THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th October, 1951.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*) Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*) Messrs. M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, F. L. WALCOTT, R. G. MAPP, L. E. R. GILL, and J. A. HAYNES, B.A .

Prayers were read.

Messrs. E. K. WALCOTT, ADAMS, SMITH and DOWDING entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 2nd October, 1952, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following Document:—

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure in respect of Highways for the parish of St. Andrew for the period April 1950 to March 1951.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1947, with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor a Message as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 37/1951.

His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Address dated 5th June from the Honourable the House of Assembly and to inform the Honourable House in reply that under the Representation of the People (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1951, provision has been made for the payment of expenses of elections for the General Assembly from funds of the Central Government.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
15th October, 1951.

PETITION

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present a Petition from the Commissioners of Highways of St. George praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to increase the salary and travelling allowance of the Inspector of Highways of the said parish. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition was taken as read.

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $33,100 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 31, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $8,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52 Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 32, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the appointment of a Puisne Judge and to prescribe his powers and duties.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill intituled an Act to amend the Shops Act 1945.

Mr. ADAMS: To move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolutions of which I have just given notice. In connection with the first Resolution, I would like to say for the benefit of the hon. junior member for St George, that this money is to give backpay to the labourers at Dodds and Seawell plantations. The other Resolution is to provide backpay for those persons who work at the Agricultural Stations. In fact, in view of the urgency of these Resolutions I shall ask the leave of the House to deal with them in all their stages today.

A Private Member's Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. DOWDING: Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. George to increase the salary and travelling allowance of the Inspector of Highways of the said parish.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to make provision for the appointment of a Puisne Judge and to prescribe his powers and duties, was read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Bill to amend the Shops Act 1945, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING seconded by Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, the Bill to authorize the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. George to increase the salary and travelling allowance of the Inspector of Highways of the said parish, was read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Messrs. BRYAN, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY and ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to postpone the first two Resolutions.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of $370,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951—52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Before I begin, I wish to apologize to the Committee if I am comparatively inaudible; I got out of bed this afternoon at 3.20 to come here. That was not through laziness but on account of influenza. However, I shall endeavour to put this programme of the cost of living proposals of the Government as fully as possible and as lucidly as I may be able to put them. In dealing with these Resolutions that are before the Committee, I shall do more than it is usual to do on occasions of this sort; I shall do what may appear to be extraordinary, that is, in the course of asking the Committee to accept these proposals I will give some indication as to the financial position of the colony. In doing so I shall be almost anticipating my Budget Speech in March next. I believe I am entitled to say that because I am told that even if my friends win the coming Election they will still propose that I conduct Government Business. (Laughter). Honourable members know that a short time ago the Civil Service Association approached the Government with a view to persuading the Government—they began with persuasion—to grant the Civil Servants a cost of living allowance in view of the rising cost of living. The devaluation of the pound sterling as mentioned by them and sundry matters have caused an increase in the cost of living not merely to Civil Servants but to all sections of the community. The proposals of the Civil Service Association entailed an expenditure of $1,300,000 for all sections of the Civil Service for which they were asking for this allowance. Inasmuch as a request of this sort was based on the rising cost of living, the Government could not see its way to grant a cost of living allowance assessed at 40% in respect of the lowest income groups, 30% on incomes between £100 and £200 and 15% on incomes between £200 and £300. At this stage I would like to give a stern warning to the Civil Servants; to adopt the method of the Barbadian fisherman who will say that a fish is worth a shilling but he is not passing 18 cents is stupid. If you have a good case, prepare it properly and ask for what you mean; do not ask for a bigger sum than that because you feel that your employer is likely to bargain with you and cut you down. I am told that the Civil Service Association did not expect to get any 40% but they asked for 40% believing that in the course of bargaining with the Government they would get something like 25% or 20%. The Government looked at this matter as it should be looked at — making the dollar which the Civil Servants got in 1948 worth a dollar today. To ask for a 40% cost of living allowance when the cost of living had not gone anywhere near 40% was unreasonable; we considered the matter in Executive Committee and appointed a Sub-committee of the Executive Committee comprising the Honourables Mr. Cuke, Sir John Saint, the honourable senior member for St. Peter and the Acting Financial Secretary Capt. Bryan, to deal with it.

I shall interject at this stage to refer to the criticism that we have ignored the Whitley Council and it has been suggested that we have ignored the Civil Service Association. That is quite inaccurate. This Sub-committee of the Executive Committee received a delegation from the Civil Service Association, and the honourable senior member for St. Peter who, I believe, will speak on this matter, will tell the Committee that it is not true even to suggest that the Whitley Council, most of the members of which comprised the personnel of the delegation, did not have an opportunity of presenting their case to the Executive Committee. I will leave the honourable senior member for St. Peter to deal with that aspect of the matter in case the accusation is repeated on the floor of this House. If the Government failed to accept the figures of the Civil Service Association and adopted figures of its own and did not send the matter back to the Whitley Council, it was because of the desire to get the matter before the House as speedily as possible; in fact, the

promise was made to the Civil Service Association that we would get the matter before the House before the end of September. The delegation from the Civil Service Association met the Sub-committee of the Executive Committee and expressed their views; the Sub-committee recorded in their report to the full Executive Committee that although they did not accept the principle of tying the cost of living allowance on to the cost of living index, it was inevitable that they would, in any event, consider it. I say nothing today as to whether I am on this side or on that side where the question of fixing wages according to the cost of living index is concerned. Economists differ and I agree that some of these differed from the others. The request from the Civil Service Association was based on the fact that the cost of living had gone up and therefore the cost of living had to be examined; although the Sub-committee of the Executive Committee did not accept the principle of tying the allowance to the cost of living index, they nevertheless examined it and discovered that up to the latest figures, the cost of living had increased by roughly 15%. It was as a result of that, although there was a minority Report suggesting that the figure should be 20% in the lowest brackets, that the Government sent down the Resolution as it was a few Tuesdays ago. The cost of living was 15%, the other things were more or less arbitrary and that is why honourable members had the cyclo-styled copies in respect of 15% on the first $480 or part thereof, 7½% on the second $480 and 5% on the third $480. Although the Government was convinced that that was fair because it represented the increase in the cost of living, restoring the dollar to the 100 cents which it was worth in 1948 when the salaries were reviewed, the Government nevertheless reviewed the general position of the colony because it was suggested that if the cost of living was 15% when the Resolutions were sent down, it would be sure to rise; therefore the Government should give a greater percentage of cost of living allowance than was represented by the figures which we had at the time when the Resolutions were sent down. We should anticipate the rise in the cost of living which will take place next year. The Government investigated the financial position and in spite of what one may read in the Press about the vast sums of money which are there due to income tax which we collected and we should not have collected so much, it is a fact that if in these proposals we had gone up to 25% or anything of that nature, unless we were prepared to scout around for every conceivable source of additional taxation, the social services would have to be curtailed if not completely stopped for a number of years; the programme of capital works would come to an end for the next five years. It is true we could make a capital levy on honourable members on that side of the House and their friends; but it is not the language of exaggeration to say that if we had sent down some arbitrary sum above this Resolution we would be discriminating in favour of Civil Servants. The figures show that the cost of living has increased from 15% to the neighbourhood of 20% and we have therefore decided to ask leave of this Committee to amend this Resolution and base it on the figure of 20% instead of 15%.

I want to emphasize that addressing rude and crude remarks to a Government does not help your case nor does it mean that the Government is going to give way to your rudeness: I am suggesting to the Civil Servants that they try and be more dignified and not to pass any Resolution of the crude sort which they passed to the Government the other day. That Resolution was a stupid one; it is preposterous to accuse this Government of ignoring the needs of anybody. However, if the figures had been available originally, we would have come down with a Resolution based on an increase in the cost of living by 20% instead of 15%. Since the Government has decided to send down these new figures, they have been put before the Whitley Council and the Whitley Council has accepted them, so that I hope when honourable members begin to speak they will bear that in mind. The persons who are affected are satisfied with the present decision, but although that is so, if honourable members intend to attack the Government, they will attack it nevertheless. As long as you are in politics and you are in the Government, you have to bear the slings and arrows of the Opposition, especially when it is among the members of your own Party.

I shall not speak at great length on matters which were the background both from the point of view of the Civil Servants and our point of view; but I will say that the Civil Service Association made certain suggestions to the Government as to how this additional money might be obtained. If necessary, when those points are again raised, I shall deal with them although the fact that the Civil Service Association, including that rude Division, having agreed with the Government's decision, will make those points largely of academic interest now. However, inasmuch as I have promised to give honourable members what may be called a preview of the financial position of the colony in order to assure them that the Government in sending down these proposals had to take into consideration its financial position generally, I shall now refer to that aspect of the matter. I hope I will enable honourable members to temper their criticism when they will have had a more accurate knowledge of the facts as far as the financial position of the colony is concerned.

The proposals of the Civil Service Association would have entailed an expenditure of $1,300,000. That Association does not seem to have reflected on matters which I am going to mention; out of a revenue of roughly $10,000,000, the Civil Servants have already received five and a half million dollars according to last year's figures. It has to be borne in mind that more than 50% of the revenue of this colony is allocated to the payment of salaries. The original proposals of the Government would have entailed an expenditure of $490,000; the present proposals where the Civil Servants are concerned, would have come to $574,206, but we considered that we should add the Ecclesiastical people which, it is true, does not amount to much more than $6,240. The contract officers amount to $468 and the allowance for pensioners, $39,270, making a total of $620,184. In addition to that, the Government has expenditure which will also go up as a result of the cost of living; there is the question of heat, light, fuel, printing, stationery and so on; that was not thought of by the Civil Service Association. We have to maintain supplies at the General Hospital and other Government Institutions, which will also cost more, but the Civil Service Association did not take that into consideration. The increase between 1950 and 1951 amounts to $258,454 which is a huge sum; with the proposals before us, the increased cost will be $600,000 which covers the salaries but does not cover the additional expenditure which the rise in the cost of living is going to add to the burden. It is not possible to make an accurate assessment in relation to next year's estimates, but within the past few weeks we have been able, by watching carefully the monthly estim-

ates of revenue and expenditure, to know fairly accurately what the position is likely to be in the coming year. Some honourable members may remember that in the Memorandum which accompanied the Estimates last February, the revenue from Customs and Excise was determined on a conservative basis having regard to what we thought would be a crop of 173,000 tons. I will be as frank as possible although I will give ammunition to honourable members on my immediate left. It is easy for some writers in the Press who, for some reason or other, seemed to be deprived of the power of concentrated thought, to say "Look how much money you have in the Treasury, look at the surplus you are getting," and confuse two things which should be kept as far apart as the Poles—recurrent revenue from year to year and general revenue balance. Estimating that the crop would be 173,000 tons at the time when the Budget was introduced, we sent down these estimates of revenue and expenditure, and honourable members will remember that we budgeted for a surplus of $150,000. As a matter of fact, as honourable members know, the crop instead of being 173,000 tons was 187,000 tons; therefore we got additional revenue. In addition to that, the Korean War came along; the threat of War became greater than it was at the time of the Budget. The merchants in Bridgetown wisely began stock piling and the Customs revenue went up; so that instead of a surplus of $150,000. it is more likely to be $950,000. Under the Head "Customs and Excise" there was an estimate of $5,222,000, but the amount is likely to be $6,300,000 at the end of the financial year. As regards Income Tax and Death Duties, I am sure that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew especially will be glad to hear that taxation under that Head will produce $275,000 more than had been anticipated. Our finances are likely to be in a healthy state and the anticipated bankruptcy of Barbados if a Labour Government came into power has been postponed for another 50 years. (Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Until the rains stop falling). If the rains stop falling our water programme will take care of that. We must be thankful that instead of our approved estimate of just over 10½ million dollars it will be nearly 12 million dollars.

On the other hand, when we look at the expenditure side, honourable members will remember that in our Budget we approved of an expenditure of 10½ million dollars, speaking of round figures. It is likely that that expenditure will be increased by supplementary estimates by half a million dollars, so that the expenditure will be in the neighbourhood of 11 million dollars. From what we can see by our monthly calculations, if we are correct, the surplus will be nearer a million dollars than $900,000. There are other advantages which may come to us in other directions; honourable members may remember that we budgeted for $540,000 in respect of temporary emigration, but the latest estimate with a reduction of workers and other factors is $260,000, and in this current year we may receive $130,000 instead of $30,000 we estimated we would get in refunds. I thank the honourable senior member for St. James for reminding us about the rain; if the rain stops falling and our crop goes back down to 130,000 tons, down will go production bonus, wages for workers and so on. The honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable junior member for St. Andrew will tell me whether I am right or wrong, but statistics for the period of half a century show that we will get one drought in three years. However, because we have a surplus of half a million or a million dollars, we cannot, in a flourishing year, come out and spend it. Occasionally a $50 fee comes to a barrister; if he lives on champagne for the rest of that week, the day may come when he cannot afford to buy a lemonade; it is therefore advisable to put some money on the Bank for a rainy day rather than spend it all. This Government or any Government with the knowledge that we depend on sugar alone, with the knowledge that the crop is liable to have seasons of drought or disease, would be entirely wrong if in a particularly good year it got rid of the extra money which a good crop may have brought in.

This bonus is an additional sum to our estimates; as long as the cost of living has an upward trend, and as far as I can see we are at the bottom of the ladder, it has to remain on our estimates. We have to look for this extra $620,000; the cost of living is an additional expenditure so that our balance in respect of next year's budget will come below the $150,000 for which we budgeted this year. I must remind honourable members that every year there are normal increases to be added to the estimates; there will be, for instance, an increase in the number of old age pensioners—I have forgotten the figures — but every year some people become 68 years of age and there is an increase in the cost of running the public services. I say that so that honourable members might see that although we are getting a surplus above what we expected to get because of the reasons I have already given, there are factors in relation to next year, which we have to bear in mind. I am told—the honourable senior member for Christ Church will say whether the information is accurate or not — that the excessive stock piling is over and the merchants are not buying in such large quantities, therefore we can anticipate a decrease in customs receipts. The recent Sugar Agreement will mean that the income tax in respect of the crop of 187,000 tons is going to be diminished in proportion as money is paid out under that Agreement; but whatever our financial position is, it is not a question of our discovering any fresh sources of revenue, but it is because the Almightly gave us rain and we had good crops.

Having given the bright side of the picture, I will now come to what may be a bitter pill to be swallowed by my friends on the left. In a review of the Government's financial position and having regard to the Government's commitments, it has become apparent that in order to do justice to the Civil Servants and put their cost of living at such a figure as would put back their salaries to what they were in 1948, we may have to go slow on capital expenditure. I have said this in public and I have always intended to say it on the floor of this House: I will go out of politics first before I give way to the clamour of one section of the underprivileged in this island. When we were first sending down this Resolution it appeared to us inevitable that the school-building programme would have to be stopped for four or five years, and I was not going to do that merely to give the Civil Servants 25% cost of living allowance. We have to consider the possibility of the future when we have not got a crop of 187,000 tons; if we have to extend the elementary schools, our medical services and so on, and the money is not there, we cannot possibly do a great amount for one body of people and ignore the rest; we have to stretch our money as much as possible. I am perfectly frank and I issue the warning to my friends and to the public generally that the possibility of increasing taxation next year is, by no means, just a mere possibility. A word to the wise is enough; in order to satisfy

the Civil Servants and do justice to them we have to go slowly in relation to capital expenditure and social services and we have to increase taxation. Honourable members have therefore had an early warning that steps for obtaining increased taxation may have to be taken next year; honourable members know that the Maude Report which is before them will have to be considered and the proposals will require money.

The Government's policy in sending down this Resolution is to do justice to the Civil Servants where the cost of living is concerned and by not anticipating what the cost of living might be in another six or twelve months, do nothing to keep back the programme of social reform. Nobody knows what is going to happen; it is anybody's guess as to whether we will have a War or not, but certainly I do not think that anybody is guessing wrongly if he comes to the conclusion that the cost of living is going up next year. This is no promise by the Government, but if the cost of living went up tremendously, it may be necessary to review—as we did during the War—the cost of living allowance. I hope honourable members will agree with the Government that if the cost of living has risen by 15% and we sent down this Resolution in respect of 15%, that is fair; 40% is fair if we had the money. The higher the cost of living goes, the more necessary it becomes to increase taxation, and the Government does not feel that it should indulge in increased taxation without issuing a proper warning and without the necessity for such taxation having arisen and not merely looming on the horizon. I again warn honourable members that it may be that the cost of living will go so high next year that we may have to review this cost of living allowance next year, but that will surely bring about increased taxation. The Government feels that the correct way of dealing with this matter is not to anticipate the cost of living going up; some honourable members are asking for a cost of living allowance and others should pay back what they are receiving. I am asking leave to amend this Resolution by changing the amount of the Resolution from $370,000 to $470,000; honourable members will see that the proposal now is to pay, in the case of monthly paid Government employees, 20% on the first $480 of annual salary or part thereof; 7½% on the second $480 of annual salary or part thereof and 5% on the third $480 of annual salary or part thereof. The same thing applies to weekly paid employees; on the first $10 of weekly salary or part thereof, 20%; on the second $10 of weekly salary or part thereof, 7½% and on the third $10 of weekly salary or part thereof, 5%. We propose to add Secondary School Teachers and Government Pensioners and the sum thereby involved will amount to approximately $620,000.

Leave having been granted the honourable member to amend the Resolution,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of $470,000 do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not think there is much that one can say on this Resolution. I would like first of all to thank the honourable senior member for St. Joseph for having given us figures pertaining to the financial position of this island at the present time, but it is a little difficult for anyone to digest properly, at such short notice, the true import of those figures. However, I do not think it makes much difference on this occasion because I do not believe that there is any member of this Committee who would desire to reduce the allowance which is given to meet the cost of living; and it would be impossible for any of us, except members of the Government and those in the know, to be able to say whether or not the cost of living allowance should be increased. I take it that this allowance does not go any further than the end of the financial year and in due course a statement as to the finances of the colony will come to hand; it would then be easier to say whether or not more money could be afforded and should be afforded to meet the cost of living. I do not think that any of us will question this cost of living allowance from the point of view of wanting to make it lower, and no honourable member without the figures in front of him, could honestly get up here and say that this amount could be higher. We have listened to the finances of the colony explained to us by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, and, speaking for myself, I cannot say that I can digest the figures sufficiently so as to be able to say whether this allowance could be higher; but I do say that I do not think anyone has ever voted against taxation or increased taxation when it was felt that the object of the increased taxation was correct or wholesome or it was for the benefit of the community. If it is that we have to face increased taxation, I believe that all of us would face it firstly from the point of view of whether it is necessary and then whether it is in respect of a year when money is less spent and so it would be unnecessary. One of my complaints has been that when the finance is presented to us at times, the expenditure side is puffed up, the proposed work could not be done and you invariably find at the end of the financial year that the proposed expenditure has not been carried out and the sources of revenue seem to have increased; hence the finances of the colony always look very prosperous at the end of the financial year. If that is so, then new taxation should not be lightly undertaken; but when the object is worth the taxation or when the taxation is necessary, I fail to see any member being likely to object to it.

As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has mentioned, school buildings must be provided, because, in the opinion of everybody, both school buildings and school teachers are an absolute necessity for any country. We know that we are enjoying rather prosperous years for two reasons; one is that we have had good crops in spite of a Labour Government (Laughter). They have not prevented the rain from falling on the just and on the unjust; and the other reason is that the price of sugar has been such that a profit could be made. I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is altogether pessimistic. I do not think he has any cause to be pessimistic. So long as you are getting good money for your primary product, that money keeps on revolving and your revenue increases. Once your crops are good, the result is that even if you pay income tax you get it back in revenue returns because of greatly increased sales, because the population and the community as a whole is in a position to spend more. That is an old doctrine and one which I have always held; therefore I do not think we need have any hesitation or worry in granting this cost of living allowance at all. I go further and say I do not think we should have any hesitation in planning for the improvements which we should have had before. You collect your income tax from the year before; so that the income tax which will come in the next revenue year will be on the bountiful year which you have just received; and if the rains continue to fall you can practically see that, with a suitable price for sugar, you should not only get a good income tax for next year but also for the year after. Therefore, speaking for myself, I am rather on the optimistic side.

If I am permitted to say this, it is recognised that in so far as Barbados is concerned, we have never had occasion to raise loans in respect of any

expenditure having regard to the money in the island. We have been encouraged in the old days to raise loans in that respect, but, thank Heavens, we have not followed that advice. The position is that even if we were faced with any situation in two or three years from today—which I do not visualise—we would be in a position to meet that situation by reason of the fact that we are in such a sound financial position as to be able to obtain loans easily and on any market for the purpose of carrying out such necessary capital work as would help us to regulate unemployment. Our position could not be affected in two or three years from today as long as the rains keep up and as long as we expect a suitable price for our sugar.

That is all I am able to add to the debate at present. I would like to repeat that I have tried my best to digest the figures which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has given, but I cannot really say that I have been able properly to digest them sufficiently as to be able to say whether or not I think the Government could have done better. I feel they have done something and I do not think that there is anybody who would deny this increase which the Civil Servants will get thereby. Perhaps it is regrettable that this allowance cannot be more, but I am not in a position to say whether the Government could afford more or not. I hope and believe that when the financial year ends the position will be such that we may be able to afford some increase to the salaried members of the community, and, of course, that should be started by the Government. I believe that the Government should make the start and I hope it will run down through all sections of the community who employ labour.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Apparently the honourable introducer of this Resolution has succeeded, by the threat of increased taxation, in terrifying the Conservative Opposition; and although in their minds they regard this increase as being insufficient, the Acting Leader of the Conservative Opposition is prepared to accept it on the plea that he has not been able to digest the figures given by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. We were told by that honourable member that the Government was of the opinion that the original 15% which was offered would have been enough to bring the dollar earned by the Civil Servants in 1948 up to a par with the dollar earned today. In other words, the cost of living had increased only to that extent; however, subsequent figures for August and September this year have forced the Government to the conclusion that the cost of living for these three years is now in the neighbourhood of 20%. It is a moot question as to whether the new figures of the cost of living rise for August and September have brought the Government to its new decision, or whether, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has termed it, the crude and rude and persistent protest of Division 3 of the Civil Service Association has forced the Government to make this decision. Be that as it may, the point is this; are we really to understand that it is the Government's conviction that the new increase of 20% adequately covers the cost of living increase from 1949 until today? Frankly, I do not quite understand it. What worries me about this matter is this; parochial employees and a number of private firms are going to follow what the Government does, and it is true to say that there are very few firms in Bridgetown or in any part of the island, which in the three years—1949, 1950 and 1951—only gave their employees an increase of 20%. As a matter of fact, I am almost sure that if private employers over the past three years had only increased the salaries of their employees by 20%, there would have been strikes taking place throughout the length and breadth of the country, because 20% could not adequately cope with the increase in the cost of living. Many of the mostly used items have gone up as high as 50% within the three-year period; condensed milk is to-day 40% dearer than it was in 1948 and so is cocoa and salmon. I really cannot see how the Government or the Sub-committee could delude itself with the idea that an increase of 20% today would enable Government employees to cope with the increase in the cost of living.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has endeavoured to suppress any opposition to this Resolution by claiming that the Whitley Council of the Civil Service Association has now accepted the 20% increase given by the Government. In actual fact, what else do you expect the Whitley Council to do? The Civil Service Association originally asked for an increase of 40%, which, in my opinion, would have enabled Government employees to cope with the increased cost of living, and the Government decided to grant an allowance of 15%. After a delegation was sent back to the Government and, in the words of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, rude and crude and abusive language was used, the Government decided to give this 20%; there is nothing more that the Civil Service Association can do. They presented a reasonable demand, they abused the Government and what more can they do now? Can they get a gun and go to the Treasury or can they get a machine gun and go to Government House and blast the whole Executive to smithereens? In my opinion, the Civil Service Association were faced with Hobson's choice; short of a general strike or a revolution, what else could they do but accept the 20% and hope for better days?

The Resolution which is now before us will provide for a 20% increase on the first £100, a 7½% increase on the second £100 and 5% on the third £100 or part thereof in each case, and the Civil Servants right through will receive an increase of $156 a year—$13 a month. Personally speaking, since it is true that in 1948 Commissioner Adams fixed the salaries of employees in the higher brackets of the Civil Service at reasonably satisfactory levels, and since the Government claims that 20% is all that is needed in order to enable its employees to cope with the present cost of living, I see no reason why this increase should apply as well to salaries, say, above £500 a year. My contention is that officials who draw salaries of £800 to £1,000 a year and over, should be able to carry on if the cost of living is only 20%. I do not know how many people there are in the bracket under £100, between £100 and £200 a year and so on up the line; but it is highly possible that if we were to stop this increase at £500 a year, we would be able to do a little more for people in the lower brackets. I remember that in Trinidad when they first started to give a cost of living allowance, only people who earned up to $120 a month got it and then they went up to people earning as high as $200 a month. Similarly in British Guiana; the first cost of living bonus was only paid on salaries of $60 a month and under. It may well be that the number of officials who draw salaries of over £500 a year may be somewhat limited and you would only save £500 or £600 a year if you were to exclude them from this Resolution; but in the meantime we can do a lot of things. We should be able to add more to the educational services of the colony or the money may be useful for some other urgent matters.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has given us the new figures as to the estimated revenue of the colony for the current financial year and he gloats over the allegations that with a Government labelled Labour in power, the colony would probably go bankrupt. It appears to me that through fear of the threat of being accused of sending the colony into bankruptcy, the Government is afraid to do the thing which it should really do. The honourable member has referred to the increase in customs revenue and claimed that at the beginning of the Korean War the merchants in Bridgetown began to stock pile and therefore we got an increase in customs revenue—an unexpected increase in that revenue; but the honourable member knows fully well that that is not the whole story. He knows that since the prices of commodities have risen so considerably, the Government has been reaping a harvest from increased duties and it has really exploited the situation brought about by the increased cost of goods. The Report of the Comptroller of Customs for the last three months, for instance, is a very revealing document; it shows that the total imports for these three months have given the Government the unexpected windfall in customs revenue of over $400,000. And those three months, I submit, are months when the importation of any commodity into the colony is not at the highest. Later in the year when the Christmas trade begins to come in, the imports will be considerably higher, and the average increase of revenue in customs over and above the estimate will therefore rise considerably. Faced with this unexpected revenue from customs brought about not necessarily through stock piling, but from an increase in the cost of imported commodities what does the Government claim? They claim that the food for Government Institutions, the clothing in respect of uniforms and what not, have cost them a lot more money than they thought these things would have cost, and therefore they are only too glad for any new but unexpected increase to defray this unexpected increase in the cost of running the Government. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph claims that the figures are around $258,000 more, and I should like him to relate what percentage this $258,000 is in relation to the estimated expenditure for these items over this same period, because I am sure he will discover that it is more than 20%. If the Government is so glad for this unexpected windfall to help them to tide over the cost of the increased expenditure, and a man who is working on the Unestablished Staff is given $1.50 or $2.00 a week more as is now proposed, is he in a position adequately to cope with the increased cost of living? From 1948 he has not had any increase and it is now 1951. I want to submit that the first demand of the Civil Service Association of 40% was based fairly accurately on the increased cost of living, and while it may be true that the Government could not pay anybody 40%, the cost of living to-day is more than what the Government is offering the Civil Servants. What the Government is offering could not possibly enable any Government employee to meet the rise in the cost of living to-day.

I said earlier that these proposals apply to all Civil Servants, with the exception of the Governor, of course, and we know what the policy is; we leave out the Governor now and later on we will come back and see that he is properly treated. We can therefore easily see that every single member of the Government Service is going to enjoy some of this money—those who really feel hard hit to cope with the cost of living and those who, by reason of the tolerably good salaries they receive, do not find it so difficult to exist. If, Mr. Chairman, an official whose salary is £800 a year is entitled as he is under this Resolution to an increase of $13 a month, don't you think that a man who is working for $15 a week is entitled to an increase of more than $3 if we are merely attempting to assist Government employees to cope with the rise in the cost of living? This Resolution does not seek to increase the basic salaries of any Government employees; what it most decidedly and undeniably does is to give them a few shillings per week more because the Government claims that the cost of living is 20% more. These employees have not had any increase since 1948 and therefore it is felt that this 20% will enable them to live as comfortably in 1951 as they were supposed to be living in 1948. Instead of earmarking this considerable increase in customs revenue for defraying the increase in the cost of running the Government, I feel that the Government might well consider taking some steps to lower the cost of living not only for Government employees but for every member of the community. The Report on Trade and Agriculture for the quarter April to June, 1951, shows that the total value of imports during the corresponding period in 1950 has risen by over four million dollars; and the collection of customs import revenue for the first quarter of the financial year April to June, 1951, is over $300,000 more than it was for the same period last year. Therefore at the end of the year the figures would be over a million dollars more in customs revenue than we estimated to collect. Last year, to take a few items, the duty on flour coming into this colony was $82.000; the import duty on rice was $47,258; on salt pork, $21,636; on corn meal, $6,800 and on canned fish like sardines, salmon and so on, we collected $6,692. In other words, the total import duty last year on the essential articles of foodstuffs was in the vicinity of $200,000. This year, since *ad valorem* duty is paid on some of these commodities, we should collect more money and then in the case of those items on which a specific duty is paid, since the imports themselves have been increased in volume, we should also collect more money and then in the case of those items on which a specific duty is paid, since the imports themselves have been increased in volume, we should also collect more customs revenue. If we are expected to collect over a million dollars over and above the estimate from customs revenue, I think that the Government could well afford to do one of two things; either put the customs duty on certain essential commodities of foodstuffs and clothing at a given figure, or, better still, remove the import duty on commodities like flour, rice, corn meal, salt pork and items which are in immediate demand daily by every section of the population. If, for instance, we were to remove the customs duty on flour, and for last year the Government collected over $82,000 duty on that item that would mean that the cost of flour could be reduced by half cent per pound. For the average householder who uses 6 or 8 pounds of flour a week, that would still mean a small saving in the monthly budget; similarly with rice and other commodities I have mentioned. The Government is more than recouping itself from the customs revenue owing to the increase cost of the commodities. I do not think that the Government, as a result of the abnormal situation created by the increased cost of imported articles, should want merely to be able to say that they want to accumulate a big surplus so that you cannot say that they are running the colony into bankruptcy, or to have

enough money so that when they want to embark on one of the usual extravagances the money would be there; something should be done to enable the entire community to get the benefit of some decrease in the cost of living. There has not been any worthy attempt made or any big programme started by the Government to bring down the cost of living in Barbados. There are so many things which can be done; there is no reason why we should go on importing corn meal. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it is the wish of honourable members that we should adjourn for tea at this stage. (A MEMBER: No). That suits me. There has not been any proper attempt on the part of the Government to produce locally an item such as corn meal which can be produced locally; during the last year Jamaica has been exporting corn to Europe. We continue to import corn meal and flour which can be manufactured locally from imported wheat, and so save the colony nearly a million dollars in subsidisation; but the Government has refused to consider this local manufacture.

We have recently passed an Aid to Industries Bill at a very late stage and no attempt has been made to acquaint the outside world with its provisions. When Jamaica and Trinidad passed their Aid to Industries Bill pages were taken in the leading journals in America, England and Canada to advertise the fact that these colonies had an Act on their Statute Books, extending concessions offered to industrialists, and every attempt was made to acquaint foreign industrialists of the terms of the new laws in those colonies in order that the industrialists might be attracted to come to those colonies and start industries, manufacture items which were not locally manufactured and assist not only in providing employment for the people but also in keeping down the cost of living. For instance, the textile plants in Lucas Street provide underwear for people at a much cheaper price than that which is usually paid for the imported article. If we really want to embark on a programme of industrialisation, it is our business to let the outside world know what we have done to attract new industrialists to the colony. We are now importing a variety of canned fish at fairly high prices; salmon, for instance, is being sold at 66 cents per tin, and the Government collects an import duty of more than four cents on every tin of salmon arriving in the colony. Do you not think the time has come when we should start trying to can some of the millions of small fish which abound in these waters? The trouble is that the Government of this colony has no desire to plan satisfactorily to improve the economy of the colony, whereas all other West Indian Islands are doing something in this regard. You have a corn meal factory in the little Leeward Islands; in Trinidad they smoke and can herrings and the decision to smoke and can herrings is the result of a deliberate attempt to keep down the cost of living. Why should we import salmon to be sold at 66 cents a tin? Because we can pay duty of 5 cents a tin on it? It is all well and good to sneer at well-meaning suggestions for putting the economy of the colony on a more satisfactory basis and increasing it as far as we possibly can. Not only the Civil Servants but the entire community is suffering from the high cost of living.

At this stage, the CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who took the Chair.

Mr. REECE came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. CRAWFORD was speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me that he needs to be relieved for a short period.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the honourable senior member for St. Peter be Chairman of Committees until the return of the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT being in the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD rose to continue his speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In view of the time I would suggest that the honourable member move that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, a few moments ago I suggested that we should adjourn and the honourable introducer of this Resolution said that he was not agreeing to any adjournment now.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is accustomed to saying the most untrue things. He suggested that honourable members were willing to adjourn at that stage, and I heard honourable members on my right say "No." I did not express my own view; it is immaterial to me whether the House adjourns or not.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is the difference?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. BRYAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. MOTTLEY seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On the re-assembling.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House adjourned the honourable junior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—As I was saying when the House adjourned, Sir, let us as soon as we can, take whatever steps lie within our power to bring the cost of living down as far as we can for everyone in the community; and one of the best means of doing that is the establishment at the earliest possible date of all the new industries that we can establish, and the production locally of as many as possible of the commodities which we now import. Let us proceed with that programme as fast as we can.

As far as the Civil Servants are concerned, now that we are told that they have accepted, but not necessarily agreed with these proposals, let us keep before our mind's eye the fact that these increases are not really adequate, and that therefore if there be any further increase in the cost of living, we shall know that further attention will have to be paid to them. There is no doubt about it that we would be able to afford considerable relief to Government Employees in all brackets if we start as soon as possible with the long talked of Housing Scheme for Civil Servants—loans to help them erect, or even repair their own homes. It is quite some time now since the Association has been working on that matter, and submitted proposals to Government. I think that in British Guiana Civil Servants now get loans for Housing

from the Widows and Orphans Fund. One way to assist Government Servants to cope with the present day living costs would be to give them what assistance we can in the matter of Housing, since rent represents no small item in the monthly budget of the average Government Servant as it does more or less with almost every person in the community.

With these few remarks, Sir, I conclude my observations on this Resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,— I think it is fit and proper that in giving attention to this matter some attempt should be made to nail to the cross some of the fantastic remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip. I heard him say that in considering this matter the Government should not have considered people above £500 a year; and in going on to speak of the limiting to $13.00 a month those who get £500 and over as compared with $8.00 a month to those who get £100 and over, he forgot to mention that the Civil Service Association sent in a claim which would have given a man of £500 and over $34.00 a month and those below that, $8.00 a month. That is a claim which he said he would have accepted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In what part of my speech did I say so?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: He said that 40 per cent. was reasonable.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the honourable member had elementary intelligence he would realise that if you stop at £500 it does not matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is so blatantly stupid! If you stop at £500 you still give the people at £500 thirty-four dollars a month.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The 40 per cent. was only on the first £100.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: And then 30 per cent. on the second and 15 per cent. on the third. That is what the Civil Servants asked for.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I repeat that all I suggested should have been done was to give 40 per cent. on the first £100. A child of two years could understand that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member said he was accepting what the Civil Service Association were putting forward.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said nothing of the kind. I said that the Civil Servants asked for 40 per cent. Government found it impossible to do that, and what they were now proposing was unfair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: They asked for 40 per cent. on the first £100, 30 per cent. on the second and 15 per cent. on the third. The honourable member thinks he is dealing with people who do not check up on what he has said. On the last occasion he made a statement here, tried to check up with the Reporter and then ran out of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is absolutely incorrect. When I asked the Chairman of Committees to have the Reporter read back what I said, and His Honour the Speaker resumed the Chair, His Honour saw no reason for establishing a precedent of that sort. That is exactly what happened, and anyone who says differently is a complete stranger to the truth.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,— May I suggest that since we are in Committee the honourable junior member for St. Philip can make a note of these things and reply to them. The spectacle of two members on their feet together is not a good one.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member is always afraid that he will be proved wrong. He checked up with the Reporter outside the House and when he was told he was wrong he did not come back in the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is an infernal lie, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not tolerate anything of the kind.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will not really deal with the honourable member. He cannot speak the truth when he is on oath, furthermore when he is in here. He should be the last person to accuse anyone of telling lies. He has his public record. Mr. Chairman, let us examine the honourable members' statements about £500 and over. I want to say, Sir, that the Whitley Council met yesterday evening and representing the staff side agreed to those proposals. The honourable member said the Civil Servants did not agree but only accepted this. That is the kind of statement he makes all the time.

No member of the Government or of the community would say that Civil Servants, like other workers in the community do not have a claim for a cost of living increase. But they asked for an increase, not a revision of their salaries. The wording of their memorandum to the Government was to the effect that the cost of living had increased since 1948 and they were asking the Government for an allowance. Government therefore had to review the situation as it was in 1948, and compare it with what it is today as far as the cost of living is concerned. They did not ask Government to revise their salaries. So if anyone is working on the assumption that the Government was revising salaries, it is the wrong assumption.

Let us look at the £500 people. There are 4,917 people in the Government Service, including people in the Unestablished Staff on the Key Scale. Of these, 200 people are above £500. If you take this $13.00 which the Government is giving to the men above £500 you will be paying people like that $2,600 in cost of living allowance which cannot give the people in the Key Scale or below £300 one cent a week increase. What amount of discontent you would create in the Service where you regarded £500 as a margin in your cost of living and where the Unestablished Staff and the Key Scale people were not.

The Association made requests in respect of the first, second and third £100. Government says it cannot give all they have asked because firstly, the cost of living has not gone up 40 per cent. since 1948, nor does one, in other parts of the world always get an increase equalling the rise in the cost of living. In very few countries is the cost of living always absorbed into the increase that you make. Government on this occasion has seen fit to absorb it in respect of those on the lowest rung.

Honourable members would be amazed when they realise that in the Key Scale you have about 2,000 people who are not in the Graded Service at all. They do not get annual increments. You will be tempted to take the view to cut off at the £500 which is low; but when you cut it off what are you doing? You cannot give an increase to the ones you cut it off from because you cannot increase their salaries anymore. How can you justify no cost of living increase on a salary of £500 when you realise that any man in the Service who is today working for £500 must have been working for the last 20 to 25 years. He must be educating a family and things of that sort. There are 200 people in that bracket from £500 up. How can you stop at £500? How can you say that the man who works for $200 a month should not have a cost of living increase?

Let us look at the people in the Key Scale. When the wages of these people were revised in 1948 they were fixed at the rate of 18 cents an hour. In 1948 no

one challenged those rates. The cost of living has risen, and the Government has decided to give the majority of these people a full increase. So those people whose wages are in the vicinity of $8.64 a week will now get $10.94 a week or $10.03 for a 44-hour week. Let us look around the whole island and see if any other employee of that type in any branch of work is receiving more than the Government proposes to give to these people. When this is passed the Vestries and private employers must of necessity push up the rates of this type of worker because general wages for this type today are in the vicinity of $1.44 a day and the Government proposes an increase of 20 per cent.

No one can say that this is the limit; that is that this will absorb the cost of living. We are nearly all living a life of want. We cannot always satisfy our needs. But on this basis the Government will have to provide $620,000 annually out of this budget. I do not want to talk about putting an *ad Valorem* duty on flour. You will have to provide additional taxation. New industries do not grow up in a day. They call for more planning than for speech making. I will say this: The Government was accused by the Civil Servants of by-passing the Whitley Council. That would appear to some members of the Civil Service Association to be true. But a delegation went to the Head of the Administration and asked him to get through with this matter because they would be glad if the Government could get it through by the 30th of September. A sub-committee of the Executive Committee asked the Civil Servants to send a delegation to meet them to discuss the matter. All the members who comprise the Whitley Council came to the meeting with an additional member. You can clearly see, therefore, that there was no intention of by-passing the Whitley Council. Civil Servants must realise that when you have a body representing you, you must put confidence in it that it is putting your case. Bargaining broke down and Government again sent the matter back to the Whitley Council. The agreement contained in the proposals of this Resolution is the agreement that has been reached with the Whitley Council. In a big country like the U.K., with the Whitley Council situated as it is, this matter would not have been debated in the House of Commons at all. But in Barbados, on the eve of a General Election, everyone wants to be on the good side of as many voters as possible.

But I can say with a clear conscience to all Civil Servants, and especially those in the lower brackets that no one can say that this cost of living allowance is not the most the Government can afford. This is a problem that we have. With four thousand Civil Servants and with limited resources—some people think that our reserves grow overnight—out of ten million dollars we are paying nearly 15 per cent. in wages—$4,368,721. How can anyone ignore that fact? Look at what the Vestry of St. Michael suggested as a cost of living allowance. They suggested something like 10 per cent, 7½ per cent. or something like that. That will give you an idea of what was operating in people's minds. Without an examination of the facts they said let us give 10 per cent. Here I will say that the world prices have not yet hit Barbados in full. You have an idea now about the rice from British Guiana.

We heard an argument about the increase in Customs Duties, but because Customs Duties have increased by x per cent. that does not mean that the Cost of Living has gone up by that percentage. Suppose we say that the budget level is $17.00 a week. That does not mean that a man cannot live on less than $17.00 a week. If it means that, then half of the population is dead. That is how the layman works out a budget; but if you work on that basis the whole of our ten million dollars would not be able to pay the bill. We had to point out to the Civil Service Association that a budget worked out on that basis could not be an indication of the true cost of living increase.

I am sure that any honourable member who has paid as much attention to this matter as I have will agree with my arguments. I do not represent the Government as an employer. I represent the majority of workers in this matter in that what we propose to give to workers in the Government Service, when you compare it with what workers are getting anywhere it can stand up favourably. When the honourable junior member for St. Philip makes out a case that only the people at the bottom should get an allowance I would like to tell him that even the people at the bottom feel that if they must get an increase the people above should get one too. Can anyone say in their approach to this question that the Government should have given up everything to those at the bottom? Can anyone suggest that that would be a fair basis on which to give this cost of living allowance? Suppose you decided to give everyone in the Service $12.00 a month more; it would be $12.00 multiplied by a greater number of people, and it would come to more than is proposed here.

Honourable members will see that every device had to be used to bring satisfaction to the majority of workers and maintain wages. The last thing we would like to see is Barbados going in for retrenchment. The remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip are neither reasonable nor fair. He is never willing to give favourable consideration to anything the Government does. He referred to Housing for Civil Servants. That matter was before the Whitley Council for the last eight months. This Government is not like old time Governments which decided on things without referring them to the people. If honourable members feel that the members of the Executive go up and have a cocktail party at Government House every Thursday I feel that it is time that those statements should be corrected.

What I am pleased about where this Cost of Living allowance is concerned is that there is agreement with the people concerned, and accepted after long negotiation with the members of the Whitley Council.

Mr. CRAWFORD: One small point with reference to what I said, Sir. Anyone with a normal capacity for understanding anything would recall that my argument was that there might be less than 200 people in the Service who are in receipt of salaries of over £200 a year, and that the increase of $156.00 a year for each of them would cost the Government around $5,000. I also said that although that $5,000 might not mean much in the matter before us, it could help us to add a few more teachers to the Teaching Service of the colony.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—When three days ago the Government gave notice of this cost of living bonus I must confess that at the beginning I prepared a speech that would have been diametrically opposed to the views expressed by the Government. But I must confess now that I have been taken pleasantly by surprise today to see that the Government has seen the case for an increase in the first bracket from 15 to 20 per cent.

Indeed, Sir, anyone who has studied the increase in the cost of living within the past six months as it affects persons in the lower walks of life immediately after the Oils and Fats Conference, will know that after that Conference things like soap and cotton seed oil had risen so appreciably as

to affect tremendously the budget of the man in the street. Then when I got my first Papers in respect of this matter, I studied them carefully, and was at pains to make discreet and thorough investigations.

I am not one of those people who would be moved because the less than 5,000 people in the Civil Service made certain demands. I would first have to see what was right and what was wrong. While it is true that you have to pay attention to the needs of the people who make demands, at the same time, as soon as you come to occupy a position of responsibility in any community, whether you are in the Government or not, it is your duty to strive to do justice to all sides. I say I did not feel that the increase of 15 per cent. in the lower brackets was a correct thing. Again I say that I too feel, like the last speaker that of course the increase in the cost of living must affect people in the middle class group. In many cases it affects these people to a much greater extent that it affects many other people. People above certain salaries in any community, when the cost of living goes up can very well do without some luxury. But it does not mean that they are affected to the extent that the middle class man is affected. There are people in Barbados who carry a tremendous lot of pressure, when you think of his servant and of the people whom of necessity he must carry. There is no reasonable man in this country that has not within the last eight or ten months thought that he would have to give his employees an increase.

I am saying therefore that much of what I would have said today I have not had an opportunity of saying because I have been disarmed. It is true as the honourable member for St. Peter has said, that everyone has today the tendency to take Government wages as an example. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I would have liked to see an increase of 25 per cent. in the lower brackets; because quite honestly, after going carefully into the matter I do not think that $1.80 a day is a fortune for the average worker—I have figured it out that an increase of 25 per cent. instead of 20 per cent. would bring instead of $1.44 a day, an increase of 36 cents which would bring this type of worker to $1.80 a day, and working that out for even a single man, I do not think of $1.80 a day as being very much. But I say I am disarmed because I came here with that idea as against a 15-per cent. increase, and now I find that the Government is offering 20 per cent. and we have been assured that they are offering this, not because of the threat that we read of in the Press made by the Whitley Council, but because they have further investigated the matter and have discovered that since they made the recommendation of 15 per cent. the cost of living has risen further and justified an allowance of 20 per cent.

In dealing with Civil Servants who number less than 5,000, it may seem that you are picking out in the community first those who are employed in the Government. But our authority in this House is limited to those persons employed by the Government; but I believe that I can express the hope from the floor of this House that after this Resolution has been passed, not only the employers of labourers, but those people who employ people in commercial life like clerks, etc. will realise that this increase should be forthcoming to their employees. I am referring to employers both in St. Michael and the City. I do not depend on clerks only to put me in the House. I have no guarantee of what my own children will be, and I would like, when this Resolution is passed, the merchants in Bridgetown and employers of labour generally to realise that it is their duty to follow the Government's example.

While all of us would like to see employees given even a greater increase, at the same time it must be borne in mind that when you are in certain positions, or running a Government you have a certain measure of responsibility; and that responsibility is to consider the economic stability of the community. It would be popular to get on the floor of this House today and say that you should give increases of 40, 50 or even 100 per cent. That would meet with the approval of every working man; but it would be just so much hot air. It would be just the type of thing which you would expect from politicians outside of the House when they are trying to get in. But you have got to have a sense of responsibility to the community.

I repeat, Sir, that I am not thinking only of the benefit which this will bring to the Civil Servants. I am expected to say this due to my peculiar position. I hope that it will be an indication to the merchants in the City, shopkeepers and other employers of labour; and if they belong to the Electors' Association they should do it more so because we hope to win the Elections. I hope that this will be an indication and pointer to those who have not already done it, but who are holding out and refusing to consider the matter; because there are still some of that hard-hearted type who employ labour today. I believe that people should be given every opportunity to make money. I equally believe that if you make money you should see that your employees are given a salary that is commensurate with a decent standard of living. But you cannot deny that in and around the City today there are still some people who, unless you force them to give a cost of living allowance by an act of legislation, will not think of doing so.

Now the honourable member for St. Peter said that parochial Boards, at least in enlightened parishes, will immediately take steps to follow the Government's example. That is true. But it is today known that the Government actually followed the Vestry of St. Michael in fixing war bonus because it must be remembered that that Vestry offered 25 per cent. and the Government gave 10 per cent. The honourable member mentioned the fact that St. Michael's Vestry when the present matter was first discussed made a suggestion to pay 10, 7½ and 5 per cent. That is correct. But he will agree with me that those figures were arrived at nine months ago, and that there had been a tremendous increase, not gradually as at the beginning of the last war, but which could not be seen one Saturday but was very evident the following Monday. When you get things like soap going up seven and eight cents a bar, and things like cooking oil going up by 6 cents a pint, you feel that you have to increase the cost of living allowance more than you originally thought. Therefore I do not want the honourable member to feel that when that suggestion was made there was an idea not to give a cost of living allowance commensurate with the increase in the cost of living.

Some people think that a cost of living bonus is a question of fixing basic salaries. If you are going to argue that the basic salary is too low you can do so. When it comes to cost of living bonus you should offer something that is commensurate with the cost of living. Now for reasons of this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, because of my association with a parochial administration, and because I have had to do for many years with expressing free and unbiassed opinions, I actually got some figures which I know that you, in your capacity of merchant-shopkeeper will appreciate, and will be able to correct me if

I am wrong. These figures convince me, with great respect to the Labour Department which advises the Government, that the time is not far when you will have to look and see whether the basic salary is not too low.

I have got these figures. It is absolutely necessary to get figures like these for yourself because to just take up a paper or consult the statistics from the Labour Department and to be guided by them is not sufficient for a Barbadian who should come into contact with the people. Therefore I got these figures and am applying them to a man who works seven days a week, including Sunday, at $1.44 a day, which is $10.08 a week. I went into one of James Tudor's Shops and Pickerings, to satisfy myself on these figures before I came here and suggested that the cost of living increase should be more. But I hope to show that the basic wage is too low.

Now this is the budget of a man who works for $10.08 a week. He has a wife who does not work, and one child. I have checked it and rechecked it for three Saturdays. He pays a rent of 5/- a week which does not seem exhorbitant at all. He proceeds to buy goods, and starts off with eight pints of rice, 56 cents. You can help me in this, Mr. Chairman, I know that you take some of these people from the cradle to the grave. This rice costs him 56 cents, and I understand that it will cost him four cents a pint more in a few weeks. Next is one and a half pints of cotton seed oil, 48 cents; two tins of milk, 68 cents; four pounds salt meat—two pounds at 29 cents and 2 lbs at 19 cents a pound — 96 cents; two boxes of matches, four cents. I am not working on the Labour Department's figures. I can prove this. Now we get one pound of salt, three cents; three pounds of flour, 24 cents; three pounds of meal, 30 cents; a small tin of cocoa, 26 cents; a quarter cake of soap, 15 cents; a gallon of kerosene oil 32 cents and also a bundle of wood for 24 cents. I challenge any Labour Officer to disprove this. He buys ½ lb. of butter for 24 cents; two balls of cassava starch for four cents; a cent of blue; ½ lb. onions, 30 cents; seasoning, paisley and thyme, six cents. I discovered funnily enough that while I was buying English potatoes at 10 or 12 cents a pound he was getting four lbs. for 36 cents; four lbs. of sweet potatoes, 12 cents; a tin of salmon, 56 cents; bread, 48 cents; two lbs of subsidised salt fish, 54 cents; three pounds of sugar 24 cents; once a week he gets 1½ lbs. of fresh pork, 68 cents — Sundays only; 12 cents biscuits; two lbs. of coals, nine cents; a half-bottle of rum, 50 cents —that works out at ½ pint during the week and ½ pint on Sundays. Even in the lowest walks of life a man still likes to be able to offer a friend a drink. Then we have two packages of cigarettes, 24 cents.

Mr. Chairman, I got these figures because I did not want to come here and just talk hot air. I still think that the 25 per cent. allowance for those in the lower brackets is correct; but what I am trying to show is that the basic wage is too low as compared with the cost of living. Now when you add up the figures I have given they come to $9.99 out of the salary of $10.88 which the man works for. When he buys one shirt, he must wear it until it melts off. You know that eight pints of rice a week is not too much for a man who is lifting block stones or loading lorries; and no one could consider it too much when you take the wife and child into account. There are some men who eat 1½ pints of rice at a meal. The trouble with most Barbadians is that after they rise to a certain position they seem to forget. But I really know; I have not forgotten. After these people buy sudsidised salt meat at 19 and 29 cents a pound they can only buy fresh pork at 2/- a pound on Sundays. I hate anyone to suggest that because such a man spends $9.99 in food and rent he cannot have clothes. In that $9.99 no luxury at all is included. This is not the type of man who wants to live above his means. His money goes on the bare necessities of life. Anytime that this man wants to buy a pants he must borrow. Therefore I do not agree with the argument by the honourable junior member for St. Philip about the cost of living allowance. You cannot put your cost of living allowance beyond more than a certain percentage of the basic salary. The question therefore is whether your basic salary is enough for a man to eke out a decent standard of living. The answer is no; unless you feel that a man should send his seven-year-old child to work.

An honourable member has reminded me that there are employers in the Party to which I belong. When I look over the other side, I see a lot of employers too. You get a lot of hard-hearted people who look like me. The honourable member does not appreciate that we know there are capitalists over there. They may be miniature capitalists; but they are capitalists nevertheless. If you have experience like I have, or if you come into contact with these poor people, you will be only too happy to do something for them. You will not despise them because you happen to be in a better position. You will say, "there but for the grace of God go I."

I again commend the Government on amending the Resolution from 15 to 20 per cent., and I again want to tell them that the time is not far off when they will have to consider this question of the basic salary. And not only the people in the lower brackets, Mr. Chairman, but the middle man, like the clerk is seriously affected too. I support this Resolution strongly, and I hope that it will go through; because in another few days I will have to be working out ways and means, either breaking the law, or getting people to wink at breaking the law, if another set of people — 400 parochial employees — are to get the same benefit as we are giving to Civil Servants today.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman,—I too intended to severely criticise this Resolution. I was fortunate in that the honourable member who has just spoken told me the results of his enquiry. I am pleased to see that the Government has reconsidered the matter, and after consultation with the Whitley Council has introduced a Resolution with amended figures. When all is said and done, the responsibility for the finances of the Colony remain with the Government, and it is they who have to say how much should be spent under any particular head. If they in their wisdom and knowledge of the finances of the Country have decided that at the present moment they are unable to go beyond the figures in the Resolution, then I say the responsibility is theirs, and we can only express ourselves as being glad that they have been able in the circumstances to increase the figures. I do not agree with the honourable member who said that half of the people in this Island just live. I say half of them just exist. It will be surprising to know how many people are carried by others. There are vast numbers unable to get employment, and who are entirely dependent on their families for existence.

That of course brings me to the question of emigration, but I do not think that it would be strictly in order for me to bring that into this debate. But the fact stares us in the face that there are large numbers of people in this Country who, owing to the economic set-up, barely exist. The increase as suggested by the Government must be of great benefit to those persons who have to carry their brothers, sisters and the other unemployed members of their family. I hope, as the last speaker said, that employers other than Government, will adopt these figures as the basis

for the increase which they should give to their employees.

I would like to refer to the hardships which the members of the middle class are suffering, and in respect of which they should be given consideration by these people in the City and elsewhere who employ many of them as clerks. I believe that some of these employers have already considered the question of raising the salaries of their employees; but like the honourable senior member for the City, I think it is a matter which should be most forcibly brought home to every employer — that in whatever capacity a person is employed he should receive a living wage. I am not suggesting that an employer should do the impossible. But there are some who run big stores and who would be in an entirely different capacity from the small employer who is unable because of his financial limitations, to do what another employer could do. Nevertheless this is a question which should be looked into. So as I have said, Sir, I hope that Government's action will be followed by other employers, and that clerks, and those in the lower brackets will receive assistance in the form of a cost of living allowance, and in some cases an increase in the basic salary, or wage.

There can be no two ways about it. There are people in this island whose salaries are extremely low, and it is a wonder that they manage to exist at all. The figures which the honourable senior member for the City has given are a clear indication of what obtains in many instances. I am not going to repeat what he said; but the man in receipt of a wage of $10.08 a week with a wife and family must find himself very hard-pressed to keep things going. So the whole question of basic salaries will have to be re-considered both by the Government and by other employers, and if the cost of living continues to rise, as the honourable member for St. Peter has assured us that it will, the basic salaries will have to be increased.

I am very glad that the Government has been able to arrive at an agreement with the Whitley Council. The honourable member for St. Peter has told us that, although I had heard otherwise. But if a body of persons delegated by others to act for them have reached agreement with representatives of the other side there is no gainsaying the fact that the representatives of the Whitley Council have reached an agreement with the Government. I am perfectly sure that although the increase may not be as big as they expected, the Civil Servants will loyally support the agreement, inasmuch as it was made on their behalf by the Whitley Council, and if the cost of living continues to go up they will make other representations, not on the question of a cost of living allowance, but on the question of basic salaries.

I want to repeat finally, Sir, that I hope that every employer with a full sense of the responsibility which he has to the persons who work for him, and with the welfare of those persons at heart, will do his utmost to make them happy and contented and able to provide for themselves and their families the necessities of life. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that now that we have advanced so far along the road of enlightenment, agreement and harmony between employer and employee in this country, everyone who is in the position of employer will see to it that his employees receive the highest possible figure for their labours which is compatible with the welfare and prosperity of the particular business.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—Your patience is admirable, and I do not intend to impose on it any more than I can help. I want to sound a note of warning which has been disregarded for some time now. I think that the time has come when this Government or any other, bearing in mind the figures which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has given us today as to what the Civil Service is costing us, should consider that it is time to cease adding red tape to red tape and adding assistants to assistants in an island of this size, when we know that eventually the economy of this island will be strained beyond bursting point. It is getting to such a stage Sir, that in my opinion the people in the higher brackets, overwhelmed by ream upon ream of paper from commission after commission, inquiry after inquiry, this expert after the other expert, are spending more time outside their offices than inside. Those are two notes of warning that I want to throw out to the present Government. I think that even the Leader of the House from the figures he has disclosed will realise that the superstructure is getting so big that it may topple over and smash itself at any time.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am very pleased to know that the amendment introduced by the Government represents a compromise with the Whitley Council. I understand that it represents the opinion of the Government, accepted by the Whitley Council; and that makes it easier for us to consider it, and to know that at least in some measure it will give satisfaction for the present.

I cannot share the view of the honourable junior member for St. Philip that this Whitley Council is one which would allow the Government to push something down their throats; not when I read that a division of the Civil Servants Association can say what they have said of the Government. I do not think that the Whitley Council would be competent to represent these people if they were guilty of what the honourable junior member for St. Philip thinks they are guilty of.

Now, Sir, we all know that it is very difficult to relate the cost of living index to any cost of living bonus that you give. Every now and again you have to revise the method by which you discover what the cost of living increase is. If it drops a few points you have to take them off, and if it rises a few points you have to put them back on. So you have to get some means by which to assess the situation as far as the Government Employees are concerned, and hope that other employees will follow suit. I did not quite understand what my colleague meant when he said that from his peculiar position he hoped that the merchants of Bridgetown and the shopkeepers would see what the Government has done and would do likewise. I thought that that would be the peculiar position of myself. My colleague, I think, comes more directly into contact with the merchants of Bridgetown, and his words should have greater effect. Coming at a time like this his statement might be taken in the sense that he was merely making a political speech. Knowing his influence with the merchants, I hope that he will use it more directly.

I must say that I admire him for the figures which he brought in today. It is a strange co-incidence that the University College of the West Indies started to make an income survey in this colony only this week. I hope that the figures which the honourable member has suppied us with will be of assistance to them. I must thank some honourable members for their concern today. I can only hope that is genuine enough to be used in the direction where it will do a lot of good. A certain amount of sympathy must go out to the Government on this occasion; both sympathy and understanding. At a time like this when it is perhaps making up its budget, it is a very difficult time to have to make up its mind on granting a cost

of living allowance; and especially at a time when the House is dying and a new House is to be elected.

For all that, Sir, I congratulate them on having hit on figures satisfactory to both sides. They can always review a situation like this, and I congratulate them for giving a measure of relief and having it accepted. That is what I feel is a very good feature of the Resolution which we are dealing with to-day.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

C.O.L. FOR SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next order is a Resolution that the sum of Nineteen Thousand Six Hundred and Fifty Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951-52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 27, which form Schedule I to this Resolution in order that with effect from the 16th day of June, 1951, a Cost of Living Allowance may be paid to

(a) teachers of First and Second Grade Schools;

(b) teachers of First and Second Grade Schools who retired at any time between the 16th day of June, 1951, and the date of the passing of this Resolution in circumstances rendering them eligible for the grant of a pension or gratuity, and

(c) teachers who were transferred from the full time service of the Crown in this Island to the full time service of the Crown elsewhere between the 16th day of June, 1951, and the date of the passing of this Resolution,

at the rates and subject to the terms and conditions set out in Schedule II hereto.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

C.O.L. FOR PEASANTS' LOAN BANK STAFF

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Order is a Resolution that the sum of Three Hundred and Eight Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951-52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 28, which form Schedule I to this Resolution in order that with effect from the 16th day of June, 1951, a Cost of Living Allowance may be paid to the members of the staff of the Peasants' Loan Bank at the rates, and subject to the terms and conditions set out in Schedule II hereto.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT the Schedule was taken as read.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

C.O.L. FOR GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—the next Order is a Resolution that the sum of Thirty-three thousand Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951—52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 29, which form Schedule I to this Resolution in order that with effect from the 16th day of June, 1951, an additional Cost of Living Allowance may be paid to persons in receipt of pensions from the Government at the rates, and subject to the terms and conditions set out in Schedule II hereto.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass and that the Schedule be taken as read.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Chairman reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee, and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the House adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 96, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas; the Replies to Questions No. 97, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew: the Replies to Questions No. 98, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip; the Replies to Questions No. 100, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and the Replies to Questions No. 102, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 63, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, relative to leave to public employees.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended in order to deal with the Bill of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon — the Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the appointment of a Puisne Judge and to prescribe his powers and duties—as the next Order of the Day.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

CHIEF JUDGE AND CROWN LAW OFFICERS (ADDITIONAL JUDGE) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:— To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the appointment of a Puisne Judge and to prescribe his powers and duties.

Mr. ADAMS: Honourable members will have before them cyclo-styled copies of this Bill. His Lordship the Chief Justice has recently drawn to the attention of the Governor the state of work in the Courts, and the necessity to have somebody appointed temporarily as Puisne Judge who would be able to take charge of work in the High Courts and assist him in reducing the arrears of work. As honourable members will know, there is a proposal to have a Bill

introduced in this Assembly for the re-organization of the Judiciary of this island. Owing to my being occasionally out of the island and to the illness of the honourable senior member for St. James in the earlier part of this year, it has been impossible for the Committee which has been set up to advise on the re-organization to meet often. I believe that the honourable junior member for Christ Church and the present King's Solicitor have met the Attorney General on one or two occasions, but the rest of the Committee have not met. Before Mr. Justice Ward left Barbados he had, in collaboration with the Learned Chief Justice, drafted a Bill—I think it was when Mr. Justice Ward was acting as Attorney General that he drafted that Bill — which was considered by the Executive Committee. Honourable members will therefore see that this is a matter which has long engaged the attention of the Executive Committee, and it was thought by the Executive Committee that those members of the House who are members of the Bar together with the King's Solicitor should meet the Attorney General, get the advice of Magistrates and put our heads together and get some scheme of re-organisation which we thought would meet the necessities of the state of affairs existing in this island where local Administration of justice is concerned.

That Bill is still being considered, but while that is so, the cases in the High Courts have been accumulating. It is regrettable that in recent years every Assize Court list seems to get longer and longer, and it seems to become the fashion not to have an Assize sitting without a couple of cases of murder. Such cases prolong the sitting of that Court and the other work of the Chief Justice is held up. Although this Bill is to make provision for the appointment of a Puisne Judge and to prescribe his powers and duties, honourable members will see from Clause 9 that it is proposed that this Act shall continue in force only until the 30th June next year. This post is a temporary one for nine months because we hope by that time that not only will the comprehensive Bill for the re-organization of the Judiciary be ready, but will be passed by both Houses of the Legislature. Meanwhile the Executive feels that this Bill should be passed immediately in order that some of the arrears of work in the High Courts should be got through. As honourable members know, the Chief Justice will be taking the Assize Court in a couple of weeks' time, which means the postponement of getting rid of the work of the other Courts until December. I am told that honourable members of the Bar will be standing for election to membership of this House and therefore they will be too busy to attend the Courts; that will mean a further postponement of the work.

I repeat that whatever we do about this Bill will be of a temporary nature, but, undoubtedly the Legislature will approve of the Bill which is to be brought down and which will make permanent the post of one or more Puisne Judges. A Puisne Judge is a High Court Judge who is not the Chief Justice; he will be a person who, as is provided in this Bill, will have the right to exercise the same powers as the Chief Judge now exercises. He will be equal in status as far as jurisdiction is concerned with the Chief Justice, but he will not be the Chief Justice.

The only other provision to which I should refer is that of the salary of the Puisne Judge. One of the chief matters on which the advice of legal practitioners has been sought is whether Puisne Judges should be put in the same salary scale or not. That matter has not yet been determined, but as regards this temporary appointment it would be better to leave the matter as it is now instead of fixing in the Bill what this temporary Puisne Judge will be paid. We may consider going out of the island to get a good Judge who may be quite content — I do not say we will do this, but a retired Judge may be content to come here for less than if this post were a permanent one; on the other hand, he may want more or on the other hand it may be possible to make out with one of the Judges of the Assistant Court of Appeal and make adjustments to his salary. However, we do not want to put in a Bill the salary which we feel this post is worth permanently; I have no doubt that the Head of the Executive in consultation with the Chief Justice will find some figure which is reasonable and fair to pay an acting man, but which, at the same time, may not represent the figure which the permanent post ought to carry. That is the only reason for not sending down the specific salary in the Bill, but it will be somewhere in the vicinity of £1,050 and £1,500 per annum. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am glad that attention is at last being paid to the fact that there is an arrears of work in the High Courts and there now is the possibility of many High Court cases being tried. I know that a case has been lodged in the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes over a year ago and it has not been possible to get the Registrar to set down a date for the hearing of that case. I do not know if that is an exception to the general rule of what is taking place nowadays. There is only one High Court Judge—the Chief Justice—and every March, July and November he is called upon to preside at the Assizes, and that is about six weeks during which the Chief Justice has to be engaged with criminal matters. I am wondering what has been the reason for the delay in the drafting of the Bill for re-organizing the Judiciary, because although the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has had to be out of the island, yet when he is back with us and the rest of the legal profession has been available, one does feel that if this matter had been treated with the urgency with which it deserves to be treated, this Bill could have been on the Statute Book by now. Again, I am wondering if we appointed a Puisne Judge to carry on only until the end of June next year, if we would get legislation drafted in respect of the reform of the Judiciary to be passed between now and then, and further, if we would have arrangements made for the accommodation of the extra Judge or Judges. I should like to say that it is not only necessary for us to have a Puisne Judge for the purpose of relieving the present congestion in the work of the High Court, but also to have a permanent Puisne Judge to sit in the Court of Criminal Appeal. There is no getting away from the fact that today there is nothing more seriously lacking in the judicial establishment of this colony than a Court of Criminal Appeal in which you should have three Puisne Judges sitting as in Trinidad, British Guiana or any other colony.

Now, I do not know, and I gather that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph does not know, who may be the person likely to be selected for this post of Puisne Judge. I would suggest to those who may be making any recommendation to the Governor for transmission to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that some of the elderly, retired Judges are not the best persons from whom to make the selection for this post. Sometimes these Judges are a bit rusty with their law and their points of view in respect of sentencing people at

the Assizes belong to the Middle Ages. Of course if this temporary post of Puisne Judge is created, I would rather expect that one of the Judges of the Assistant Court of Appeal, who, in the opinion of the responsible authorities is capable of filling this post, would be appointed and then the necessary adjustments in the Judiciary would have to be made. Perhaps the Petty Debt Judge could act as a Judge of the Appeal Court and a Magistrate could act as Petty Debt Judge. I have just heard *sotto voce* that the Junior Crown Officer may act; well, I know that he is prepared to do anything in the service of his country, and if he feels that he must be more effectively serving his country he would not be found wanting. However, I entirely agree with the appointment of an additional Judge and I look forward to the day when we will have a Bill before us having for its object the appointment of three Pusine Judges to sit in the Court of Criminal Appeal which is so necessary. I heard an honourable member say *sotto voce*: "Even if they have to sit and do nothing." As honourable members know, no person who is found guilty and sentenced at the Court of Grand Sessions has the right of appeal as is the case in British Guiana, Trinidad and other colonies whether a point of law is involved or whether it is a question of the sentence being too heavy. Anyway, I trust that this Bill before us will receive the sanction of honourable members without any opposition and that the appointment will be duly made by whoever is responsible for making such appointments and we will have the arrears of work wiped off. I also hope that provision will be made for the accommodation of this additional Judge as soon as possible.

Mr. LEWIS: This is a matter in which I cannot help the House, but I believe it is one in which the House can help me. I take it that if this additional Judge is to be of any use in this colony, there must be a time when he will sit simultaneously with the Chief Justice and hear cases. (A MEMBER: All the time). If that is so, then this is only the beginning of the expense in connection with this matter. You will have to provide another Court and the usual things belonging to a Court; you will have to provide an office and all the other necessary things. We cannot consider ourselves as having relieved any of the congestion of the work merely by the appointment of an additional Judge. The next thing is this; I understand that the appointment of another Judge will tend to bring about the holding up of cases in the lower Courts, having regard to the non-appearance of the lawyers therein. If you have two Judges and the lawyers have to run from before one Judge to the other, we do not know what will happen; of course we have an increase in the number of lawyers and one may be able to hold the papers of the other until he arrives. I hope that the Government will be able to give us some idea to what this entire proposal will cost; I also hope that satisfactory arrangements will be made, seeing that this is only a temporary provision being made, but it seems to me that we will have to go back to the place where we went at one time.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The nine Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to ask for the recommittal of Clause 8 for the purpose of asking a question. That Clause reads.

"The Puisne Judge shall receive such salary as the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall determine.".

I am wondering if the words "with the approval of the Legislature" should not be inserted in this Clause.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am moving that the House resume Committee and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee to deal with the additional Resolutions of which I gave notice earlier making provision for the payment of Government Employees at Dodds etc.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION NO. 31

Mr. ADAMS: The next Order is a Resolution that the sum of Thirty Three Thousand One Hundred Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951-52, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951—52, No. 31, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution seeks to provide under Head XXI — Department of Science and Agriculture — $3,000 for Labour; $2,000 for Labour for reaping canes and $12,000 for general running expenses at the Pine Plantation. Under Head XXIX — Miscellaneous — provision is asked of $4,800 for conferences. Under Annexed Estimates, Head II, Seawell Plantation, there is a provision of $3,000 for Labour, and under Head III, Dodds Plantation $7,500 is sought for Labour and $800.00 for Freight.

As regards the first three items, note 7 shows that the increase of 12½% in wages for the 1951 crop, the production bonus of 19% payable under the Domestic Sugar Agreement and the usual end of the year bonus have occasioned an insufficiency in all of the votes provided for the payment of wages to workers in the sugar industry at the Pine, Codrington Experimental Station, Dodds and Seawell Plantations. The supplementary expenditure set out under the various items above is therefore urgently required.

As regards the $4,800 asked for relative to Conferences the note shows that expenditure during the year on account of Conferences has been very high and the provision made in the 1951—52 Estimates has proved to be insufficient. Additional provision is requested to meet outstanding commitments and expenditure for the remainder of the financial year. I think that honourable members will agree with me in spite of the stupid sneers which sometimes appear in the Press and elsewhere about "joy rides", the Conferences which members of the Government or others have attended have been of sheer necessity. Honourable members might be surprised to know that some of us tried to avoid attending some of these

Conferences, far from being anxious to go. The Conferences actually attended were such as the Trade Delegation Conference and the Conference held by the World Health Organization which was attended by the Director of Medical Services. Inasmuch as there is only about $900.00 left for possible future Conferences between now and March, this supplementary provision is being asked for.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—For the benefit of the Government and those who attend these conferences I am going to suggest that it would be a good idea if after a conference takes place some note of the expenses in connection therewith and how the money is made up is given to the House. In that way we will know what is the established custom as regards conferences, and they will probably not occasion any such debate. It is Government's duty not only to the taxpayers, but to this House, to supply such information when it comes to a block vote for conferences.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION NO. 32

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of Eight Thousand Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 32, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

This Resolution follows from the last one. It is to provide money to meet additional expenditure at the Central Livestock Station and the District Agricultural Stations occasioned by the increase of 12½% in wages for the 1951 sugar crop, the production bonus of 19% payable under the Domestic Sugar Agreement and the usual end of the year bonus.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION NO. 30

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of Fifty-Two-Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Three Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52 No. 30 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Honourable members will see how this is made up. There is $1,575 as a grant to the Boy Scouts' Association on a dollar for dollar basis to send representatives from this colony to the Scout Jamboree in Jamaica. There is also $408.00 to provide an ex-gratia gratuity for an employee of the Highways and Transport Department who has not completed 10 years of service and would not come under the Act. It is felt that this is a hard case, and this provision is sought. Provision of $3,780 is also being asked to cover expenses in connection with the preparation of a new cost of living index. Honourable members will see from the note that this money may not be spent. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa has kindly said that they will do it for us and that they may not have to charge us. If they do have to charge, it will be about $1,000 Canadian. So we will have to have the money before we can tell them to go ahead. If we did not do so, and they charged us, we would incur the displeasure of the House.

The next item of expenditure is in connection with the Representation of the People Act. Honourable members will see that the costs of election these days—the legitimate costs—are very high. The figures have been carefully gone into. It is not possible to see how we will get people like Returning Officers, Polling Clerks and the like, except at the rates we have agreed to pay.

I move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — In spite of the honourable member's remarks we have been really given no details as to how the $3,780 under Item 3 is made up. We are not told what are the salaries, travelling allowances or allowances of any sort. Government has on occasions supplied such details in an addendum.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, — As regards this proposed new Cost of Living Index, I am wondering whether the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can tell us more definitely whether the Government will use this survey to any great extent. The explanation given to the Press by Mr. Straw recently was not very clear on the point.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agred to.

COST OF LIVING FOR C.D.W. EMPLOYEES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker — I am asking that Order No. 5 be taken as the next Order.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: This Order is a Resolution that with effect from the 16th day of June, 1951, a Cost of Living Allowance be paid to officers employed under Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes, at the rates, and subject to the terms and conditions set out in the Schedule hereto.

This is an abstract Resolution of the same effect as the others dealt with today. I move that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

C.O.L. FOR SAVINGS BANK EMPLOYEES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. SPEAKER, — The next Order is the following Resolution:—

Resolved that with effect from the 16th day of June, 1951, a Cost of Living Allowance be paid to

(a) Officers in the full time service of the Savings Bank who receive their salaries from the funds of the Bank;

(b) Officers who retired from the full time service of the Bank at any time between the 16th day of June, 1951, and the date of the passing of this resolution in circumstances rendering them eligible for the grant of a pension or gratuity

at the rates, and subject to the terms and conditions set out in the Schedule hereto.

Mr. ADAMS: This Resolution seeks to provide Cost of Living Allowance to employees of the Government Savings Bank, and I beg to move that it do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE FOR OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to deal with the Resolution to provide a cost of living allowance for the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk and the Marshal of the House as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

On the Order being called,

Mr. ADAMS: This is the usual way in which we deal with these Officers who are Officers of the House; it is the one way in which we can deal with them. This is a Resolution which does not come from the Government inasmuch as these Officers are deemed to be our servants and not the servants of the Government. This Resolution reads as follows:

Resolved that the salaries of the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk and the Marshal of the House of Assembly be increased by way of cost of living allowance, at the same rates and on the same terms as those mentioned in Resolution No. 26 of 1951—52 relating to officers of the Civil Establishment drawing equal pay, from the 16th day of June, 1951:—

viz: On the first $480 of annual salary or part thereof	20%
On the second $480 of annual salary or part thereof	7½%
On the third $480 of annual salary or part thereof	5%

The terms and conditions are the same as those relating to Officers of the Civil Establishment. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

ADDRESS *RE* COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE FOR OFFICERS OF THE LEGISLATURE

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to deal with, as the next Order of the Day, an Address to His Excellency the Governor asking that legislation be sent down to provide a cost of living allowance for the Official Reporters, the Chaplains and the Librarian and Confidential Secretary of the Houses of the Legislature.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave.

On the Order being called,

Mr. ADAMS: This Address reads as follows:

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to send down the legislation necessary to provide a cost of living allowance at the same rates and on the same terms mentioned in Resolution No. 26 of 1951—52, for the Official Reporters, the Chaplains and the Librarian and Confidential Secretary, of the Houses of Legislature, with effect from the 16th June, 1951.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to have the position of the Librarian and Confidential Secretary explained to me. I understand that he is an Officer in the service— — — —

Mr. SPEAKER: His position has not yet been entirely defined.

Mr. LEWIS: I understand that at present the Librarian and Confidential Secretary comes under the Civil Establishment. I think that the position should be clarified to honourable members; I am very sorry that it is hazy now. Honourable members should know where they stand in a matter of this sort; it is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs to find that we have somebody working with the Clerk and nobody knows whether he is entirely an employee of the House, whether he has been incorporated in the Civil List or in any other list. It seems to me to be very unsatisfactory that the Officers of the House cannot get any holiday unless we specially grant it to them, but the Library and Confidential Secretary can get his holiday because he is thought to be a member of the Civil Establishment and now we discover that he is not a member of that Establishment. I think we should readily understand what our position is in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. I ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to present this Address.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

LEASE OF LAND TO MR. J. W. HINDS

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 13 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution — Resolution to make it lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to James Winston Hinds that parcel of land, abutting on Bay Street but otherwise surrounded by the lands of "Murray Lodge" the property of the said James Winston Hinds, situate in Upper Bay Street in the parish of St. Michael and containing by admeasurement twenty-one perches.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is a Resolution to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease this land to Mr. J. W. Hinds. It is a matter which has been hanging fire for a long time. As honourable members will see, the Addendum to this Resolution states:

"On 24th December, 1947, the Executive Committee enterd into an agreement with Albert Clarence Greaves to rent him for a period of ten years with effect from 1st January, 1918, the plot of land just south of the Bay Street Boys' School (but separated from the School by the gap to "Murray Lodge"). Since 1928, when the agreement expired, up to the time of his death, Mr. Greaves continued to rent the land on a year to year basis. James Winston Hinds who has recently purchased the property known as "Murray Lodge" from the estate of Albert Clarence Greaves, deceased, has enquired through his solicitors whether the Government would be willing to rent him this area of land.

This Resolution seeks to give the Executive Committee the necessary authority to lease this land to James Winston Hinds in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951."

This is only a formality. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I happen to know this land and it is very inconvenient for anybody owning the house not to have this piece of land, especially if he is going to carry on any kind of business there. I am wondering if the trees which are on this land will become the property of the person who has leased it, and if, for his own convenience, he will be able to alter the situation which exists at present. I think he should be allowed to do so, but I would like to know if the Government is apprised of any special use to which this land will be put, or if it will be left as it is. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Peter will be able to answer me to the best of his ability, otherwise let us postpone the consideration of this Resolution until the honourable member can supply the facts.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This land was leased to Mr. Greaves and the lease has been going on for many years. I do not know if, because the land is leased to somebody else, something will happen to the trees.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that Mr. Greaves had leased the land and he might have been glad for some trees to grow there because he did not want to use the land; but a new person leasing this land might want to put it to some use. He might want to use it in carrying on business.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In so far as the conditions of this lease are concerned, I will not be able to answer the honourable member; I do not know what business the man is going to carry on. This land is adjacent to the property which the man has bought and he is asking for the same lease which Mr. Greaves had in respect of this land. For us to postpone this matter so as to find out whether Mr. Hinds will cut down the trees or allow the land to remain as it is, is something which does not arise.

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

SELECT COMMITTEES DISCHARGED

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable senior member for St. Joseph moves the adjournment of the House, I have the honour to discharge the following Select Committees:—The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to provide for the notification of accidents and occupational diseases; and the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on His Excellency's Message relating to the Farm Institute in Trinidad.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 23rd day of October, 1951, at 3 p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.