

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, May 12, 1953.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*) Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Dr. H. G. CUMMINS M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs. M. E. Cox, F. L. WALCOTT, F. C. GODDARD, J. A. HAYNES, J. C. MOTTLEY, C. E. TALMA, Mrs. M. E. BOURNE, and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS LL.B.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting of the 28th April, 1953, which had been printed and circulated were taken as read and were confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended March 31 this year.

I have also received the Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 31st of March this year from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. John in connection with tenantry roads.

Also the Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 31st of March from the Commissioners of Highways of St. John.

Mr. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay the following Paper:—

Report of the Commissioner of Income Tax for the year 1951-52.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Fishing Boat (Loans) Regulations, 1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution that with effect from the 1st of April, 1952, the allowances set out in Column II of the Schedule hereto shall be applicable to the officers set out in Column I of the Schedule.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1950.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

Mr. ALLDER the House and took his seat.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT the Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1950 and the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921, were read a first time.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave that the honourable junior member for St. Peter be allowed to take Order No. 8 on the Order Paper as the first item in to-day's sitting.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE FANCY
MOLASSES RATE

On the order being called for Mr. F. L. WALCOTT to move the passing of the Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the rate payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on fancy molasses produced during the crop year 1952—53.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, — This Resolution, as I said on the last occasion when I dealt with it, has been amended because it has been discovered that the price is now 68 cents instead of 67½ cents. This is purely a formal matter, but on the last occasion honourable members began to bring in arguments about the general sugar industry with which this Resolution is not concerned. I do not intend to begin to stimulate a debate of that nature today.

It has been drawn to my attention that the price of 68 cents and not 67½ cents has been quoted in Canada. As I have said I do not wish to

stimulate debate on irrelevant questions. Anything that is worth replying to I will reply to. This is a formal matter, and I now beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, — I desire to draw to the notice of the Government that the molasses industry in this island is already threatened with extinction, and it will be a sad day for labour when these small syrup factories go out of production. There has not been a year now for the last five or seven years that the people interested in the molasses industry have not felt some apprehension as to its continuance. It is time that we who represent the labouring interests of that industry draw to the notice of the Government their plight and do everything in our power to see that this ancient and profitable industry, an important part of the economy of this country, does not go out of existence.

That is all the more important because as far as I know, the Government is making no efforts to establish new industries which would take the place of the molasses industry. Every year there is apprehension on the part of those concerned with this industry as to whether it will be the last year that they will produce molasses. Last year several hundreds of labouring folk were out of work for several weeks before the normal end of the crop season owing to the lack of demand for molasses in the Canadian market. Some hitch hindered that normal demand on the part of Canada for Barbados molasses; a demand which this country has traditionally looked forward to.

The Government has sent a Commission to Canada; but it is not yet apparent what purpose the visit of that Commission has served. I am warning the Government that it is their duty to go seriously into the matter, and do everything in their power to save this industry, regardless of what is necessary to save it. If it is bulk shipment that is necessary, bulk shipment must come in. The few labourers or porters in Bridgetown whom that might displace cannot be compared with the number of agricultural labourers who depend for four months of the year on the wages which they get from syrup production. It is a very false policy just to bolster up a small section of the trade union community in Bridgetown, and at the same time put in jeopardy another very much larger section of the labouring class of the island. If, I repeat, bulk shipment is necessary to save this industry, then bulk shipment must take place no matter how unpopular it may be. It is the majority that we have to think about—the primary producers. It is they who are actually concerned with the production of molasses and not the actual shipment of it that must be considered. I desire again to emphasise the serious effect it will have on labouring families in this island if the Government allows the molasses industry to dwindle or to be abolished altogether.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—It is not my intention as the honourable introducer of this Resolution has said, to prolong the debate on this matter. But I think I can say that since I have become a member of this House I have advised many a cooper to get out of this industry, because bulk shipment, whether we like it or not, will have to come. I think that the over-all picture which the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board has arrived at has bulk shipment in it. The large wholesalers in Canada want molasses in bulk and also in a form in which they can put it in some kind of wax container. Another thing is that in Canada there are several substitutes with which Barbados Fancy Molasses has to compete. So we need not think that we can go to Canada and tell

them what to do and when to do it. We cannot.

I think it is pretty generally recognised that bulk shipment will have to be employed in order to keep down costs. It is largely a question of cost. I think that the delegation which returned from Canada have agreed so far on bulk shipment from 1953. On the other hand it seems that all the wholesalers in Canada will not be in a position to accept molasses in bulk, so I think it will be the policy of the industry to send some in bulk and some in cartons. I think it is too early to give more details. The new Fancy Molasses Bill is about to come before the House, and I think I can assure the honourable junior member for St. John that everything is being done—as far as I am concerned as a member of the Fancy Molasses Board—to save the industry. But I am not prepared for one minute to let people live in fallacy. Up to yesterday I said that anyone who went and bought a new cooperage at this stage was mad, and anyone who held the idea that we would just have to change the form of shipment from puncheons to drums was equally mad. Everyone knows what a puncheon of molasses looks like when it reaches Canada. We are living in a world where conditions are changing every day, and if Barbadians do not want to face those new conditions it is just too bad for them.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, — We thought that we would have got more information from the honourable senior member for St. Peter today; because I understood that that was why it was postponed—in order that honourable members could get some information as to the cause of the closing down of some of these syrup factories, and other things concerned with the molasses industry. But instead of giving the House more information the honourable member has given less.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution did not deal with that originally.

Mr. ALLDER: I really expected that the honourable member would have given us more enlightenment on the matter, and I hoped that he would have been able to allay the fears that were expressed on the last occasion. But I notice that he was on his feet a shorter time today than on the occasion when the motion for postponement of the Resolution was successfully made.

I must agree with what has been said about the importance of this industry to the economy of the island, and I must agree also that we should not allow it to be destroyed. It is no secret, Sir, that some of the interested parties are expressing the opinion that because the Government has allowed manipulations in the trade by the bigger combines the smaller factories are being forced to close down or to face the difficulties which monopolistic tendencies create.

I sincerely hope that the Government will clarify the position so as to allay the fears which not only small plant owners are experiencing, but which are also being experienced by workers in the industry. I feel Sir, that you should not allow so many plants to go out of operation without making some safeguards as regards the reaping of the canes which the island produces. And do not forget that the people who will meet with the most difficulty are the peasants who have no other alternative on which to depend but selling their produce to the factories. They are arriving at the state where if they refuse the price of a particular factory they cannot get any other factory to take their canes unless they are prepared to spend more money so as to transport the canes to another factory or other factories several miles away. Pricing peasants' canes will thus become an arbitrary matter because

there would be too few factories willing to take their canes unless the prices which those factories offer are accepted by the peasants. Government cannot allow the peasants, a reasonable and respectable section of the community, to suffer such hardships without creating such safeguards as are necessary.

If these factories are allowed to close down it will be very difficult to put up new ones. Scarcely any of the existing owners would be willing to go that far in putting up new factories. Last year a few of them were closed down. This crop just a few remained especially in the parish which I have the honour to represent, and now there are rumours that about two or three others will be closed. That means greater difficulty and hardship for the industry as a whole, and especially for the peasants — a thing that should not occur.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,— I cannot agree with the honourable senior member for St. Peter that it was irrelevant to bring up the matter which was brought up on the last occasion, and which has been brought up again today. The Resolution deals with the rate payable to producers and the rate of tax payable by the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board. I do not see how the control and marketing of molasses could be irrelevant to the question of its production.

I am the person who started off this debate because I had seen from the Official Gazette that the local canning company had gone into liquidation. I thought it strange that we should allow such a thing to happen. I did not think we should allow such a thing to happen without mentioning it in this Chamber and finding out if the Government had taken any notice of it.

When the molasses industry wants to find out what is happening in Canada they come to this House for eleven thousand odd dollars to send a commission to Canada. This is a matter that concerns this House. On that occasion the molasses industry was treated as if it were a department of the Government. Eleven thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent. I admit that it resulted in a very interesting report. But I find it strange that the people in Canada are complaining against our canning molasses and sending it there, and the Barbadian element in the canning factory wants to close it down, while a Canadian firm in the West Indies wants to carry it on. There is something peculiar from A to Z. It needs a clear sight on the part of the Government to watch and see if we are not being let in for something.

I cannot follow the argument of the honourable senior member for St. John when he brings in the peasant proprietor in this matter. The peasant is not going to get any more from canes when they are made into molasses than when they are made into sugar. He brought in the question of transporting the canes. At present a syrup factory might be next door to a peasant; but if one is set up far from him he will have to send his canes to it just the same.

I think that the molasses industry is a worthwhile one, and I think that when we can it here and put it in a tin with Barbados on the label, it is known in Canada that that is Barbados molasses. That in itself is a form of advertisement for the island. We are asked to spend thousands of dollars to bring in tourists. The hotels would like every thing free so that the tourist industry can be encouraged. They may soon want free food. But now that we have this opportunity of advertising Barbados, it is fading out because the people in Canada

are objecting to our canning molasses, and at the same time the Canadians in the West Indies want to take over the canning. In the face of all this one must come to the conclusion that something is seriously wrong somewhere. I am asking the Government to look into the matter.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am merely holding on until the honourable senior member for St. Peter comes back to the House. But even if I were not doing that, I must draw attention to the fact that the last honourable member who spoke sat down on a sentence half of which showed no intelligence, and the other half, at least forgetfulness. The honourable member is entirely wrong when he suggests by implication at least that the Government is not more than interested in the molasses situation, and he is entirely forgetful when he speaks about spending eleven thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money. The Government's attitude on that occasion saved a near riot. Half of the Bridgetown exporters of molasses were saying "tank shipment" and the other half were saying "puncheon shipment." With that conflicting element, and with the waterfront seething with unrest there would have been out and out war if the tanker had been allowed to take the molasses away. We put the facts to the Legislature and asked for a vote to send a delegation to Canada to take evidence for ourselves. That evidence was taken, and it was very conflicting.

I can say that I did not know I had a single friend in the merchantile community who was so anxious to fill me with news as to how this or that should be run. He did that because he was in favour of puncheon shipment. Today you get one exporter arguing in favour of tank shipment, and another arguing for puncheon shipment. The honourable member knows why the Government spent that eleven thousand dollars. He knows better than to try to make a point by suggesting that it was just a case of merchants quarrelling among themselves and then the Government treated the industry as if it were a Government Department.

A few weeks ago while on my way back from England I met two of the most prominent Canadians in the molasses industry. One whom I had met only a month before had told me that he sympathised with the workers of Barbados. He knew that if Barbados went in for tank shipment it would mean that people like coopers would be out of work. But it paid him to import molasses by tanker. When I saw him a few weeks ago he was engaged in importing molasses from Cuba by tanker. That is one of the difficulties we have to face. The Canadians themselves are divided over the question. Sir John Saint, honourable Mr. Chandler and I went into a little shop in Canada where there was a puncheon of molasses on the floor and a little hand pump. Someone would come along and buy a gallon. On the other hand we visited shops where the customer could come in and serve himself. That is obviously the reason why you get conflicting evidence.

The gentleman who came here with the tanker on the occasion of the near riot was disappointed. He has five new tankers along the waterside in much the same way that Tom & Cameron's building is along the water side here. A 30 foot pipe brings molasses from the tankers right to his back door. Of course he likes bulk shipment. Other people in Canada who have those facilities will also benefit from bulk shipment; but all the Canadian importers do not have those facilities.

I have spoken at length so that honourable members can see that not only are interests in Barbados

divided over the two forms of shipment, but the Canadians themselves are; and Government is taking a keen interest in the matter. It is not fair to give the impression to the public that the Government is standing by and allowing the industry to die. The honourable senior member for St. John ties himself up with the English language, and he can be forgiven for some of the things he says. But the honourable junior member for the City should know better. Anyone listening to him would imagine that the Government is allowing the Molasses Industry to die because the Government is not doing its duty. I am, as I said, only holding on for the honourable senior member for St. Peter, but I wanted to correct that impression. In the short space of a few weeks you get a friend of Barbados saying to me that he realises the difficulties that would face the coopers if Barbados went in for bulk shipment, but he soon realises that it is a question of business where he is concerned, and he begins to import in bulk from Cuba. Business is business, I am told. I think that that is one of the most damnable phrases in the English language. The honourable junior member for Christ Church is in business, but he is not of business. In business there is no humanity; no consideration for the other man except as regards what you can get out of him.

We have said in the report that the horse and buggy days are over — although there are a few picturesque relics. Similarly the day will come when nearly everyone in Canada will not be satisfied to carry a skillet into a country retail shop for molasses. He will want his in a package. To suggest that Government or even business men in Barbados are not alive to the problem is not true. I have often had cause to attack business men by reason of the fact that they are — well — business men with business men's ways. But you cannot accuse them of lethargy. I will not particularise about business men in Broad Street lest I abuse my position of privilege by saying in the Legislature what I would not say outside. But they can hold their own with business sharks anywhere.

Does the honourable junior member for the City think that if you ignore what the Canadian exporter tells you you will get a single can of molasses sold in Canada? If he thinks so he is **completely mistaken**. Again I apologise for this long speech, but it is not fair to suggest that the Government is to be blamed in this matter. Business men in the city have taken a long time to try to get together to do what the Commission suggested. The individualistic nature of the average Barbadian business man has prevented him from combining in the past, and the "tankers" are still fighting the "non-tankers." Not always because of humane interest in the coopers, but because the non-tanker exports to people in Canada who sell in villages and who want the molasses in puncheons.

As regards the suggestion about advertising Barbados by sending molasses in cans with the name "Barbados" on it, I will tell the House that some people in Canada went into stores and saw the can with the name Bema and the map of Barbados, and they turned away because they thought it was tinned ham. The mistake arose because of the shape of Barbados on the map which appears on the can. It is all these little snags and difficulties that business men must combine to solve. Need I say that the Government owes its continuance and the immortality which it is doomed to have to the fact that trade union people believe in us and support us. Does any honourable member think that we would be so foolish not to have the interests of the waterfront worker at

heart and to see that legislation is passed which will keep them in a job? To accuse us of not doing our best in this connection is to accuse us of trying to cut our own throats.

I hope that I have heard the last of the suggestion that the Government is marking time with this industry. If any honourable member feels quite sincerely that there is danger of the industry dying, and he wants more information, he has only to go to the honourable senior member for St. Peter. The honourable member will not be as short in individual conversations as he is on the floor of the House. What is more he has information which it may not always be possible to give in public. I will even go so far as to say that he will listen sympathetically to the honourable member for St. John, believing that he really has the interests of the working classes at heart, however misguided he may be, and however dazzled he may be by the glare of the Electors' Association. I was about to say the honourable senior member for St. John, but I reflected that that would not be doing my duty to the junior member. However, I will say both members.

I think I have said more than enough. Honourable members will pardon me if they think that I have over stated the case. But I wanted the House to see that this is a difficult problem, and we are watching it keenly.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I want to say that this is not a matter on which information should be withheld until interested parties make known their desire to have it. This is a matter which concerns a very large section of the population. In my opinion there is no need to regard it as personal knowledge to be given secretly.

Now the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that the action of the Government in spending \$11,000 at the time saved a near riot. One wonders who would have led the riot. One wonders if half of the "big sixes" armed with cutlasses and the other half armed with sticks would have marched upon the Union Headquarters in Fairchild Street and attacked the officials there when the tanker came down here to load molasses and was unable to do so. One also wonders if perhaps this riot would have been composed of all the big sixes armed with cutlasses and the waterfront workers trying to cut off the necks of the officials. It is now conceded that the tanker which came here at a cost of something like \$17,000 must have had the green light to come before it came. No one could imagine responsible business men in Bridgetown putting themselves to the expense of \$17,000 to bring a tanker here to load molasses unless they had had some previous undertaking that they would be allowed to load molasses in bulk. And one must remember too that a section of the road had been taken up to facilitate the loading of the molasses by pipe line to the tanker. It seems to me that if the authorities knew nothing about the digging up of this road the country must be running itself. The only riot that could have taken place would be of the big fellows divided into two—half in favour of tank shipment and the other half in favour of puncheons. The latter half would be saying, "we do not mind the bulk shipment; but let us get rid of our shacks first. But until then you are not going to bulk ship at all." Those were the two opposing sections of the mercantile community, and on the other hand there were the waterfront workers highly incensed over the situation. One can only deplore the fact that the riot did not take place. It would have been the most interesting riot in the history of the island. It would have been called the "friends revolution." It certainly would have made

the 1937 Disturbances look like a Sunday School treat in comparison.

What I am interested in, however, is not whether someone has shucks on hand, or whether someone has to recoup the loss they suffered in getting that tanker down here. What I am interested in is a market for our entire output of molasses or whether the demand will be increased if we bulk ship. That is the information which I would really like to get. If you are closing down factories all over the island and putting people out of work—not only in St. John but all over the island—merely over this question of shipment, then I think we should do something about it. We spent \$11,000 for a Commission to investigate the question on the spot, because we wanted to have first hand information with regard to the marketing possibilities of locally produced fancy molasses in Canada. With that information in our possession we should be able to arrive at some decision as to whether bulk shipment is in the interest of the island as a whole so that we cannot merely look at the sectional interest of the waterfront workers as the dominating factor in making our decision one way or another. Neither should we regard as the dominating factor the equally sectional interest of that part of the mercantile community who are temporarily interested in shipping in puncheons. Our decision has to be in the interest of the island as a whole. It is not merely the question of a few hundred thousand dollars invested in canning equipment or in puncheons; it is a question of the preservation of the island's economy and the effect that will be caused by the closing down of these factories throughout the island. As pointed out by the honourable senior member for St. John, if these syrup factories are allowed to close down the location of many sugar factories in relation to large numbers of small holders will mean that the extra cost incurred in sending their canes to the sugar factories can very well mean a difference between producing canes economically and otherwise.

So this is not a question on which we can afford to hide information or to regard it as special knowledge for a special section of the Community. It has to be regarded from a single point of view—what is the best thing for the industry and the colony as a whole. That is the attitude which should activate the policy of the Government in this matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have heard so much about sectional interests that I want to say at the outset that I do not pretend that my representation is not sectional. I do not represent everyone, because everyone does not want me to represent them. I represent Labour. I have heard a lot of extraneous talk about this matter. But I do not want to take over the preserve of Your Honour. We had a report of the Commission that went to Canada. Honourable members have not quoted the report; but everytime you bring down a Resolution of this sort they take advantage of the opportunity to bring in all sorts of irrelevant matters.

On the question that the Government is allowing people to close down factories it is amusing to hear what honourable members will say on things of this sort. Of course the honourable senior member for St. Philip was trying to hit at the Union of which I am Secretary when he said that an agreement was made by the Union Officials to bulk ship molasses without the knowledge of the other people in the Union and there was a near riot. That is why the organisation which he had has collapsed. He had no decisions to take and no workers to represent.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is speaking on a point of order?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The honourable senior member for St. Peter has quoted me as saying that a decision was taken by officials of the Union without the knowledge of the workers. I would like him to say where and at what time I said that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member said it in this debate. He said that the near riot would have been worse than the 1937 Disturbances. He was trying to give the impression that the Officials of the Union made an agreement to allow molasses to be shipped in bulk without the knowledge of the workers concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the honourable member wants to tell us that that is what happened he can tell us.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is now out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said it would have been the big sixes divided into two camps. I went on to say that it would be surprising at the least that a section of the road could have been dug up without the knowledge of the authorities.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would hate to misquote the honourable member. But I am not going to allow him to make any wild statements without replying to him, and I made notes of what he said. When the Debate of this meeting comes out it will prove what the honourable member said.

As I was saying, Sir, as regards this question of the Government allowing factories to be closed down, the Government does not open a factory, nor does Government close down one. Honourable members have spoken as if the Government closed down syrup factories. Can anyone tell the Canadians to buy anything at a special price? The Cuban Government is now fighting the Dominican Republic over the way in which they ship sugar. When you are dealing with a country that has sovereignty what can Barbados do? Where this industry is concerned labour costs are more or less the costs of shipping in puncheons. Honourable members talk about trying to protect interests. There is nothing wrong in protecting the interests of those who are going to be thrown out of work. In one breath the honourable member said we should not regard sectional interests; and in another breath he said the peasants will suffer.

I am prepared to debate the Report of the Commission that went to Canada, not to listen to wild statements. Honourable members speak as though the Government has set out to destroy the molasses industry. If the price of sugar drops to-morrow will you blame the Government? Sugar has been bought already for next year? Can we control that? As regards the question of shipping the molasses there is a division of opinion between the shippers and the producers. Another committee went up to Canada since and investigated the question of shipping. The very members who talk so much about sectional interests are the ones with the sectional interests. My sectional interest can be seen and known. I do not have to make private pacts with employers. In any matter in which the interests of any section of the workers is involved I must see that the interests of those workers are protected. And when it comes to the question of putting people out of employment I must see that provision is made for that. Let no one think that if there will be a reduction of employment for sugar workers or port workers I will sit down and say that it is inevitable. I ask honourable members what are they doing in their own capacity to assist in this matter? Have they come here with facts, or merely with jibes? But they cannot jibe me. I have worked too hard.

If a person makes out that he is suffering a loss by operating a factory can the Government prevent him from closing it? Suppose the honourable junior member for St. Andrew wanted to retire and sell out to Spring Hall, could the Government stop him? What is Government's concern? It is to see, if you must go out of business, that the people who work with you are properly compensated. There are people who have no desire to do any hard work on behalf of the workers. They can only make insinuations and try to impute bad motives to other people, and to spoil their characters, while they themselves are far from having any character.

The question of shipping in bulk or not shipping in bulk is one which the island has to watch very carefully. This is a matter that cannot be rushed. All the facts have not yet been stated, and things are still cloudy as regards the real wishes of the Canadians.

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT GENERAL AMENDMENT NO. 3 ORDER

On the order being called for Mr. Adams to move the passing of the following Resolution:

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the passing of this Resolution I hope that I shall have the forgiveness of the House if I say things which also apply to other Resolutions on the Order Paper, though I shall not go into much detail. They have to be separate orders because they deal with separate heads, and in the case of the Savings Bank you deal with a special Act. I think, therefore, that the House will forgive me for speaking in general terms of the proposals for salary to the lower grades of the Civil Service.

If I do not speak at great length it is not that I am desirous of rushing things through, and trying to prevent honourable members from seeing all the the points which doubtlessly they have seen before coming into the House. But after the Five Year Plan and the Turner Committee Report, and the discussions that took place on both of those matters, and after the attention which honourable member must have given to this subject—it is even more important than was the question of higher salaries for the highest grades of the Service—to speak at length and to go into much detail would be like trying to teach honourable members the alphabet. Therefore, I shall endeavour, rather in the nature of a second reading speech on a budget, to point out the main features of the Government's proposals as regards the salaries of those members of the Civil Service who have not been dealt with by the Turner Committee, and by the subsequent legislation that came to the House.

Honourable members will remember that it was far back as August last year—we could not get a suitable Commissioner before—it was as late as August last year that Sir Errol Dos Santos was appointed in compliance with the expressed policy of the Government to deal with the Civil Service as exhaustively as possible, although the Government admitted that when it first started its object was to stop the drain of professional officers, especially secondary school teachers from Barbados to Trinidad and British Guiana and other neighbouring colonies.

Sir Errol was appointed, and the House will pardon me for repeating his terms of reference. I will repeat them so that honourable members may reflect before possibly making certain attacks as to what he was supposed to do. The terms were:—

To review and to make recommendations regarding the remuneration of all Government servants in Barbados, excluding those covered by the Turner Committee Report, except where it is considered anomalies still exist or would be created by the recommendations to be made.

To enquire into and report on any matters incidental to the foregoing which may appear relevant to the enquiry, and to make recommendations as to any consequential adjustments arising therefrom.

Well, the subsequent history of the matter is well known to honourable members. I need only say that Sir Errol did keep within the time. The Report was laid in the middle of December last year. One of the reasons why I am going to be brief is this: No member can claim that he did not have Sir Errol's suggestions before him for a considerable time, and that there has not been ample time in which to come to some conclusion as to the general worth or worthlessness of the report. Honourable members will agree with me that Sir Errol did a very careful job although he used one or two phrases which might not be pleasing to the Barbadian. It is always difficult for a non-Barbadian, even if he thinks he knows the Barbadian and knows the things that will please him, not to unwittingly offend. I am sure that Sir Errol put that scriptural reference into his report knowing how religious Barbadians are. But it has been quoted against him. I think we will agree that he has also offended the susceptibilities of some Barbadians, and drawn on himself unjustifiable criticism by using the word "Trinidad" very often. But he knew Trinidad better than any other West Indian colony. He went through the ranks as high as he could go. But although in these two respects he has incurred some criticism I think we will agree that he has done a careful job; and after all, since we were saying that we were trying to prevent officers of the highest grade from being drawn away to Trinidad and British Guiana; surely he was justified in saying that Trinidad pays so and so. The fact that he made comparison with another colony should not diminish the value of his report.

I know that some honourable members have been critical of the delay which has occurred in sending down these proposals. I have been at pains to keep the House informed from time to time of the cause of the delay. On this occasion, at any rate, it cannot be suggested that the Leader of the Government was out of the island too often so that these proposals could not be dealt with. As honourable members may be aware I came back to this island last month in the hope that the Civil Service would be ready and that I would have been able to do what I am doing to-day before going to London for the Federation Conference. But they were not completely ready. The Government which is always ready to face any situation is to-day ready to face the situation of some honourable members attacking us purely out of habit. They will say that the Government is always ready to pour a lot of money on those at the top. If the honourable members for St. John do not accuse us—to use a phrase of the honourable senior member for St. Philip—of being nitwits, I want to see what they are going to say to-day. They are always attacking the Government for spending too much money on the Civil Servants. Before the negotiations with the Whitley Council were completed we were in the position of reporting to the Executive that it looked as if we would be criticised for paying too much. We are prepared to face either criticism—that of doing too much, or that of doing too little.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very strong as regards the suggestions that certain recommendations

result in too much money for this or that particular post. The mere fact that you will get two accusations—too much money and too little money—shows that we have done a good job.

Another point: No member of the Service as far as I know is blaming Government for the delay, because they understood that the delay was caused by the desire of the Government at every stage of our consideration of these proposals, to get as far as humanly possible acceptance by the Civil Service Association and Whitley Council. The Whitley Council met no fewer than 15 times in the past three months. There was a considerable amount of work and a considerable amount of consultation. If they met at the rate of more than once a week to consider proposals which had already arisen out of serious consideration by Executive Committee it is obvious that these proposals have been completely threshed out. I am saying what I am saying now not because I hope it will carry conviction to anyone who wants to attack the Government; but it does seem a little farcical, if the Civil Servants ask for money; Government makes certain proposals; they say it is not enough and we bargain and bargain until they say they are satisfied; and then when the matter comes before the Legislature, although the Civil Servants have said they are satisfied, some honourable member gets up and says we are not giving enough. I have not heard any member of the Civil Service saying they are getting too much, although some were surprised at the increases suggested by Sir Errol.

I repeat, Sir, and I will not say it again, that the Government has not got to apologise for the fact that this matter is being dealt with to-day and not nearer the beginning of the year. I also repeat with emphasis that in every case in which the Whitley Council told the Government they had not agreed on any particular point, the Government told them they must agree, and they had to go back and consider it again until agreement was finally reached.

I think in view of remarks that have been made from time to time, and which will be made again, that I will say there are times when it may reasonably be said that the Civil Service, or some portions of it, forget that they are only one section of the community. That argument will be raised by the two honourable members for St. John, and also the argument that there are other things to be done, like building more schools etc. That is true. Therefore the Government took a strong hand in several cases with the result that concessions, if you call them that, were made by the Whitley Council because they saw reason, and were content with the Government's proposals. On the other hand, in some cases Government increased its original proposals.

In referring to some figures I will just point out that although I hinted at the time I introduced the Estimates that possibly the Government would have to come down for a substantially greater amount than was set out in Sir Errol's proposals, in actual fact the cost of the present proposals are not so much higher than Sir Errol's. I do not suppose that the Government, being human, has to apologise for saying that there were times when it felt that it would like to lop off some of Sir Errol's suggestions. On the other hand it is hard to persuade the Legislature that you are acting rightly when you appoint a man to make recommendations and then go against them, as for example if he says \$20.00 and you say \$10.00. I say that, because the proposals affecting the Police were a little startling.

Now the cost of the present proposals is estimated at \$386,834 for 1952—53 against an estimated amount of \$374,887 contained in Sir Errol's proposals, an over-all increase of nearly \$12,000 for the past finan-

cial year, 1952—53. The figures for this year are \$435,368 against \$413,894, representing an increase of \$21,474 over Sir Errol's proposals. So again although we have gone above his proposals we have not done so by any great extent. Cost of living allowance is \$17,600 for 1952—53, and \$19,900 for the present financial year. I will remind the House that most of the increases over the Commissioner's proposals are largely offset by reductions elsewhere. For instance, as I have already said, there were certain matters over which the Government and the Whitley Council differed from time to time—mainly over the question of allowances. As regards some of the allowances in Sir Errol's recommendations he was thinking primarily of Trinidad, and when we went into his proposals carefully, we found that it was obvious in many cases that Trinidad could not be used as an absolute guide, and therefore we did not approve of some of his suggested allowances. As a result, although we have increased in some directions, by not allowing allowances in other directions we have not gone, in the over-all picture, in actual pounds, shillings and pence, very much beyond Sir Errol's proposals.

I would like to say again that I think the greatest critic of the Government will pay tribute to Sir Errol for having done a thorough job of work whether you agree with all of his proposals or not—it seems to me impossible anyhow for a Barbadian to agree completely with anyone else—and the thanks of the Government of Barbados and of the Legislature are due to Sir Errol for having been so careful and thorough in his recommendations.

Now I propose under one or two heads to deal with outstanding matters which honourable members are sure to comment on, and to say why the Government has adopted the attitude that it has adopted on these particular heads. Perhaps the first question with which I should deal is whether or not cost of living allowance should be consolidated. Sir Errol says no, and the Government has said no. Under the present circumstances, with the absolute uncertainty of the world situation and world prices, it is not Government's view that cost of living allowance should be consolidated. At one time we hear that the prices of commodities will soon come down. We hear that the Korean War will soon be over and that prices will tumble. At another time we hear gird on your armour, the fight is about to begin and prices will go back up. So with the world perhaps in greater uncertainty now that that so much peace is being talked about, Government feels that it would be unwise to say that there is that much stability in prices that would warrant us in consolidating cost of living allowance with basic salary.

As honourable members will see, the Government is proposing to keep the existing rates of Cost-of-Living Allowance, which are 20 per cent on the first \$480, 7½ per cent on the second \$480, and 5 per cent on the third \$480. This will, undoubtedly require an additional \$17,600 as already stated for last year and \$19,000 for this year to meet this cost of living on increased salaries.

Now, I do not know what the criticism is going to be on the question of emoluments, but Government has seen no reason to differ from the policy as adopted in the 1948 revision of salaries. It will be remembered that the policy is: when a person enters on a new scale, he enters at the point of scale immediately above his present existing emolument. We know that in many quarters of the Civil Service, this is one of the sore points; but we also know that in some quarters this is a method which meets with approval. However, this Government feels that this policy was right then, and on that

feeling Government thinks it is also right to do so now. I will not say any more at this stage on this matter.

There are one or two matters in detail which I shall deal with briefly. I will begin with the grading of the Civil Service. As regards to the Executive Grade, Sir Errol Dos Santos recommended that this grade should be split into two groups: Group A receiving a salary of \$2,880 x 144—3,456. He did not propose any revision of salary for those in Group B. Government after looking into this matter has decided that this grade which is only a few years old should be continued as it is; therefore, it has not accepted Sir Errol's recommendations of splitting it into two. As regards to Senior Clerks and officers of similar status, Sir Errol has not recommended a change in salary for these officers. The scale of salary for an officer in this grade is \$2,160 x 120 — 2,880. The Government's present proposal for this grade is \$2,280 x 120 — 3,000. For the maximum of \$2,160 recommended by the Salaries Commissioner for the Long Grade Clerk and other corresponding scales, the Government's present proposal is \$2,280. However, the rates for these two grades are to be offset by a commencing salary of \$1,680 rising by the usual yearly increments; therefore, although Government has pushed up the maximum in both grades—the Senior Grade to \$3,000 and the Long Grade to \$2,280,—the increase is not as great as it appears at first sight.

The next matter I will deal with is the Police. I shall say nothing more about them than to say that most of us think that they are generously treated in the recommendations of Sir Errol but that Government has not agreed as to the increased allowances as was recommended by him. I do not think any honourable member can be approached by policemen complaining about the increases given to them even though that honourable member may be approached by Civil Servants in every other department of Government.

So far as nurses are concerned, we have accepted the recommendations of Sir Errol as a whole, but the maximum recommended for Charge Nurses has been increased from \$1,200 to \$1,344.

With regard to messengers, as honourable members would have seen, we have recommended the substitution of a single grade of \$480 x 48—816 instead of the two scales which Sir Errol has recommended.

We have raised the maximum of postmen from \$912 to \$1,056, as well as the recommendations to certain technical staff of Department of Highways and Transport have also been divided upward.

Now, Sir, we come to the second lot of Civil Servants who are normally very critical of reports and enquiries by the Government. They are the teachers. As can be seen these teachers are not contained in the resolution with which we are dealing but I hope the House does not mind my referring to other things on the Order Paper in this matter of increases which appear under separate heads. I have already said, when I gave notice of the first item, that I shall be dealing with the whole matter at the same time.

The Government has accepted the recommendations set out specifically for Head Teachers but does not accept the recommendations of Sir Errol for qualified teachers.

The proposals affecting teachers are as follows:—

SCHEDULE A

Men	Women
Annual Emoluments	Annual Emoluments
\$600.660.720 (E.B.) 768 x	\$576 x 48 — 672 (E.B.)
48 — 816 (E.B.) 888 x	732 x 60 — 792 (E.B.)
72 — 1,320.	852 x 60 — 1,092.

SCHEDULE B

Qualified Teachers

Men	Women
Annual Emoluments	Annual Emoluments
\$1,296 x 72 — 2,160 x	\$1,056 x 60 — 1,776 x 96
120 — 2,280.	— 1,872.

SCHEDULE C

Head Teachers

Men	Annual Emoluments
Grade I	 \$2,280 x 120 — 2,760
Grade II	 2,400 x 120 — 2,880
Grade III	 2,520 x 120 — 3,000
Grade IV	 2,640 x 120 — 3,120
Women	
Grade I	 \$1,824 x 96 — 2,208
Grade II	 1,920 x 96 — 2,304
Grade III	 2,016 x 96 — 2,400
Grade IV	 2,112 x 96 — 2,496

Doubtless, the honourable Senior Member for St. Lucy will ask why there is no equal pay for men and women teachers. I will only say that the answers are so innumerable that it will take me a long time to trot out. We have not accepted Sir Errol's recommendation that they should be the same. Whatever you may feel, as a sort of broad moral or ethical principles, you get tied up in any view when you say, "equal pay for equal work," because as it is, the analogy that any woman can do equal physical work with the average man does not exist. Except for the athletic and amazon-typed woman, there is no equality between men and women physically; but of course, that is not the answer to the teachers' question. We have kept differentiation in the rates between men and women teachers. As I have said, I am not proposing now to go into details affecting teachers, but there is much which I will say when dealing with them specifically.

Speaking of allowances in general,—if I am to go back to that—with the exception of the Police, we have accepted generally, the recommendations of the Commissioner. If I may mention two cases, the ration allowance which has been proposed for people like orderlies, etc., at the General Hospital and the Mess Allowance to the staff of the Mental Hospital.

Although I have spoken at perhaps a little too much length in introducing this resolution and incidentally the others, thereby giving the impression that I have picked out certain things and stressed them, I will say that the whole structure of the whole Service came under review. Indeed, the mere fact that the Executive had to consult the Whitley Council so often made it absolutely necessary for the Executive and the Secretariat at

all times to give their attention to the possibility that things might be overlooked if the whole structure of the Service was not looked into, both that which was done by Sir Errol and the previous Commission. I say that, just because some honourable members may get up to point out how the structure of the Service in their judgment might be improved other than by a mere increase of pay. Government was aware of the possibility some people might think that not only a mere increase of salary might take place. In short, although this seemed to have started as a mere upward revision of salaries; it developed into a complete overhaul of the whole structure of the Service and an attempt—I may say a very successful attempt—on the part of the Government to get rid of anomalies and to round off the rough edges as they appeared, and as would appear when you deal with this Service or any organisation piecemeal or in a time of emergency.

I hope that the expressions of goodwill and the desire not to blame the Government which the Civil Service as a whole has given voice to, will continue until they get not only their new salaries but their backpay. I may just remind that some delay may ensue in the Civil Service getting the retrospective pay because, in spite of the structure, the Secretariat is constantly overworked and may be more overworked in the next month.

(A VOICE): This is scandalous; I know you mean because of the Coronation festivities.

Mr. ADAMS: I was not thinking of the Coronation, but the administrative side of the Government. I can only promise, because Government is too well aware of the fact that "he gives twice who gives quickly," that the Service will not be unduly kept back out of what is called nowadays backpay.

I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats while Mr. ADAMS was speaking.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and passed *nem. con.*

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR SPEAKER

On re-assembling:

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to ask leave of the House to apply for six weeks leave of absence commencing as from Monday next for Mr. Speaker.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE ACTING GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to read Message No. 12/1953 from His Excellency the Acting Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly. This Message was delivered just before the adjournment took place. I do not believe any honourable member will object to it being read at this time.

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

Mr. ADAMS: The Message reads as follows:—

*His Excellency the Acting Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to refer to his Message No. 1 of 1953 which was laid in the Honourable the House of Assembly in connection with the finances of the University College of the West Indies as reflected in the "Report of the Conference of Representatives of Governments of the British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras, met to consider Finances of the University College of the West Indies, Jamaica, 1st to 4th September 1952," a copy of which was laid at the same time as His Excellency's Message under reference.

2. In the absence of a specific reply to the Message but on the grounds that the necessary provision was actually voted in the annual estimates for 1953-54 to cover a capital grant of \$37,546 and a current grant of \$110,592, it has been assumed that it was the intention of the Honourable the House of Assembly to agree to the proposals in paragraph 1 of Message No. 1 of 1953.

3. It has now been discovered that owing to an error in the original estimates, the average annual subvention required by the University College was quoted as £343,890 instead of £345,290. This will mean that participating Governments will have to revise their annual contributions slightly upwards. It is proposed that all contributing colonies allow the previous figure to stand as the basis of the provision to be made for the first year of the quinquennium, but that the amount "short" contributed for the first year should be spread equally over the remaining four years of the quinquennium.

4. In the case of Barbados this will mean that the funds provided in the current Estimates viz. \$110,592 (£23,040) will remain unchanged, but that in each of the subsequent four years of the quinquennium the Island's contribution will be \$111,168 (£23,150).

5. The Honourable the House of Assembly are invited to approve the proposal set out in paragraph 3 of this Message.

R. N. TURNER,
Acting Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
12th May, 1953.
(M.P. 4334 Vol. IV).

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—When the last resolution was passed, I am always accustomed before the question is being put by you of hearing the Clerk read out the resolution; therefore I was quite unprepared when you informed the House: that the "resolution is now passed."

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order, Mr. Clerk did put the question. The honourable member must have been certainly sleeping at the time.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (LEAVE PASSAGES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1953.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This is a short resolution. It merely seeks to give legislative effect to this Order which amends the principal Order so as to make its provisions applicable to the Governor as is done in all colonies for Leave Passage.

I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—This is a very peculiar Order. It seems to me that if the Leave Passage Order of 1952 does not include somebody, you cannot pass an Order saying that the principal Order should include that person. That Order either includes the Governor or it does not. It seems to me that the better thing to do is to make out another Leave Passages (Amendment) Order for the Governor in the same way as the principal Order is made out for the other officers. How can you pass a law to say that such and such a thing is entirely different to another law? That will be wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I am merely submitting that this Order seems to me a most peculiar thing. It seems to me that the principal Order of 1949 has been taken and stretched to a breaking point.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an amendment; it is an amendment to an amendment. This Order says; "The provisions of the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) Order, 1952, shall be deemed to apply and to have always applied to the Governor." I say it is either so or it is not so. If it is not so, let us now make an Order for the Governor and the Governor will have his own Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think if the honourable member reads carefully that part of the Order, he will observe that it says definitely that the provisions of the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) Order, 1952, shall be deemed to apply and to have always applied to the Governor. This only emphatically, makes that clear.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, Why should this Order be interpreted in that way? As I understand it, the Leave Passages Order did not include Civil Servants who were in the employ of the Government Savings Bank. That Order started off in such a way as to include them by saying that it should deem to apply to all people drawing pay from the Government under any act of the Colony, but then it excluded them by saying "drawing pay in the Public Treasury" and as is known Civil Servants in the employ of the Government Savings Bank do not draw their pay from the Public Treasury; they draw their pay from the Bank. I am wondering why the Governor should be in this predicament when you know that to make certain Civil Servants eligible, you have included something in the Act to make that type of Civil Servant eligible. Now you are putting in something to include the Governor and you are yet leaving out those Civil Servants who are in the employ of the Government Savings Bank. I am wondering whether this Order can be amended so as to include Civil Servants in the employ of the Government Savings Bank. It seems to me that you know that certain Civil Servants are left out and you ignore them altogether. As yet, there is no amendment to the Barbados Savings Bank Act so as to make such provision for officers of that Bank; perhaps they can be included there. It however strikes me that whenever the Governor is left out of any provisions, we are in a hurry to include him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—Far from amending the Act to include additional people, I hope that some of those already included will be taken out. I am of the opinion and I have already expressed that view, and will continue to do so, that

leave passages for these high Government officials are beyond the capacity of this colony to pay. Certainly, Sir, it is not enough to say that because you are paying leave passages to other Government officials and not the Governor that you should include the Governor.

I personally would like to see a Bill brought in to-day, to amend the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, to erase the entire question of leave passages as this has already proved too much a burden for the colony. I for one agree that an official in the receipt of a salary as the Governor with all the other emoluments attached to that office, should not be given this further concession of leave passage. What I want to say is this: the total cost to-day of maintaining the office of the Administrator of the Colony is too much for a small colony as this. The salary of the office has increased to the tune of \$14,400 a year and besides that he is given a Duty Allowance of \$4,800. He has also a free motor car; he gets a travelling allowance and a special vote to maintain the car. If you would look at the Estimates, you will see that between 1951 and 1953—a mere two years—the cost of the vote for the office of Administrator of the Colony of Barbados has increased by something like \$15,000 for the two years. In 1951 it was \$29,457 and this year it is given at \$45,616. Now, with the addition of Leave Passages for the Governor and his wife, this will very well carry the annual cost of Government House to £10,000 a year in a small two by four island like this.

Sir, the Governor of this colony is merely a figure head; he merely occupies the position of Governor; he, really, having no actual power to govern except in very special cases. Therefore, it seems to me that a colony of 166 square miles, as this is, with our annual revenue of \$13 million having to spend \$50,000 on the office of Governor is a luxury because you are spending that amount only for the purpose of having somebody to sit down at Government House. I repeat that it is much more than we reasonably can afford. If you say that other Government officials have to get this Leave Passages, it does not necessarily follow that the Governor should be given leave passage. He is not an average Civil Servant that if exception was made in his case, that you would be breaking a very special principle. In his case, one can point out that he gets so many other concessions already that there is no reason why he should be given leave passage also. We can point out to him that the reason why we granted this concession was to retain certain officers here; to give those officers the opportunity of visiting their families and returning here. But, are we justified in assuming that a Governor cannot afford to defray the cost of his passage and that of his family in getting back to England when that officer is getting \$14,400 a year and duty allowance, free of income tax; and to whom we are defraying the cost of much of his domestic service at Government House and is also granting a special rebate on Customs duty on everything that he purchases? I think that at this stage this is such a highly desirable post in the Caribbean to-day that there should be a scramble to get it.

Sir, I am not going to vote for this Resolution. The time will come and very soon too, when a lot of these officers who are getting leave passages will not get them; therefore, it is not fair to accustom additional people to get them, when very soon they will not get them. Just think of it, that of all people, this Government seeks to add the Governor to the schedule of officials in a certain category for Leave Passages. We are thinking entirely of our pleasing

him and paying little or no attention to the economic position of the colony and to what it can really afford to expend on this matter. We should not undertake this burden.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—One gathers experience by trial and error, therefore, one would have expected that through the light of recent experience which the Government has had by the demands for leave passages since it has conceded them, that it would have realised that it cannot continue to increase the numbers who are to benefit by that concession. In that case, one would have thought that Government would have taken this opportunity of excluding the Head of the Administration instead of including him in that concession so that in the process of time it would be able to cut down on the number of officers who are now benefitting by that scheme. The reason why I say that the Governor should have been excluded from this concession of leave passages is because since it has been instituted, for that short period of time, the Government should have known just as I have known, that it has cost the colony a considerable amount of money; therefore, as I have said, Government instead of bringing down this Resolution, should have hoped for the day to come when it could reduce the numbers benefitting thereby.

I think the honourable senior member for St. Philip has put it mildly when he referred to what the Governor was costing this colony. This concession of leave passages is applicable to officers their wives and children. If we were to get a Governor with a large family,—say, a wife and about 10 children—you can imagine what it would cost this island to grant him leave passage, he taking his family with him; you can imagine what it would cost the island coupled with what it is now costing by conceding it to Heads of Departments; you can imagine how heavily is this burden financially to this island through the enormous number of officials who this Government has set down to benefit from this concession. I would like in the strongest terms to object to the inclusion of the Head of the Administration in this concession. We all know that it is the intention of this Government to increase the salary of the Head of the Administration out of proportion to what the colony can afford and I think this is a move to bring that increase in salary about piecemeal instead of bringing it altogether. I have heard this from the mouths of Heads of Government Departments.

Sir, you will find that the Head of the Administration is costing this colony what it will take to employ thousands of under-privileged people in construction works for the improvement of the colony. The Government knows this. If your policy is intended to be reactionary, do not band yourself as something else by saying that you are a Socialist Government with your interest in the welfare of the masses, when you know that you are saying so at their expense, that your policy is definitely different. I must, Sir, at this stage, register my disapproval to the inclusion of the Head of the Administration in this scheme of leave passages.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, TALMA, HOLDER, BRYAN, ADAMS, COX, BRANCKER, HAYNES, E. D. MOTTLEY, GODDARD, Mrs. BOURNE, and Dr. CUMMINS,—12

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, WILLIAMS, CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN and ALLDER.—6

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1953

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg leave to take Item No. 4 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. Joseph:—To move the passing of the following Resolution—Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1953." I have already made reference to this Order. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir,—In his report with reference to Head Teachers, Sir Errol Dos Santos states that the methods of payment lead to many anomalies and in many instances to inadequate remuneration for the responsibilities of the post. One of those anomalies deals with the Head Teacher of the Boys' Foundation School and it was drawn to the attention of the Government by Sir Errol. It is claimed that it is possible, and it has happened, that the Assistant Headteacher of that school with his extra emoluments receives a greater salary than the Headteacher. I have not heard any comment by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on this matter, nor do I see any provision made by Government to circumvent that anomaly. I therefore would like to draw it to the attention of Government.

Mr. COX: Wait until we are dealing with Item No. 7, and you will see the provision made by Government.

Mr. GODDARD: The report did state that these anomalies exist. This is the one anomaly which Sir Errol did find from the Turner Report and it has been drawn to my attention. I do not know if any provision has been made to remedy it. The salary of the Headteacher of the Boys' Foundation School was always based on the same category as the Headteacher of the St. Michael's Girls' School. To-day it is less than that and I think it has been drawn to the notice of the Government. I would like to know if Government has made provision to remedy this in these Orders, else it will have to bring in something soon to this Chamber to do so. I repeat that this was the outstanding thing of the anomalies mentioned in that report.

Mr. TALMA: Sir,—before the question is put, I too would like to join in the remarks made by the honourable junior member for Christ Church. At the present moment, we are not dealing with the Resolution affecting teachers in First and Second Grade Grant Aided Schools, so I shall reserve my remarks until that time. I will only like to say now that I would like the Leader of the House to explain what provision has been made for unqualified special graded teachers as set out in Appendix 12 of the Current Estimates. As far as I can see Sir, no special provision has been made for them. I would say that unqualified teachers as set out in the Estimates for the current year should feel that their case has been dealt with and their position clarified.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir,—I notice that we are going back to the idea of giving personal allowances. It seems to me that every couple of years when we go into salaries that certain things are implemented to be removed at the next salaries revision and when they are discussed again, the same things which were removed are brought back again.

I see in the Teachers (Amendment) Order, that Government has gone back to pensionable personal allowances. That was cut out of the Civil Service Salaries Scale some years ago. Because of that, only one Civil Servant of the colony,—Dr. Saint, the now Sir John Saint,—got personal allowance and it was made pensionable by law. Now, it seems as if Government is giving a personal allowance rather than increase the salary.

So far as paying teachers are concerned, the female teachers get less than the male teachers. I think this is a paradox of the Barbados Government. Government makes this distinction between men and women in the Service in the one department which you can say that it calls for the same ability from both sexes. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that it was physically impossible for a woman to perform the work of a man. I say that it might be physically impossible, but mentally it is possible. In the Clerical Service, a woman gets the identical salary as a man, though there are certain jobs that Government would not allow a woman to do, but the jobs which she is allowed to do, she gets the same salary. You therefore would have expected that in the one service that there is equality, that each should get equal pay, but you will find that a female headteacher in Grade I gets \$1,824 x 96 — 2,208 and her counterpart gets \$2,280 x 120 — 2,760. I fail to see that the male teacher works better than the female and should get better salary except you are taking into consideration social conditions and not actual work. This has always been very amazing to me. I feel that if the Government has not been told that before, it should be told so now. Government makes no difference between male and female in the Clerical Service, but it makes a difference in the Teaching Service.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—There are one or two points which come to my mind about the difference in qualifying to be a teacher and that necessary to enter the Clerical Service. I put them to the House to show the anomalies that arise in these two branches of the Service.

If you take the minimum qualification necessary to enter the Clerical Service, you will find that after obtaining the necessary School Certificate, all that the youngster needs to do is to pass the Departmental Examination which calls for no more tuition or expense than what he obtained at school plus ordinary common sense. This qualification can take the youngster over a course of years in the Service with aptitude and ability for work up to a Senior Grade Clerk. In the case of a youngster joining the teaching Service he has to qualify with a similar School Certificate as the youngster entering the Clerical Service, — sometimes a more distinctive one — and for him to pass over the average salary bar, it will cost him an average of £100 to spend in further tuition. This amount comes out of his income, therefore, he is placed at a disadvantage with the youngster who enters the Clerical Service.

A similar anomaly occurs in connection with those in the Executive Grade and Graduate Teachers. Here again, the Holmes Report contemplated that for an officer to qualify for the Executive Grade he should be a graduate just as Graduate Teachers. But the point I am making is this: you have two youngsters with a B.A.; one goes into the Civil Service and one goes to a School as a Graduate Teacher. You pay the Graduate Teacher up to something like \$2,280 per annum, whereas the Executive Grade Officer can reach a maximum which is at a further point than the Graduate Teacher.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I get up to point out that with these increases of salaries and condition of work, one would hope that they meet with the approval of the teachers. I am glad to see that they are not left out of consideration by Government as was suggested by Sir Errol Dos Santos. In view of that, I have seen the necessity for a definite overhauling of the educational setup in the island so as to get the best results for the money which is going to be spent.

My own feelings are in the first instance, that there are too many vacational periods per year. I know that this statement is not going to be accepted by all; but I still stress that the vacational periods are too numerous and too long and that the actual number of hours which is spent in the class room per day is too short. That is my opinion and it is the opinion of several who are interested in improved education for the children of this island. I agree with those who say: "Pay your Service," but I also agree with those who say: "We demand a dollar's worth for every dollar we spend on the Service." I have nothing against the teachers in general, but I feel that 25 per cent of the education vote can be saved if children were allowed to spend more hours in the class room instead of outside on the playing-fields marching up and down and doing things of that sort.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had not made reference earlier today as to his views on the question of equal pay for equal work, I would not have been constrained to get up and re-emphasize the point which I have been making in this Chamber for so many years that the rates of pay for men and women teachers should be the same for similar work done. This is a relic of the Victorian Age when it was thought that women was out of the category of men and in consequence of that, now when women do the same work as men, yet they are not paid at the same rate. One trusts that the Government will not continue to think along these lines.

The illustration provided by the honourable junior member for the City when he said it was without justification to give a female head teacher of a school a less pay than a male teacher of a similar school is morally right. I really trust that the honourable senior member for St. Michael will not be converted to the idea because I remember, some years ago, he was one of my most ardent supporters of equal pay for equal work done by male or female. The differences in pay as are set out in the Schedule of the Order to this resolution brings to one's mind vividly this Victorian line of thought and makes one wonder whether we are to continue with that idea that women must always be paid less than men. One cannot help thinking that those persons who are continuing to think that women do not deserve equal pay as men when they do equal work should revise their attitude in the light of modern reasoning. They should see that they cannot logically justify the contention which they make, and the quicker they undergo a change of heart, the sooner will justice be done to females who do the same work as men, but who are less paid. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that it was only the amazon-type of female who might do the same work as a male. That argument, if it may be called argument, might well apply to labourers and in respect of the next resolution with which we may deal; he might be more able to justify the difference in the rates of pay between females and males in that Order. There is no doubt that the average man is more capable of more physical work

than a female. That argument might be used for labourers but certainly it cannot be used with any force and certainly without any logic in the case of female headteachers. We can do nothing more than express the hope that in the not distant future Government will see the injustice done to females who have a similar responsibility and duty as a male and attempt to right it.

Mr. ADAMS: I am endeavouring to discover what information we have on the point raised by the honourable junior member for Christ Church, but as has been pointed out by the honourable senior member for Christ Church, his point will be dealt with later when dealing with the First and Second Grade Grant Aided School Teachers.

As far as the remarks which I made about "equal pay for equal work," I was very careful to say that there was no equality between men and women physically, that is why I used the words "athletic" and "amazon-typed." Physically it is impossible for women to do equal work as men. They are not made that way, but when it comes to female teachers doing equal work as male teachers that is a question which has been discussed on several occasions in more grown up places than this Chamber and yet has not been settled. Every now and then, you get a long drawn out debate in the House of Commons over the question of "equal pay for women who do equal work as men" and this question has never been settled. That is why I said what I did. For years I have been reading articles in the Teachers' Journal printed in Great Britain over this question. Some women teachers writing their views, think that women should not receive equal pay because the man is responsible for his household and that a woman's responsibility is not equally the same as a man's. They argue that some women might have the responsibility of supporting their mothers, orphans or some invalid children, but that was not the normal rule; headmistresses or female teachers did not have the responsibility as that of a headmaster or male teachers or rearing a family. That is one of the logical arguments used against "equal pay for women who do equal work as men." They argue that while a female teacher may do mentally equal work as a male teacher, yet their legal responsibility is not the same and that is why the question has not been settled and that is why I said so. That is the answer in regards to that question.

As regards to the question asked by the honourable senior member for Christ Church on the question of qualified teachers and unqualified special graded teachers, I would inform him that what this schedule has not changed remains the same as what was contained in the original schedule of the 1949 Order. An unqualified teacher will still get \$888 going up to \$1,760 according to that Order. I do not think any other point was raised.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, There is just one point on equal pay on which I wish to make a brief comment. I am not sure of the position, but as far as I recall, the British Government has contemplated giving equal pay for women in the Government Service including the Post Office and local government employees such as school teachers. A Royal Commission was set up about eight or nine years ago to enquire into the matter and I think it reported in either 1946 or 1947. In its report it did recommend equal pay in the Service. I have no recollection of the Commission recommending it for those in commercial employment.

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

SALARY SCALES PAYABLE TO PERSONS HOLDING NON-ESTABLISHED OFFICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution that with effect from the 1st of April, 1952, the salary scales payable to persons holding Non-Established offices as set out in Appendix B. to Resolution No. 33/1949 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, This resolution deals with those persons holding non-established offices and honourable members will see from the Schedule attached the present salary and the proposed salary of the office concerned.

I will ask leave to make an amendment so as to include the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board.

(A VOICE): I think there should be a separate resolution for the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board.

Mr. ADAMS: There seems to be some dissent as regards whether the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board should be inserted in this Schedule and until that matter is settled, I think it is only fair to allow honourable members to know beforehand that the Executive did not accept the recommendation of Sir Errol Dos Santos as regards the salary of the Manager-Secretary, Housing Board. Sir Errol based his recommendation on a Trinidad figure of pay which was found afterwards to be wrong by £100 short. Apart from that, the House will remember that after a meeting of the Executive and Sir Errol, it was decided to leave the salary of the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board for a recommendation from the Housing Board. The Housing Board made a recommendation of \$4,460 and Sir Errol did not accept that figure partly for the reason that he had given before and partly because the sort of persons whom he placed in the same category such as the Superintendent of Public Works, the Assistant Income Tax Commissioner, etc., were paid below that of \$4,460. The Housing Board, nevertheless, has stuck to its original figure and put it back before the Executive who have since agreed not to pay the whole amount, but making comparisons as far as possible with other persons in the Civil Service, agreed to pay a salary of \$4,320. That is the proposal that has been made, and as I do not see it in any of these Schedules, I am asking leave to insert it in this Schedule above those other offices under the head "Housing Board."

Sir, I am now asking for leave to postpone this Resolution and to take the next Order, Item No. 6, until we get the exact figure that is being paid the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board at present.

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

SALARY SCALES PAYABLE TO UNESTABLISHED AND CASUAL STAFF

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution that with effect from the 1st April, 1952, the salary scales payable to unestablished and casual staff as set out in Appendix C to Resolution No. 33/1949 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto.

Mr. ADAMS: This Resolution seeks to give effect to the salary scales payable to unestablished and casual staff as set out in Appendix C to Reso-

lution 33/1949 to be varied as shown in this Schedule attached to the Resolution.

Before I sit down, I anticipate that the question will be raised by honourable members that they understood that the Whitley Council of the Civil Service Association was asking for six cents more per hour as against the two cents more which Sir Errol had recommended. I would say that the increases which the Civil Service Association were asking for amounted to \$1,300,000. In this case, there has been a compromise to three cents and this schedule represents the three cents increase.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir,—This unestablished and casual staff has always been very near to my heart and these revised key scale rates, given to these employees, I must confess, are definitely inadequate and within a year or two would have to be revised. Now Sir, as we know from Appendix 13 in the Colonial Estimates, the female labourer is now getting 14 cents per hour and the male labourer 18 cents and the recommendations as contained in this Schedule are 17 cents per hour for the female labourer and 21 cents for the male which is an increase of three cents per hour. In a 44-hour working week, it would mean an increase of 88 cents as had been recommended by Sir Errol Des Santos. In the same 44-hour working week by this proposal of three cents per hour by the Government, the increase will amount to \$1.32 per week. As we all know, Sir, we can do nothing except to pass this increase of \$1.32 per week should the person work 44 hours that week.

Well Sir, the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph who has just introduced this resolution, said that if the Government had accepted the proposals of the Civil Service Association it would have meant an increase of \$1,340,000. That is, if persons of this unestablished and casual staff were paid an increase of six cents an hour.

Mr. COX: No, No. He meant the overall increase by the Association.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, anything is a compromise if people give way to it but certainly this compromise has worked very hardly on the labourers. Their representatives have gone from the figure of six cents down to three cents, whereas Government has gone up to that amount from the figure of a penny which was recommended by the Commissioner. One would have expected that the compromise would have been at least four cents, therefore, one is surprised at the representatives of the labourers yielding to three cents and not stopping at four cents. When considering the increases which these people are receiving and comparing them with the increases which were published in the newspapers that Heads of Departments have received—some \$120 a month more—one cannot ignore the fact and does realise that these people were justified in expecting what would be a proportionate and reasonable increase for themselves—at least \$1.76 per week—having regard to the department to which they are working. If I may point out again what increases of two to six cents per hour would mean in a 44-hour week; they are as follows: two cents would be equivalent to 88 cents increase; three cents would mean an increase of \$1.32; four cents \$1.76; five cents, \$2.20; and six cents as \$2.64. This last figure is what it would be, had the recommendation of the Civil Service Association been granted.

Now Sir, the reason at the bottom of making these increases was that it should not be merely something nominal, but that it should be something which could be appreciated; something which the

recipient could derive a benefit from and would with care be able to balance his weekly budget. With the cost of living continually increasing, I ask how far can this additional benefit of five shillings and sixpence which these people will be getting for a 44-hour working week go? It must be remembered that most of these labourers are prolific and are in possession of large families. With this nominal increase, this House will be asked in a short time to give consideration to a further revision in the payment to these deserving employees unless the cost of living is drastically revised or cut down.

We have to face facts. So far, it is that type of person who wanted us here and who is prepared more than any other to keep us here. Again, it must be remembered that when it comes to work being done by the Department of Highways and Transport, it does matter who is the most outstanding, highly qualified certificated person, if that person does not have under him these sort of people to do the work which he gives instructions to be done, the very best plans will be defeated. It is the same thing in the Army. Persons who belong to this category must not be overlooked. Every now and again, you hear criticism by thoughtless and reactionary individuals and by those who write in the capitalist Press of this island—the Daily Press—of their passing by or driving along a certain road or roads and surprised to see how long a certain job is taking to be done. What would you expect, if that were true? Would it be unreasonable to presume that these people who are doing this work cannot push along any faster because they are underpaid and as a result, they are unable to provide the necessary nourishment for their bodies? How can you expect people to work eight hours a day on roads when there are no proper means of subsistence for those who do the work and for those who look to them for support?

This increase of three cents is what the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph regards as a compromise. I do not know the reason why the Civil Service Association or the Whitley Council of that body backed down to this considerable extent. One would hate to think that the Whitley Council backed down to such an extent because it was not bargaining for people within its own category. One must assume that the members of the Civil Service Association and the Whitley Council are responsible people. One must assume that they would not have rushed in with a recommendation for six cents increase if they had not given the matter careful consideration. If you are convinced that they gave the matter their deep consideration, how could they have been influenced to back down from six cents to three cents—just one cent above the figure recommended by the Commissioner and three cents below their recommendation? One of the suggestions is that the members of that Association sold those labourers out or gave away their rights, but no matter what is the reason, it does take a certain amount of explanation to say why that responsible and authoritative body should drop from six cents to three cents in its representation of this large, very important and indispensable element of the Public Service of this country.

Sometime ago, near the end of the last Session preceding Election time, this House gave consideration to an increase proposed for the people in this class. You will recall what happened on that occasion. This House sent back the recommendation which was for a very small increase for reconsideration by the Executive and they returned it to the Legislature with a resolution for an increased amount. I think it was a 100 percent increase after the House had intimated that the first increase pro-

posed was hopelessly and utterly inadequate. Under the present set up, I doubt whether such a gesture would succeed on this occasion, but it is my duty to voice protest on what I think is an inadequate increase and with regard to the unsatisfactory nature of the compromise from the standpoint of the people who would be the recipients of this increase. Most people would agree that the officials who were dealt with by the Turner Committee were most generously and magnanimously paid. It does appear as if the Chairman of that Committee was unaffected by what that Committee did. Sir, that Committee having set that example, of what have been generous treatment to public employees, one is surprised to see the provision which is made for people of the unestablished and casual staff; people who are like ourselves, people of the Caribbean, people of Barbados, people from our own villages and parishes. Sir, this increase is \$1.32 per 44-hour working week is really inadequate for those people and I must deprecate the inadequacy.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, — What has been worrying me all afternoon is this: When the debate began the honourable introducer of the first Resolution told us that the surprising thing about this debate is that in this House we should be called upon, or expected to discuss proposed rates of pay which had already received the sanction of the Whitley Council which is more or less the trade union body for the Public Service as a whole, the suggestion being that since the trade union of the Civil Servants had more or less accepted these rates, it would appear as if the Legislature should not be expected to do more than to assent. Normally, that would appear to be the true position. But now, in addition to being told that, we have also been presented with another side of the picture. The commissioner who investigated these salaries and conditions of service made recommendations which would cost the Government \$413,000 a year. The Whitley Council which is more or less the trade union of the Civil Service, made demands which would cost us, we are told, over one million, three hundred thousand dollars a year—a difference of roughly \$900,000 on the total cost of the Dos Santos recommendations. The Government comes along and after weeks of frustration and debate and what not, has sent down legislation to the House which will only cost \$21,000 more than Sir Errol Dos Santos recommended; and we are asked as reasonable men to believe that the Whitley Council, the Civil Service trade union, were so stupid and ignorant as to agree to accept only \$21,000 more than Sir Errol recommended when they were asking for \$900,000 more. Either the Government regard the majority of us as fools or the entire thing is a farce. For us to believe that, we would have to come to the conclusion—either that the Whitley Council is comprised completely of lunatics who do not know what they are doing, or the Whitley Council was so frustrated or fed up with these prolonged and long drawn out negotiations with the Government that they decided it was no point going on anymore. They decided that the Commissioner made his recommendations in November; it was now March or April, all they were doing was negotiating backwards and forwards, and they might as well be satisfied with what they got. And they got \$21,000 more than Sir Errol recommended. Now, in spite of all those facts and figures, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is suggesting that after all, the Whitley Council has accepted these figures; we should not mind the disparity between \$21,000 and \$900,000; the Whitley Council are satisfied and the Legislature should be satisfied also. That is not good enough. There is

something wrong somewhere, and I am somewhat inclined to come to the same conclusion as the honourable senior member for St. Lucy that the non-established casual workers, and the unestablished staff receive less than justice from the Whitley Council.

I think, Sir, that the House would certainly like to find out what would be the cost of giving an increase of six cents an hour to the people mentioned in this Resolution. I am sorry that the introducer of this Resolution failed to make any reference to the actual cost of the three cents an hour increase, and what it would have meant if we had decided to give the full complement of six cents an hour. It seems to me, Sir, that the treatment accorded to the lower brackets of the Government Service reflects the entire spirit in which this question was approached by the Government. When you compare on the one hand what has been referred to as the liberal and handsome increases given to officers in the highest brackets—the equivalent of twenty-five and thirty dollars a week shared out *ad lib*, and on the other hand the increase of \$1.72 a week to people who were getting less than \$8.00 a week it is difficult not to recall that when this entire question of the revision of the salaries of the Public Service came up, the then Governor, Sir William Savage, made the statement that the people in the lower ranks of the Government Service were being well paid; they were well taken care of. It was the higher brackets that needed revision. That is the spirit that animated the entire question of this salary revision. In so far as the Governor expressed Government's view at the time it was not the Government's intention to consider the salaries of the people in the lower brackets. But after the handsome increases that were given to the high officials, and the resulting public hue and cry, some attention had to be paid the lower brackets; but with the spirit to which I have referred animating their policy, it is not surprising that these meagre increases have resulted. The very approach to the question was faulty.

Government appointed two of the key men—the Financial Secretary and the Colonial Secretary—to sit on the Commission to revise their own salaries and the salaries of other officers like themselves. But when it was time to revise the salaries of the lower brackets Government brought in an outsider on whom they could lay the blame for anything unsatisfactory or unpopular that resulted. It seems to me that the logical thing to have done inasmuch as you allowed some of the higher officials to revise their own salaries, would have been at least to put one or two of these people in the lower brackets on the committee that investigated theirs. That would have been the logical thing to do if you wanted to be just and fair; but you bring in Sir Errol Dos Santos and he recommends two cents an hour more.

Honourable members would be surprised to know that arising out of the proposal before them, the salaries of those people in the revised key scale of the Government Service will be even less than those of agricultural workers who are by no means overpaid, or who by means receive what the Sugar Industry could afford to pay them. The wages of casual workers in the Government Service will be a few shillings less than the wages paid to plantation workers in this island. And there are some plantation owners who will admit, as one in St. Lucy has admitted, that they could afford to pay a little more in wages out of the price that they get for sugar. If one of these casual workers of the Government Service went and dug cane holes by the task he would get twice as much as he gets for working in the Department of Highways and Transport.

It does seem to me that a government which could afford to pay these handsome increases to high officials, and then turn around and slap on \$100,000 in leave passages alone could afford to pay its unestablished staff at least on the same rate as that on which agricultural workers are paid. There is no justification for the Government refusing to do that with the finances of the colony in the position that they are. With the increasing taxation that is being squeezed out of the people every week, and the generous attention we have paid to people who were already well paid, there is no doubt in my mind that this country could afford to have given a six cents an hour increase to these people — able bodied men with wives and children most of them — and they have to work a full week to get about nine dollars. And it must be remembered that fairly often they do not get a full week's work. But the Government can give the equivalent of \$25.00 and \$30.00 a week increases to an engineer, a Registrar or a Police Magistrate, while the entire wage for a week for one of these men is only \$9.00. That is all the Government can afford. I could never agree with that.

I am not voting for this Resolution tonight. These people have been waiting a long time and they can wait a little longer to get some more money. I am seriously suggesting to the House that this matter needs a little further revision. It needs more consideration. No one who has studied this question from all its angles could be convinced that we are acting fairly by these employees. What I would really like is a statement showing what the increases would have cost at the Dos Santos level, the Government level, and the level of the original demand by the Whitley Council. Obviously the Whitley Council is there to represent Government employees. As I said earlier, if they carried their demand for an increase from two to six cents an hour they must have felt that these employees had a claim for better attention. But the Government which has been throwing away money so generously can only put one cent an hour on the Dos Santos recommendation, cutting the Whitley Council's demand in half.

There is no justification for a policy of that sort in so far as it applies to these employees. They have to face the same higher cost of living as other people, they have to pay the same increased Customs Duties, postal rates etc. Some of the men in section 5, engine drivers, mechanics, repairers, plumbers, blacksmiths, tap inspectors etc. will get \$1.76 a week more. Do you think, sir, that the average casual employee at a pumping station will be satisfied to get under \$2.00 a week more when he sees one of the engineers, whose post cannot be said to be so hard to fill — he was there for years and will be there until he retires — getting \$32.00 a week more? To an assistant head of a department the Government can pay \$32.00 a week more, but to a casual employee only \$2.00 a week more. I hope that honourable members will see the necessity in the interest of justice of revising these rates upwards. I sincerely hope that honourable members will by their action force the Government to make that revision in order to pay due consideration to the needs of the people with which this Resolution deals.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—I entirely agree with all that the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said and I heartily support it. When he speaks about revision of these rates he is right; but what needs greater revision — I always touch fundamentals — is the social conception of members of the Government. They have taken over power merely to carry on government as it has al-

ways been carried on. I thought that this Government had taken over power so as to change things. I thought that their intention, as they led people to expect, was to bring a new system of administration into the country. But they have accepted and followed without question the social philosophy of a conservative governor sent out here by the Colonial Office. The last honourable member called these rises inadequate; but inadequate is not the term. Does the Government think that giving these people who receive seven and eight dollars a week — and they do not always get a full week's work — three cents an hour more will have any fundamental meaning to their standard of living? Can it have any meaning with the rise in the cost of living that they have experienced in the past few months?

We have been told that it would have taken \$1,300,000 to give what the Whitley Council recommended for the whole Service. Last year the Government collected a surplus of over one and a half million dollars, and when you take out non-recurrent expenditure it was over three million. That has been the rule during the past 10 or 12 years where the revenue of this colony is concerned, and the Government has objected to increasing the rates of pay to the extent that would bring an expenditure of one million three hundred thousand dollars. They do not object to paying people in the higher brackets eighty, a hundred, one hundred and twenty and one hundred and sixty dollars a month more; but they object to giving the half-starved labourers who work on their roads and in other departments six cents an hour more. What does their Labour policy mean in these circumstances? If a Labour Government does not mean a change of the old bad ways it means nothing to the people. They have it in their power to change these things; but they do nothing. Sir, I will use a perfectly good word, a word that you will find in any English dictionary, and say that they lack the "guts" to be morally courageous where the people who put them in power are concerned. They lack the guts, and therefore they have to act as if they were put in power by the Conservative element in this country which they are never tired of condemning. But that Conservative element, if it were in power, could hardly have given less to its lower bracket workers. They would not have dared to have given less and they would not have dared to have given so much to those who do not need it.

Again I have to say that they have not got the economic sense, imagination and insight to see that if they increased the purchasing power of their working classes by one million three hundred thousand dollars it would have a substantial effect on the raising of revenue. These people would have to spend it. The man who gets \$960.00 a month can save; not an \$8.00 a week man. But the Government is lacking in any virtue of socialistic philosophy. There is no direction in which you can look and say that they are succeeding. They have failed every time. It is lamentable and regrettable to see the anomalies in the revision of salaries which they have made. They have got waterworks employees in Bridgetown whom they pay at time and a half on Sundays and bank holidays but at the pumping stations it is the same rate for Sundays, bank holidays and ordinary days. Is there something different between the personnel in Bridgetown and that at the pumping stations?

If tomorrow I were to gain the confidence of the people so much as to be placed in a position of power I would have to show the people that their confidence in me has some meaning. I would not carry

on the same type of administration as the people who ruled this country formerly. There is no difference at all between this Government and the old Conservative Governments. The only difference is in platform talk. A Labour Government must have some meaning to the kind of people you are dealing with in this Resolution. Three cents an hour has no meaning to them. It cannot lessen their hardships or decrease their sacrifices. They will be compelled to put up with the same deficiencies of existence. Unless a Government has some meaning by the way of lessening the sacrifices that the man of small wage has to put up with; unless it has a meaning to the labouring class family man who when his child has a cold cannot even buy a bottle of cough syrup, what use is it? It is useless; and the sooner the Government learns that, the better it will be for all concerned.

Government objects to paying its workers \$1,300,000 out of a revenue of thirteen million dollars. If they found it necessary to abolish certain posts so as to get this money they should be abolished. I am referring to the higher paid posts which are not essential to the good government of this country. That is my conviction, and it is the conviction of many people more qualified than I am. But the Government has not got the guts to do that. What is the difference between them and the people whom they condemn on the platform? The only difference is talk and abuse and accusing every one else of conservatism when they themselves are conservatives dyed in the wool. A man is known by his actions, not by his speech. They have had many opportunities for social action. Have they taken them? Ask the labourers. If you took a referendum tomorrow you would be overwhelmed with the reply "no"! They have not taken the social action necessary to have a meaning to these people. They have only displaced what they call "the high and mighty" from their seats; but they have not exalted the humble and meek. They have displaced those whom they condemned; but they have in no way benefited those on whose behalf they swore they would carry on government.

Regardless of how much I am abused I will never cease to condemn this sort of thing. It was alright 20 years ago when the other side was in power and they looked upon us as something less than the dust. But the Conservatives could not have done worst than this Labour Government has done. A Governor just from an African colony where people still work for a shilling a day says that the people in the lower brackets of the Government service are being well paid, and this Government shamelessly and ignorantly accepts that. They must have accepted it, or they would not have brought a Resolution like this to the House.

Sir, I want to see the day come and come soon when there will be some public outcry, not just an outcry by a few of us in here, but some big public outcry against some of this shameful administration of Government. The people of British Guiana have just returned to power a party that most West Indian conservative elements are trembling at. The Government of that colony has just given the workers two days' additional wages as a Coronation gesture. There has been no mention of anything like that in Barbados.

I do not agree with the honourable senior member for St. Philip that we should refuse to pass this Resolution, because I know what the back pay they will get means to these people. I know how they are waiting on it, and it will have a meaning to many of them. The Government is impervious to good suggestions; completely impervious. But I know that the people of this country are not blind, and they

can recognise what is being done to them by this Government which they have so willingly, generously and ably supported at the polls.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I had not intended to speak on this Resolution, but the honourable junior member for St. John has brought me to my feet. I think that every member of the House will remember that when we were debating the Estimates in March this year the honourable member condemned the Government for including \$415,000 to pay increased salaries to Civil Servants.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—On a point of order. I condemned increased salaries for higher officials, clerical staff etc. I was not referring to the unestablished staff. That is what I thought the \$415,000 meant.

Mr. COX: The honourable member is supposed to be a parliamentarian who takes his work very seriously. He usually speaks as though he has gone through everything before the House more carefully than anyone else. Now he has got up saying that he "thought" something. When you come to the House to speak you must come with facts. It was particularly pointed out at the time that we discussed the Estimates that the \$415,000 was to pay increased wages and salaries to Government employees. The Leader of the House warned at that time that we might have to vote more than the \$415,000 because the negotiations with the Whitley Council were still going on. The honourable junior member for St. John, as I remember well, and I believe other honourable members remember also, quoted Professor Beasley's Survey at Page 41, saying that Professor Beasley had said that in another six years from now we would need a million dollars in respect of the Civil Service. The honourable member said that the Government was doing in one year what Professor Beasley says should be done in six.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I said that with reference to taxation policy. I said that the Government was collecting in one year what Professor Beasley said should be collected in six.

Mr. COX: The honourable member strongly criticised the spending of \$415,000 in one year as against—

Mr. VAUGHAN: The honourable member is misquoting me. I must protest.

Mr. COX: I took time to note down what he said because I know that both he and the honourable senior member for St. John were saying that we were giving the Civil Service too much money. Honourable members can bear me out that the honourable member said it should not be more than \$100,000. We have passed Resolutions of this sort already today; but the honourable member makes the criticisms he has made at this late stage, merely, I would say quite frankly, because among the members of the Civil Service the unestablished staff has the greatest number of votes. We have dealt with teachers getting ten dollars a month more; other people getting nine dollars a month more, and the honourable member did not say a word. Anyone can see that he is making Whitley Council demand for six cents an hour more—I am not saying it is too much or too little. The Whitley Council has agreed to three cents an hour and I am prepared to support it—If we had followed the demand for six cents an hour more it would have meant that the unestablished staff would have cost us \$270,000, or \$170,000 more than the honourable junior member for St. John was advocating for the entire Service.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip said that Sir Errol Dos Santos had recommended \$415,000 increase, and while the Whitley Council originally made demands that would have resulted

in a cost of \$900,000 more than the Commissioner recommended the Government had only given \$21,000 more. That is a misstatement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I merely quoted the introducer of the Resolution and the figures which he mentioned.

Mr. COX: I am saying that in the Dos Santos recommendations figures for the first year were \$297,887; for the second year, \$336,894; for the third year, \$376,729; for the fourth year, \$418,471; for the fifth year, \$439,221; for the sixth year, \$447,836. So it will be seen that those recommendations would not have reached the four hundred thousand dollar mark until the fourth year. It will also be seen that the recommendation which is being made is over \$415,000 now, including allowances. It has been quite rightly said that the Civil Service Association has discussed these rates and gone into them very thoroughly. It is true that there had to be a good deal of trimming because the Government realised that there are so many things to be done under the Five Year Plan, that we cannot pay rates as high as were asked for. But I must repeat that other Resolutions have been passed tonight without a quibble by the honourable junior member for St. John. But everyone knows that is full of words, many words, uncommon words, words that mean nothing. He is always inviting people to march in protest; and when the end comes they lose and he gains. I am sure that no one will be moved by his fiery speech because everyone knows that he just blows hot air.

Reference has been made to the salaries of the people in the higher brackets. But honourable members must not forget that while it is true that \$100,000 was put into the Estimates to pay these people, at least \$40,000 will come back in Income Tax.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I have no intention of making a spectacular speech or attempting to do what has been done by certain honourable members who have already spoken. I hope I will not be accused of attempting to make a vote catching speech. But I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without at least asking a few questions. The main one is whether or not casual employees in the Government Service are properly represented on the Whitley Council. I would like to know what sort of representation they have at present so as to know whether or not when a decision is made by the Whitley Council affecting them it represents the wishes of the casual workers. I infer that the three cents compromise which has been agreed to, and which is only going half way to meet the full demands may not in truth and in fact represent the wishes of duly constituted persons chosen by the casual workers to sit on the Whitley Council; but it may be a figure agreed on by people on the Council having no direct connection with the casual workers, and who in many cases do not know and cannot state the case of the casual worker in any material particular. When one considers that the wage of the average agricultural worker is tantamount to that which is now paid by Government to the casual worker, and further that the agricultural worker receives what is known as back pay and other emoluments and favours, one wonders if by virtue of the fact that the casual worker is not entitled to pension the fullest consideration has been meted out to him, especially by a Socialist Government which is expected to set an example to employers all over the island.

I am not accusing the Government of not trying to do their best, but they should by every means in their power see to it that they treat their casual workers in the best possible manner so as to set an example to private employers. I am inferring that

the case of these workers has not been stated by the Whitley Council in as impressive a manner as it should have been so that a proper decision could have been reached in these circumstances. I believe that the Whitley Council should include duly created representatives of the casual workers who will state their case, and I hope that in future a similar mistake will not be made. Speaking on behalf of the casual workers I must say that with no pension rights, no security of tenure etc. I feel that their case should be reviewed within another year or at least within the not too distant future. I also feel, Sir, that a Christmas bonus should be paid to casual workers in the Government Service, because with their low wages they cannot enjoy any festival season.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—After listening to the speech of the honourable senior member for Christ Church I do not think that the members of the Government can accuse me of making a vote catching speech after I have said what I am going to say. In my case I think it was the other way. I was caught by the voters of St. Philip against my own will. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that since the voters of St. Philip have caught me and sent me here to look after their interest and welfare I am in duty bound to disagree with these recommendations especially on behalf of the casual workers. I think that where wages are concerned the Government should set a standard. If agricultural workers who are trade unionists receive certain wages then I think that their counterparts in the Government Service should receive equal wages. In the agricultural set-up today male workers get \$2.16 a day and female workers \$1.53. I really hate to continue opposing the Government but I am in duty bound to do this, because of the attitude adopted by the Government. If the Heads of Departments are entitled to this increase what about those in the lower brackets? Three shillings an hour for a man who has to work in the sun and the rain and all sorts of weather? He is called upon to eat more to sustain his body, and he can eat more than some of these Heads of Departments. I am not saying that the Heads of Departments are not entitled to increased salaries; but I think that these casual workers are deserving of better treatment. Reference has been made to the fact that we did not oppose the Resolution for the teachers. We were manoeuvred into passing it. Before we knew what was happening it was rushed through. With all due respect to you, Sir, I did intend to raise some objection where the Resolution for the teachers was concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that at some future date Government will give further consideration to these casual workers. I hope that in the near future Government will do that, and "let justice be done though the heavens may fall."

Mr. SPEAKER: Before any other honourable member speaks I think I heard the last honourable member make mention of some manoeuvre.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I did, Mr. Speaker, and if it was out of order I withdraw it.

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I am quite willing to make a motion at this stage that the House adjourn or three quarters of an hour as that seems to be the wish of honourable members.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER takes the Chair.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—You will realise my position. I want to endorse the remarks made by previous speakers; but if I make a motion

for adjournment and it is lost I will lose my opportunity to speak. However, Sir, there seems to be general agreement that we should adjourn at this stage, and I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. HOLDER seconded.

The question was put and agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—The honourable senior member for St. Michael in replying to the charges made by members on this side of the House accused them of being vote catchers. If I do not rebut such charges they may be taken for fact. No one could have appealed to the electors on the basis of getting their support more strongly than the members of the Government Party. I can recall quite a few of the policy slogans which were in use and which have not been put into practice. The honourable member seems to forget the slogan about nationalising the Electric Company in six months, and about the nationalising of all industries. Another policy slogan was "soak the rich" and of course everyone knows that the rich have not yet been soaked but that the poor are being drowned. Therefore to make that fallacious charge against members on this side can only surprise those who have true Socialism.

The honourable member has argued that out of the \$100,000 which Heads of Departments have received, about \$40,000 will come back in Income Tax, but he forgets that the Key Scale members of the Government Service have recently been included as income tax payers, and therefore where this three cents an hour increase is concerned, if they are not careful more than that will go for income tax; because the addition of the three cents an hour might put people in the income tax bracket who were not there formerly. What is true is that the policy of the present Government has been such that no one worries to think that they are Socialists anymore. As the honourable junior member for St. John has said, they are merely perpetuating the policy which was carried out by the Conservatives, and, I would add, to a more dangerous extent.

When on the principles of campaigning accepted by members of the Government Party they told the people, or caused them to feel that they were interested primarily in the well being of the underprivileged, and the people, influenced by those promises returned them to power with a large majority, the people were impressed that this Government were their saviours. Who would not be so impressed? But when you are in power you can do what you like, and even the Head of the Administration cannot say "no" effectively. But the time has come when due to low living standards and the public cry for revision of salaries and conditions of employment, the Government have set about to pretend that they were doing something. But what has resulted? Overwhelming increases for people who could have done without these increases, and meagre small amounts given to people who were greatest in need. Now I do not mind the Government doing that, because by their actions they are letting the people see whether their placarded Socialism is truly Socialism as practised by people who are really Socialists.

But what has happened, Sir, I will draw to your attention. The under-privileged are always considered as an inferior section of this community. That has always been the attitude, and it has been carried on by a government which was expected to change it. The Resolutions granting increases of

salaries to big officials were brought to this House shortly after the Turner Committee met and made its recommendations. Then you took it right down the grade. The Resolution for all the big bosses came first and down it went until yesterday afternoon about four o'clock I received a copy of the one for the unestablished staff and I did not even have sufficient time to examine it carefully and make comparisons. But what I want to point out is the order which was followed in passing these Resolutions: First the big shots, then the second big shots, then the third big shots and the small people last of all. That has a psychological bearing on the outlook of those who have something to do with the sending down of such Resolutions. So what I want to draw to your attention is the fact that the people who are most in need of the sympathy of the present Government are the last to receive consideration.

But what is more important is the fact that when true Socialist Governments have a pound to spend or a million pounds they will see that the greatest amount is distributed among the lower classes. But that policy does not obtain here. A particular officer is getting \$800.00, and you say that is not enough, and the officer who might not even have expected such generous treatment is given an increase of \$160.00 a month bringing his salary to \$960.00, and is now in Europe having a good time.

Think of it. Men who are called to work in sun and rain and to do laborious tasks, you are paying a miserly six shillings per day. You are saying that an increase of three cents per hour which is a shilling per day is sufficient increase for those men. How have you—a Socialist Government—arrived at such a conclusion? How do you consider that he can make ends meet on that miserly amount? How have you arrived at the conclusion that three cents an hour can help him recover himself against the increased cost of living? You can only say that this Government is bare-faced or wicked. You can only say that it is tyrannical and it is ungrateful because the few to whom it has given increases cannot by any stretch of the imagination be the ones who would represent the Government Party or would vote for that party. It is to those who this Government has made grandiose promises such as "leading them to the Promised Land" during election time that it is now telling them: "Old boy, you have been born for this; although we promised you, we cannot raise you any more than this." This Sir, is a perpetuation of a system which is worse than any which the Conservatives of the past ever offered. That is to say while you are pretending to be a Socialist, by your policy of class increases, you are maintaining a separation of the various classes. (Sneers) The honourable members on that side of the Table may sit there and sneer but they can only do so because they have stout hearts. I am wondering whether the honourable members of this Chamber on the Executive in their sleeping moments ever reflect on what they are really doing. How can you excuse the honourable member on the Executive who attached his signature to this proposal when he is not man enough to say here whether this six-cent demand by the Whitley Council for these people was too much or too little? By that indecision that honourable member has committed a large section of the working class public of this colony to a continuous position of servitude which brings in its train all the calamities which human beings can suffer. I do not think that honourable member realises the responsibility of his position. He thinks that throwing out a few cheap jibes is answering responsible matters in a responsible way. He thinks that way: he practices cheap arguments to justify his misdeeds. Although

it is a fact that the people of this island have advanced considerably and intelligently, I do not think that the public is apprised of what takes place in this Chamber by the people whom it supports chiefly. What is more, those honourable members seem to think that their position is very safe because by sinking or swimming together, they feel that their existence is perpetuated. But I know it will not always be so. I know that before anything can be done to clutch these unfortunate people from this tyranny, you must allow them a duration of suffering so that they may become able to appreciate the helping hand which others are offering to them.

Again, I say that this miserly increase is definitely a disservice to the unestablished and casual staff. This Government claims to be strong, boasts of its strength, and yet allows itself to be controlled and directed by a band of Civil servants who call themselves a Whitley Council. I am not saying that you should not give freedom of expression to all whom you employ, but surely it seems to me that the so-called Whitley Council which is supposed to get higher increases for all in the Service has not stressed the claims for these persons of the unestablished and casual staff, but only for the influential persons who happen to be like the majority of the members of that Council. When you get representatives coming and claiming demands which would amount to over one million dollars in increases throughout the Service and then asking for a paltry six cents more per hour for persons of the unestablished and casual staff and even then without any sincerity, because it can be seen from the figure arrived at in what is called the compromise; and also when it is realised that their demands for those in the higher brackets were met, those things go to show the shadow which those representatives put up when they were making their demands for those in the lower brackets.

Sir, I know that a lot of those persons of the unestablished and casual staff has already committed themselves to debt on the expectation of receiving a reasonable increase. I shall show you the thoughtless measure of ingratitude which pervades a large section of the public in matters like this. You will get all of them approaching honourable members on this side of the Table and asking us to do this and that for them, and not to allow Government to take advantage of them, but when the increases are given, those same fellows sit back with a feeling of safety and security and when the time comes for them to give members on this side of the table their assistance, they go and give it to members of the Government Party. Of course, Mr. Speaker, a still-born child sometimes helps the constitution of the parent . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is straying directly from the points at issue in this resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I will be careful not to do that, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that this whole thing is wrong; with this spirit of disservice and ingratitude which has been manifested by the Labour Party, anything is liable to happen.

Mr. Speaker, what I would ask is: What consideration has Government given to watchmen who receive \$1.50 per day for a period lasting from 4 o'clock on an evening until 7 o'clock on the morning following? The man who watches is one who has to give up the quietude of his home and go out into the cold weather of the night to keep vigil over materials owned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Any lapse on his part can mean a great loss on the part of the department of the Government. That man is only

getting \$1.50 per day to do watching for over 12 hours every day.

(A VOICE): Not \$1.50 but \$1.75 per day.

Mr. ALLDER: An honourable member says that it is \$1.75 per day. Well might some honourable members say that a watchman is not called upon to labour with a peck or shovel, yet I feel that watching is as great a task as those labourers who work eight hours a day lifting a peck and a shovel. I feel that in view of the fact that watchmen are put to much inconvenience and are called upon to work long hours on a stretch and because of the sacrifices which they make in preserving and protecting the property of Government that they should be adequately paid. The amount of \$1.75 per day is insufficient. Sundays, Bank-holidays and all other holidays, these men occupy a W.C.-shaped hut to watch over property of the Government for this paltry sum. On the other hand, a gentleman of wealth and good standing whose salary is \$800 per month and sufficient for him to live comfortably on, is given an increase of \$160 more per month by this Government. I ask where is the sympathy for the persons in the lower brackets? It is by these actions that you can see the political complication of the darkened hearts of the present members of the Government. (Sneers). I say again that abusing or jeering members is not arguing a case.

(A VOICE): Well you do it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I wonder when this Government Party members meet other international labour leaders around a table to converse on labour matters how do they feel. Certainly they can only adopt the character of Dr. Jekyll! and Mr. Hyde. If I were a member of a Socialist Government and I was going to spend \$413,000 on increases in salaries and wages of my Civil Servants, I would stick to my obligations to the underprivileged and see that 60 or 75 per cent. of that amount was spent on increases to that section of the Service. I would little care of what anybody would say. I would make it known that I was not put there to satisfy the big fellow. I would again ask: How can this Government feel safe in doing the things which it has done? And mind you, when its members after such misdeeds hear an outburst against them, they trot around the eleven parishes and say: "Weeds in the garden, pluck them out."

Mr. Speaker, I am bold enough to move this motion that this Chamber does not accept the recommended increases as contained in the Schedule for the unestablished and casual staff. I am bold enough to do it although I realise that these unfortunate beings have been waiting several months for these increases, yet I feel that they can wait a little longer to get something better.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member moving a motion for the rejection of this resolution? Do you intend to move that this resolution be rejected?

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Your Honour.

Why I do that, Sir, is because I prefer justice rather than charity. I am sure that justice is lacking in these recommendations for the unestablished and casual staff. That is why I prefer for them to wait and get something better. While some of them might feel disappointed over the delay, they must remember that some of us in this Chamber are cognizant of our responsibility to them.

It has also been said that the Government had a bad case when they set out to make increases to those in the lower brackets and because of that, it had to get a bad man to handle the case. I do not know the gentleman who enquired into this matter, but those who claimed to have known him have express-

ed the feeling that he was well suited for the task. I was even told that the Government made an ultimatum to the Commissioner stating that he must not go beyond a certain figure. As a man of wealth and affluence, it is not too much to expect that he can sympathise with people who share his interest both socially and economically, therefore it is not too much to be surprised over when his recommendations show that he was inclined to give more consideration to the demands of those in the higher brackets and could not see the real needs of those of the unestablished and casual staff.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will forgive me if I refer to some men who work at the Pumping Stations and in doing so, repeat some of the points which I have made already. I know that a number of the staff at these Pumping stations are stricken with illness owing to the conditions of work at these stations. These workers have to get to work on the stroke of the clock whether it rains or it shines. These people are given less consideration for the number of hours which they work per day and for the sacrifice of their labour than is given to those persons who spend only about three to four hours at work per day in offices. This is not socialism. I have no apology to make when I express myself as a real socialist. It is a fact that in some offices of Government, some officers cannot find any work to do; some have no desire to work, and yet when any consideration is to be given the whole service, you start from those same men and satisfy them more than they desire.

Sir, I would not read out all these poverty-stricken workers of Government whom I want to refer to, but will mention those who repair the taps of the Waterworks Department. It is no surprise if the work of these employees cost several times that of a private employer because the wages of these poverty-stricken employees are comparatively lower than that of private individuals, therefore they are always a dissatisfied bunch of servants. They feel that they are sweated as much as if they were living in the days of slavery; therefore they shirk. I feel that they would hardly shirk if they were given their due reward by Government for their labour.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that my few remarks will bypass the ears of members of the Government, but if its members are sensible, they would not permit that to happen. However, I shall not tire in bringing to light the sins of omission of this present Government. The time has come when a different outlook by the Government must be brought about.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— For many reasons I would not like to keep this House longer in its consideration of this Resolution. I think, I do by my silence sometimes, encourage honourable members to sit down. I came from nothing to much, but I tried by hard reading to do something to help my fellow-man. I therefore have some sympathy for people like the honourable Senior Member for St. John who is a self-made man and who has told us that he is trying to help the underdog. But when, out of his own mouth, he knows he is not speaking truthfully, it is time for me to make a reply to the honourable member in no uncertain terms.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,— I rise at a point of order. Is the honourable member suggesting that I am not speaking the truth? Is he imputing bad motives of me in my statements? If so, I must object to his statement.

Mr. ADAMS: Day in and day out, Your Honour, this honourable member speaks unlike a rational man, and because no one appears as if they hear what he says, he . . .

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I objected to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph's reference of my not speaking the truth and I ask that he withdraw those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member or St. John is objecting to some remarks which you, he honourable senior member for St. Joseph made relative to dishonesty of him.

Mr. ADAMS: I have not said that the honourable member was dishonest.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member or St. John is saying that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has imputed him of dishonesty. He is objecting to that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not subjecting to that because I did not say so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I repeat again that the honourable senior member for St. John is objecting to our remarks relative to his being dishonest and has asked that those remarks be withdrawn. Before we proceed, let us withdraw those remarks. The honourable member spoke glibly and did say something of dishonesty.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable senior member for St. John says one thing outside of this Chamber and then says another in this House. The honourable member does not attack this Government outside of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is only responsible for what the honourable senior member for St. John says in this House. When in parliament, can't you draw it to his attention that he is saying the reverse of what he said outside of parliament?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this House too long not to know what is parliamentary. The honourable member does not mean a fittle of what he says in this House, because outside, he does not say so; but when he comes in here and sees people in the strangers' gallery, he accuses the Government of things which he never accuses it outside of the House. Isn't he merely playing to the gallery?

Mr. ALLDER: At a point of order again Mr. Speaker. I have demanded the withdrawal of the allegation which the honourable member has made against me. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph admits that he forgets things.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. John is still objecting to any remarks which you made referring to his being dishonest. The honourable member did use the word 'dishonest.' I am asking the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to withdraw it.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— I say again that I have not the faintest recollection of my using the word 'dishonesty' in my remarks of the honourable member. However, if I did use that word, I withdraw it. I repeat that when the honourable member gets on his feet in this House, he accuses the Government of things which he never accuses them when he is outside of this Chamber. I say he is merely playing to the gallery. I do by my forbearance and silence try to make this honourable member think that I pay little regard to some of his remarks against this Government. This honourable member, as I was saying, is a self-made man, he had no advantages in life as some of us; because of that, everyone is willing to give him a chance to express himself; but when he attacks this Government out of proportion because of our silence, then it is time to reply to him.

Mr. ALLDER: At a point of order, Mr. Speaker; the honourable member has not yet withdrawn that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will sit. The honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph has said: "He will more than withdraw it." If you have not heard him say so, I have heard. The honourable Senior Member for St. John cannot speak again on this matter.

Mr. ADAMS: Now Sir, what is before this House with regard to the criticisms? Can you believe anything out of the mouth of the honourable Senior Member for St. John? Nobody can believe him. He says in his address: "The people are ungrateful..." "In spite of this Government letting them down, they return us in abundance." I say that will always be done. With regard to the honourable Junior Member for St. Philip, I will say no more now than that he is a very sincere man. I pay him that tribute; although it is courtesy, I give him that respect for his considerate outlook on matters. But when it comes to the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip, what respect can this Government have for his criticisms? Let us look at his decline. Once he had a party in this House of seven members. What has he got now? In short, he has so aggrieved, he has so wrongfully treated the people of this country that out of retaliation they have thrown him down as if he were a red hot brick. What good do they do themselves by telling untruths of the Government? This is an agricultural country with a one-crop economy. What earthly good do they do except to be nuisances? If those honourable members would come in this House and give constructive criticisms, and show how they can improve this, that or the other, this Government would act on their advice. This Government has already acted on what they said. But when those hon. members merely come in here to waste time; when they come in this House and get up and make half-hour tirades against the Government, when they go as far as to accuse the people of Barbados; I repeat again, what earthly good do they do themselves? In spite of attack after attack, and libel after libel against members of this Government by the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip, this Government starting in 1946 with a slender majority, has election after election been returned by the people with more strength; surely three hon. members—I omit the hon. Junior Member for St. Philip—cannot be completely right and the whole lot of other Barbadians wrong. Those hon. members in this Chamber, try to make the people of Barbados think that this Government has fallen from its promises to the people; that it has let them down. I simply would ask: Why is the Barbados Trade Union the strongest in the West Indies? It is because we have made promises and kept them. It is because the Barbados Trade Union with its affiliation with the Barbados Progressive League, has been able to get better wages for the people of Barbados, more than any other people in the Caribbean can get by any other Trade Union in the area.

(A VOICE): That is not true.

Mr. ADAMS: Even the very attempt to scorn at what I said shows that what they were saying is not true.

Is it not remarkable that this island of Barbados should have that international fame which the honourable Senior Member for St. John was trying to quibble at? Why is it that what is happening here in Barbados in respect of these Labour Conferences is not happening in Jamaica or other parts of the West Indies? Why is it that this colony has this international fame?

I repeat, Sir, that the whole reason for the Dos Santos Commission and an attempt by us to do the very things for which those honourable members

have criticised us was an attempt to set an example. We are aware that this island is an agricultural community and because of that we feel that the wages of its workers should not lag behind other countries in this area. I ask again: Who got the wages for these workers? Who else, but the Barbados Workers Union. The Barbados Workers Union has set a standard of wages for agricultural work which I repeat with incentive bonus and conditions of labour are better than in any other part of the West Indies.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has not only to think of the Civil Service; it has also to think of hospitals, schools, and such other things as food production and of increasing our chances of being self-sufficient. If we open more schools and neglect hospitals, or build more hospital and neglect schools, we would be an unbalanced Government. We cannot only think of the Civil Service. If that were so, we could spend the other \$2,180 on adding on the other two cents to the unestablished and casual staff. That is the reason why we had to be content with the three-cent increase instead of the six cents.

Sir, it cannot therefore be true to say that we have not set an example to private industry. Our rates of pay will now force private industry to pay better wages than what was paid before. We have got nothing for the people except by blood, sweat and toil; I would not say tears because we had nothing to cry about. It may have taken years to achieve our purpose, but we have got it; it was only by hammering on and on that we got it. We are the people who got holidays with pay for the workers in every employ; we are the people who have brought about a summary sugar agreement in spite of the attack made on us. Because of that, we can with heads held high, come and ask this Legislature to approve of these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken as I have because it is not right that Government should be content to sit here and smile when these attacks are made on it thinking that it does not matter. A man may push a knife in your ribs and it may not hurt you too badly; but one day it will go too far in and will end tragically; therefore, sometimes the only answer to these attacks is not to smile, but to hit back hard. The honourable Senior member for St. John can rest assured that I will not smile any longer, but will hit back hard at his attacks against this Government. I do so now because he knows what he was saying was absolutely untrue. Sometimes, in the heat of a debate, your tongue may slip and you may say something, but did not mean it, but it would appear as if the background of this honourable member is to state untruths.

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to expatiate, but I must remind this House that sometime ago, these two honourable members—the Senior member for St. John and the Senior member for St. Philip—criticised Government and said that it was spending too much on its Civil Servants; if we go on in that manner, we would have to bring in a Retrenchment Act so as to cut down on our expenses. Now these same honourable members have changed their tongue and are saying that we should give this branch of the Service more money. They are saying so now because they want to give the public the impression that this Government is mean to this branch of the Service. I will just ask honourable members of this House to reflect and they would see that this Government gained its power—and will remain in power—because it believes in the democratic custom of conferring with the people whose interests are concerned, in any legislation affecting them, and with the extent of the knowledge it has

thus gained, having regard to the general needs of the community and not the needs of the particular section with which it is dealing, it will act as it thinks best for the whole community. This is why this Government has acted as it has in this manner. If everything else had been seen after, if this Government did not have to think of those social services which I have mentioned already, then it would have been possible to grant this six-cent increase. We in Government, have to think as one would think in his everyday life as to how much he can afford to spend on food, on clothes and to remember that one cannot live in the open. You cannot spend all on food and clothes. With this instruction, I ask honourable members to support the Government in this and the following resolutions which will be put forward to you regarding this matter of increases.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not wish to get in the debate on this resolution for many good reasons, but rise to draw attention to the wording of it and the Addendum. I however must say that one time every member of this House and every member of the public must have had the impression from the persons attended by the Turner Committee that the Government felt that the others were getting adequate wages and salaries. There are no two ways about that. A speech was made from the Throne and if it reflected the opinion of the Government as we are led to believe, then this would be the only impression.

(A VOICE): That is not true.

Mr. LEWIS: The trouble is that when you say that the speech from the Throne represents the opinion of the Governor, the Leader of the House will tell you that he knew every word that was going to be put into it. In that case, you do not know where you are. Anyhow, that was the impression given. There is no doubt about it that since the Turner Committee Report has been accepted, the cost of living has increased, especially to those people whom we now propose to pay three cents more per hour. We have to pay since then one penny per glass more for rum and for a package of cigarettes among other increases. I do not know if the unestablished and casual staff was represented by the Whitley Council, but in considering the next resolution, I will have something to say on that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember a resolution of this wording ever coming to this House before. This is the first time that I have seen a resolution so worded. It seems unusual to me. We have a resolution—Resolution 33/1949—as a sort of principal resolution with this resolution or these resolutions varying that resolution. I cannot see how a resolution can vary a previous resolution. It was only the omission in the last resolution with which we were dealing that I discovered this unusual procedure. As has been set out in the Schedule of the previous resolution, it gives the proposed salary and also what is the present salary of the person or persons carrying out the office, but as far as this resolution is concerned, I see nothing like that. By the full facts not being set out in this resolution, people will get the impression that you are trying to put something on them.

Sir, the next thing is that I got the impression that the \$415,000 set down in the Estimates for the current financial year was to cover the recommendations of Sir Errol Dos Santos for only one year, but this does not appear to be so because the introducer of this resolution was pressed into saying: "we are providing for the paying of these wages from the 1st April, 1952." It took a long time for him to say that was so. We are now told that this is so, therefore, without making any apologies for speaking on the matter now, how can it be said that this \$415,000 is to meet the needs for one year when the Estimates

were laid? It seems to me that at the time of the laying of the Estimates, the Government did not intend to pay out these salaries from 1952. If Government did intend to do so, then the Estimates have given a very incorrect view of the financial position of the colony. These are abstract resolutions and I feel that an explanation should be given in that respect. I repeat that the way you have set down this amount in the Estimates, and with your saying now that it is to cover increases from the 1st April, 1952, the Estimates have given a wrong impression of the financial position of the colony. Of course, it is not necessary to pass a resolution for this money, but it is passing strange that full provision was made in the Estimates for the other people to get their money. I would like some explanation on these points before we deal with the other resolutions and that which was postponed.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was then put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, MILLER, LEWIS, TALMA, HOLDER, BRYAN, ADAMS, COX and Mrs. BOURNE.—9.

Noes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN and ALLDER.—4.

SALARY SCALES PAYING TO PERSONS HOLDING NON-ESTABLISHED OFFICES AGAIN CONSIDERED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I propose to go back to Item No. 5, the resolution which was postponed earlier dealing with those persons holding Non-Established offices.

I am now asking leave to insert above the items under the Head: "Housing Board" the following amendment to make provision for the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board:—

Under the Head "Housing Board" in column one the words "Manager and Secretary"; in column two the figures "\$4,320" which is the salary he is proposed to receive; in column three the figure "1" and in column four the figures "3,840" which is his present salary.

I beg to move that this resolution with the amendment do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am taking this opportunity to solicit information. I would just like to know the reason of departing from custom of having a resolution cancelling previous resolutions and now having resolutions varying a previous resolution. It seems to me to be something wrong. I cannot see why you should read this resolution with a resolution of 1949. It only gives confusion. If you recommend or accept any increase for certain people put them down in this resolution, as was done in the resolution of 1949. Now you have to look at both resolutions to find out a variation. I would like to know why this was done.

I would also like to know whether the \$415,000 included in the Estimates will be sufficient to meet the increases in salaries, wages and allowances that have been proposed as from the 1st April, 1952. If that amount is insufficient, an entire departure has again been made, so far as what you did when similar provision was made for those in the higher brackets. I ask again: Are you merely doing this thing because you must now? I think an explanation should be given to the House on this point.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said he was going to be brief when he was introducing these matters. Perhaps, it may be that he is unfamiliar with everything contained in these resolutions owing to his absence from the colony. I do not

think he understands everything in them. However, owing to his knowledge of how things like this should be done, it must have struck him that this is a peculiar method.

Sir, I would also like to draw attention to the fact that the items under "Housing Board" seem to have been inserted twice and had to be taken out of page 2 of this schedule. In looking through the offices that are recorded here as non-established posts, I find that of the Assistant Librarian. This seems to me unusual for a non-established post. It seems to me that this office is an established post. I think this office is sufficiently permanent to be on the establishment. I hope nobody would suffer any disadvantage by these offices being inserted in this way. I feel that you should not have an office as an unestablished post unless you were thinking of disposing of it or you did not regard it as anything of great importance.

I would also like to reply to remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph about cost-of-living allowances. The honourable member said that Government had consolidated the cost-of-living allowances. This was one of the terms of reference of the Salaries Commissioner to review "the extent, if any, to which the present cost-of-living allowances should be regarded as permanent" and be incorporated in basic salaries, or as temporary and related to the cost of living index." I thought when this House was discussing the cost of living allowances of those higher officers who came under the Turner Commission, we were distinctly told that their cost of living allowance would be in abeyance until Sir Errol Dos Santos went into the matter to see whether it should be continued. It was questioned by the honourable Junior Member for Christ Church. I understand that those officers in the higher brackets continue to draw cost-of-living allowances. We are hearing now that this allowance is to continue for those in the higher brackets in addition to the high salaries which they have consolidated. I am very surprised to hear now that this cost of living allowance would be continued in view of what I heard before.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I merely want to refer to one of the details in this resolution with reference to the Schedule of Non-Established Posts. As was stated earlier on the matter of the unestablished and casual staff, it is difficult to reconcile the conflicting policy of the Government as regard to the increases in the various categories in this resolution, especially since we have heard that these resolutions have been proposed by a Government which in its capacity gets the highest wages in the Caribbean for its supporters. Well, of course, that is a statement which can very easily be denied. I have heard that statement announced in St. Philip by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and I took his own newspaper to prove that what he said was not true. To give vent to my contention, let us review the salaries paid to the Currency Control Officer and the Accountant in the Controls and Subsidies Department. They at present get \$2,472 per annum and it is proposed that they should go to \$3,000 a year. The position of these officers is not of any vital importance to this country. They merely carry out regulations of the Imperial Government in order to support its policy with regard to the conservation of sterling. How can you then say that this colony benefits in any way from actually having these posts in its Government service? But as you can see, you are giving these two officers an increase of \$44 a month despite the fact that they are now getting \$200 per month. On the opposite page, under the Department of Education, the proposed salary to be paid

to a maid at Erdiston is \$360 per annum which is \$30 per month. That salary is also proposed to be given to another maid at the Housecraft Centre. One of the unfortunate holders of these two posts is at present getting \$320.32 per annum — roughly seven dollars per week—and by your proposal, you are going to give her an increase of 75 cents per week. The Currency Officers, who have got no day's work to do in any day are going to get \$44 a month more, but this maid is given only 75 cents more per week. May I ask if this is reasonable on the part of the set-up which claims to get the best salaries for its supporters? I am saying that it is not so. Lower down the columns, you will see the Supervisor and Planning Officers of the Housing Board getting \$3,024 and \$2,748 respectively per annum. The increase proposed for them, jumps them to \$3,456 per annum, something like \$60 per month more. Now, two cooks at the Maternity Hospital by their salary increase will get one dollar per week more; they getting now between \$10 and \$11 per week, but your Supervisor and Planning Officers of the Housing Board will go from \$230 to \$290 per month. I will give another example. The Student Nurses at the General Hospital, some of whom were getting as low as \$30 a month by the proposals will be getting \$1.50 per week more, while the Price Control Officer will get from \$1,296 to \$1,416. Now, if it can be found satisfactory to give your porters, cooks and student nurses an increase of only between 75 cents and \$1.50 per week by what stretch of reasoning can this increase of \$44 and \$60 per month which you propose to give to your Supervisor and Planning Officers be supported? These latter officers are already in receipt of good salaries, and many like them do not have to do a proper day's work, and who are not so unreasonable as to expect this appreciable increase in emoluments. This is the sort of policy you find running through these resolutions and it is expected of us to sit here and pat the Government on its back for it and to do everything to get them passed in this Chamber tonight. If this is the policy of the Government, I cannot for my life understand this type of mentality or the conception emanating from the Government and it expecting that these resolutions should be certified without any opposition, and, more apparently, its members expecting that they should be congratulated for having succeeded in perpetuating these abnormal conditions on the part of deserving government servants. I recall that these Currency Officers are some retired Civil Servants, brought back into the Service and they are probably drawing a pension. Now they are given on top of their salary and pension an increase of \$60

Is that the sort of attitude that one expects from a Government which boasts that it exists solely to improve the lot of the working class people? These increases certainly reflect the opinion of the Governor that these people need no increases, being already well paid. It does not seem to me that the policy of paying these people in the highest grades salaries approximating those paid in British Guiana and Trinidad has been carried through as far as these employees on the casual staff are concerned. Let us have a list of the salaries paid to comparative posts in British Guiana and see if they are not on a better scale than those set out here, although the salaries of Heads of Departments now compare and are in some cases better than those paid in Trinidad and British Guiana. If the country can afford to pay salaries on the same level as British Guiana to the people in the top posts the salaries of those lower down should be on the same level also, and where the difference between the two is great the lower salaries should be

raised to a level more in proportion with those at the top.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution has been amply covered by my colleague, but there is one item which he omitted to comment on — the investigating officers for Old Age Pension. There is no mention here of such officers. In the case of St. Philip the Investigating Officer has to run the parishes of St. Philip and St. John and I do not think he has got a rise in a salary since old age pensions were instituted. The Paying Officer in St. Philip is the Postmistress, and she will now be getting \$16.80 for that work. But the Investigating Officer has not been mentioned. He has two parishes to look after, and has to supervise the spending of much money in these parishes where old age pension is concerned. I want to draw the attention of the Government to that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—The honourable senior member for St. Philip dealt with the Student Nurses, but I do not think he stressed it as it should have been stressed. Here we have 81 Student Nurses being raised from \$26.00 to \$32.00 a month. When we think of the general wards at the Hospital and the number of people who go into those wards for attention, you will readily agree that these nurses are among the hardest working people in the island, and they have got a lot to bear. When they do not work as conscientiously as they should they are abused by patients, doctors and other nurses. They have a hard time. I hear a *sotto voce* remark that they also abuse patients; of course they do. The whole thing is upside down and in an institution for the sick you should not have those grievances. How can the nurses fail to have a grievance when, after all the hard work that they have to do daily and nightly they are considered to be only deserving of six dollars a month increase? People will say that they are being fed. But most of them supplement this feeding by spending almost all of the small pittance they get. When you get patients complaining how badly they were treated, and you get the nurses saying how uncouth the patients are, here is the cause. A lack of money is a trial to anyone. If you were adequately compensated those troubles would not arise. These are the things which Government expects us to be satisfied with.

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

RESOLUTION FOR 1st and 2nd GRADE TEACHERS

On the order being called for Mr. ADAMS to move the passing of the following :—

Resolution that with effect from the 1st of April, 1952, the salary scales payable to Teachers in First and Second Grade Grant Aided Schools as set out in Appendix D to Resolution No. 33/1949 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution is for the First and Second Grade School Teachers. The honourable junior member for Christ Church is not in his place but I would like to answer a question put by the honourable junior member and supported by the honourable senior member. The position of the Christ Church Foundation School is the sort of thing that happens occasionally and the anomalies are drawn to the attention of the proper authorities. I am told that even in the Army at one time it was possible for a sergeant major at the top of the scale to get more than a non-commissioned officer at the bottom.

They tried to avoid that difficulty by beginning the scale slightly above the top of the scale of the officer below him. One can readily imagine that if there is at the present moment a headmistress without a degree it is possible that her Senior Assistant who may be higher in the scale will draw more than she. However, I have made inquiries relative to the position at the Foundation School and the matter is not yet settled. But it is being borne in mind by the Education Department.

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

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I would like my position to be clarified. As far as the salary paid to the Headmaster of the Foundation Boy School is concerned I see that it is an anomaly and that while it may be true that the Deputy Head may be at present in receipt of a larger salary than the Headmaster owing to the allowance he gets, I want to make it perfectly plain and clear to the Leader of the House adjustment which may be made by the Executive should not be by the way of a reduction of the Deputy Head's salary but by an appropriate increase in the salary of the Headmaster. It is not that the Deputy Head is being overpaid. In truth and in fact, he, to all intents and purposes should be the Headmaster. To my way of thinking. Any allowance that he gets is the result of long years of service and his special qualifications as a teacher. I want to make my position very clear because it might take root that the members for Christ Church are saying that the Deputy Head is being over paid. But there is no question of that.

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

BILL TO AMEND SAVINGS BANK ACT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 9, Bill intituled an Act to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—In moving the second reading of this Bill I would say that owing to the fact, as honourable members know, that the Savings Bank comes under a special Act revision of the salaries of the employees of the Bank has to be done by way of amending the Savings Bank Act. But it is the same thing that we have been doing as regards other officers by amending Orders. It is proposed that the Manager of the Bank should get \$4,800 a year, the Accountant \$1,920 x 120—\$2,880 x

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I think that some member of this House should say something about this Bill. It is merely attempting to do justice long after an injustice has been done. I cannot understand how the Turner Committee which was appointed to consider the salaries of Heads of Departments could deliberately leave out the Manager of the Savings Bank, and the officer who is virtually his assistant. It is regrettable, and as a result of that action all sorts of rumours have gone around that the particular officer was left out because Government wanted to attach the Savings Bank to the Post Office and they wanted the Manager of the Bank to resign.

I am glad to see that the particular officer is now being given some sort of redress. His salary is fixed very low when you take into consideration the fact that other Heads of Departments got £1,050 a year at least, and he is being given \$1,000. Since the Turner Committee sat we have increased the amount

that anyone depositor can put on the bank. We have therefore made the Manager of the Bank responsible for more money than heretofore. His being left out by the Turner Committee was deliberate, and even now he is being given less than you gave to other Heads of Departments. It looks as if it is a certain amount of spite work on the part of people who tell you that nothing like spite can ever enter their minds. **They are above all that. A virtual Head of another department because certain recommendations were not accepted is at a disadvantage.** Other Heads have got their wonderful increases. These same people **got leave passages, and the Leave Passages Order is worded in such a way that the Manager of the Savings Bank is left out, and some of the people who dealt with the Leave Passages are the people who will benefit from them.** It is a disgraceful state of affairs, and something of which no Civil Servant, high or low, should be guilty. If you want to amalgamate the Bank and the Post Office do something about it, but do not keep a particular officer as the Head of a Department and then ignore him in this manner. It is a very serious matter.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed. Clause 4 was called.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would like an assurance from the honourable member in charge of the Bill that the terms and conditions of this new salary will be applied to persons who have retired while in the service of the Bank. I know of people who have suffered in this way from increases of salary in the past. I would like that assurance.

Question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was called and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the House adjourned until Tuesday, 19th of May, 1953, at 3 o'clock p.m.