarily to hours or days. You are only taking care to see that he does not get less, as the Hon. Minister puts it. I think, if "hours and days" came out, that the draftsman could put it into better shape. You must get in the word "task".

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is another possibility which is a little bit more unusual, but it has to be borne in mind. It is the possibility of mixed hourly and task work in the course of one week. That also has to be borne in mind. There is no provision in the Bill to deal with that. It is not a usual situation, but if you run out of task on a given day - it is not unknown for a plantation to turn people over to hourly work, as I have been informed. I have never been a plantation manager or overseer. It is not unusual in the course of one week for tasks, to be completed and there is still other work to be done. There is no provision at all in the Bill for that, a hybrid week. I refer to task and hourly paid work. There may be need for two more subsections in this section: one making it clear that for task work it is a guaranteed wage you are aiming at, and one for allowing a mixture of task and hourly paid work - one day of task and two days of hourly-paid work.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not think that difficulty arises at all. We feel that any worker is entitled to a minimum standard of living, and he can only have a minimum standard of living by receiving a minimum wage. If he begins a task, say on Monday and the task work ends at midday on Tuesday and up to that time he has not covered enough to compensate him for two full days' pay or three full days' pay, if he were paid at hourly rates, all that happens is that the plantation is committed to give him hourly work to complement the equivalent of three days' pay.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Minister says that the plantation is committed, but the Bill does not say that. The Bill envisages exclusively task work for seven days, or hourly-paid work for seven days. I think the Minister will find on reflection that he really needs another section which would apply to task work either in whole or in part; that the method of computation is on the basis of a minimum weekly wage of the sort appropriate to workers of that class. There is nothing at all in the Bill that bears out what the Minister has said. The Minister has said what the Government intends, but the Bill does not say it.

If a man does his task on a Monday - suppose you even call that the equivalent to two days' work - there is nothing compelling - he can insist to the plantation that as he started out on task work, he has to be paid the equivalent of a minimum wage even though there is no more task. The plantation, as this Bill stands, cannot compel him to do a day of hourly work, if it had it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The point is that the plantation cannot compel him to do a day of hourly work. If the task work is finished and all the plantation can offer him is hourly work, if he does not accept it, it is a matter for him. That is his business. The position is that the plantation will have to offer him employment to bring him up to the minimum. If you look at the Second Schedule, par. 2, you will find that provision is made there. It reads:

"In the case of sugar workers employed on a task work basis the minimum employment to be provided during each period of seven days in each employment period by employers in the sugar industry for those workers to whom this Schedule applies shall be such as would enable each such worker to earn not less than the minimum earning of a sugar worker of the same class as set out in the First Schedule who is employed on an hourly basis."

This brings out what I had pointed out.

Mr. St. JOHN: I did not want to raise the point, but, now that the Hon. Minister has read it, I will speak. If you do not take upon yourself the power to prescribe the task under your Section 3, it means that it would be advantageous for the plantations to put their workers on a task work basis, and put the task at such a high level that, in fact, they would be getting more work out of them for the \$1340. There is no obligation here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: There are rates for tasks, too. As a matter of fact, for task work, I think the increase is 12 1/2 % on the former price for task work.

Mr. St. JOHN: There is no definition for task work. You must have the power to prescribe what is a task. My understanding is that in no agreement that is in existence now - I believe you will have trouble with this unless there is a definition of task. Nobody knows what the task is now. A task varies from area to area.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is a point which should have been made in Section 1. You should make a note of that and put it in Section 2.

The question that clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 and 5 were called and passed.

Clause 6 was called. It reads as follows:-

- 6.(1) If an employer -
- Penalty for non-compliance with orders under section 3.
- (a) pays to a sugar worker to whom a minimum wage order applies wages less than the minimum wage; or
 - (b) fails to provide conditions of employment in accordance with a guaranteed employment order, or the provisions of the Second Schedule,

he shall, for each such offence be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding 500 dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 6 months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Where the employer or any other person to whose act or default the offence was due is found guilty of an offence under subsection (1) (e), the court may order the employer to pay such sum as is found by the court to represent the difference between the amount which ought to have been paid to the sugar worker by way of wages if the provisions of the minimum wage order had been complied with, and the amount actually so paid."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is the penalty section for non-compliance with the order made under section 3. It will be remembered that under section 3 the obligation is to pay the minimum rates prescribe by the orders. Until those rates are prescribed by the order, the obligation is to pay the rates set out in the First and Second Schedules. Those rates that are set out in the First and Second Schedules only apply to sugar workers who are registered, but there is no obligation or no duty cast upon the employer to register until he is called upon to do so by the Chief Labour Officer.

11.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, when you look at this, there is no penalty in here nor is there any penalty in the Schedule, which I have been able to find which makes it an offence for an employer who does not register when he is called upon to do so by the Labour Commissioner. If you look at the second Schedule, paragraphs 3 and 4, if you read them, paragraph 4 says this:

"For the purposes of this Schedule the management of every sugar plantation and of every sugar factory or cane syrup plant shall, as soon as may be after being required to do so by the Chief Labour Officer, forward to the Chief Labour Officer the names of all persons who are employed as sugar workers in such plantation or in or about such sugar factory or cane syrup plant and the dates on which the employment of such persons commenced."

It does not say if you do not do it what happens. Where is the section which says that if you do not do it what happens? And it is these workers to whom this Schedule at paragraph 3 applies as being registered with the Chief Labour Officer. The worker has to be registered on the 1st July 1968, as a sugar worker at a particular plantation, sugar factory or cane syrup plant. This paragraph says:

"Being a person who during the immediately preceding three years was employed as a sugar worker on any plantation, or in or about any sugar factory or cane syrup plant for not less than 480 hours in each employment period during the said period of three years."

He must be registered on the 1st of July. It does not even say in Section 4 that it shall be the duty, but words to the same effect. It says "as soon as may be after being required to do so by the Chief Labour Officer." It does not go ahead and say that if he fails to do that, he shall be guilty of an offence. It says in section 6 (1) (a) that it is an offence for an employer to pay less than a minimum wage or (b) fails to provide the conditions of employment, but it does not say that if he does not register what happens, so that it only becomes an offence if he is a sugar worker and he only becomes a sugar worker if he is registered; but there is nothing to make you register him, so that you can fail to make him a sugar worker.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member's point is well taken.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think, Mr. Chairman, what is really needed is that Section 4 of the second Schedule should not be there at all. Since it deals with the Chief Labour Officer, I would suggest that it should be more appropriately Sub-paragraph (d) of Section 12. The words in Section 4 of the second Schedule should really be taken out:- "For the purpose of this Schedule" and the form of words used should be that: "The Chief Labour Officer may require the management of every sugar plantation...." And put that in Section 12. In other words, you should compel the management to register sugar workers and then you will have this Section 6 applying; but,

at the moment, there is to my mind as a lawyer not the slightest doubt that unless a sugar worker or the Chief Labour Officer applies to the Supreme Court for a mandatory injunction to force the employer to register a worker or his workers, the Act is, in fact, meaningless because any employer who cares to be difficult, any employer who says: "He can grow the sugar cane, but I will fight this Act", can refuse to register his sugar worker and ignore the provisions of this Act altogether. And the only remedy, as I see it, a civil remedy, is for the workers or the individual worker or the Chief Labour Officer to carry him to Court for an injunction. Of course, that process may take a very long time indeed; and if he happens to live outside of Barbados, it is a process which might never be possible at all.

The question that Clause 6 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 7 was called. It reads as follows:-

7. (1) "Where the immediate employer of any sugar worker is himself in the employment of some other person and that worker is employed on the premises of that other person, that other person shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be the employer of that worker jointly with the immediate employer.

(2) For the purposes of this section the expression 'premises' means any land or building under the management or control of any employer."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is the section. If one looks at the marginal note he will see that it says: "Liability of agent and superior employer." And the section starts off on the assumption that the agent of an employer who employs on behalf of somebody else is an employer, but he is not an employer because, if you look at it, you will see that "A" acting as agent for and on behalf of "B" employs you; it is not "A" who is doing the employing, it is "B" who is doing the employing and he is doing it by an agent. That was the intention there. Draw this point to the attention of the draftsman that that does not cover what they really mean, because it assumes that a agent is not in the employment of the other person.

The question that Clause 7 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 8 was called and passed.

Clause 9 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, Sub Clause (3) in the fifth line, the word, "an" should be changed to the word: "and". That is a typographical error. I beg to move that Clause 9 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 9 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 10 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in the second line of this Sub-Clause (b) I should like to have substituted the word: "superannuation"-one-word-for the word "superannuation"-two words. I beg to move that Clause 10 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know where this definition in Clause 10 comes from, but if one looks at the old 1943-25 Act, it has a different definition of "wages". It is not the same as what is here and I do not know whether parts of it have been left out.

In the old Act it says this:

"Wages means all sums which may be due to the worker for or in respect of any work done by him or in the event of work involving expenditure on the part of the worker the net remuneration obtainable by the worker in respect of and in connection with the same."

11.25 p. m.

Now, that is Clause 10. I would be glad if the Minister can give me an explanation of what it means.

"Any reference in this Act to wages shall be construed as a reference to the amount obtainable or to be obtained in cash by the sugar worker from his employer after allowing for the worker's necessary expenditure, if any, in connection with his employment and clear of all deductions."

I am not worrying with the last part. What is the meaning of this necessary expenditure? How is that incurred?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Before the Minister replies, I must say that I find this the most baffling section of all. I do not know if this "necessary expenditure" mean necessary expenditure in the income tax sense - "necessary expenditure" meaning what the Inland Revenue allows as necessary expenditure, or if somebody really is not going to think that "I live a little way away; so I have to pay bus fare," or you have to pay me my minimum wage plus my bus fare," or whatever it is.

As it is written, it does not correspond to any definition of wages with which I have ever dealt. Even the phrase "and clear of all deductions in respect of any matter whatsoever." I am still a little baffled about. It cannot be made clear of all P.A.Y.E. deductions.

(A VOICE: No, that is covered in the Income Tax Act.)

After allowing for the worker's necessary expenditure, it seems to me to put on the Chief Labour Officer and the managers of the plantations the necessity of acquiring the knowledge which the Commissioner of Income Tax and the income tax lawyers only acquire after years and years of practice as to what is allowable as necessary expenses and what is not. I do not know what it means.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, most of these plantations have small bits of land rented to the agricultural workers as small holdings and they pay in some cases 25 cents a week, or 10 cents a week for the land which is rented from the plantations. The other thing is that if the plantations have ground provisions - yams, potatoes, cassava, eddoes, and so on, they allow the workers to have some on a sort of credit basis, and it is normal practice to take it out weekly.

There are several plantations at which workers are allowed to get advance from the managers to be repaid weekly, by weekly deductions from their pay. All of these is what is referred to as necessary expenditure on arrangement between the worker and the estate. That is how I take it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: What he has just said is expenditure in connection with the worker's employment. If he was being employed or not being employed, whether the plantation owner rented the land to him, he would have to pay. That could not possibly be the explanation. That could not be the meaning of the word "in connection with his employment."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The position is that the plantation owners only rent this land to people whom they employ, and I am now looking into the Security of Tenure and Small Holders Act because what has been happening recently is that some people have been reaching the age of 70 years, and so on, and because they cannot work any longer they are pushed off the land and it is taken away from them.

I am looking into this matter to see what can be done for these people who have given of their days to the plantation, and now that they have reached the stage where they can work no longer on the plantation, the land is being taken away from them. That is being done in this country today and I am having a look at it; so, Mr. Chairman, you can appreciate what I am trying to say.

(ASIDES)

Representations have been made to the Ministry. I can only tell you what representations have been made to my Ministry. This is not fictitious; this is a fact and representation has been made to the Ministry in this respect. The position is that if you stop work on a plantation, they tell you: "Look, let me have the

land." Then they go and offer it to some other worker. This is normal practice. I have lived in an agricultural community for years. I have not just gone down there; I was born amongst them.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I appreciate that the Minister has this in his mind and I do not want to talk about the Security of Tenure and Small Holdings Act while we are discussing this Clause; but I do have some acquaintanceship with the problems of the Minister since I am informed as a lawyer that I, and I alone, have appeared in the only cases which arose out of the type of matter that he is talking about that have ever gone to the Supreme Court. I have appeared in a lot of these cases.

What the Minister may not know is that in 1955 when the Barbados Labour Party's Government brought in that legislation, it was intended then that the only way that you can give a man notice to move from an agricultural holding was if he farmed it badly. If the Minister studies the Act, he will find provision in it that the plantation must pay to any worker to whom it gives notice at least a year's rent - at least the minimum they must pay if they have given him notice on any grounds other than bad husbandry.

I have appeared in a number of cases in which plantations were surprised to discover that they had to give a man a year's rent at least because he had ceased to work on the plantation and they had given him notice to leave the land on that account. Therefore, I am well versed in that.

But I do not think it quite answers the queries which we are making because the answers which the Minister gave apply to deductions, not necessary expenses.

What he was talking about was lawful deductions that may be made under the Protection of Wages Act, and so on. What we want to know is why is it necessary to have this phrase in about "allowing for the worker's necessary expenditure, if any," because it seems to me, for example, that if the conditions of a man's work is that he wears uniform but that the employer does not pay for the uniform, you will now be making the employer pay for the uniform. It may be a good thing, but I wonder if it is recognised by the draftsman what they are doing.

The question of allowing for the worker's necessary expenses possibly can be "necessary expenses" under certain circumstances.

11.35 p. m.

It might well be that your plantation will require you to live in a tenantry so far away that you would be justified in taking transportation to get somewhere else. I just say this is a possibility; I do not know that is happens. That would be a necessary expenditure. I wonder if the draughtsmen know what they have allowed in when they allow in this subclause. I wonder if the Minister has a note of what the draughtsmen have in mind! He has explained about the deduction, but he has not explained about the necessary expendi-

ture. Certainly I find this is the most baffling of all the sections of the Bill after section 7 which is meaningless in one respect.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it is not baffling; it does not make sense. "Worker's necessary expenditure, if any" How can it be necessary if you say "if any". If it is necessary, it is necessary. What the hon. member says is perfectly true, but it is not a condition of his work. Forgive me for referring to myself, but I have a man who does a little kitchen gardening for me. I told him that to make some more money I have an extra acre of land, and that he could work that for the half. That is more or less on the same footing as what the Minister says. It is not part of his contract of work with me in the Kitchen garden that he has to do that work. That is something extra. Similarly if a man rents a spot of land, it is not incidental to his employment. It is not necessary expenditure in connection with his employment. The fact that you rent a man land because he is working with you on the plantation has no connections whatever. The two things are not connected in the least bit. It is a matter that all three of us as lawyers wonder what it means; therefore make a note of it and ask the draughtmen.

The question that Clause 10 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 11 was called. It reads as follows:-

11.(1) The employer of any sugar workers to whom an order under section 3 applies shall keep such records as are necessary to show whether or not the provisions of this Act or of any such order are being complied with as respects them and the records shall be retained by the employer for three years.

(2) The employer of any sugar workers shall post in the prescribed manner such notices as may be prescribed for the purpose of informing them of any order under section 3 affecting them, and if it is so prescribed, shall give notice in any other prescribed manner to the said worker of the said matter or on such other matters, if any, as may be prescribed.

(3) Any employer who fails to comply with any of the requirements of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding..... dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 11(3) there are two blanks. The fine is \$500 and the imprisonment is six months.

I beg to move that Clause 11 as amended, stand part.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a minor point, but the English of lines 4 and 5 could

be improved. ".....any such order are being complied with as respect....." You could alter "as respects". That is Bajan.

The question that Clause 11 as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 12 was called. It reads as follows:

12. The Chief Labour Officer, the Deputy Chief, Labour Officer, and any other Labour Officer or person authorised in writing by the Chief Labour Officer may -

- (a) require the production of wage sheets or other records of wages kept by an employer and inspect and examine such sheets or records and copy any material part thereof;
- (b) at all reasonable times enter the premises of any employer of sugar workers to whom an order under section 3 applies;
- (c) examine; either alone or in the presence of any other person, as he thinks fit, with respect to any matter under this Act, any person whom he has reasonable cause to believe to be or to have been a sugar worker to whom an order under section 3 applies or applied or the employer of any such person or a servant or agent of the employer and to require every such person to be so examined and to sign a declaration of the truth of the matters in respect of which he is examined:

Provided that no person shall be required under paragraph (c) to give any information tending to incriminate himself.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in that clause there are two Chiefs, and one should be deleted as you can only have one Chief.

I beg to move that Clause 12 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is the clause, Mr. Chairman, in which we think paragraph 4 of the Schedule should be included. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I think this is so obvious that I really would like the Minister to give some consideration now as to whether he could not agree to make paragraph 4 of the Second Schedule.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I promised the hon. member that I would make a note of the points raised. I have made a note of it already. I am no lawyer and I will discuss it with the legal draughtsmen.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The suggestion to be shown to the legal draughtsman is this: this is only off the cuff; so I hope the legal draughtman is not going to pour scorn on the suggestion when it comes up,

because I have left out a word. The suggestion is that there be a new paragraph (d) in this section and that paragraph (d) consist of the words "require" and then use paragraph 4 of the Second Schedule from "management" to the end. So paragraph (d) would read "Require the management of every sugar plantation and of every sugar factory....."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member would just repeat what he has said in respect of the new paragraph (d).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That the new paragraph (d) embody the provisions of paragraph 4 of the Second Schedule, because section 12 says what the Chief Labour Officer may and shall do, and paragraph 4 of the Second Schedule is one of the things that the Chief Labour Officer may do, and therefore you should collect them all together, and you will solve a lot of the difficulties, because you would be able to enforce section 14. There is a penalty attached to breach of section 12; so you would have a penalty attached to non-registration of a worker.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in the last line of this paragraph, the Minister should point out to the draughtsman the words "incriminate himself". Incriminate himself in respect of what! That is not as clear as it should be.

The question that Clause 12 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 13 was called. It reads as follows:

13.(1) Proceedings for an offence under this Act may be instituted in the name of the Chief Labour Officer or of any person authorised by him in writing in that behalf.

(2) The Chief Labour Officer or any person authorised in writing by him in that behalf may, if it appears to him that a sum is due from an employer to a sugar worker on account of the payment to him of wages less than the minimum wage, institute and conduct on behalf of and in the name of that worker civil proceedings for the recovery of that sum in a magistrate's court notwithstanding that such sum may exceed two hundred and fifty dollars.

(3) In any proceedings instituted under subsection (2) the court may make an order for the payment of costs by the Chief Labour Officer or other person so instituting the proceedings as if he were a party to the proceedings.

(4) The power given by subsection (2) for the recovery of sums due from an employer to a sugar worker shall not be in derogation of any right of the worker to recover such sums by civil proceedings.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 13 I should like to insert the words "or to" between the word "by" and the words "the Chief Labour Officer" in the third line, so that it reads "by or to the Chief Labour Officer".

I beg to move that Clause 13 as amended, stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now again, Mr. Chairman, I would have to study this over, but it seems to me that the words in that same amended clause are redundant. ".....as if he were a party to the proceedings." This clause deals with the situation where the Chief Labour Officer is party to the proceedings. It says that when he is a party to the proceedings he can get costs, and then at the end again you say "as if he were a party to the proceedings". This section gives power to the Chief Labour Officer to bring proceedings; so what is the point of saying that in any proceedings instituted under subsection (2), that is by the Chief Labour Officer, he can get costs "as if he were a party to the proceedings"? They are his proceedings; so you do not need to say "as if he were a party". That is a question of misunderstanding on the part of the draughtsmen.

It has been drawn to my attention by the hon. senior member for Christ Church that there is "or other person", but the other person can only be a person authorised by the Chief Labour Officer in writing to institute the proceedings. The whole point is that you do not draft Bills in these ways because there will be some doubt, if you leave that as it is, whether if the worker brings his own proceedings against the employer, you can then order costs not only for the sugar worker, but for the Chief Labour Officer. That is the only thing it could mean, and obviously that is not what is intended. This section gives the Chief Labour Officer the power to be a party, and therefore when he is getting costs, he is getting costs on the basis that he is a party; so to say "as if he were a party to the proceedings" is foolishness. Either he or the Deputy Chief Labour Officer is a party. What I envisage will happen is that either the proceedings will be brought in the Chief Labour Officer's name or he will assign an officer to bring actions just as the City Council really sends officers to Court to bring actions in the City Council's name, but the Mayor and Corporation do not appear. There is an officer who brings the actions, and probably the Chief Labour Officer will have an officer too.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, if the word "he" in that line were changed to "the latter", then there could be no reference to the Chief Labour Officer. It would mean "or any other person bringing the case."

The question that Clause 13 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

11.45 a.m.

Clause 14 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 14, line 2, I beg to move the substitution of the word "Deputy" for the word "Deputy". I beg to move that Clause 14, as amended, stand part.

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

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

Clause 15 was called and passed.

Clause 16 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 16 stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is pure lawyers' objection, and it has nothing to do with sugar workers or anything else. This is not the way to draft Clause 16. You do not say "Notwithstanding section 114....." You say "Notwithstanding the provisions of....." "Notwithstanding anything contained in....." Section 114 is not a legal entity; it is "the provisions of section 114". That is a matter of draftsman's language. That is point 1.

I will refer to point 2. Section 114 of the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act which deals with the limitation of time within which cases can be heard in the Magistrates' Court, does not say that the information cannot be laid except within six months. It says that the Magistrate can only try on information if it is laid within six months. If you give power to lay information within a year, you are not in fact affecting Section 114. What you have to say is that "Notwithstanding anything contained in..... a magistrate shall have power to try any information which is laid within a year." In any case, you do not need to mention section 114, because section 114 says: "Except as otherwise expressly provided by an enactment." If you want to allow these matters to be tried within a year you just say: "Prosecutions under this Act may be brought within a year", or "Magistrates are empowered to hear prosecutions brought within one year." This is just a badly drafted section showing signs of very hasty and inexperienced work.

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

Clauses 17, 18 and 19 were called and passed.

The First Schedule was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in paragraph 2 of the First Schedule, I would like to suggest the insertion of the following words after the word "mechanics" in the first line - "and other factory workers".

In paragraph 2, the addition of the following category and rate of wage as category (iv):-

- "(iv) Other Factory Worker.....
an increase of 7 cents per hour over
and above the rates of wages existing
immediately before the coming into
force of this Act.

I beg to move that this be the First Schedule, as amended.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I gather that this has some reference to the definition problems involving legislating for "A" class men without saying who "A" class men are. That has already been raised in the speeches of other members and, therefore, I am not going to pursue it. When I first looked at this Act and I saw "A" class men and "B" class men and I asked what they were, nobody could explain exactly what they were. The only definition of an "A" class man is that he is an "A" class man. Does it go with age, or the ability to do certain things?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, there are three specifications for an "A" class worker to perform. He either has to cut canes or dig cane holes, or dig drains. Either of the three makes him an "A" class worker. A man who does one of these three and carries out manure and so on is a "B" class worker.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the lucidity of the hon. member for St. Thomas' explanation. By not defining these things, at every prosecution you will have to call an expert from a plantation to say who is an "A" class and who is a "B" class worker. A man will have to prove that he is an "A" class worker, or the Chief Labour Officer will have to prove it. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that it is messy, where you have different classes specified in an Act of Parliament and you have to rely on special knowledge as to what the classes are. You have these words: "..... pursuant to an agreement reached between organisations representing such workers and the employers in the sugar industry." How are you going to prove in court that the organisations are the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation? There is nothing in the Act which says so. This is something which seems to be almost impossible to prove.

Are you going to say the Act of Parliament says "pursuant to an agreement reached between organisations," and we think Parliament meant the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation? Mr. Chairman, I really have the feeling that a court would be taking a great deal on itself to accept something like that. The Agreement should be scheduled just as you would find in different Acts. When we adhere to the Vienna Convention of Diplomatic Relations, we schedule the conventions in exactly the same way as you schedule the agreement. There is nothing in this Act saying whom the agreement was made between. How are you going to prove in court that these were the task rates which apply to that particular type of job? How can we do that without scheduling the agreement in order to have clear evidence of what we are doing?
11.55 p. m.

I may have just said that we all know that the Agreement was meant to be between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation, but that is exactly what you cannot get in Court and say. You cannot get in Court and say: "They said in

Parliament that it was those organisations and therefore that goes." Mr. Chairman, in my very humble opinion, no court should accept that Agreement. No Court should accept proof of these words as they stand. They are too vague. The Schedule in the Agreement is not as difficult as all that. I daresay that copies are possible. Make the Agreement the third Schedule.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest through the Minister to the draftsman that the definition given by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas - at first I thought he would have said that "A" class men are tall men and "B" class men are short men. (Laughter) If the employer is to register a man, let him make the decision. He registers "Browne" as "A" class and he registers "Jones" as "B" class and then there is no difficulty. He can think of it in the definition Clause, but put the onus on the employer. If he registers a man as "A" class, well, he is satisfied that he is "A" class.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there are things in law which one has to prove, which are questions of fact, and there are things of which one takes judicial notice. What the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is asking us to do is to write in the Agreement or make provision for writing in the Agreement from time to time in the Act itself and the only difference is that it would not have to be proved as a fact when the Court should take judicial notice of the Agreement. I really do not see this because, in any case, in the Court there are things which have to be proved and things of which you take judicial notice. In so far as "A" class men and "B" class men are concerned, the first time that the employer gave an "A" class worker "B" class pay, he would soon find out who is an "A" class man and who is a "B" class man, because the worker was not going to accept "B" class pay if he is a "A" class man, although the "B" class worker may accept "A" class pay, and the average working man is not going to object to somebody else being promoted to "A" class, but the "A" class is certainly going to object to being demoted to "B" class. Therefore, the question as to whether a man is "A" class or is not in the definition of an "A" class or "B" class worker, is a question of fact, and you have an Organisation on both sides which will be able to iron out any disputes as to the relative categories in which these people should be designated from time to time. A man is not an "A" class worker or "B" class worker for all time. His category may change depending upon his capability; therefore I do not think that that should concern us so much.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church, at an earlier stage, raised the question of a man power survey. We have actually had experts down here working on the question of man power surveys. We have written not only the sugar industry and the Workers' Union Organisation on this matter, but we have actually written the Barbados Chamber of Commerce, according to my recollection - whether it was a formal circular sent to them or otherwise - and the Employers' Federation about the categorisation of workers in all industries. For instance, right in the

Public Works we have a problem arising out of every salaries revision, and we have asked several organisations to get together and let us have a general classification so that this is something which is under investigation now, for at least, I think, four years. The fact that we have not come out with job classification - we have done some kind of manpower survey in the Economic Planning Unit, and what we are doing now is to work out a manpower budget for the island, because we are not satisfied that in an island where there is unemployment we should have an organisation asking us to import into this island 1,500 workers to take out of the island something like \$75,000 a week on the average for four months of the year. We think that there should be training in the island in order to have people in the several different avenues of employment which are still open. As far as I am concerned, as long as we have a sugar industry in Barbados with all its bad history, sociological and otherwise, we will have trouble, and the sooner we have dignified labour for the people in this island by diversification and industrialisation and creating other job opportunities, the better it will be for the economic and social health of the island. We are going to have these things with us as long as we have the present economic structure of the sugar industry. I would not like the House to go away tonight feeling that because we have stood up until midnight, I am going to say: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter into thy reward", wherever it is supposed to get a reward, because if it is not this year, it will be next year. As long as you have agitators and as long as you have irresponsible people in the country, we will always have trouble. Well, we will have to face it in the same way as we have confronted the problem which has faced us in 1968.

The question that this be the First Schedule of the Bill as amended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Second Schedule was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in the fifth line in paragraph 1 of this Schedule, I should like to have the word "each" substituted for the word "any". I beg to move that this be the second Schedule of the Bill as amended.

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

The question that this be the Second Schedule of the Bill as amended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in moving the third reading of this Bill, I should like to make an amendment to the long title. In the fourth line I should like to substitute the word "incidental" for the word "incidental". With that amendment, I beg to move that this Bill as amended be now read a third time.

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

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

12.05 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not propose to do any more Government Business at this sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday 6th March, 1968 at 12 o'clock (noon), Tuesday being the last day of the Test Match as far as I make out. If hon. members would like to meet on Tuesday, it would be all right.

I should also like to say that the Minister of Finance on Wednesday proposes to lay and to have the first reading of the Appropriation Bill and to lay the Estimates at this time of the year, as hon. members know. The following week we propose to go into Committee of Supply on the Estimates for the next financial year. I think hon. members should know this.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If, as the Leader of the House has said, the Estimates are to be laid at the

next meeting and the intention is to have them done at the meeting after, can the Minister of Finance indicate whether we are going to be asked to pass supplementary estimates of \$362,000 to Capital? It is the second item under the First Order of today's Government Business. The same question applies to the Resolution for \$242,000 under the first item.

It is only one week and then we will be asked to pass the regular Estimates the following week. We have been asked to deal with these two reasonably large sums of money at this time. This is Development Board estimates.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: We need this money now for people who are waiting to move into factories. As far as I remember, this \$300,000 odd is a sum that we are providing for people waiting to move into factories which we are providing for about seven new industries. Every week counts as far as I am concerned.

Now, it is possible that we would not exhaust this vote by the 31st March. In this case, we can come back for a supplementary; but in the three weeks or so that we have, they would be vital as far as the industrial programme is concerned. I therefore have to ask hon. members to pass this sum. If it lapses, it lapses. Unfortunately, I do not allow them to spend the money before the House approves of it.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Wednesday, 6th March, 1968, at 12 o'clock (noon) was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

12.13 a.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 6th March, 1968

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that there are the Minutes of four meetings, which, according to my information, have been duly circulated amongst hon. members. They are the Minutes for Tuesday, 13th February, Friday, 16th February, Tuesday, 20th February and Tuesday, 27th February, all of this year. Unless I hear any objection, I will declare the Minutes of the meeting of the 13th February duly confirmed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on page 2 line 12 from the bottom left hand corner, we have the word "Ddputy". That is a minor error for correction.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. junior member for St. Peter for drawing the error to my attention. The word "Deputy" is spelt by the Government Printery "Ddputy". I will have it corrected.

As to the Minutes of the meeting of Friday, 16th February, unless any errors are drawn to my attention, I will, and I so do now, declare those Minutes to be duly confirmed.

As to the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday 20th February, unless I hear any objection, I will declare them, and so I do now, duly confirmed.

Lastly, the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 27th February, are now before the House for confirmation. Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of that meeting now duly to be confirmed.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the Draft Estimates for the Financial Year 1968-69.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, I am commanded to lay the Report of the Registrar of Trade Unions for the year 1966-67.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$63,901 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I- Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 59 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$3,604 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I- Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1967-68 No. 60 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$4,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1967-68 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 61 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$393,226 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1967-68 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1967-68 No. 62 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act 1960, the Annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1968-69.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

Mr. LYNCH entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker with respect to Resolutions Nos. 1, 2 and 3, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting in order to deal with these Resolutions in all their stages.

In respect of Resolution No. 4, copies of which will be circulated to hon. members, it is the intention of the Hon. Minister to ask the leave of the House to proceed with this Resolution today in all of its stages. When hon. members read the text of the Resolution, they will see the reason for the urgency.
12.25 p.m.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice that reply to Parliamentary Question No. 149 asked by the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. Thomas, is now ready;

Also, reply to Parliamentary Question No. 150, asked by the same hon. member, is now ready;

On behalf of myself I give notice that reply to Parliamentary Question No. 30, asked by the same hon. member is now ready;

Also, reply to Parliamentary Question No. 46 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter;

Also, reply to Parliamentary Question No. 76, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph;

Also, reply to Parliamentary Question No. 90, asked by the same hon. member;

Also, reply to Parliamentary Question No. 116, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James;

Also, reply to Parliamentary Question No. 136, asked by the same hon. member.

These replies are all now ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I beg to give notice of the following replies to Parliamentary Questions:-

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 101, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas;

Also, reply to Parliamentary Question No. 114, asked by the same hon. member.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the year ending on the thirty First day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine, was read a first time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Through some unfortunate misplacing of papers, this notice which I had given to the Clerk was not circulated to hon. members, but it is being circulated now. So I beg to give notice of this Resolution:-

RESOLVED that this House takes note of the report of a letter recently sent by the Ministry of External Affairs, purporting to act on behalf of the Government Party in this Honourable House, to His Honour the President of the Senate seeking permission for the use of the anteroom of the Senate by members of that Party:

This House further notes that the Leader of the House in forwarding this request to His Honour the President of the Senate declared that for some time it had been considered necessary to review the accommodation now used by Parliament with a view to making better provision for the comfort and convenience of both Chambers;

This House, being unaware of any Resolution of the House on the above matter or of any review of the necessity for considering the state of its accommodation, considers it a gross breach of its privileges on the part of the Leader of the House in purporting to act on behalf of the whole House and calls on Mr. Speaker at least to admonish him for this unwarranted and contemptuous conduct;

This House, moreover, will view with grave displeasure any action by the Honourable Senate which, by entertaining or approving of the aforesaid request purports to make arrangements for the accommodation of certain of the members of this Honourable House.

I would just like to say that notice of this Resolution was given on the 27th February, 1968.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY re PASSING OF Mr. J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds to the Business of the Day, I shall like to move the following Resolution:-

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THIS HOUSE place on record its profound sympathy at the death of Mr. John Hadley Wilkinson, O.B.E., a former Member of the House for the parish of St. James, 1931 -51.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Wilkinson.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members, would have heard with sorrow and regret of Mr. Wilkinson's death. There, probably, are no more than four or five hon. members of this House at the moment, including Your Honour, who have had the privilege of sitting in Parliament - the Legislature as it then was - with the late hon. member.

He served in this House for twenty unbroken years and left only at the General Election of 1951. Within that period his service to the House and country was in every way distinguished. He acted as Chairman of Committees of this Hon. House on several occasions. He was foremost in the constitutional experiment with which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was himself so very closely connected, and the late hon. member, as Your Honour recalls, was the first recognised Leader of the Opposition under that constitutional development.
12.35 p.m.

Before that, of course, he had served as a member of the Executive Committee and Executive Council of this Island, he had been awarded the O.B.E. for distinguished public service in 1936; he was also, in addition to his service in this Honourable House in national politics, very much concerned and very deeply involved in Local Government, having been a member of the St. Michael's Vestry as well as the St. James' Vestry for some time during that period. He was Chairman of several organisations not in any way connected with politics - the Transport Board, the Win-the-War Fund, and of course in charge of rationing some time during World War II.

Mr. Wilkinson was, as everyone knows, a Conservative in politics, but this in no way, Mr. Speaker, detracted from the high esteem in which he was held and the very deservedly high repute which he shared with his contemporaries and with all who came into contact with him. It can certainly and safely be said of him both by those who associated with him closely in politics whether in this House or in the two Vestries that he was a thorough gentleman, that his outlook, though conservative, was by no means hide-bound or reactionary, and that he made a distinguished contribution to his life and times.

There are others who, apart from politics, associated with him in business and in the commercial life of this country in the last half century. They will speak of his rectitude, of his integrity and of his commanding sense of fairplay. I myself did not have the honour of knowing him as a person, although I knew him by sight and had spoken with him briefly on three or four occasions; but I am sure that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, you yourself, Your Honour, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and I believe the hon. junior member for Christ Church, my colleague, all of whom sat with him in this House, can testify to the service which he rendered to his country and to his probity in public affairs.

It is never a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to move this kind of motion because although we do it as a

duty, as I have said before, every bereavement is first and foremost a personal bereavement, and the sense of loss which hon. members feel cannot of course be matched by the loss which has been sustained by his wife and by his close relatives. I am sure the whole House in paying tribute to him today will wish to have its profoundest sympathy extended to his relatives whose loss we share quite fully.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is with a little difficulty that I second this, not difficulty in seconding of itself, but difficulty in speaking of Mr. Wilkinson, because I think all hon. members who know me will know that I am not addicted to exaggeration in anything I may have to say; but I do say of Mr. Wilkinson that in all the years that I have been associated with politicians in the House of Assembly since 1937, more than thirty years, I have never found a political opponent for whom I had higher respect than I do for Mr. Wilkinson.

When I was Leader of the Government, I could always feel - and I say this with no political implications, no desire to reflect on the conduct of some hon. members today, and I say it without any exaggeration and from the bottom of my heart - you looked upon Mr. Wilkinson as the Leader of the Opposition or as a member who differed from you politically, as a man whom you could one hundred per cent trust, who never said anything just for effect, who never lost his temper, who never used an abusive word in this House or on a public platform against people who differed from him. Mr. Wilkinson had often left his place when I was Premier and come round to me and made a suggestion which I welcomed. He would often ask me, at least on two or three occasions I can remember, not to proceed with this Bill because they were not ready for it in the Opposition, and it would not hurt if we postponed it for a week, and without the slightest hesitation, I always said "O.K., Mr. Wilkinson." He was not trying to put anything on me or on the Government. He merely felt that if we were to have a good debate, both sides of the question should be presented, and as he and his Party were not quite ready for the debate, he would ask me to hold off for a week. Invariably I said "yes". He was not the kind of man, however much any extremist political detractor might say that we were playing up the Opposition or anything of that sort, to do a thing like that for political gain. He was just honest and sincere, and a man whom you would welcome to have as an opponent. He never played up to us in the sense of saying something which he thought would please the Government and assuage any strong feeling on our side. He put the Conservative case strongly and honestly, and we respected him for that. That is why I began to say, Mr. Speaker, that I found it difficult to speak on a motion of this sort, because even though this may sound in the language of extravagance, I say that in all my political life before I came to this House and after I came into this House, I have never met a man of whom I could say more than I can say of Mr. Wilkinson,

that he was fair, fair-minded and honest in all he did. I cannot remember a single occasion on which I felt that Mr. Wilkinson was saying something on the floor of the House merely for effect or merely because it would catch a few votes for the Conservatives in the next elections. I cannot give him too high praise.

That much abused word "gentleman", a word which most of us try to avoid using, was most appropriate in his case. He was a thorough Victorian, if you like, gentleman in the highest sense of that word, not giving you a dirty deal, not misleading you, not lying to you, not just making a political point, but a man who sincerely and from the bottom of his heart told you what he felt, and, respecting your views, nevertheless stuck to his own. The Hon. Leader of the House has recounted the positions which he held. I think the hon. senior member for Bridgetown will join me in saying that while Mr. Wilkinson was here in the House, we always felt we would get the Conservative view put fairly and honestly, and not for reasons of Party politics.

If I go on any further I would only be repeating what I said. He was a thorough gentleman, a most honest and sincere man and of all the politicians I have known on the floor of this House since I first became a member in 1937, I do not know anyone whom I would praise higher. There were other Conservatives here who were straightforward, and now we look back on the old, what you might call, unhappy days, or the old happy days by comparison with the days today; but of all of the then Government's opponents, I do not think anyone or very many like himself, liberal although they always voted Conservative, but liberal in their views - Mr. Lisle Smith, Sir John Chandler, Mr. Julian Mahon, Mr. Laurie Yearwood, all the old capitalist, planter, merchant brigade of those days were liberal and many of them were very liberal in their views, although they always voted against us, but you felt that they spoke from the bottom of their hearts, and you felt glad to know that you had opponents who would stress strongly their point of view, what they considered for the good of the community, and although we did not agree with them, you nevertheless respected them. I do not think any member of the Barbados Labour Party who was in the Government in those days had the slightest reason whatever to say in this House or on a public platform anything really derogatory of those persons for holding their views. The most we could say was that that is the Conservative point of view, that is the planters' point of view, that is the merchants' point of view, but these are rather different days, we have to get rid of all that. That was the most we could say.

I have never known Mr. Wilkinson to raise his voice, never known him to show the slightest signs of anger, and I know this from one campaign that the Party waged in St. James when we, as far as my memory goes, first ran the present Minister of Social Services for a seat in St. James, never could we attack Mr. Wilkinson except on the ground that he was a Conservative merchant.

12.45 p.m.

Never in his life did I ever hear that Mr. Wilkinson descended to abusing, let alone speaking of the personal character of his opponent or of his family, as so unfortunately it recently happened in this Chamber. In short, Mr. Speaker, he was a man, politically speaking, taking all in all, that we shall not look upon his like again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we, today, pay tribute to John Hadley Wilkinson, retired merchant and ex-politician. I, who would know more and better than anybody else in this country, can say he was truly a statesman. I first came into contact with Mr. Wilkinson, for the benefit of all members in this House, as a canvasser. In those days many, many, years ago, I found, of all the politicians in this country, that he was one of the easiest men to talk to.

As time went on, as you and members of this House know, Sir, I joined the Party of which he was Chairman. In due course, I succeeded him as Chairman. I want to say here, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, there has never been a more liberal man in this country of the Conservative Party than John Hadley Wilkinson. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, he was one man whose word you could take. There was nothing mean about him. As I said, I am in a position to say that, like all Parties, when meetings were held by us to discuss matters which would come before the House the following Tuesday, I, at times, was really surprised at the views which he would express, and how he would assist me in bringing round other members of the Party to a compromise. He has often said that it is always better to give up a portion than to have to give up all. That was during the Bushe experiment.

I can well remember, Sir, during the campaign in St. James, as the Leader of the Opposition said - and would to God I could see this in Barbados again before I pass on! John Hadley Wilkinson's chief opponent was the now Minister of Social Services. Of course, I may add that while it may be said that they were both out of a different cloth, from a financial point of view, they were both gentlemen. I recall John Hadley Wilkinson saying: "Talma, let us go out of this House and have lunch; let us have a drink; I do not quite agree with all of your views." Talma stuck to his guns, and Wilkinson stuck to his guns, but there was no character assassination, there was no abuse, there was no vilification; there was just a question of putting the point of view of the Conservative and the point of view of the then Socialist.

Mr. Wilkinson served on several Boards in this country before he came to this House as a member. I think Mr. Wilkinson will best be remembered in this country for the work which he did on the Transport Board. It was John Hadley Wilkinson who saved many a man in this country from himself. It was John Hadley Wilkinson who brought up the suggestion and got legislation enacted to prevent 6, 8 and 10 buses running on one route. It was John Hadley Wilkinson who saved many a man from having his property sold.

I have had the privilege of travelling with him on Saturday nights when the idea was to allot routes in

the various areas to transport operators. This is the sort of thing which he will best, in my opinion, be remembered for. Today some of the operators of these routes still will look at me as, possibly, their enemy. Mr. Wilkinson in those days felt, and I always remember him saying: "Mottley, it is stupid to allow five or six people to operate on one route. From a business point of view they are doing nothing: waiting at a door calling for people; picking them up at their work and so on. This will never work. It is time we have a proper service and allot routes to various people driving in Black Rock, Jacksons Road and so on."

I recall this for many reasons. There were several people on the Black Rock route of the Wilkinson class. I remember discussing with him one night when we were coming back home this question. I asked him what he thought about the matter. He said: "I think the route run by Stuart is giving the best service; it is the cleanest and so on." There was never a question of his saying: "Because a man is in my class, I am going to give it to him instead of giving a man who was giving the best service."

I know, today, although he has lived to a ripe age and has passed three score years and ten, none of us can get accustomed to death. As a man who was not born among us; he lived among us for over sixty odd years, and he has always told us: "While I was born in England, I am more Barbadian than many people who were born here and just went to England."

Today we regret very much to record his passing and, in doing so, I join with the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, as I have already done personally as the ex-Chairman of my Party, in expressing condolence to his family.
1.00 p.m.

I now associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I believe that both of those hon. members are sincere in what they have said, because, although the Hon. Leader of the House did not have much to do with Mr. Wilkinson as a member of this House, I am sure that he would have heard and would have come into contact with people who, on authority, would have told him of his services to the community as a Commissioner of Health and a member of the Road Board - his services to this country on the Transport Board - and on nearly every other Board operating in this country in those days, Mr. Wilkinson served. As I said, in my view, he will best be remembered for bringing about the Transport services which we have today, because hon. members will remember when the train went out and the tramcar went out and people just picked up money blindly and bought buses and went here and there scampering about. I was very much impressed at the time when the firm of Eckstein Brothers tried to get all the routes in this country, I repeat, I had the privilege of going around with Mr. Wilkinson to see, unknown to people, how the routes were being cared for, at night, not during the day, when people could see, and I know that the big operators felt that they

would have the entire services of the country; but Mr. Wilkinson was man enough and was fair enough to make his recommendations which were adhered to.

It is true that he was Chairman of the Conservative Party, but I would say this. If ever a Liberal man and an Ultra-Liberal man existed in public life in this country, it was J. H. Wilkinson. I associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; "May he rest in peace!"

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, occasions of this sort make it somewhat difficult for one not to be understood when he has to speak for a colleague who was once in this Hon. Chamber. Now, Sir, it is more difficult having to speak after the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. I would have to scratch for a few words in order not to be misunderstood. Sir, Mr. Wilkinson had all the ingredients that were there to make him a gentleman, and he was a gentleman. He was sympathetic, kind, respectable, intelligent and always ready to give you that smile. Do you know, Sir, that Mr. Wilkinson never gave us at that time the slightest thought that he would even think of segregating himself when we assembled at that lunch table on afternoons? He always greeted us there, he would always sit with us, he would always give us a joke and that smile. I am sure that he never thought of segregating himself from among something looking like me. I can remember when they once ran a candidate against me in St. Joseph, Mr. Wilkinson was at Horse Hill for the first meeting. I can remember his speech very well, as I always loved to attend my opponents' meetings. That is the only way in which I can throw them down - by attending their meetings. Mr. Wilkinson said: "I have nothing against Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has come from among you. Mr. Smith, I am glad to say, is a gentleman, but, as you know, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Smith is in another camp. I have nothing at all to say against Mr. Smith. The question is with you and you have to decide for yourself. If you feel that Mr. Smith is worthwhile returning, I, John Hadley Wilkinson, will bow to your decision." And the people of St. Joseph did it. They felt that I needed to be returned and Mr. Wilkinson's candidate was made much smaller than what he was.

Now, Sir, when one has to speak like this, bearing in mind that Mr. Wilkinson was a rich man representing his class of people, and I am a poor man representing my class of people, as I said in my opening remarks, there is a possibility of my being misunderstood. They will say that Mr. Smith is praising up a Conservative; but if a Conservative have done his duty to the country, which Mr. Wilkinson did well, it would be fair and honest to let the people of this country and those all over the world, know that Mr. Wilkinson was a gentleman. I cannot find out, after thinking about the work which Mr. Wilkinson has done for Barbados, why he was not knighted.
1.05 p.m.

He is responsible for helping to mould or remould Barbados. He is responsible for stepping up

the progress of this country. He is responsible for thinking in terms. I would not say that it is everything which he voted for or everything with which he was in agreement, but in Mr. Wilkinson, comparatively speaking, we had no opposition. Comparatively speaking, when you think of the Housing Board, which is not for Mr. Wilkinson's class, but for my class; when you think of the assistance that was given to the peasants of this country by way of the Peasants' Loan Bank - well, it was not for his class - it was for my class.

Speaking under correction, if my memory serves me well, he was responsible for the remuneration of members in this Hon. Chamber. I think he was in here at that time. I know he was here long before. However, he never gave us the trouble that we would expect when we were seeking to take money out of his pocket. He would speak his mind; in other words, I do not know if I took a leaf out of his book or if he took one out of mine because he would speak his mind and finish there. He had no malice or anything of the sort after he spoke his mind. If he had to vote for a measure, he would vote for it, and if his conscience told him to vote against it, he would do so.

Sir, as I have said, at that time when we met in this Chamber, we met as brethren; we met as children from one family and when we were out in the lunch room, well, then, we met as if we were all in one bedroom. Sir, it grieves me now to say so. I cannot say so today. Whither are we now? Look around this Table and see. It should be on the reverse; it should be that we meet now as brethren; it should be that when we go out in the lunch room, we should be closer. But, Sir, it is the reverse.

I regret to say it, but what I have in mind to say, I say it regardless of the consequences. How would one feel now looking at us and hearing what is happening and what is seeking to be done? You are seeking segregation among your own ranks; your own members. In those days, out yonder, when it should be expected that there was segregation in this House, that was not so. I hate to call the word, but at that time it was white and black - and very few blacks.

Today, Sir, it is grievous when we lose one that was amongst us for one to talk in the way that I have just spoken because I feel that in all cases it is not the colour that does it. It is the mind and this gentleman, the late John Hadley Wilkinson, was a man that was born. There are some who were hatched. Our behaviour and actions would make one feel that one is hatched. On the other hand, the behaviour and actions of some of us would make one know that you were born. The late Mr. Wilkinson was born and remained a born gentleman.

May he rest in peace!

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I consider it only fitting and proper that I should add my short quota to the numerous tributes which have been made here this morning and which have been very ably made by the various members who have spoken on

the occasion of the passing of the late John Hadley Wilkinson. I would like to endorse the sentiments which have been so well expressed by the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for the City whom, I believe, knew the late gentleman better than any of us in this Chamber. I also endorse the sentiments expressed by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who has just spoken.

I have had the privilege of opposing the late gentleman, John Hadley Wilkinson, when I contested a seat in the parish of St. James in the year 1942 as a member of the Barbados Labour Party. I was unsuccessful by the type of clean fight, but I can say that I gained great respect from both of the members for St. James in the gallant and clean manner in which the elections were contested and the various courtesies which were extended to me even on the days of the actual nominations and polling. It was unlike the behaviour which prevails nowadays.

The late Mr. Wilkinson was a fair-minded, courteous, cultured and a knowledgeable gentleman whether he was Conservative, Liberal, or whatever you may have regarded him as. Of course, we all knew he was Conservative to the backbone, but the fact remains that he was in my opinion one of the most knowledgeable, courteous and constructive statesman that ever graced this Chamber in my time, and I think that we would do very well if we had a few more Wilkinsons around today, even though he might have been Conservative in outlook.

I know, Sir, that he made a great contribution to the various statutory Boards and the various Government bodies. He was a member of the Vestries of both St. Michael and Saint James for very many long years and played a prominent part in the Transport Board, the Housing Authority and the various Sugar Boards of which he was an expert.

The whole community has sustained a great loss in the passing of the late Mr. Wilkinson and I too, join in paying tribute to his passing and trust that he may rest in peace.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not think, Sir, that it is unorthodox for so junior a member of this august Assembly to rise to endorse the tributes paid to the late J. H. Wilkinson. I find myself in the very honoured position to sit in this august Chamber where the late gentleman used to sit. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that he was a statesman and, more so, a gentleman. 1.15 p.m.

I rise on behalf of the constituents of St. James to express their heart-felt sorrow and to extend to his bereaved family the hope that he has gone from this earth, but may he in the Far Beyond live as great a life. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the other hon. members who spoke before me are much more qualified to speak of his political behaviour in Parliament, and from what I heard here this morning, I can only say that he carried his seat with the dignity of a true Parliamentarian. On behalf of myself and my junior

colleague who unfortunately is not in his place, I wish to endorse the sentiments expressed by the other speakers, and may I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying, may he rest in peace, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant!" for thank God to his country he has done his duty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put this question, I crave the indulgence of hon. members to add a word to what has been said in memory of the late Mr. J. H. Wilkinson. I knew him as a member of this Chamber, I knew him extremely well as Chairman of the Central Road Board and the Transport Board. It was indeed a very great privilege to serve under that supremely tactful man. From him I learned so much of the art of Chairmanship, and never was there a man whom I have met so unfailingly courteous at all times. Verily he was one of Nature's gentlemen. As it is recorded, in the First Book of Chronicles in the 29th Chapter, of David the son of Jesse who reigned over all Israel, so may it appropriately be said of the late lamented John Hadley Wilkinson "and he died in a good old age, full of days, riches and honour."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to say that in communication with Mr. Tom Wilkinson this morning, I believe members would like to go to the funeral. I noticed you were going to put the question, but before you do, I am certain hon. members would like to be pall bearers and the funeral will be at St. George's Church at 4.15 p.m. I know that the Leader of the House has consented to adjourn at 2.30 p.m. so that hon. members can get away and be able to go to the funeral.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I intended notifying hon. members that the funeral takes place at 4.15 p.m. o'clock today punctually at St. George's Parish Church. I am asking hon. members to associate themselves in the usual way with the passing of this Resolution by standing in their places for two minutes.

Members stood in their places for two minutes.

I declare this Resolution unanimously to have passed, and I direct that the Clerks at the Table forward the appropriate communication to the widow of the late Mr. Wilkinson, and I leave it to the Hon. Leader of the House at the appropriate moment to move the adjournment of the Sitting in order that the attendance of hon. members at St. George's Parish Church may be facilitated, as it is hoped and expected that certain hon. members at a certain stage be amongst the bearers of the coffin of the former distinguished Parliamentarian.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended. This is the one under which the meal time recesses operate. This would enable us to go straight through until 2.30 p.m., and we would have at least an hour and five minutes for work which I would suggest would be Government Business, Committee of Supply. If at 2.30 p.m. when

we are taking the adjournment we have not completed very much, we will then have to consult about when next we will meet, but we will definitely stop at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I understood that we would be adjourning at 2.00 o'clock so that hon. members would be on time for the funeral. You have to bear in mind that I live a good way out in the country, and one would have to go home and cool off, bathe and things of the sort. 2.30 p.m. is a little too late, and I would appeal to the Hon. Leader of the House to adjourn at 2.00 o'clock so that there will be no need for the suspension of the Standing Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually the 2.30 p.m. o'clock motion ~~has~~ not yet been seconded. I thought the hon. senior member for St. Joseph rose to second it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I certainly do not mind amending my motion, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I do not need to amend it. I do not mind withdrawing it, but I think hon. members will appreciate that we would like to do some Government Business today. Would they then like to come back at 6.00 p.m.?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to co-operate with the Hon. Leader of the House and do everything to get through with the work because we have a lot of work on the Order Paper and the Estimates have been laid, and the reply has not yet been given to the Budgetary Proposals for last year and things of that sort. Rather than coming back at 6 p.m. what about tomorrow morning? We had a good time watching the cricket and we should give up time now to do the Government's Business; so the hon. member could come back tomorrow morning or Friday morning at 10 o'clock if he cares and let us fire through until night, because coming from the funeral this evening would not afford much time. There are very few shops up there, but I might still stop somewhere and "fire" one, and I am liable to be late coming back here at 6 o'clock. So let us waive that at the moment, and let us come back tomorrow morning or Friday morning or even Saturday, because I am willing to do some work. I hope the Hon. Leader of the House will accommodate me and give us as much time as to get through with our reply to the Budgetary Proposals and so on the Order Paper. 6.00 o'clock is entirely out of the question. I am not voting for 6 o'clock. 1.25 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had official intimation that the Leader of the House is willing to adjourn at two o'clock. I am glad to know that he is willing to withdraw his 2.30 motion. I would like to agree with my colleague from St. Joseph that it is far better to meet on Friday and, as far as I am concerned, from 6 o'clock in the morning is all right for me. Any hour that suits the Leader of the House on Friday will be all right for me. I would suggest that we adjourn until Friday and not until later this afternoon at six o'clock. Friday is the day we are accustomed to meeting when we do not meet on Tuesday.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, may I just, through you, put to the other side whether Friday at ten o'clock suits them? (Mr. MOTTLEY: Friday at ten o'clock would neither suit the Speaker nor the Deputy Speaker. Make it twelve o'clock.) Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw the motion which I made.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the indulgence of the House to withdraw the motion which he originally made. I hear no objection, and I declare that motion to be withdrawn.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is Government Business No. 1. It is for the Hon. Leader of the House to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that some paltry sum for the University Grant is not controversial, and it should be the First Order of the Day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that there be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to deal with a Resolution for \$393,226 of which notice was given earlier in today's Sitting.

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

The question was put and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 62

A Resolution for \$393,226 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. I think it speaks for itself.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1967-68 No. 47

Head 3 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, Head 3, - Parliament - Item 25 - Commonwealth Parliamentary Association - \$1,500. Hon. members are already familiar with this. I beg to move that Item 25, Head 3 - Parliament - stand part.

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

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

Head 18 - Economic Planning Unit - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18 stand part.

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

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

Head 36 - Waterworks - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the explanatory notes set out, I believe, the reasons for this expenditure. The expenditure under this Item, hon. members know, is recoverable. I beg to move that Head 36 stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in a sense it is a bit unfortunate that this is the particular Resolution which has been introduced, because we could not possibly on this side regard a \$240,000 supplementary estimate on March 6 for the Waterworks, under the control of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. We could not possibly regard this as an uncontroversial matter. One only has to think of the condition of the water supply in my own constituency at Welchman Hall, St. Thomas; the condition of the water supply at Chimborazo and at Castle Grant, St. Joseph. Some of this is meant to remedy conditions in the constituencies of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I can think of a lot that can be said in the interest of our constituents in those areas to realise how difficult it will be for the House to do any business between now and two o'clock, if we have to discuss this Head of the Resolution.

There is a gentleman at Welchman Hall by the name of Mr. George Best, who is employed at the Water Works Department, but who behaves as a political canvasser for the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, who walks about making it more difficult for the people in Welchman Hall to get water than the Hon. Minister himself has made it. It can hardly be reasonable for us to sit down and just let this pass. If it was a question of a Resolution for \$664 or some of the other Resolutions on the Order Paper - even at this stage I am finding it a bit difficult to go through them. I think it can safely be said..... (Asides)

Mr. Chairman, even I am a little at sea with these things. I was trying to select the Resolutions which would be a little easier for us to pass than this one. I think it would have been easier for us to pass the Resolution relating to Old Age Pensions. If there are more Old Age Pensioners surviving than the Government anticipated, we in the Opposition cannot oppose the increase in the money for Old Age Pensioners. I refer to the Resolution for \$73,947.

I do not think we find it very easy to pass a Resolution for bringing back a witness to give evi-

dence at a trial. We will not go into that now, but we imagine that that would be long and tedious. It would be difficult to do that one as well, Mr. Chairman. It would be impossible, I think, in a short time to do the Resolution for \$362,000. The Resolution for \$19,380 deals with the Fire Services. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that would be very easy to be dealt with either. In any case, we have to face the fact that this particular Resolution is going to take time.

If the Government wants Resolutions passed, it should try with some of the Resolutions I have mentioned. I do not know if the Minister will accept a motion that further consideration of this Head be deferred, while we try with those Resolutions which can be passed and save time. That is what I have to say, at this stage, Mr. Chairman, without speaking at length on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am taking a different view of this Resolution. I have to admit my faults - I cannot find it. Anyway, it is under the Head of Waterworks. With regard to this amount of money, we know that the Financial year ends this month. I am wondering whether the Minister is in a position to tell us what he intends doing with this money. Can this money be spent before the end of this month? From the suffering of the people between St. Joseph and St. Thomas, it would appear that we want a new reservoir.
1.35 p.m.

We want something new. We want a lot of money to be spent. I do not think that this amount will remedy the trouble that we are undergoing up there. I think that there must be a handsome amount in the Estimates now so as to relieve the people of this water question. It is for the last three or four months in respect of the parish of St. Joseph that I reminded you that the Waterworks are doing their utmost. I know that and I see it; they are doing their utmost to relieve the people, but it seems to me that it needs money to relieve us and the money is not there at the moment. It is not a question of the particular action; they are acting, they have done a lot, but we are still not getting the water as we would like it. I would like to draw this to the attention of the Minister; I would like him to ask that the Waterworks Department waive our water bills from, at least, last December up to last month and refund us our money because the Government is really robbing us this time. We are paying for something which we are not getting and it is not fair to the people. That is point No. 1.

Sir, before I go further with this Resolution, I would like the Minister to get up and tell us directly what this money is really for. Is it to pay for goods which have been taken in already or for labour which has been executed or has this money been spent already? It seems to me that that is what is happening nowadays - they are coming down here for money which has been already spent. It is too near to the end of the month, regardless of whatever we are going to do - this is the first week in March and you could just as well say that one week has gone, there are three more weeks to go and you cannot spend this money

before the year ends. This money is bound to lapse, in my opinion. If it is to be spent from now on - at least the Senate may be meeting this week and nothing can be done until next week; really and truly this money cannot be spent. Some of it is going to lapse; therefore, let us know what is going to be done. If this money is for the purpose of paying bills, if it is to make things right, things which have been done, then let us know; but really if you are going to start on a new scheme the money is bound to lapse. It is going in to come back out again.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, as to this amount of money under Item 34 - Mains, Hydrants and Standpipes - I would like the Minister when he is making his reply, if he is going to make a reply, because it would appear that as soon as one has to get up from this side of the Table and only look as if he is going to say something in the interest of the people of this country, as far as the Minister of Communications and Works is concerned one can see a swelling in his face as if he has toothache. I do not understand what is the idea. You only have to get up and deal with his Ministry, and there is a sort of atmosphere created like some bull having got out of the woods or something like that. This is the people's business, and if they, on that side, are in the position to form the Government of this country, to be the spenders of Government's money, then we, on this side, are only the watch-dogs of the people's money. Therefore, it is our duty not to oppose as one might say, for the sake of opposition, but it is for us to offer some criticism or make some observations.

Some time ago I put a question in here asking the Ministry of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas under whose portfolio this item falls, to help the people in a place called Springhead with water. It is unfortunate for these people that there is no light, no road, not even a sign to show you how to get into Springhead. I do not know if the hon. member at times eats something which does not agree with him before he comes in here, but he has the audacity to come in here and say that he made a survey of this area in the presence of my junior colleague and the people in Springhead, and they are satisfied with two standpipes to serve almost 100 people, and they are approximately some three miles apart. That is what the Minister came in here and said. How, in the name of earth, could I sit down here and not be expected to put up the case of the people in Springhead when the Government is asking us to spend this amount of money, and not possibly help the same people in Springhead with their water needs? That is not fair. What hurts me is that the Hon. Minister said that there are two pipes in Springhead which are almost three or four miles apart, and that is enough. I do believe that in the Minister's house he has about six or seven. I repeat, Sir, that these things are not fair. You only have to go into that village and see what it is like, and the Minister himself should be a person who should have sympathy for such people. The note to this Item 34 Mains, Hydrants and Standpipes, reads as follows:-

"The extension of the distribution mains system and the increasing number of tappings in water mains

in consequence of installations of water services have resulted in increased maintenance costs."

I do hope that if and when the Minister gets up to make his reply, he will at least reconsider the needs of the people of Springhead in the parish of St. James. I would have to say that I had an unpleasant moment when one morning around a quarter to four, a gentleman from Hoyte's Village called me and said that he called the Minister to inform him that there was no water at his home since six o'clock in the afternoon, and the Minister said that he is nothing to do with that, that the gentleman could go and get some buckets and bring some water. I am not saying that the man was right; I can only report what he told me. I told the man that there was a low pressure in that area and tried to relax him because he was furious. 1.45 p.m.

I do hope that when they set out to spend this money, they will not only think of going into the pet nest of Welchman Hall where the junior member for St. Thomas believes that everything that is to happen in Barbados must happen there. It is Welchman Hall all the time for him.

I feel that it is but fair that as a Minister of the Crown, it is his duty to serve not only Welchman Hall but every possible district in this country with those things which come under his portfolio. I am making a humble plea to the junior member for St. Thomas to forget his likes, his tooth pick in his mouth and to give the people of this country the needed service of which they are worthy.

I wish, Sir, to ask again of you to review the situation in Springhead, St. James. I am quite confident that if the Minister has any kind of sympathy, he would go and see the plight of the people of Springhead from whom all of us have sprung and let them get one of the two standpipes which the former Government of Barbados had recommended for them. Since then, the population of Barbados has increased. I am asking the Minister to review the situation and please give them at least one standpipe. I am not asking for two, Mr. Chairman; I am asking for one.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I appeal to the Leader of the House. The Hon. Minister can see that there is some opposition on this side to this matter. We can do the last three Resolutions with thirty or forty seconds' talk on this side of the House or the other. Let us get on with that.

To go on with this Resolution, it means that two o'clock would come and we would have done nothing. I suggest to the Leader of the House to defer this Resolution and take such things which ought not to take more than a minute's talk from anybody. We can by two o'clock finish the last three things. Let us do the Resolutions - one providing for the Old Age Pensioners, the \$664 one, and so on. Nobody needs to talk on those.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the junior member for St. Thomas is seeing to it that the

people in fact, do not get Old Age Pensions, because he wants to get up and reply. Let me say that he is not going to get the chance even to reply because the matter would not be ready by two o'clock.

I have not spoken yet and if the House is to adjourn by two o'clock, out of the remaining time, we have to report progress and move the adjournment. If he does not know Parliamentary procedure, it is for the Leader of the House to tell him. If I speak on this Resolution now, I will still be speaking when the time comes to report progress. I can afford to say that, because I have a lot to say about water in Welchman Hall.

The Hon. Leader of the House should get up if the Old Age Pension Resolution is as urgent as he suggested and the other Resolutions - one for \$664, one for \$10,000 and one for \$53,694. If they are as urgent as that, accept the motion to defer further consideration on Head 36 of this Resolution and let us pass the other Resolutions. That is getting on with the people's business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still hearing the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on Head 34.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you want to hear me on Head 34 - I think you mean Head 36 - I can speak on it, but I am trying to facilitate things. If the Leader of the House tells me to go ahead with this, Mr. Chairman, Welchman Hall stands at an altitude.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that this Resolution be now postponed.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No. 53 was called.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the note to this Resolution sets out the necessity for it. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No. 56 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1967-68 No. 57 was called.

HEAD 21 - ESTABLISHMENTS DIVISION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 58

A Resolution for 53,694 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 49

A Resolution for \$19,380 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We have to put the brakes on at this stage, Mr. Chairman. There is something which I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister. We do not intend to oppose this, but something has to be drawn to the attention of the Hon. Minister in respect of the Fire Service. Now, I want to make the point as succinctly as possible so that we can vote on it as quickly as possible. It is this.

Under the Constitution of Barbados, the Fire Service was in effect brought under the general conditions of the Public Service. It is within the knowledge of members on this side that firemen are still being dismissed or recommendations are being made for dismissing firemen under the summary procedure of the Old Fire Service Act, and they are not receiving the protection of the Public Service procedure.

In one case of which I know, a fireman was fined \$10 for something which a senior officer said did not amount to dereliction of duty. Eight months later, without having the opportunity of being heard, or making any representation to anybody, he received a letter saying that a recommendation for his dismissal was being made. Now the matter is still pending and that is why I would not seek to initiate a debate on it, nor I am not asking the Minister to go into that case because it is in the hands of the Privy Council.

But I hope the Minister would look into it, if he agrees and if he finds that abuse is being carried out, that direction be sent to the Chief Fire Officer to the

effect that he must follow Civil Service procedure in dismissing firemen.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I would draw all that the hon. members have said to the attention of my colleague.

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

1.55 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of six Resolutions in Committee of Supply, the postponement of one, and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 8th March 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to the Hon. Leader of the House - I am being very mild - to see that we ought to fix the Order Paper in the procedure that has been departed from in recent days. We ought to fix the Order Paper, because there are some things on the Order Paper, especially in Private Members' Business that are so low down that we do not get to them, and the Order Paper should be fixed on the adjournment. For instance, we were today handed the Estimates for the coming year, and we have not yet concluded the debate on the Order Paper on last year's Estimates. That should not happen again. So I suggest to the Leader of the House in future for us to fix the Order Paper so that the most important things can be brought up on the Order Paper instead of being down at No. 10 or No. 12 and so on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This point, Mr. Speaker, is well taken, although in fairness to ourselves I must point out that we have not been keeping back Private Members' Business. I think I ought to say this.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to make this point. If Your Honour rules that it is enough when you come to an Order to say you are postponing that Order or the moving of it, and somebody can get up and say he would like to take No. 6 first, - if Your Honour rules that is permissible - then my point falls to the ground; but you will forgive me for repeating that if we have not yet concluded debate on last year's Estimates, what are we doing?

The question that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 8th March, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

2.00 p.m.