
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th June, 1959.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P. (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E., Mr. C. B. SEARLES and Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*)

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for one month ended 30th April, 1959.

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - April, 1959.

Reply to Question No. 4/1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding certain conditions of service of Police Constables at rural stations.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay reply to the Question No 13/1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding accommodation for patients at the Barbados General Hospital.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to reply to Question No. 15/1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew in connection with the Belleplaine Housing Scheme in St. Andrew.

Also, I have in hand the oral reply to Question No. 4 1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John regarding the acquisition of lands at Bath.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$36,195 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement Supplementary Estimate 1959-60, No. 8, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Harbour and Shipping Master Act, 1909.

A Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

I also wish to give notice of my intention to move that Orders No. 1 and 2 on the Order Paper be exempted from the provision of paragraph (4) of Order No. 5 of the Standing Orders of this House.

I shall also like to include in this request, Order No. 6 which is a Resolution to approve the terms upon which the Housing Authority may borrow a sum not exceeding \$1,800,000 for the purpose of financing loans for housing as provided under the Public Officers Housing Loans Fund Rules 1958.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

WHEREAS a Statement has been made in this House, on the 2nd June, 1959, by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, purporting to answer an allegation of Police discrimination, practised within the yard of the Public Buildings during meeting of this House on 26th May, 1959;

AND WHEREAS this Statement has been laid without any investigation whatsoever having been made (in accord with recognised judicial procedure), either by Police Department or any other source, as to actions and omissions of Policemen on duty at the relevant periods on 26th May, 1959, within the said area;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House place on record its abhorrence of, and uncompromising hostility to, any attempt (by Police or otherwise) to prevent, or even to render uncomfortable, citizens peacefully entering and patrolling the "Public Buildings" area when the Legislature is sitting or at any other reasonable time; and that steps be forthwith taken to bring this matter to the attention of appropriate authorities.

12.25 p.m.

QUESTIONS

Mr. DOWDING: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

In view of the fact that the cost of living has recently increased, will he take the necessary steps to increase the amount granted to Old Age Pensioners or take any other steps which will counteract the increased cost to the said Pensioners?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Whether he is aware that the owners of the land surrounding St. Augustine's Girls' School in the parish of St. George have stated that they are willing to negotiate for the sale of 1 1/2 acres of this land; and whether he intends to take the necessary steps to purchase this land in order that the School may be provided with playing field amenities, etc.?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

How many young people who left school at the end of the last school year are still unemployed?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

What is the present number of unemployed persons in the Island?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Social Services:-

Is it the intention of the Government to implement the Address passed by this Honourable House relating to the installation of a slot machine Telephone in the Bathsheba area? If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Government state when?

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Social Services:-

Is the Government aware of the fact that the people of St. Joseph's parish are still in need of latrines and baths and a proper Social Centre and playing field in the same way as the adjoining parishes, St. John, St. Andrew and St. Thomas?

If the answer is "Yes," will the Hon. Minister state at the next meeting of this House, why such provision has so long been delayed?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Lands and Fisheries:-

Is it the intention of the Government to place a tractor or tractors at the disposal of the Peasant proprietors and tenants of the Northern area for the purpose of ploughing their land?

To enquire of the Honourable Premier:-

Is the Government aware of the fact that, due to the high cost of living, certain Government employees encounter great hardship to educate their children?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Government find, as soon as possible, a way of making a family allowance for the purpose of helping these employees?

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Social Services:-

1. Is it a fact that the Hospital Authorities have sent a Circular to all Undertakers informing them of the discontinuation of the services formerly rendered by the Orderlies in conveying corpses from the Hospital Mortuary to the Undertakers' vehicles in the street?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Honourable Minister give immediate consideration to this unsatisfactory state of affairs?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is it a fact that the Cleaner of the Magistrate's Court for parishes of St. Lucy and St. Peter is required to work five days per week and is remunerated for this job with a monthly salary of two dollars thirty cents B.W.I. Currency, for her duties which include cleaning, dusting, sweeping, the entire top floor of District "E" Courtroom and Magistrate's Chambers and toilet, and laundering of towels?

2. If the reply to the above is "Yes", will the Minister state whether it is proposed that this lady's salary be subjected to addition of the nine dollars monthly cost of living bonus, as contemplated, if same becomes effective?

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Harbour and Shipping Master Act, 1909.

A Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910.

EXEMPTION FROM PROVISIONS OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1, 2 and 6 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The question that Orders Nos. 1, 2 and 6 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

12.35 p.m.

INTERIM CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT OF LAND BILL

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. Bryan being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House reported progress at its last sitting, the Minister of Communications and Works was speaking on Clause 5.

The question is that Clause 5 stand part.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, the mere fact that there are amendments in here made one think that the Minister would have got up and said something as to why he brought these amendments. I would ask the Minister at least to continue so that we would know the reason, because these amendments have just been given to us.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, wait a minute ...

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the amendments which have been circulated, do not include any amendment to Clause 5 as hon. members will see if they look at them carefully; these are amendments to the Definition Clause, but nothing in Clause 5. We had discussion on Clause 5 at length last week.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege. If amendments have been circulated, I do not know anything at all about them. I have not seen them. There are at least four members on this side who have not got them.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I am still not very clear as to what is happening. These amendments have only just been put in front of us. They include changes in the Definition Clause which may affect any Clause of the Bill, and it would at least be parliamentary if the

Minister who has just had these (we thank him for that; we are perhaps lucky that we have had them put in front of us) could give us some explanation. Regardless whether we are dealing with Clause 5 - and these are matters affecting Clause 2 - all Clauses are dependent in one way or another on the other. We are entitled to some explanation in order that we may now view the Bill as a whole.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as far as I understand, Clause 5 is before this Committee, so what is the hon. member speaking on? There is no amendment to Clause 5.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. member had arisen on a point of order, but he rose on no point at all.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I heard them say that they are going to keep us here until morning. I wonder who they think are in a better position to stay until morning!

We are dealing with Clause 5. When the House adjourned on the last occasion, Sir, although I might have been premature in dealing with a Section which had not been before this Committee and going back to one which had already been passed, I was arguing that Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were so bound up, they should have been put differently. They certainly left one not clearly settled on the situation. The Minister intimated then, when I was dealing with Clause 4, that I should not be dealing with it because it did not deal with an appeal and that Clause 6 was the Clause with an appeal. I wanted to make my position abundantly clear because, although Clause 6 dealt with an appeal, Clause 4 and 5 were as much bound up with Clause 6.

The Minister, I think, said in reply that he did not see the necessity for having an appeal to the Judge in a matter of this sort; he felt that there was another Clause in the Bill where you could appeal to the Judge. In a case where an owner or occupier of land changes the land before getting such permission or direction from the Town and Country Planning Officer, if the Officer directed that the land should be put back in the same condition as it was before it had been changed, that gave the right of appeal to a Judge. He agreed with that, but he does not agree with an appeal in this case because he asked "how can you have a Judge adjudicating on the question of policy of the Government?"

I made it clear then, and still say now, that as soon as Government comes into this Chamber and enacts legislation to this effect, you must have a Town and Country Planning Department and Officer to do this, that and the other. We heartily agree with this Bill and feel that it is long overdue, although we did not mention names of places with the exception of the new proposed development area. If we all have an interest in Barbados, and I think we should, then we should like to see things done - especially development of housing - in a more orderly fashion and in a modern way.

In any British country where people believe in law and order, and in the administration of justice as set apart from politics, and where the thrust of politics between one Party and another or between one political conviction or ideology as against the other exists, you are going to adhere to the principles of the law; and would rightly agree that you prefer, after legislation is enacted and this is your policy, to abide by the decision of the Court.
12.45 p.m.

Whether it is in Africa or not, wherever it is, people still have that confidence and faith in the judiciary. They say: "we will go to the highest judiciary in the Empire." That is how people feel about these things and that is how they should feel about them.

There is one consolation which I have today: (and I ask for no bouquets) that almost every suggestion I made

on the last occasion was worth something. The Hon. Minister has shown, for once, some decency in accepting the suggestion for the postponement and, as a result, I see amendments which he has put before us. Nearly all of these embody the proposals I made, more especially the one which defines "highways". As it was on the last occasion, according to the definition, that could only apply to the Bridgetown Act when, in truth and in fact, you are dealing with a law which deals with the whole island so to speak.

In the initial stages, in my capacity as Mayor, I had discussions with Mr. Stevens, the Town and Country Planning Officer. He is a very amiable character and, although he is a master in his own field, he was prepared to listen to people on the spot; and that is something which I appreciate in a person rather than one who says that it is so and I say so.

If some hon. members on the Other Side feel that, because a Bill is drafted and pushed in the hands of a Minister who has a Permanent Secretary, we should say that this is that and that is this, that is a matter for them. The Opposition will still do its job; I will, at least, do my job. I still feel that an appeal should not go to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I would like to hear the Hon. Minister on this again.

On the last occasion he said: "how can I know that a Judge will not be mixed up in this?" He might be speaking from practical experience; I do not know. Whether he thinks a Judge will be mixed up or not, let us put it this way. There are barristers who might be trained in the law and who have definite leanings with the present Government or any Government in power. Would you say, therefore, that it would be a mistake to appeal to a Judge?

I am not going to vote for any appeal to the Governor-in-Executive Committee; it is a question of appealing from Caesar to Caesar; and no person can say that, in a democracy, that is a right thing. If you do not have the right to appeal to a Judge, if you feel that a Judge would be mixed up in politics, I cannot see your reason for saying that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. The hon. member is continuously stating that I said that a Judge might be mixed up in politics. I did not say so. I said it was undesirable to have a Judge, and I gave reason of what happened to a public utility recently in the case of a Judge hearing the appeal. I said that we should not bring down a Judge to this fight.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I know that it sounds very badly, but is the Hon. Minister saying that I recklessly misinterpreted him? Is he saying that he did not say so? He did say: how would he know that a Judge would not be mixed up in politics. I challenge him to say that he did not say so. If it is a slip on his part, it is a matter for him. I do not know if he wants to throw any aspersions on any Judge.

It has been said by members over there that certain people who occupied very high positions in the Judiciary, certain people who occupied positions on the Bench, when the Government came into power, those people called writ-servers and told them to go and vote for so and so. Personally, I have never heard of any judge or magistrate saying so; but I have heard from members over there that it had happened.

If the Town and Country Planning Officer is the person to administer this Bill and to whom you must make your application and the Governor-in-Executive Committee can say to him: "let me see that application or all of them," why the appeal should be to the Governor-in-Executive Committee? You cannot read one section without the other; you have to read Sections 4, 5 and 6 together. I entirely agree with that section which says: "Send me so and so and, in that case, if you appeal, that appeal is abated." There is no motive but the purest motive in that. The Government may have their own ideas for some planning and I say that is the correct thing to do.

When I speak of the Government I do not think of the people in power; I think of the Government. I do not think that the present gentlemen in power will be in power for all time. I am not passing legislation for them; I am passing legislation for the Government. It does not matter to me who comprises the Government.

I came in today fortified to make another suggestion to the Hon. Minister. If that is his feeling towards the judiciary, then I am throwing out this suggestion to him. 12.55 p.m.

Why can we not set up an Appeals Committee? You have your Valuation Officers in the Inland Revenue Department and, when there is an appeal, you have a panel of solicitors and experienced people who adjudicate the case. Why should they not appoint a panel comprising a barrister and three or four advisers such as architects, engineers and people of that sort? There must be dozens of barristers who can be trained to sit as chairmen. You are dealing with the Government's policy being carried out after all the regulations have been drafted; when you pass regulations, those regulations become the law of the land and it is then a question of very simple sailing.

It is true, as the hon. junior member for St. John has said, that, although you may not give the right under the Act for appeals to be dealt with by a judge, there is such a thing as a mandamus; but why put the average person to that expense? If the rules and regulations said that this and that should be done and the Governor-in-Executive Committee said "We do not feel like doing this," is it above or beyond certain hon. members to be spiteful?

Set up a panel to be known as the Appeals Committee of the Town and Country Planning Board; that Appeals Committee would be comprised only of such persons as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may select. You might say that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall appoint one person who shall be the Chairman, and you should have a panel of advisers. The Town and Country Planning Officer can take advice from people if he wants to do so. I am quite sure that people would be infinitely more satisfied that justice is being done, and not merely appearing to be done, if this suggestion is carried out.

We came out clearly and told you right away that we are in agreement with this Bill. However, when we see Clauses in this Bill which are not workable, as Clause 2, we will draw them to the attention of the Government. What we have done here as regards the suggestions we have made, is to make the Bill tighter; no Solicitor will be able to drive a carriage and pair through it. We would like to see that the average citizen is given the right of a British subject to appeal.

Mr. Chairman, we have been brought up in a democratic atmosphere where we feel that people should have their right. What I am saying now in connection with Clause 5 will apply to Clause 6 as well. I should like the Hon. Minister to reply to the suggestions which I have just made. 1.05 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am going to put Government's point of view in this matter and leave it to the House in Committee to act as it thinks fit. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I can't hear you.) My voice is not as loud as the hon. member. I cannot speak louder and I do not propose to bawl.

Mr. Chairman, Sections 4, 5 and 6 are the guts of the Bill. It would be most inadvisable to alter them in any bit or degree from what they are at present. What is the essence of Clause 4? Somebody may come into the island, or somebody in the island itself, may want to undertake some project. It may be a simple project; it may be building houses or putting up a housing area either by an individual or Government; they may want to erect a Hotel or some other bigger project, an industrial estate or an industry like the Beer industry; they

apply for permission to put up this particular project to the Town and Country Planning Officer; and, as set out in the Act, and will be set out in the Regulations, they must comply with all the requirements, specifications and so on. What does this Section say?

It says that the Town and Country Planning Officer may on his own initiative, either allow the applicant to put up his project or carry out his application in the particular area in which he wants to carry out such a project; he may allow him to go ahead in the form which he wants, or he may allow him to do it subject to such alterations and conditions as the Town and Country Planning Officer lays down; that is, you must allow so much frontage and so on; or he may refuse the application.

The Town and Country Planning Officer may allow the applicant to go ahead because his application fits in with the Government's plan; or he may grant permission in that particular area, subject to certain conditions - just as at Sandy Lane where you must have freedom of access - so that the inhabitants can go to the beach and so on; or he may turn down the application flat.

In the first instance, where the Officer allows the applicant to go ahead because his application fits in with the plans and policy of the Government, everything is all right. There is obviously no appeal. In the other two instances, Mr. Chairman, where he may allow the applicant to put down the project but with certain conditions and alterations laid down, or with a refusal, the applicant may say that he is not satisfied because he thinks the conditions are too harsh and should be changed or altered. Therefore, he makes an appeal.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I never suggested that. My suggestion is that the man may say that the interpretation of the Regulations and Law by his Solicitors is not the same as Government's. The question of the Rules and Regulations being harsh does not apply. You may grant permission to an applicant with conditions and strings attached, and what I am saying is that the applicant may say that that is not the advice which his Solicitors give. I hope the hon. member will excuse me for crossing him, but that is my suggestion.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am coming to that possibility, but there are other possibilities as well which arise under this particular Section. If hon. members read the Section carefully, they will see that, where an application is made to the Town and Country Planning Officer, in accordance with the provisions of an Interim Control Order, for permission to carry out development or for any approval under this Act or any subsidiary Legislation made thereunder, that Officer may grant permission or give such approval either unconditionally or subject to such conditions as he thinks fit, or may refuse permission or approval.

Now it is not a question of interpretation there. That is saying that, if you want to put up a building, whether it be a hotel or anything of the sort, you apply to the Town and Country Planning Officer to do so. The Officer may give directions to go ahead in the form the applicant wants because it fits in with his plan, or he may say that it cannot be done there because it is arable land and he wants to protect it for agricultural purposes alone. The applicant may want to put up a housing project but the Town and Country Planning Officer may refuse on the ground that it is not suitable for a housing project. There is nothing about interpretation of the Law there. That is what I am pointing out. The hon. member must appreciate that, because the moment he comes back after further consideration and sees the danger of what he is talking about

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If my interpretation is wrong, I withdraw it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member says I understand and appreciate what he is saying; I always did appreciate that. But what I was saying concerning refusal and what not, is that, if it is not so, he is making things worse. The Town and Country Planning Officer may grant permission to carry out development or give such approval either unconditionally or subject to such conditions as he thinks fit, and these are subject to your regulations.

From the time I read this Bill I expected that you would pass Regulations zoning certain areas which would be developed for certain things. The Executive is going to make these Regulations; if not, you would be having a dictatorship. The Officer can only do these things in accordance with the Regulations which you, according to this Act, will pass; but, if he misinterprets these Regulations, then some person other than the Executive Committee should be the final authority. By doing that people would feel that justice is being done.

The hon. member must realise that we might have a very able man now, but what is going to happen when we get somebody who is not going to listen to the Executive Committee and decides to do things his own way?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the hon. member has finished his thirsty ranting, but let me point this out to him: he said that Regulations may be made for zoning and so on. If we allow an appeal to the Chief Justice or any other Tribunal under Clause 4 of this Bill, we are not only allowing an appeal of interpretation alone; we are giving the Tribunal power to cut right across what the Town and Country Planning Officer would say.

If we really intend moving forward to self-Government, then I maintain that we must follow what other countries with self-Government have done. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What is that?) In England the appropriate Minister is the Appeal Tribunal. We are not putting the Minister, we are putting the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

I do not understand, Sir, how on earth hon. members can argue that a person who might be affected by any decision of the Governor-in-Executive Committee should appeal to the Chief Justice. You cannot appeal from a decision of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but you can do so from a decision of the Town and Country Planning Officer. Can you find more satisfaction in the decision of the Chief Justice than from persons who are subject to the will of the electorate?
1.15 p.m.

If the Ministers of this Government, if the Governor-in-Executive Committee are given the authority and the power to make a decision, then obviously the Ministers would be in the hands of the people if they make a wrong decision. You cannot do that if it were in the Courts. If a man comes here and wants to put up a big hotel project and the Town and Country Planning Officer says "No, you cannot do that, it affects the country too much; it takes up too much agricultural land," under Clause 5, that matter is referred to us. The decision rests with us. If we are responsible for deciding the appeal, that must be so.

This is a measure of a Conservative Government. I hope that the hon. member will see the wisdom that, regardless of who is in power, if he puts the final authority in another man's hands, that would be a dangerous thing. It is not a question of a mere interpretation of the law. When it comes to the interpretation of the Regulations we give you the right to appeal to the Chief Justice.

Let us say that we told you that you had gone ahead and done so and so and you have not asked us for permission; therefore, we are asking you to take down all those buildings you have put up and put back the land in the same condition as it was before, you may say that you have asked me to do too much; therefore, we have given you the right to appeal to the Chief Justice, because he may say that we are making you do too much.

If you allow a tribunal other than elected representatives of the people to come in and cut across your policy, that would be too dangerous a thing. We are always told to look at the United Kingdom and to copy from them, and that we must maintain British traditions. In Great Britain, under a similar Act, the appeal lies to the Minister. Obviously, you may feel that you cannot trust a Minister; but, if you cannot trust a Minister, I say that we are not yet fit for self-government. Recently, in England, a Minister had to resign because of a Civil Servant's error. It would be a matter for this House if they knew that something had gone wrong and allowed us to remain in office.

Sir, I am expressing my views on this because, very often, it is said that we are relying on numbers to pass this and that; but, in this case there is every reason for doing it this way. When we lose confidence in these processes and ourselves and the electorate, it goes back to what the hon. senior member for the City said.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I cannot support the hon. senior member for the City, but I support what the Hon. Minister has said. However, I hope that the records will keep a strict account of what he has said. I believe why the Hon. Minister has said what he said just now is because this present Government has not shown by example that it is willing to do that.

I am glad that the Hon. Minister agrees with the famous Crickle Down case, because it was on that same thing, that this Government was afraid to say that it was an improper thing for one of their Ministers to do when land was sold out in St. Philip before this House of Assembly knew anything about it. It was a mistake; but the fact that it was a mistake, means that the Minister in charge was responsible for a very serious error. The Minister is also responsible for the mistakes in the administration; and, if a secret gets out in the administration, he cannot say that it is not a question that it leaked out by him. When Mr. Hugh Dalton resigned as Chancellor of the Exchequer it was not because something in the Budget had leaked out through him; sufficient it was to know that the newspapers knew of the contents of the Budget Speech before it was delivered.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is right about the Crickle Down case, but when it comes to the case of Mr. Dalton he is not correct. Mr. Hugh Dalton admitted that he gave a slight hint about it before he went into the House of Commons.

Mr. WALCOTT: I stand corrected by the last statement as regards Mr. Hugh Dalton, but the fact is that it was something for which he was responsible, whether or not he did it inadvertently.

The Hon. Minister could have drawn an example from the Customs Tariff Act where it is a question of deciding on certain matters of policy. Under the Customs Tariff Act there are certain things from which you can appeal from the Comptroller of Customs to the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the appeal to them is final. That is one of the answers so far as this question of the appeal in this Bill is concerned; and there is nothing wrong in it.

Owing to the recent behaviour of the present Government, which is an unfortunate thing, the hon. senior member for the City is afraid to entrust them with this power. Their recent behaviour makes people feel that that is the way they will react if we give them more power.

I believe all these things have been copied from that Bill in England which was drafted by Mr. Silky. You must, of necessity, give the same authority to the Governor-in-Executive Committee in matters of policy if you are going to develop land; you cannot leave the question to a Chief Justice to decide because I foresee some very unfortunate things taking place as a result of that.

You had a Judge running for this House of Assembly and you had a Judge who was appointed to the Public Service Commission. I do not like the idea of your taking certain people and putting them in certain positions in view of their political leanings; but I do not attribute improper motives to a man when he has judicial functions to perform because he is of a certain political persuasion; that is saying that it is only people who are without political persuasions who are honest.
1.25 p.m.

I agree with this amendment, and I appeal to the hon. senior member for the City, who is in the position of the first Mayor of Bridgetown, to see that, although we would like to pass laws to take away power from some people, yet we must leave certain things in their hands. You must have it so that where the laws are concerned, in so far as you are carrying out certain things where policy is involved, you will have to leave them in the hands of some people.

If you say that you want Bridgetown developed in such a way that you do not want houses erected at corners, you do not want shops or houses erected at the seaside, it means that if somebody wants to build a house at the seaside, the Town Planner will tell him that he has to build according to the regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee; and these regulations are regulations not dealing with what a legal interpretation should be; they deal in broad terms as to how developments should take place.

In so far as the recent behaviour of the present Government is concerned, I would be the last person to put power in their hands because I am satisfied that some hon. members have abused this power. I want to say that I am not passing legislation for those hon. members as such; we are passing legislation for the island of Barbados, and we hope that it will be in perpetuity and anybody who has the power will carry out this legislation.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, this is the second time that I have to speak on this Bill. As I have already said, this is a very important Bill; it is for the development of this country. I quite realise that anyone who is about to erect any building in any part of this island should have the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. As long as anyone is able to purchase a spot of land he can erect a building in any direction in which he likes to do so. What I am saying is that the Government should have power over the erection of buildings whether they are in the town or in the country; the Government is responsible for the welfare of this country as a whole. It is useless for us to get here day after day commenting on this Bill.

If there are any flaws in this Bill so that it needs to be amended, I quite agree that the Minister should amend it and bring it back here and let us pass it unanimously. That should be done instead of our wasting so much precious time in this House and we have so much work ahead of us to be done.

Mr. GODDARD: The hon. senior member for the City is so right that if you are not going to have this Appeals Committee you need not worry to make Regulations; each and every application can be dealt with on its own merits. As I see the position, Regulations will be made and they should be made as soon as possible, and they will define generally what is required by the Government, because the Government is making the Regulations.

These Regulations will be drafted by the Town and Country Planning Officer, I suppose, who understands planning; he will submit the Regulations to the Government for their approval and the Act will be worked along those lines. The Regulations will say, for instance, that it is not permitted for any one to go into a residential area and build a house; or that a house is to be set back so many feet from the road.

I cannot see why they cannot accept this suggestion of the hon. senior member for the City that appeals be dealt with by an Appeals Committee to be comprised of members selected by the Government. If anybody is coming in to this island to erect a building, he wants to know what the Regulations are. People are not going to be satisfied that they have to appeal to the same persons who are making the Regulations. This is not a matter of policy; the Government may say that this is an area for industrial purposes and that area is for other purposes and the Town and Country Planning Officer must interpret the matter according to the Regulations. If the Government say that a matter should be sent up to them and they will have the last word, well, they will have the first and the last word and nobody will have any opportunity to appeal to anybody else.

1.35 p.m.

It is only a matter of time before this Bill and the Regulations will have to be handed to the Local Government; in all countries this is administered by the Local Government. They may say that the Local Government is only just getting on its feet; but if this is to be administered properly, it will have to be handed at some time to the Local Government.

When the Local Government takes it over, will the Governor-in-Executive Committee say that they must be the final authority, or will they only see then that they will have to set up an Appeals Board from decisions of the Local Government? I will bet you that they will do that; they will feel that they cannot be wrong, but everybody else may be. It is quite obvious to me that the suggestion of an Appeals Board appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee would answer the criticism quite well. I would support an Appeals Board of that nature.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think this is the last time I will speak. In answer to these questions the Hon. Minister said that he did not like people to think that he relied on numbers. I cannot understand the hon. member's reasoning. You will pass this today as you did the Town and Country Planning Act, but, when the House was reversed and I stood on it for two hours and spoke, this did not see the light; the Government did not want to say Mottley is right; but he is right. I will say again that it is not a matter of any Government in power. It does not matter if I were in power tomorrow morning; this is my temperament and this is how I feel about it.

What is this Bill? This Bill is simply an Interim Bill - you have not got the final Bill yet - to make Regulations for the Interim Control of the development of land. People have gone wild in building houses. A person may want to put down a Leather Factory or a Brewery, but the stench from the Brewery may offend people; or a person may want to go in a residential district and put down a big Theatre or Dance Hall, and it is there that I agree with him 100 per cent; but you are not passing the Bill and then waiting on the whims and fancies of the Executive to say how things should be done. Each case will be viewed on its merits. You will not say that on the Hastings Road John Brown can put up a Theatre but another person cannot do it; you are doing it in accordance with the Law. We have appointed a Town and Country Planning Officer and then you will be passing Regulations.

The hon. member introduced the question of agricultural land and so. That brings in a different phase. That really does not involve the question of appeal. The Government will decide there and then under its Regulations to zone certain areas.

I have been a member of the Public Health Board for a long time and I have had to do with the Director of Medical Services and such people on this question. There is no point if you are developing land in Hastings, Top Rock or even at Wildey, to say in your Regulations that your frontage must be the same as if you were developing in St. Andrew or Bathsheba where you are developing a

peasantry. If you are however developing a peasant area, industrial area or housing area in which the houses will be of a certain size and value and so on, are you saying that, before anything can come before the Board of Health for the development of land, it must have the blessing of the Town and Country Planning Officer? If so, that is all well and good; but you are not doing that alone. You are going to have Regulations - I understand you are having them from the mouth of the Minister - saying that there must be roads so many feet wide, houses of a certain size, water and so on.

I entirely agree with the Minister that Clauses 4, 5 and 6 are the guts of the Bill. He said there are provisions for appeal to the Judge when persons have taken land and done something which is contrary to the Regulations which Government has made for that area not contrary to how the Officer will think although Clause 4, which the hon. member read out, is for the purpose of granting permission. The exact wording is "where an application is made to the Town and Country Planning Officer in accordance with the provisions of an Interim Control Order, for permission to carry out development or for any approval under this Act or any subsidiary Legislation made thereunder, that Officer may grant permission or give such approval either unconditionally or subject to such conditions as he thinks fit, or may refuse permission or approval." It is not a matter of the Officer going to Sandy Lane and telling a person that he cannot put a hotel there or use it for some other purpose, because the Governor-in-Executive Committee would have by their policy already decided in their Regulations what is to be done.

In the Bridgetown-Speightstown Act now, it is the right of the Health Committee to decide that, in the area of Bridgetown, development should be carried on according to the Regulations which you have made. That Committee has similar power to the Executive. The right is given to the Committee, if you are making any development or structural alteration similar to what you have here, to say that an area should be widened by so many feet. You have standing Regulations, but if a man had a building that was 15 feet wide and the Committee decided under the Bridgetown-Speightstown Act that they wanted to take off ten feet to widen the road leaving only five feet for the man's building, are you saying that a man should not have the right to appeal to an equitable Court? The Chief Justice of the country also sits in equitable Court. If the place is 15 feet and you want the man to take off ten feet, do you see how much it would leave for his building? I draw that instance for the Government.

Despite the fact that you are making Regulations and passing Laws, this could not come here with a Party Government unless it was the policy of the Government. 1.45-p.m.

The policy of the Government is to tell the Income Tax Commissioner what income tax you must pay, but the policy of the Government is also to make regulations concerning that. You make regulations saying that if you are dissatisfied about it that, not only can you appeal to the Chief Judge, but you can also appeal to a special Income Tax Committee. What, then, is this idea of your talking of cutting across the policy of the Government? You do all of that when it comes to income tax but, for some unknown reason, you say in this Bill that there must be no appeal.

You will decide that such and such a place is for industrial development; in such a place, you can have breweries and things of that sort, but you cannot have a leather making factory in a particular area which is a residential area. You cannot have a theatre in a particular area. I agree with you. If your administrative officer says to you that he noticed, under the regulations you have made that no one can drive a carriage and pair through all districts, all you need to do is to come back down here with an amendment or addition to your regulations. And not only you are empowered to do that, but you

can go further and say that this amendment or addition to your regulations is retrospective and it dates back from such and such a time. You cannot prevent the Government from doing that because that is their policy.

Why should anybody be asked to submit an application to the Town and Country Planning Officer when, in truth and in fact, it is the Governor-in-Executive Committee because that Officer is carrying out the policy of the Governor-in-Executive Committee? As soon as you appoint a Town and Country Planning Officer that Officer must carry out the policy of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, or out he goes. He must carry out your policy; he must carry that out according to the laws of the country; he must stick to the letter of the law while carrying out your policy and the regulations which you make.

I will not talk any more on this, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter for the Government if they pass it. They have the numbers but, if the party to which I belong were in power, I would not agree to this. I am going to oppose this section.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the rights of the community must be protected against any individual who wittingly puts up any type of development - factory, business or otherwise - to the detriment of his fellowmen; but I am absolutely positive that this particular matter, fundamentally, affects the rights of the individual.

Now, Sir, I think that what democracy stands for is the freedom of the individual, so long as he is working to the betterment of the community. But let us face facts. In England today this particular Bill, which we have copied from them, is causing great controversy.

I happen to know of a lady who, for political reasons only, has been unable for nine years to get any decision out of the Minister concerned. This is a particular case in which the particular political matter has been put to me. It is of no use for hon. members to tell me that it would not be human for any political party which is in power, if it is politically wise, to hold up, to turn down or to do otherwise in the interest of politics. Mr. Chairman, I am not casting any aspersions against anybody; I am arguing purely and simply on how, in my opinion, the matter looks regardless of whatever political party is in power. I am also arguing on certain knowledge of English Laws.

I cannot for one moment see the wisdom of allowing politics to enter into a decision as far as the individual is concerned. I agree with the hon. senior member for the City that it is quite possible for any Government to phrase Regulations saying that a road must be so many feet wide or that a house must be three-sided, four-sided two-sided, or have one side or whatever they like, or that no particular factory may be within so many yards of a particular house or that no dairy should be within a particular distance of a particular house. I cannot agree that, as this particular Clause is worded, if an individual wants to develop or to erect or to do anything else, and the Town and Country Planning Officer in the first place is willing to allow it, the matter must come to the Executive Committee or they may call for it if they think it politically advisable to do so. If I were running the Government I would want to know of every single proposal which is put there; and the Town and Country Planning Officer would have to provide the Governor-in-Executive Committee with every proposal which is put there. That is obvious from the way in which this Clause is worded.

If an Election is in the air, and something will benefit a certain political Party, if that political party is in power, it will act in its own interest. Do you think that an individual would allow a person to carry out a building that is not in accordance with future development? The matter will be held up. Of course, there are certain hon. members in here who feel that they are in here for life (Laughter)

but if they were in for life, the matter may be held up for life.

Whether it be a Conservative Government in England or a Labour Government or a Liberal Government or any type of Government in any part of the World, whether it be in America, England or Russia the situation will be the same. Strictly speaking, could one expect the political party which is running the Government, to prejudice completely their case of winning an election because one or two individuals may want to carry out certain development which does not suit them politically?

At this stage, it now being after 2 p.m. of the clock Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being after 2 p.m., of the clock this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the Bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Is any hon. member ready to proceed with Questions? (AFTER A PAUSE). There being no Questions ready, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution re Report on the Sugar Industry by Mr. A. F. Mc.Kenzie. (AFTER A PAUSE) Order No. 2 is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution :- Resolution re Statement of the Hon. Premier on the 14th April, 1959. (AFTER A PAUSE). Is there any Item under Private Members' Business with which hon. members want to proceed.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. As regards Order No. 2, the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking on the last occasion. I have the right to reply if no other hon. member wants to speak, and I am in my place.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Is this Order the one which deals with the matter as regards the Constitution? (MEMBERS: Yes.) Could I ask Mr. Speaker, that it be postponed? I wanted to speak on this matter and I did not know that it was coming up today.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgency of the matters under consideration where Government Business is concerned, I am wondering if hon. members will allow Government Business to be dealt with now. On the next occasion we can deal with Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would be a matter for the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak without forfeiting my right to reply, I would like to say that we understand that the Premier is leaving next month in connection with the Constitutional talks, and we would certainly like this debate to be finalised in one way or the other before then. We also understand that the people are proceeding to take certain steps in connection with the Sandy Lane matter; that is the next Order on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. I notice that as regards Order No. 1, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is now in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was not in his place when I called the Order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this House was not adjourned in accordance with the Rules. It was adjourned after 2 o'clock p.m. and I thought at least some sort of grace would have been given over the period for lunch.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know about the House not being adjourned in accordance with the Rules at 2 o'clock p.m.; I had no such report from the Chairman of Committees. I asked him about the time before 2 o'clock. 2.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Your Honour usually waits on the chiming of the clock and the clock never chimed at 2 o'clock today.

I was not present to draw to the attention of the Chair that it was after 2 o'clock. The Clerk left and looked through the door of your Chamber. It was drawn to your attention that 2 o'clock had gone.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may inform the House that I myself was listening for the chimes at 2 o'clock. I made inquiries on more than one occasion from the Chairman behind his back, and from the door of my Chamber, and he told me that it was not yet 2 p.m. Then I was told that the clock hands were pointing to 2 p.m. and I came and took over. (A VOICE: Nobody could tell you that.) Of course I do not take notice of asides, if the hon. member is saying that nobody could tell me so.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to explain that what you said is perfectly correct; that is, that you inquired all the time from me before 2 o'clock. I usually wait until the chime of the clock and the striking of the hour which I did not hear. I came to the conclusion that the clock on the Table must have been somewhat fast, but it was drawn to my attention that it was five minutes after 2 o'clock. Straight away I knocked the gavel to stop the hon. member from speaking. That is the explanation I have to offer.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation. Perhaps due to the fact that I was talking at the time when the clock should have struck, it was impossible to hear the clock. I would, however, suggest to hon. members that the Government has got a certain amount of important business to do and, as we were not here on time, those of us who have private business should get ahead with it. I do apologise for outshouting the clock.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would cooperate. I was suggesting (and I am glad the hon. senior member for St. George has expressed a similar view) - that business we have to do is so important as to allow the House to continue to do Government's business. We can come on Tuesday or whenever we adjourn to and continue with Items 1 and 2 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. Nobody is more anxious to get rid of the debate on Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business than I am.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is no fault of mine that that Order has not been debated. It was pushed down from No. 1 to No. 3 at a meeting of the House when I was not present. I returned to the House and found that it was No. 3 and, last week, I asked for it to be made No. 1. I have to leave the island soon; I do not consider it fair at this stage, having that Order on the Order Paper, not to deal with it.

I regret I was not in my place; but I considered that, in view of the late hour of our adjournment, the same facility would have been given for the full half hour period. That is why I came back at twenty-five minutes to three.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is now considering whether or not the appeal made by the Hon. Leader of the House will have any effect on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to that, I would suggest in the spirit of compromise, which we always evince over here and which is rarely evinced over there - except by the Leader of the House - that, since the hon. senior member for St Peter has admitted that he is going away within the very near future, if he is allowed to speak on the Order which is in his name, it would be perfectly fair. During the remainder of this two-hour period we can revert to Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will waive his claim to proceed with Order No. 2 in favour of the hon. member who is in charge of Order No. 1?

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes, but only for the purpose of his concluding what he has to say. Perhaps he may not be here next Tuesday.

SUGAR INDUSTRY REPORT

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case, as long as there is no objection, the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was not speaking on the Item when the House adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House adjourned, the hon. senior member for St. Michael was speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I regret that members did not see their way to continue with Government Business in view of the importance of the matters we have on the Order Paper. As I mentioned last time, there is the Bill on Interim Control and Development of land, the Resolution for Cost of Living, and also the Resolution to pay pensioners an increase. I am sorry because I myself will soon be leaving the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I presume the hon. member is aware that this is Private Members' time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was merely saying, Sir, that I regret that hon. Members did not see their way to continue Government Business. However, Sir, I will continue from where I left off on the last occasion when dealing with the McKenzie Report.

I think I dealt first with the Report of which Mr. Lewis was Chairman, and I started to deal with the actual Report of Mr. McKenzie. The hon. senior member for St. Peter alleged, in his speech, that it was clear that the Inquiry was to be a public Inquiry because it came through the Legislature and had its headlines in the Press. Then he alleged that the authority which sets up these Boards and Commissions of Inquiry, sets out, at the beginning, to find out what is taking place in the minds of the sugar people, or the employers, and then to have an adjustment made in accordance with such views as they have heard, may be with a view not only of discrediting the Organisation of workers, but of discrediting one of the leaders of the Organisation. He went on to say: "what is regrettable in an age like this, is that throughout the world where there is a spirit of social consciousness arising and people are turning to give greater benefits to the underprivileged, you find that this Government is insisting on these reactionary methods when we come to deal with such matters, and it is preventing the widest publicity being given to matters of public importance".

2.45 p.m.

To deal with the proposed terms of reference which were sent to the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers Association on the 8th September, 1958, this is what was said:

"I am directed by the Minister to inform you that the Government proposes to institute an inquiry into the Sugar Industry of the island with the following terms of reference:-

"To enquire into the economic state of the sugar industry of the island, and to make recommendations as to -

- (1) the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers, and (b) factory workers;
- (2) the establishment of a provident fund for field workers in the industry and the payment of severance pay in appropriate cases;
- (3) the price to be paid to the grower for sugar cane.

2. I should be glad to receive as soon as possible, and in any event not later than the 18th September, 1958, any comments your Union may care to make on the proposed terms of reference.

3. The enquiry will be undertaken by Mr. A. F. McKenzie, Agricultural Adviser to the Federal Government, and is expected to commence on or about 25th September, 1958.

4. The Government is conscious of the deep concern of your Union for the welfare and prosperity of the sugar industry, from which our island draws its life blood, and therefore looks forward with confidence to your ready and wholehearted co-operation in the conduct of the enquiry.

This was signed by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Trade Industry and Labour; it was sent to the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and the Secretary of the Sugar Producers' Association.

Later on, we had replies from those bodies. The first reply we had on the 12th September came from the Barbados Workers' Union. It reads as follows:-

"I have been instructed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. C. 626 Vol. II., dated 8th September, 1958, informing the Barbados Workers' Union that the Government proposes to institute an enquiry into the sugar industry of the island and to have the comments of the Union on the proposed terms of reference.

The Executive Council of the Union gave consideration to this matter and have instructed me to remind you of your letter of the 19th April, 1958, and mine of the 26th April, 1958, on the same subject, which implied further consideration before final action was taken.

It is the opinion of the Union that an investigation into the sugar industry should be conducted on the highest level and on a broader basis than that of a one man enquiry. The issues to be considered are varied and require the broadest representation to meet all of the interests involved. For this reason a three man inquiry is preferable to the Union.

The terms of reference should have been discussed between the parties concerned to ascertain what are the main differences existing between them before the publication which has been made. For example, the proposed terms of reference as mentioned in (1) of your letter state: "the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers, and (b) factory workers."

This is an important part of industrial negotiations between a Trade Union and Employers, and, before an inquiry is instituted to deal with such matters, it should be agreed upon by all sides in order to avoid misunderstanding.

The statement in my letter of the 26th April, 1958, was that the Union is in agreement with the proposal to in-

stitute the Inquiry with such terms of reference to cover the industry in its wide scope. This should not be interpreted to mean that further consultation should not have taken place to consider the terms of reference.

There is also the question of the establishment of a provident fund. This is a matter on which agreement was reached and the details of the scheme were in the hands of your Ministry. Before submitting this matter to the proposed Commissioner the Union should be informed about the stage reached in this matter.

I have, therefore, been asked to inform you that the Union is requesting a meeting with the Minister to settle these matters before the Inquiry begins.

Yours faithfully,
F. L. WALCOTT,
General Secretary.

That meeting did come off. I would like to inform the House that what I read were the proposed terms of reference. These were submitted to the Union and then to the Sugar Producers' Federation; therefore, they cannot be regarded as the terms of reference which were agreed on, or which were the final terms of reference; they were rather exploratory terms in that we wanted to hear the views of the two sides particularly as it was in this instance.

It was on the 15th September I think, that I met the Union and discussed the terms of reference with some of its members. Those members included the President, the General Secretary, Mr. Lashley and Mr. Greene.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is mixing himself up with what he is reading. He started off by saying he was reading something of the Lewis Report.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: How can he rise on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister said he was reading the Report by Mr. Lewis. He said that I said that the terms of reference he is now making reference to, are the terms of reference which had been agreed to before. You will remember that I said in the beginning, when I spoke of the terms of reference, that they were in relation to the Board of Enquiry which was to be set up. I never said anything of the terms of reference in connection with the McKenzie Report. His mind is a bit confused; it is a long time since I have spoken.

He is now saying that the terms of reference relates to the McKenzie Report. He is getting the two things mixed up. What he is talking about is in relation to the Lewis Report in that they had previous consultation with the sugar people and never had consultation with the Union.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I have here notes marked A and B. I can tell you exactly what he said as regards the Lewis Report.

Mr. WALCOTT: He cannot have my speech because I do not have it. It is not printed yet; therefore, he cannot have it. How can he be quoting my speech when it is not printed yet? He ought not to have seen it yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can agree with the hon. member. I, too, cannot see it. What he has cannot be an official report.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that I was quoting his speech. I have notes of parts of his speech. I have them marked A and B. "A" is as regards the Lewis Report, and "B" deals with the McKenzie Report. I was very careful

when I was making notes about this matter. I realised how important this item is to the people of the island.
2.55 p.m.

I repeated a part of the terms of reference, and I also pointed out that the hon. member replied to the Government; and, after the reply, the hon. member had discussions when the Minister of Agriculture was present.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member must debate this matter in a proper form. He cannot refer to the letter to which he is referring and also refer to an hon. member. That hon. member has not written any letters. The hon. member is talking about the General Secretary of the Union, not a member of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: Whether the hon. member is General Secretary of the Union or a member of the Union, whatever is said you have to reply to a member of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister should refer to the hon. member in his capacity as General Secretary of the Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: More than that. I have not written any letter as a member of the House. A letter from the General Secretary could be a letter from you, from me or from anybody else.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is so. I was saying that we had this discussion with the General Secretary and other members of the Executive, on the 19th September. This is what the Union said:

"Further to the meeting between the representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union and the Ministers of Labour and Agriculture in connection with the proposed enquiry into the sugar industry, the Executive Council of the Union have considered the statements made by the Ministers and have instructed me to state that there is agreement for the inquiry to investigate the broad economic position of the industry.

So far as the terms of reference are concerned, the Council suggest the following:-

- (1) To enquire into the economic state of the sugar industry of the island, and to make recommendations as to:-
 - (a) the method of remuneration for the sugar industry;
 - (b) the payment of severance pay in appropriate cases and methods to implement the agreement for the Provident Fund for sugar.

There is no opposition to the reference concerning the price to be paid to the cane grower, but the Barbados Workers' Union cannot speak as the accredited body for this section and therefore consider it improper to make a specific recommendation as to what the terms of reference should contain.

The Council still maintain that the importance of the sugar industry to the economy of Barbados requires an investigation on a broader basis and cannot favour a one-man inquiry for this task.

Moreover, it is a source of regret to the Union that consultation had not taken place before such firm agreements were undertaken concerning the constitution of the Inquiry. This is of vital importance to the Union and cannot be surrendered, even under the present circumstances.

I am to express the thanks of the Union to the Ministers for the cordial welcome extended to the delegation, and to state that the objections of the Union are made in good faith and with the intention of rendering an amicable arrangement to deal with this important matter."

It is fair to mention, at this stage, that when we discussed the question of having a Board of Enquiry into the dispute which existed earlier in the year, the Government made it clear at that time, both to the Union and the Sugar Producers' Association, that the Government intended to have this second enquiry.

I repeat, in so far as the original terms of reference suggested, those were the terms submitted to them as a basis for argument, with a view to reaching some reasonable conclusion as to what the terms of reference to be put to the Commissioner should be. I am quoting this to show that we treated with the Union all along before we treated with the employers. Therefore, when it is said that we were submitting our terms of reference in accordance with the wishes of the employers, that is false.

After we dealt with the Union, we called in the employers. We heard what they had to say. That was on the 20th.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The Union was never consulted on any question on which we stated that we should have been consulted. The Minister said that the Union was consulted all along....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is trying to refute something.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is trying to refute that the Union was not consulted prior to the notification. He is quoting a letter to prove that the statement I made is without either fact or foundation. If he is now reading from the letter which he purports.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot see that that is a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: If he misquotes me....

Mr. SPEAKER: He has not done so yet; he is attempting to disprove something. He has not made any reference to what the hon. member has said; he is now building up his point.

Mr. WALCOTT: He has said that the statement that the Union was not consulted is without foundation; the letter he wrote is in accordance with the question of consultation.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is something to which a reply can be made.

Mr. WALCOTT: But if he has said something different from what I said, I think that he should correct it. The hon. member cannot say something which I did not say.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules of the House provide against that sort of thing.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was careful to quote what was said. I also referred to the dates in order to prove that, before we consulted the employers, we consulted the Union. That gave the lie to the allegation made by the hon. member. The authority that sets up Boards or Commissions of Enquiry could find out what the employers want and act in accordance with their wishes, not with a view to discredit organisations.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot quote from a speech delivered in the same session. He cannot use the actual words because, such would tend to purport to be a *verbatim* report of a member's speech, which is not permitted. He cannot read anything which is *verbatim* at this stage; he must desist from doing that. I must make that ruling.

If a member has a very wonderful memory and is able to take down in whatever script or form what a mem-

ber has said in the present session, that may be for his private benefit; but he will not be allowed to read a member's speech. It would be tantamount to quoting a member's speech in a session in which it has been used.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am always willing to bow to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is a very fair explanation.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to say that time and again, in order to be accurate, members have always read what another member said so that he could not be misinterpreted.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is against the Rules of the House. I have seen it done in the Budget Speech, but the Budget is an extraordinary occasion. I am not going to encourage it because it cuts across the Rules.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would only like to say at this stage that, if the hon. member is constantly going to interrupt me - I am sure that when he was delivering his speech or harangue, I did not interrupt him - I am going to sit down and forget all about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow an hon. member to interrupt a member who is speaking. I am going to point out what I think is a point of order and what is not a point of order.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was proving that it was not a question of this Government (and least of all myself) being influenced by anything which the Conservatives or employers had to say, or that I had given priority over the Trade Union. Before discussing the terms of reference with the employers, I discussed them with the Union; and I go further and say now, Sir, that I was reliably informed by some of the Unionists, who came on the delegation, that they were satisfied with the explanations given to them by the Minister of Agriculture and myself.

The terms of reference that were put up by the employers (they were lengthy because they were asking or rather wanted a definition of this, that and the other, and we had to discuss it at a meeting) were these:-

"To enquire into the economic state of the sugar industry and to make recommendations as to (1) the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers, and (b) factory workers; (2) (a) a provident fund for the field and factory workers in the industry, and (b) the payment of severance pay in appropriate cases; (3) the price to be paid to the grower for sugar cane.

This was addressed separately to the Barbados Workers Union; the Union was invited to submit a memorandum to Mr. McKenzie. The memorandum, as far as I understand, was submitted; and, as I said on the last occasion, although a delegation called on me at the Ministry and discussed the question as to whether or not the Union should be represented in person at the enquiry, the Union felt it absolutely essential and necessary that it should be represented in person. They also said that they could see no valid reason why the discussion should be carried on in private.

I said, on the last occasion, that the only reason why the member should have stuck out for negotiations being carried on in private would be because he felt that he had lost the favour of Unionists, and he wanted them to know what he said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member mean to convey in "private" or in "public"?

Hon. M. E. COX: A memorandum was submitted to Mr. McKenzie, but the hon. member did not appear to answer to the questions in that memorandum; he said he was not prepared to come because the meeting was not held in public. I am concluding that the only reason why the member might

not have wanted to appear in private to substantiate and answer questions in his memorandum, is because he felt that he had lost the confidence of a certain section of the Union; therefore, he wanted it to be known publicly what he had to say. It could not have been for the fact that he wanted to see the figures submitted by the Sugar Producers Association; he knew well that those figures would not be published, and could not be published under the Wages Councils Act. The law is so strict, members cannot even reveal figures when they go on these Boards and discuss the figures submitted to them.

I know, and he knows, that the Sugar Producers Federation, or perhaps I should say, no Association would have been willing to put their figures at the public's disposal. That being the case, they could never arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to what should be paid to these workers.

If the hon. member wanted the fullest cooperation, and wanted all these figures which would help him to conclude what should be reasonable for the workers, and also to arm himself to fight against the Sugar Producers Association, the member knows very well that he could only get those figures in private. The answer was to appear before the Commissioner.

As to our passing money in this Legislature to set up the Commission, therefore it should be a public enquiry, is the height of nonsense. We pass money for all sorts of things in here, and many things are still confidential. The Duffie Inquiry was not done in public; and that was regarded as one of the biggest bits of social legislation or social arrangement or agreement that ever reached this island, in 1951, when the workers of this island got their production bonus and the peasants got increases for canes and so on.

3.15 p.m.

If it has been insisted that it should have been done in public, I am sure it would never have been done at all.

From my experience on this last agreement (despite what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said to people that he was prepared to have nothing to do with the report by Mr. McKenzie) the actual results of the negotiations between the Union and the Sugar Producers Federation proved that he did take that Report as a guide. What are the results? Mr. McKenzie said that the differential between the field workers and the factory workers was too wide, and that in future agreements, increase should be 75 to 25; that is to say, if you have a dollar to give, 75 cents should go to the field workers and 25 cents to the factory workers.

In the last agreement, the Union agreed to have a 7 percent increase, not on the 1958 crop, because the 7 percent increase on the 1958 crop was a 7 per cent on the 1957 rates. In this case, the Union agreed to a basic increase. It was not a 7 percent on the 1957 rates plus a 7 percent *ad hoc* bonus; it was a consolidation so to speak of the 1958 rates.

In so far as the workers are concerned, they were not given any similar increase. Those factory workers who worked for up to \$600 were given an *ad hoc* bonus of 4 percent, but all those who got over \$600 automatically got an *ad hoc* bonus of 2 percent. They did not get an increase on the basic rates; they merely got an *ad hoc* bonus.

Why condemn the recommendations of Mr. McKenzie when in truth and in fact, you are actually working on his recommendations? You did not ask for an increase on the basic rates; you asked for an increase in the rates of the sugar workers. Those getting up to \$600 got 4%; but if you went to \$601, your increase would automatically drop to 2%; so that the man who got \$600 would get \$24 increase, but the man who got \$601 would only get \$12.02. That is how it worked out.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip said that the drop in the price for sugar cane last year was caused by

the recommendation made by Mr. McKenzie. That is far from the truth. While it is true that last year the peasants got less for their canes than they got in 1957, I think the answer is obvious. I believe, by now, every peasant knows why that price was less; every peasant knows that the price last year was not at all connected with any recommendation by Mr. McKenzie. The 1957 crop in the first place reached a total of 205,525 tons of sugar.

Everybody knows of the Suez crisis; and everybody who has been following world trends knows there was an artificial shortage of sugar because conditions were so uncertain in that year, one did not know when war would break out; therefore, in order to make sure that an adequate supply of sugar was had if the occasion necessitated, sugar was brought in in greater quantity; and the world price for sugar, or rather the free sugar, was higher than that of the negotiated sugar.

Another factor which operated in our favour in 1957 is that the recovery was something like 8.58 tons of canes to a ton of sugar. I am sorry the hon. senior member for St. Philip is not present. Everybody knows that the larger the amount of sugar you produce, the lower would be your overhead expenses. That is the reason why the hon. senior member for St. George would pay to bring canes from St. Lucy to Lower Estate; he knows that, the larger the amount of canes he has to grind, the further his overhead expenses are spread. That is one of the factors which helped the factories to pay a higher price on that occasion. 3.25 p.m.

These are the 1958 figures. We produced 152,847 tons. You had an increase of \$8.00 per ton. The price of sugar dropped by \$72.00 per ton below the 1957 price. In addition to that, I should mention that the price of molasses also dropped. It was 35 cents a gallon in 1957 and it dropped as low as 15 cents last year. The wage increase was 6% or rather the bonus was 7%. The overhead expenses were bound to rise, because the number of tons of sugar were considerably reduced below the 1957 amount and the recovery was 9.94 tons of canes to a ton of sugar. Those were the main factors which were responsible for the price of sugar or of canes being less last year than it was in 1957.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip has forgotten; he stated that the factories were influenced by the McKenzie Report, and that is why they did not pay anything more for their canes. Mr. McKenzie's Report was issued long after the final payments were made. The McKenzie Report was made public, and the Agreement of the Union with the Sugar Producers was held up for two weeks before it was published with the concurrence of the Union and the Federation; it was published on the 3rd December, 1958. The final payments for cane were made on the 18th November, 1958. You can see therefore that there is no foundation in fact in the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the McKenzie Report was responsible for the peasants not getting a better price for their canes.

That is the type of thing that happens all along. Some hon. members accuse the Government of not carrying out our trust to the workers of this country. I do not mind being accused of anything under the sun because I am well aware of the fact that there is so much jealousy, grudge, envy, malice and things of that sort that at any time you can expect anything from almost anybody; but when statements are made against the Government and we come face to face and examine those statements, you will find that the accusers have not got a leg on which to stand when the position is examined carefully and impartially.

The McKenzie enquiry was done by the Government with the best will and in the best interests of Barbados. We know that we are responsible people in this country and we take our responsibility seriously; we are not prepared to be influenced by the trappings and frothings of the unfaithful, the disloyal and the disgruntled. We are prepared to examine everything as carefully as possible; and, if we are satisfied that we are right, we will pursue our course despite what the consequences may be. We were more than right in having a one-man Commission of Enquiry.

As I mentioned earlier in my speech sometime ago, it was not a question of a dispute. In a dispute the Trade Union can nominate somebody, the employers can nominate somebody, and the Government can nominate somebody and we can negotiate. The widest publicity can be given to the matter as obtained in the case of the Lewis Report.

This other Report was of a different nature altogether; there was absolutely no dispute; but the Government, in order to ward off what might have been a dispute at a later date, decided not to let that sort of thing happen again. It is all right for people to get up and shout and make a lot of noise, but when the crop is damaged it is the poor people who will lose. The politicians who get on platforms and make a lot of noise do not lose anything; they do not take any part of their salary and help the people with their families; they only fan the fire of trouble in order to overthrow this Government which has worked so hard and under such trying and unfortunate circumstances at times to uplift the people. All they are out to do is to look for the vilest bit of propaganda and at times.....

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of Order. The hon. member is using the word "they"; to whom is he referring?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member could not be referring to any individual as "they". The hon. member need not take any offence at the use of that remark. "They" may not include anybody in this Chamber as far as I am concerned.

3.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: What I want them to learn is that, when they throw stones, they must expect some in return.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now referring to hon. members of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: Anybody who falls in line with that. I did not refer to them, but, perhaps, the remarks might be appropriate to the hon. member, although I did not specifically refer to him. I do not think that he is capable of influencing any serious worker in this island; he might do it to loafers who are not prepared to work and who live on pith and cheap money, but not to a real worker - I mean politically, Sir.

As I mentioned here a week or two ago, coming from over there, two hon. members said that the price of democracy was too dear and that the time had come when we should revert to firing squads and trenches. I heard the hon. member who once used to be a member of this Party get up in Queens Park and read out Communist theory and doctrine and everything that the Communist people do to get power by any means. I heard him reading from some book in Queens Park, but perhaps he has buried that book since.

However, Sir, I am saying that when these things happen the poor working people are the ones who suffer most. It is our duty, Mr. Speaker, to do as we did in 1945 when we went the length and breadth of this island and appealed to the workers to reap the crop because we were prepared to see after them; and, incidentally, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was one at the time who knew that things would be so arranged that they would never have that sort of dispute again or, at least, in haste. If the crop was not reaped they would suffer more.

No doubt, during the 1914-1918 war, these persons who owned plantations were able to put up so much money that they could sit down and live sumptuously on that money; so, in this day, if anything happens they could not really suffer. The workers are the people who suffer. That is why it is our duty and business, even at the expense of our being slandered, maligned and abused, to explain to the people the things that are right and to lead them along the right path for their own benefit. If they accept it, it is a matter for them; if they do not, it will be a matter for them.

Mr. Speaker, we brought down Mr. McKenzie here to go into the economics of the sugar industry and to make recommendations, not as to what wages should be paid (because that is a matter for the Trade Union and the Sugar Producers' Association) but to do the initiative; that is to tell them what the economics are and guide them along the path of negotiations or form a basis for negotiations. If the wages are not sufficient in that respect, it is not our fault at all.

I want to close by quoting a bit of what I read in an ORIT bulletin. I think it is most appropriate on this occasion, and in this debate. Perhaps it is also appropriate and could have been used in the debate which took place a week or so ago. This issue is October-November, 1958. This is what Mr. Sanchez Madariaga said among other things. He was General Secretary of ORIT.

"The investigators of these subversive and disorderly activities are persons of communistic tendencies. It is true that there are many but you can no longer continue to underestimate their methods, which consist principally in demagogically fomenting the economic and social problems of our countries, and offering to solve them immediately through violence." This is what is done and has been done to us for some time in this House of Assembly. "This is accomplished by creating hate and exasperation among the groups who are most acutely affected. The old procedure of undermining the prestige of patriotic labour leaders is used, and they are submitted to the lowest type of slander. Confusion is created in the international relations, not only as regards the workers but also as regards Governments. Every means of creating a lack of confidence of the people towards their own goals and their Governments' efforts to maintain social and economic improvements in each country is made. They take advantage of the international trade problems, not with the purpose of finding a solution, but rather with the idea in mind of instigating discontent towards North America."

These words, Sir, are too true in Barbados today, and more than appropriate at this time. I was in England in 1957 with the hon. senior member for St. Peter, just on the eve of our going to Geneva, and we had discussions with the Employers' Federation, with the Trade Union Councils, and with Governments, because, we as advisers, had to be briefed to a certain extent by these persons.

In so far as the Trade Union Congress was concerned, there was a man by the name of Walter Hood, a very renowned man in Trade Union circles, and he made it clear then that Trade Unions should not be used as pawns in the games of politics. As a matter of fact, he used the criticism against politicians of using the Union as a means of helping them to get into certain positions, and then, when they got in those positions the Trade Unions only found out that they were doing it for selfish ends. He was so strong in his condemnation, that I had to defend our position in Barbados. I had to make it known that we did not come after the Trade Union; we came before and paved the way and caused the Trade Union to exist. Very strong language was used; but what do we find? We find the same thing happening today.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may be of general interest, but as far as the Report is concerned, I would like the hon. member to keep to that discussion.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this question is a very large one as you will appreciate; and we can regard it as an international question since we are in the International Sugar Agreement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, it is of a substantive nature because it deals with a specific Report.

Hon. M. E. COX: However, Sir, one will remember well that, after the Government had carried out so successfully these negotiations by way of arbitration, the Trade Unionist went on a politician's platform and said

that that politician was responsible for the increase which the people got.
3.45 p.m.

The Trade Unionists no doubt are pawns in the political game. The time has come when we have got to speak very strongly and very forcibly against those things; if things are allowed to drift, and if we allow ourselves to go by default, it would mean that we would not only be doing great harm to ourselves as leaders of the working class people but also to the same people and to future generations.

Hon. members should take their duties with a greater sense of responsibility; and, while it is true that we do not ask them to be lenient in their criticism of us—everyone of us over here has a tongue in his head and knows about the running of the country and, by that, is able to defend himself—we ask them when they criticise to be more constructive in their criticism. They should always bear in mind—although God forbid—that one of these days they may be occupying the same position as we are.

I regret that this question had been raised before the negotiations had been carried out; as the hon. member knows, we were then in process of doing so; we were to have a meeting the following day. It was improper for him to raise this matter before the discussions had ended and therefore, I refused to carry on any further negotiations before this debate had ended.

I hope, Sir, that I have been able to explain the Government's position. Government is always and ever mindful of its responsibility to the people of this country and the workers in particular. We would not, at any time, do anything which can be regarded as against the interest of those persons who put us here to represent them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will agree that, if a member of any debating assembly pleads for more than three hours to deal with any matter under discussion, that member is very limited in his vocabulary or mental construction to be able to express himself. Three hours is long enough to condemn any man to death, far less in presenting a case in which the Government does not have any concern.

Sir, I cannot get through with my reply this evening. You will appreciate that, therefore, this debate will have to be continued again. I just want to say now that, when you go down into the old sewerage pipes and try to rake up all the substance you can get from those pipes to smear other people's characters, you can only say that you belong to a category that one has to pray for. It is true that this matter under discussion is above the mental understanding of the Hon. Minister of Trade; that is obvious. He started off by reading from letters and, even in doing that, he got mixed up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to refrain from personal remarks. Of course, you have not used any yet, but you seem to be getting very near.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think there is anything unparliamentary in what I have just said. I do not think I said anything which can be regarded as offensive. I only said that the matter with which we are dealing is above the hon. member's mental development.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said, "as yet".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it need not for me to remind this House that I will not use any offensive remarks as regards the Hon. Minister although, in the dictionary, there is only one word to represent someone who says something which they know is not true. The most adequate word in the dictionary to describe that person you are not allowed to say in Parliament. I only say that any member who says and does what the Hon. Minister does possesses a sick mind, and therefore, he needs a psychiatrist to examine his mind.

The Hon. Minister said that the reason why it was unfortunate that I raised this matter at the time I did, was because we were going to enter into negotiations over this matter the next day. I just want to show that the Hon. Minister has absolutely no regard for making inaccurate statements in Parliament, and would say anything at all in order to gain a debating point whether what he says is true or not. You will be surprised to learn that the letter concerning that matter was addressed to the Barbados Workers' Union on the 5th February, 1959. I had to give notice to the Speaker of this Resolution before introducing it into this House on the 3rd February; which means that I would have given notice to the Speaker at least on the Friday previous to that date.

I had given notice of this Resolution on a date preceding even the date that the letter from the Ministry was addressed; therefore, why say that I had done something which you can regard as improper? Those are just statements of fact. The letter on the 5th February, 1959 asked the Union if it would be convenient for them to come to a meeting to discuss these matters. When a letter is written on the 5th February, it does not mean that it is going to reach you on the 5th February. This matter which I put forward was already in the House of Assembly.
3.55 p.m.

Should I forego my right as a citizen and as a member of this Chamber not to discuss my rights? This matter would have been discussed if the House had not been prorogued. Did you see the impression which the hon. member was trying to give? Something was sent to the Union one day to be discussed on the next day, and the hon. member came into this House and tried to lead off this discussion and for that reason he has postponed the discussion.

I am going to show bit by bit the hon. member's mischievousness in this whole debate; one by one and bit by bit I will show it. It is a matter of the hon. member's mental development. Do you want a clearer case than the stupidity of trying to show up the hon. senior member for St. Philip? He advanced a case to show that the employers could not pay anything more in 1959 by the facts he said he was reading out in respect of the sugar industry; but when he was dealing with the hon. member.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I will give way to the hon. member every time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say at any time that the employers could not pay anything more; I do not know what they can pay. I never said one word about that. I said that the hon. senior member for St. Philip was using the McKenzie Report.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now advancing what was said in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Philip, not to himself in this case.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have never said that at all; I do not know anything about the sugar people.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to show bit by bit that the hon. member does not know what he is talking about. With an arrogant air of ignorance he shows himself up more. What did he say in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Philip? He said that the hon. senior member for St. Philip who was not in his seat was saying that the people should get more money for their canes, but that it was a result of the McKenzie Report that they did not get anything more. He elected to leave out the price that they received for sugar.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. If I have to interrupt the hon. member I will do so. I said that the hon. member said that the publication of the McKenzie Report influenced the factory people to pay less than what they paid.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is saying the same thing.

Hon. M. E. COX: He is not saying the same thing. I pointed out that the Report was published after the final payments were made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I will show bit by bit that the hon. member does not understand the very words he is using. The hon. member is quoting the hon. senior member for St. Philip, and he is saying that the hon. senior member for St. Philip said that the publication of this Report influenced the sugar people to pay less for canes. Is that not the same thing as saying that the Report of the Commissioner was responsible for the sugar people not paying anything more for canes?

What do you mean by "influenced"? It means that this publication has influenced the sugar people to do what they have done. That is where the Hon. Minister elected to show that the hon. senior member for St. Philip was only fomenting strife, because he is now electing to give the information about the Sugar Industry.

Hon. M. E. COX: I elected to give the House the date of the publication of the Report as against the date when the final payments were made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the Hon. Minister should allow the hon. member to develop his point before interrupting him.

Hon. M. E. COX: I want to nail him.

Mr. WALCOTT: He can never nail me. He wants to use the technique of somebody else but he cannot do it well.

Sometime ago he said that he knew nothing about the industry but, when he was replying to what the hon. senior member for St. Philip said, he elected to say that he knows something about the industry. This is what the hon. member said. He said that the price of sugar this year has fallen on the free market. Although you had \$8.00 per ton as an increase the price has fallen and moreover the price of molasses has dropped. Therefore he was substantiating the point that you should have a higher price, with this drop in price, then you had in 1957.

I would like to say that there are some murderers who like to go to the scene and, when they go to the scene, they leave and wonder who has done that horrible crime! The situation in 1957 was that the price of sugar was higher than in 1958 but now he shows why the people are not getting more. The hon. member says this; last year you got this price and this year - look what he has put forward!

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I did not say look what he has put forward.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member positively said so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member intends to quote the Hon. Minister verbatim.

Hon. M. E. COX: I only want to rise to a point of order to say that I did not put forward that.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: He said that we put forward, on behalf of these people, and discussed certain negotiations not even based on the Mc.Kenzie Report but less than what Mc.Kenzie suggested. We put forward a proposal for 7%.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I cannot allow those remarks to go unchallenged. I did not say that they put forward less than what Mc.Kenzie put up.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you mean that he does not know what he said? He said that the McKenzie Report recom-

mended a differential of 75 : 25 and that what we put up to them was less than what Mc.Kenzie had suggested.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I must in no uncertain terms deny that I did say that. He is speaking from his own imagination.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to wonder; I think I am blessed with a good memory. The hon. member said what I said, and went on to talk about a differential, because the people were given 7% not on *ad hoc*. He does not understand how you negotiate. He said that we did not get it on *ad hoc* but on the 1957 rates of pay. I did not correct him, and he went further to say that, if you got 7% on that for the factory workers, it meant 4% on up to \$600 and 2% onwards. He did not want the McKenzie Report but now he comes back and puts up something on the basis of the McKenzie Report.

He was telling the hon. senior member for St. Philip that you could not get any more money and asked him to look around and see what the factories showed, but when he was dealing with me, he wanted to show that I was not in agreement with the Mc.Kenzie Report; that I actually put forward less than the McKenzie Report recommended which was a 75:25 ratio. That was the last point he was making, so I had to draw that fresh to the House's attention because he is likely to forget, and you see how many times he bobs up and down to correct that simple statement. That is an indication that he does not know what he is talking about. If he knew how negotiations are conducted he would not have said that.

I think I have established the first gross error which he tried to make. He went on to say that, when I was introducing this debate in the House of Assembly, I was informed by them that something was going to take place, and I gave notice in the House even before the Union received any communication from the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The debate is what I dealt with when he gave notice of the motion. I am dealing with the debate which took place in this House on the 10th February. The meeting with this gentleman was scheduled for the 11th at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. WALCOTT: Does that show, Mr. Speaker, that I must forego my right of discussing something in this Chamber of which I had given notice because they gave notice to me subsequently? (Hon. M. E. COX: It is indiscreet.) He does not know the meaning of the word "indiscreet"; if he did, there would not be a question of this being indiscreet. It would have been indiscreet if I had received a letter from them on the 5th and then I came here on the 7th or 8th and gave notice of something dealing with the same matter. This matter, however, dealt with a specific reference in the McKenzie Report; it dealt with a provident fund and severance pay.

I am not responsible, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member cannot appreciate good things in life; good things in life mean honesty first. Any man who wants to be a good man must of necessity be an honest man, and an honest man means that you have to say honest things about people. You cannot get up and say things which are not true and which cannot be proved to be true about people. What is worrying him is my freedom as a citizen of this community to stand on anybody's political platform; that is something which he challenges. He has the right to stand on any platform he chooses; and it is also an inalienable right which I possess and no man, woman or child in this island will ever prevent me from doing it.

What he said by innuendo is a big untruth, and I challenge it. He said that I got on a platform and said that the hon. junior member for St. John was responsible for the increases which the workers got. He also said different things from that because, in a *sotto voce* remark, he said that I stole Trade Union money. That is a more damaging statement than the one about my getting on a member's

platform. If the hon. member impresses me in the same way, I will get on his platform again. I will get on any person's platform which I care to get on, no matter whom it offends.

I can recite things which the hon. member said in this House which he cannot prove. You cannot prove a lie, unless you are going to get an army of perjurers to come and perjure their souls; and when it comes to loafers, he should be the last to talk about them. When he talks about maligning and slandering people, he should be the last to do that because his whole vocabulary is made up of slander and vile vilifications of people.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has dealt with that phase if it is meant to be a phase.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is only a reply to what the hon. member has said. You cannot ask a member to withdraw what he has said. I was trying in this debate, for a long time, not to involve Your Honour in this, but the hon. member has acquired a technique which he has copied from other people, and that is reading. Reading is still an art, even if it is a question of punctuation, in order that you may be able to understand what you are reading; and it is more difficult when you are reading for someone, because when you are reading for yourself you have the time to stop.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must avoid speaking to anyone but the Chair. I myself do not let them prevent me from listening.

Mr. WALCOTT: I see that you are ignoring them, but as Speaker, you cannot treat asides as a member can. Mr. Speaker, as you heard today, the hon. member was in a state of mental confusion about these two Commissions. You will remember that I said earlier that the terms of reference sent to the Union were in relation to the Lewis Report. Today he does not know what he is talking about, but he wants to get on with Government business, so he picks up a file and starts to read; and, in so doing, he is mixing up something which took place in September 1958 with something which took place in April, 1958.

You will remember that I made a statement saying that the Labour Commissioner wrote the Union a letter on the 18th April, 1958 which reads as follows:-

"I have to refer to the meeting between representatives of the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados and representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union held under my Chairmanship on Tuesday 15th instant in the Labour Department, when the representatives of the Federation suggested that the difference between the Federation and the Union should be referred to arbitration for the purposes of determining whether or not there is in fact an agreement between the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados and the Barbados Workers' Union in respect of the years 1957, 1958 and 1959, and the terms thereof.

In a letter dated 18th April, 1958, the General Secretary of the Union informed me that his Executive Council had rejected the Federation's proposal and, since it is necessary that both sides agree to accept arbitration, I have today informed the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour of the present position of this dispute."
4.15 p.m.

On the 19th April, a letter was addressed to the Union from the Ministry of Trade. I reads as follows:-

"I am directed to refer to correspondence on the subject of the present dispute in the sugar industry, resting with the Labour Commissioner's letter to you No. H.5001 of the 18th April, 1959, and say that it has been decided to establish a Board of Enquiry under Section 8 of the Trade Disputes (Arbitration and Enquiry) Act, 1939 to investigate the dispute and to recommend what wages should in all the present circumstances be paid to workers in the industry in respect of the year 1958. The precise terms of reference remain to be finally decided.

I am to enquire whether your Union has any suggestions to offer as to the membership of the Board, for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor."

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that around this same date, the 19th April, 1958 coincided with the inauguration of the Federal Government and therefore, CADORIT held a meeting in Trinidad around that time and I happened to be one of the delegates going there and happened to be out of the island at the time. He did not receive a letter from the Union; not until the 26th April. He did not tell the House that a letter was written on the 21st April. This is the letter which was written in reply on the 21st April, 1958.

The Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Trade, Industry & Labour,
Government Buildings,
Bay Street.

Dear Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge your letter No. C 626/25 of date 19th April, 1958, and to inform the Minister that the Executive Council of the Barbados Workers' Union has accepted the Government's offer to establish a Board of Enquiry to make an investigation along the lines recommended in paragraph one of your letter.

I am further directed to inform the Minister that the questions raised in paragraphs two and three of your letter will be the subject of immediate consideration by the Executive Council and at its meeting scheduled to take place not later than Wednesday, 23rd instant."

It was signed: "Yours faithfully, for General Secretary."

What did the Hon. Minister say? He said that he did not receive a letter from the Barbados Workers' Union until the 26th April. I am only establishing these facts to show you how he reads things and makes misstatements. He said that he is going to show you things and that he is going to pull people to bits. What bits can he pull people to? He cannot even read letters correctly or truthfully.

"For the General Secretary", means that that letter was written by the person who was acting for the General Secretary. Cannot the hon. member speak the truth by accident, even if he stumbles on it?

Now, in my opening speech, I said that they met the employers before; they themselves admitted that they met the employers before, because they said that the employers approached them on this matter. They never met the Union. Now, today, the Hon. Minister comes and says that, before they set out the terms of reference of the enquiry, they met members of the Barbados Union and the Barbados Employers Federation and took their views. That is utter mental confusion. Who is the person who talked of the McKenzie Report? He is the person who is going back in the sewerage pipes to rake up all the mess in order to smear somebody's character. Sooner or later the Hon. Minister will see. (Hon. M. E. COX: When you hear, you will run to the Court.) When you hear the Court.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The asides are too loud. I am asking the Hon. Leader and the hon. member addressing this House to confine their asides to *sotto* tones. I am not expected to hear them, but I hear them, therefore, the hon. members should restrict their asides or indicate them telepathically - particularly when they are unpalatable.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Minister has the idea that he has a monopoly on that sort of conduct; and it appears to me as if he has been agitated into doing so by the Hon. Premier and his colleagues. He can rest assured that whenever he comes in here with that sort of conduct he would get it toe for toe. He will meet his match.

The Hon. Minister cannot read well enough to find that letter of the 21st April. A letter was sent from the

Ministry of Trade on the 23rd April to us with the proposed terms of reference and it reads as follows:-

"I am directed to refer to paragraph 1 of my letter No. C. 626/25 of the 19th April, 1958, and to enclose a copy of the terms of reference which it is provisionally proposed should be given to the Board of Inquiry. If you wish to offer comments on these terms of reference, will you please let me have them by Friday, 25th April, 1958?"

A copy of this letter and the enclosure is being sent to Mr. F. L. Walcott in Trinidad."

What I did say was this: Here it is that you are sending us the provisional proposals of the terms of reference after you met the employers. I challenge them to say that they did not meet the employers before they wrote this letter with these terms of reference. The first time that any reference was given to the Union about the terms of reference was on this occasion, after they had met the employers. When you see the letter written by the employers, you will see that what they wanted the Commissioner to do as regards these terms of reference. What took place after the meeting which the employers had with the Minister?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is true that many people would have heard what I said on the first occasion. I made it clear that we did not meet any employer on any terms of reference or anything of the kind. The employers wanted to have a meeting with the Ministry, and courtesy demands us to meet or to see anybody at any time. I made it clear that the meeting we had was absolutely nothing to do with the terms of reference.

They came to us saying: "What about giving the 6% which was agreed to under the Commonwealth Wage Index?" We told them that we were nothing to do with that. That had nothing to do with the terms of reference.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, is he a crazy man? Does he know the meaning of the word "meeting"? If a man asks you to meet him and you meet him, what is that?

He said that they met the employers and he said that the employers discussed with them the terms of the agreement. The Hon. Minister does not seem to understand plain and unadulterated English. I said that, after the meeting they had with the employers, the proposed terms of reference came out along the same lines which the employers were always proposing.

If he has a Labour Commissioner and does not know how to treat a dispute, that is a matter for him. The Hon. Minister talks about there being a dispute; that a dispute was going on (according to him) in the biggest industry in the island. No, if that is so, and one side said to you that they want to meet you to discuss matters concerning the dispute, what do you think they would discuss? Was the Hon. Minister going to discuss romantic affairs with them? When they met him was he going to say to them "oh, this is a lovely night"? Oh, no. They discussed this matter concerning the dispute. It was a dispute between the employers and the Union and the employers had a meeting with him to discuss that matter.

No, Sir, what was the proper course for an impartial Minister to take? He should have told them: "I am nothing to do with that." If on the other hand, they wanted to meet him, he would have told them that he is bound to meet the other side too in order to know what is the situation. Instead of doing that, he met the employers and, out of his own mouth, he said he met them twice and that this is what they say that they were doing.
4.25 p.m.

Imagine that they were so magnanimous that, behind the back of the Union, they were negotiating with

the employers to give us more money to make the amount six percent because it was 5.95%! The Union rejects something which the employers put up, but the Government, without telling the Union anything, meets the employers and negotiates with them with this ballistic idea that they were asking the employers for more than what the Trade Union wanted.

If an employer goes to the Minister of Labour, by all means let him meet the employer; but let him hear what the Union has to say in view of the fact that he has to come to the Union. They meet the employers and the next thing the Union is going to hear that these things are all out and these are the terms of reference. They met the employers; we did not meet them. We rejected the terms of reference they sent to us and we said that they were not acceptable to the Union. That is as far as the Lewis matter is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to show you that the hon. member does not know anything about the Ministry of which he is in charge. The Commission of Enquiry Act is something which you would have found in Bechuanaland; this is no model legislation; this was created before the hon. member was a member of the House, and it was created not only for a trade dispute but in the case of any dispute. The Governor can appoint a Commission of Enquiry in anything like a dispute.

It being now 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m., of the clock the House reverts to the consideration of Government Business. On the suspension of the sitting, the House was in Committee.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (INTERIM CONTROL) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Town and Country Planning (Interim Control) Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion of Government Business the House was in Committee on the Town and Country Planning Bill. The hon. senior member for St. George was speaking.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, at the time when the debate was stopped on the Town and Country Planning Bill, I was making the point that, while it is correct to say that the community as a whole must not suffer on account of the individual, it is very important that the rights of the individual should be maintained.

It is my opinion that democracy is not formed and based on the Party system only, but that the fundamentals of democracy are based on the law. Without the law I am positive that democracy, as we know it today, cannot possibly progress. The law is the last result of human wisdom acting upon human experience for the benefit of the public. That is the main point; it is for the benefit of the public. With politics, on the other hand, there always comes a time when it is expedient for the politician to act in a certain manner. Whether or not the individual's rights will suffer, the over-all picture calls for the politician to act against his particular interest.

This Clause does not give any right of appeal whatsoever to the law, and I am in perfect agreement with the hon. senior member for the City that there is the necessity for an appeal to the law. Unlike the Hon. Minister, I feel that, unless we have a competent, impartial judiciary, no Government will be able to stand. Therefore, if we are faced with the fact that we have not got a competent judiciary at this time so that we can place more responsibility on them, if they are learning, which I rather doubt, after all of these years, the judiciary of the world is in a better position to give a decision in the light of human experience on any matter whatsoever in the interest of the public, rather than a politician sitting in Executive Committee.

I have quoted a case in the United Kingdom. In the United States of America it is a well known fact that it is sometimes expedient for the politician to act against individual interests; and, by lobbying, we have seen cases where several persons were involved in large amounts of money, that money being handed over to Party funds for running a particular campaign. The same situation can happen right here at any time with any Government. It is therefore unwise and impracticable, in my opinion, to appeal from the Governor-in-Executive Committee to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Apart from that, Sir, there is no doubt in my mind that modern day politics are merely a personal, lucrative business and I mean that all over the world.

4.35 p.m.

Politics today is not based on public service; it is based on a person's ability to get along for his own personal future, financial or otherwise. That has been said even by a Socialist M.P. who said that, since the War, politics have become little more than a lucrative personal racket. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Who is he?) The hon. member may get the book "To Dwell Together In Unity" and read it.

It is a fact, Sir, that politics today is suffering from a lack of Christianity, as the world is suffering. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: What?) Perhaps the hon. member does not know what that is and asks. The necessity to protect the public and the individual from the expediency of politics is very important to those of us who realise that politicians today will do anything to gain the vote of the electorate. Even in this island, we are suffering today from the promises made which have never been fulfilled since the 1930s or 1940s, (A VOICE: By the P.C.P.?) - not by the P.C.P., - like getting Lower Estate and Bulkeley which they only know too well - whether it be "they" that are here today, or "they" that are gone or "they" that will be here tomorrow - they will not get. They will know all the promises that were made.

Now, Sir, the whole point of this Section, in my opinion, is that it will place a sense of insecurity and instability in the Town and Country Planning Bill; the public will feel that they have no alternative but to appeal to a political body. I cannot agree with the argument that it is necessary for the Governor-in-Executive Committee, having laid down the policy, also to ascertain that all appeals are made to them. As I said before, it is simple for them in their Regulations to decide exactly what they want; and, if they find that any particular one wants amending or adding to, then it is quite in order for the Regulations to be amended or added to.

Mr. Chairman, I said in the beginning and will say again that this, in my humble opinion, is a very good effort on behalf of the community, but it has failed in this particular Section by not allowing the Law to be the particular body to appeal to, and it must therefore create a difficulty. Whether or not this is passed, as sure as we are in here, the Government will reap the benefit as soon as this starts of several insinuations and several criticisms which are going to be made because of the fact that they are going to be Caesar in the beginning and Caesar in the end.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this particular part. There is no doubt in my mind that the community as a whole needs this Bill, but I do hope that the Government will see fit to amend or change this Section now or at a later date. I do hope that, in trying to achieve the best for the community, they do not override what is the most important thing in a democracy; that is, the individual's right.

The question that Clause 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. S.A. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. SMITH; - 8.

NOES: Mr. DOWDING; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER - 4.

Clause 6 was called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendment in Clause 7:

In lines 6 and 11 delete the word "enactment" and insert the word "part".

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 as amended stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

Clause 8 was called. It reads as follows:-

8. (1) If it appears to the Town and Country Planning Officer that any development has been carried out without grant of permission or approval in accordance with the provisions of this Act or of an Interim Control Order or that any conditions or limitations to which such grant of permission or approval is made subject have not been complied with, then he may hereinafter in this section referred to as an "enforcement notice".

(2) An enforcement notice shall specify the development which is alleged to have been carried out without the grant of permission or approval or, as the case may be, the matter in respect of which it is alleged that any limitations or conditions to which such permission or approval to develop is subject have not been complied with, and may require such steps as may be specified in the said notice to be taken within such period as may be so specified for restoring the land to its condition before the development took place for securing compliance with the conditions or limitations as the case may be:

Provided that, if within the period specified aforesaid, an application is made to the Town and Country Planning Officer in accordance with the provisions of section four of this Act for permission to retain on the land any buildings or works for the continuance of any use of the land to which an enforcement notice relates, such notice shall not take effect until the expiry of a like period after the final determination of that application by that officer and if permission as aforesaid is granted on that application, the enforcement notice shall not take effect.

(3) Any person aggrieved by an enforcement notice may at any time within the period specified in the said notice by summons apply to a Judge in chambers and on hearing such application the Judge -

(a) if satisfied that permission or approval was granted for the development to which the enforcement notice relates, or that no such permission or approval was required in respect thereof, or, as the case may be, that the conditions or limitations subject to which such permission or approval was granted have been complied with, shall quash the enforcement notice to which the application relates;

(b) if not so satisfied, but satisfied that the requirements of the enforcement notice exceed what is necessary for restoring the land to its condition before the development took place, or for securing compliance with the conditions or limitations as the case may be, shall vary the enforcement notice accordingly;

(c) in any other case shall dismiss the application.

(4) If within the period specified in an enforcement notice or within such extended period as the Town and Country Planning Officer may allow, any steps required by the notice to be taken have not been taken, the Town and Country Planning Officer or a person authorised in writing by him may enter upon the land and take those steps and may recover as a civil debt from the person upon whom the enforcement notice was served any expenses reasonably incurred by him in that behalf.

(5) Where by virtue of an enforcement notice, any use of land is to be discontinued or any conditions are required to be complied with in respect of the carrying out of operations thereon, then if any person, without the grant of permission obtained on an application made under subsection (2) of this section, uses the land or causes or permits the land to be used or carries out or causes or permits to be carried out those operations in contravention of the notice, he shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding two hundred and fifty dollars and if the use is continued after the conviction he shall be guilty of a further offence and liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars for every day on which the use is so continued.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, although what I am about to say may be implied, yet in a Bill of this nature you need to be very precise and emphatic. Clause 8, Section 1 says "if it appears to the Town and Country Planning Officer that any development has been carried out without grant of permission or approval in accordance with the provisions of this Act" and I suppose that implies since the coming into operation of this Act. In other words, I am suggesting that it should read as follows:

"If it appears that since the coming into operation of this Act" such and such a thing happens, and I was wondering whether the Minister would see that point. In order to make it clearer I am suggesting that the Minister should insert the words "since the coming into operation of this Act" so that the Section will now read as follows:-

"If it appears to the Town and Country Planning Officer that since the coming into operation of this Act any development has been carried out without grant of permission or approval in accordance with the provisions of this Act, etc., etc."

I do not know if the Minister is following me or if he ignores every thing the Opposition says. In the Act at present, it is not clear and precise; it is a question of leaving a lot of loopholes which lawyers can always get around.
4.45 p.m.

I am simply qualifying the whole thing by inserting at the appropriate stage what apparently may be implied, but which is not expressly stated. If you are drafting legislation, the opportunity is given for you to expressly state what you mean and you should not leave it for inference.

Subsection (1) of Section 8 reads as follows:-

"If it appears to the Town and Country Planning Officer that any development has been carried out without grant of permission or approval in accordance with the provisions of this Act or of an Interim Control Order or that any conditions or limitations to which such grant of permission or approval is made subject have not been complied with, then he may serve on the owner or occupier of the land a notice hereinafter in this section referred to as an "enforcement notice"."

I do not know when the Hon. Minister will agree to making this Clause clear. Unless you insert these words which I have mentioned, "if it appears to the Town and Country Planning Officer that since the coming into operation of this Act", it will not be clear when the development took place because nothing is stated here and you certainly are not referring to anything which took place before.

The question that Clause 8 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative with out division.

Clauses 9 and 10 were called separately and passed

Clause 11 was called.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Before I move the passing of this Clause, I would like to add this new subsection - subsection (4). It reads as follows:-

"(4) In reckoning such period of forty days, no account shall be taken of any time during which the Legislature is dissolved or prorogued or during which both Houses are adjourned for more than seven days".

I think hon. members have this circulated to them.

I beg to move that Clause 11 as amended stand part.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 12, 13 and 14 were called separately and passed.

Clause 2 was recommitted.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that I said the other night, when debating this Clause, that I saw some force in the arguments of hon. members and I agreed to postpone it. I have gone into them with the Crown Law Officers and I am now proposing the following amendments:-

1. In the definition of "engineering operations" in section 2 substitute "roads" for "highways".

2. Delete definition of "highways" in section 2.

3. Immediately after the definition of "land" in section 2 insert the following:-

"roads" means any public or private roads in this Island including any streets, lanes, alleys, bridges, watercourses, wharves and embankments;

4. Delete the definition of "subdivision" and substitute -

"subdivision" means the division of land held under one ownership into two or more parts whether the subdivision is by conveyance, transfer or partition or for the purpose of sale, gift, lease or any other purpose;

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, although the Hon. Minister did not elaborate on the word "subdivision", I see that the proposed amendment covers the motion which I made. I see that the word "subdivision" means a division of land held under one ownership into two or more parts whether the subdivision is by conveyance, transfer or partition or for the purpose of sale, gift, lease or any other purpose.

You will remember that I made a motion to the effect whereby a lease will be included; and it is for that reason I had attempted to give a definition of "land" whereby leaseholds would be covered.

Hon. members apparently did not seem to appreciate it, but you now see for yourselves that the question of leaseholds and leases have to be covered. I am glad that the Hon. Minister saw fit to refer it back to the Crown Law Officers who have cleared up the discrepancies. 4.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, unless these changes had been made, it would have been possible for any lawyer to be able to advise his client to circumvent the provisions of this Act, and the whole thing would be a farce and a fallacy, meaning nothing at all.

The question that Clause 2 as amended stand part of the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule stand part of the Bill.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee with amendments.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN reported to MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER who took the Chair and reported accordingly

On motions of HON. R. G. MAPP, seconded by HON. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

RESOLUTION re COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when the House was in Committee considering this Resolution for \$776,000, the hon. senior member for the City was speaking. The hon. member is not now in his seat.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, so long a time has elapsed since we last discussed this matter, I think we should remind the Committee of our position. If it is a fact that the Government does not see its way to afford more than this amount of \$776,000 for an increase or for increases by way of a cost of living allowance and not by way of salary which would be subject to a pension as we would want. If the Finance Minister says that the maximum is this amount which we are asked to vote, we say that this amount should be divided exclusively amongst the lowest paid public employees in this island, who are the persons whose salaries do not exceed £50 or \$240 per month. The amounts which would be saved by not giving this \$9.00 a month to the people who receive salaries from \$300.00 up to \$1,000.00 a month, these numerous amounts of \$9.00 could be divided amongst the people in the lower

brackets; that is to say, the people whose salaries do not exceed \$240.00 a month. We contend that it is absolutely ridiculous and stupid to give a cost of living allowance of \$9.00 to people whose salaries are \$1,000.00 a month. Of what use is that to a man whose salary is \$800.00 a month or whose salary is \$600.00, \$500.00 or \$400.00 a month? It is an insult to him; he should not accept it.

The whole purpose of a cost of living allowance is to assist those in the very lowest categories who find it rather impossible to carry on with the slender wages of which they are now in receipt. The people in the \$1,000.00 or a month bracket do not want any cost of living allowance at all. It is true that people always want more; but to say that people in these higher brackets cannot carry on unless they are given this \$9.00 a month cost of living allowance is absolutely ridiculous.

In the Budget Speech this year, when the Hon. Minister of Finance addressed this Chamber, this is what he said:-

"Under the Head 'Highways & Transport' the largest is for parish roads, to meet the cost of the wages of cantonniers not on the unestablished staff. Here, I would like to say that it is well known that there is a revision by way of cost of living for cantonniers undertaken by the Government to assist the lowest paid staff in helping them to meet their obligations. I say that while there is an increase here, yet in a short time we will be faced with further increases so as to satisfy the demands not only of the cantonniers but those other employees in the various Departments."

When the Finance Minister assured us that he would like to say that it is well known that there is a revision by way of a cost of living for cantonniers undertaken by the Government to assist the lowest paid staff in helping them to meet their obligations, he obviously left us to infer from his speech that the revision by way of cost of living would have been confined to the lowest paid staff. 5.05 p.m.

Certainly, we never anticipated a cost of living which represents three tins of cigarettes for a person after the deduction of income tax in the \$800 or \$1,000 a month bracket. Is it seriously contended that, in order to purchase certain essential commodities, you must provide people working for \$300 a month and up with a cost of living? It seems as if the Government is so concerned with those higher up that it can, on no occasion, forget or overlook them, even when you are doing something which you alleged you are doing for those who need it, the lowest paid staff.

You try to save your conscience by saying that, for the man who is getting \$12 a week, this would represent 18%, but for the man who is getting \$800 a month it would only represent 1%. The whole point is that you are giving everybody, those who need it and those who do not need it; and the amount which you apply to those people who do not need it, if you cannot afford more than the maximum which you are asking us to vote, should be divided amongst the lowest paid category of worker only.

There may be differences of opinion, Mr. Chairman, as to whether the ceiling which I propose is reasonable. Some people, I know, feel that this \$776,000 should be divided among those who are getting not more than \$160, \$180, \$200 or \$240, and some even go as far as \$300, but I have heard no reasonable or sane person of a Socialist outlook suggest that there is the slightest justification for giving a \$9 increase to people who are getting \$400, \$500, \$600, \$700, \$800, \$900 or \$1,000 a month. That, Sir, is our position.

You will recall that on the first day when I initiated this discussion, a motion was made that further consideration of this matter be postponed; the reason for that motion being, Mr. Chairman, that, if it were successful, the matter would go back to the Government and they would

reconsider it in the Cabinet in the light of the criticisms of the Opposition. After all, Sir, in this Chamber it is only the Opposition which has its ears to the ground, and which knows what the man in the street is saying. If we offer Government some advice, it is a matter for them if they do not take it.

I am told by several Civil Servants that this is what they regard as the "Burrowes palliative." Whoever originated it or adopted it, it has come before us; and I say that it is a most senseless and stupid attempt to solve a difficult but most worthy problem which is worthy of a reasonable solution. You should decide how much you as Minister of Finance can afford to help the people who cannot do without help, and divide that amongst those persons. If you have enough to spare, then you can let the \$1,000 a month people get some; and you can even let the Head of the Administration get some; but you do not have it to spare. Those who need it are in the \$12, \$15, \$20 a week bracket; they are absolutely in need of it, and you should take the maximum amount you can afford (since you are conscious of the various commitments which Government at the moment has and which it is contemplating to the end of the Session) and divide it amongst those who just cannot carry on decently without something further to cope with the increased cost of living.

Let us look at the standard of living in England, Mr. Chairman, from which you have just returned - and may I say how much we appreciate your return looking in the pink of condition! You can tell us, if we did not read for ourselves, how the price of beer has gone down in the Mother-Country, and I think that happened just before you left. You went to a country where you could get your beer cheaper and you look all the better for it, if I may say so; but, in this Resolution, our concern is to persuade the Government to reconsider this matter in the light not only of what we have said from this side of the House, but from what they must have heard from the man in the street, from public employees, from Civil Servants, from the Whitley Council and various other sources since this Resolution was laid on this Table and discussion started.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you will remember that on the last occasion I cut my speech short because one hon. member who is not in his place now wanted to speak. As usual I become the butt of the Government's criticism in these things, especially when they concern the Minister for Trade. He is now taking the role of the former Premier who is now Prime Minister of the West Indies; only, he is more abusive.

The Hon. Premier has said that, in these things, there is not always everything that he makes a fight about; but, I think this is something about which he can make a fight; it is basically something which you can see is a matter of commonsense and common justice.

On the last occasion a lot was made of a speech which I made in 1949 on the Turner Report. I do not believe it was so much an analysis or comparison. The Hon. Minister of Trade has not got over a speech which he made in 1949 and which I read in dealing with the Trade Union Bill; so he is really trying to get even with me by reading something I have said; but the whole burden of what he said concerning me was about the Whitley Council. Strangely enough, I understand that on this occasion the Whitley Council did not agree with those proposals; and what is more, the Whitley Council, I understand, was not even paid the courtesy of being told that the Government did not agree with them, but they came straight to the House. That is to say, if I were meeting an employer and negotiating for wages with him and he decided not to agree to the wages which I was discussing with him, but the next day he put up a notice in his work-shop telling the workers that these are the wages he was going to pay and the Union does not know anything about it, you could agree with that!

As I have said in this House on many occasions, it is the Government's business and the business of the

workers in Government to form an Association which is representative of the workers for these questions. If anybody wants to go back and read the debates, he will find that I said that I regard wages for public servants as matters to be dealt with by negotiations. Parliament should only ratify those things, because it would save a debate of this nature. There are millions of people in the Public Service in the United States of America, but their wages are not dealt with in Parliament. Congress does not discuss postmen's wages; they are dealt with by Trade Unions.
5.15 p.m.

They regard these people as Civil Servants in this island and they have a Civil Service Association. But the dangerous thing is this: You have a woman whose rates begin from 24 cents an hour to a maximum of 60 cents per hour. Are you seriously putting them in the same category, for the purpose of wages negotiations, as you are going to put a person who is on the Civil Establishment list, and who can rise to be the Head of a Department? Are you telling them that their salary structure must come under the same salary structure as those on the Civil List?

Reference was made to the wages of some employees at the Foundry. You have heard the Hon. Minister of Trade said that he has helped the workers of this colony. He has not sat down for half second to get a cent for any worker. In a previous debate he said that somebody is fomenting trouble. When we talk about wages for workers, he says that you are joining with the employers and, when it suits him to, join with the employers, he says that you are fomenting trouble. Who in Barbados would accuse me of fomenting trouble? I would say this: if fomenting trouble is getting more money for my workers, I will always foment trouble. If fomenting trouble means getting more money and raising the standard of living for poor people, put me down as the number one fomenter of trouble. That is my reputation.

The same Hon. Minister speaks of your adding wages to somebody's pay packet, but says that you are doing that for political purposes. You ask for \$2 a week increase in order that somebody will get \$15 a week, and he says that you are fomenting trouble and you are doing that for political purposes. Can you talk of doing something for a political purpose when it is for a man at the bottom of the scale? What sort of stupid talk that is?

The Hon. Minister read out something about the rates of employees at the Foundry. He said that we asked for more wages for those at the top than those at the bottom. He does not understand negotiations. When we were negotiating the wages for these people we were able to get a wage for a boy at the Foundry after coming out of the apprenticeship grade of 34 cents an hour and, automatically after that, he got ten cents an hour increase the following year. That means that the boy got 44 cents an hour in the following year. And, before the agreement expires, that same boy will get 56 cents an hour. That means that that boy will get 23 cents an hour more than the highest paid worker in the Government. The highest paid person in the Government in similar employment gets 60 cents an hour. Such persons are tractor drivers, Chlorination Assistant and the Senior Engine Driver. This same boy goes automatically to 63 cents an hour without any further negotiations on our part, and the senior pay is as high as 74 cents an hour.

Now, let us look at the rates for sugar workers. A 'C' class man gets 54 cents an hour. You have workers in the same class getting 31 x 1 - 35 cents an hour. Let me say that a one cent increment is antediluvian. Nowadays, you do not increase a man's wage by a one cent increment per hour because that is negligible. We have finished negotiating for one-cent increments. Today, I will not go and ask for an increase of a cent per hour because I realise that it is nothing. Before I negotiate for a one-cent per hour increment, I will leave it until a later time when I

will get a more substantial increase. The 'C' class workers go to 40 cents.

The 'B' class men in the sugar industry get 42 - 55 cents an hour. And the 'A' class workers (men) supersede your top-class workers because they get 66 cents an hour; so when you talk about our joining with the employer, you do not know what you are talking about. Members of the Union get around a table and sit down with the employers. We do not ask the Government to tell us what wage to negotiate for.

The Government has just set up a Wages Council, and that Council came back to us with some foolishness talking about \$8 a week. Do you believe we are a Trade Union in Tortola where you see that sort of nonsense for a wage? The attitude of some of the members of the Government to these type of things is that you are making employers pay more money and that is a hard thing for them to do; therefore, let them resist you because the Government itself is resisting the paying of more wages.

Sir, I do not negotiate for cost of living on this kind of wages. I went to the Shell Oil Company and we got a fixed rate of increase on the wages of the workers there, not a cost of living allowance. We are not asking anybody to give a cost of living allowance to the equivalent of 4 1/2 cents an hour because that rate is more than a cost of living allowance should be. By doing that, you will be doing harm to some of the conditions of employment. (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is not so.) The Hon. Premier says "No". When you are giving a cost of living, it is non-pensionable. (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It will become a fixed salary.) If you are quite prepared in making this cost of living a fixed salary, that will be all right to me. That is one of the points I was making. I was going by the speech of His Excellency the Governor on the last occasion. He said that it was your intention to deal with the people in the lower brackets and I welcome that.

You say now that you could not reach an agreement with the Whitley Council on the basis you put up, and you had to change your mind. I would say this publicly: This is a matter for negotiation. If I had to negotiate this matter with the Civil Service this would be my attitude: We are satisfied that the cost of living for people in the lower brackets hits them harder than those in the top brackets but we do not intend to review the salaries of the whole Civil Service at this stage; we prefer to make adjustments to those people who fall in the lower category; therefore, it is our intention to review the wages of those people; then may be next year, or the following year, we will review the salaries of those in the other part of the service.

Whenever you give any person any increase which is so negligible as this which you are giving to people in the upper brackets, they are nothing to do with the question that you do not have it; therefore you cannot give them anything more; and you yourself cannot justify it.
5.25 p.m.

If you increase a man from \$400.00 a month to \$409.00 and a man from \$300.00 to \$309.00 and so on, they are going to come back to you. The people who are in this bracket do not mind if this debate went on until Christmas and they can receive this amount as a lump sum. To them, that will mean more than the increase itself represents as regards the standard of living.

When I brought the analogy of the salary of the Minister, it was not brought in with any idea of snobbery. The Ministers had an increase of \$120.00. You either increase salaries or you do not increase them. The people in the higher brackets must be prepared to wait longer for a salary revision than a man who is getting \$12.00 a week. The man who is getting \$12.00 a week is in the category of the people who are buying from the grocer every day.

When you have a situation like this you should call on the Whitley Council and put one of the Ministers there. One of the best structures which you can provide in dealing with this question is to give authority to somebody, not to commit the Government right through and through; you want somebody with the authority to negotiate on behalf of the Government. People of the calibre of your Permanent Secretary or somebody like that could have this authority. In other places you have Treasury officials who would report back to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet ratifies the agreement because the Cabinet is satisfied that these people can speak for the Government.

Mr. Chairman, this would give the Government a better opportunity of facing this issue (Hon. R. G. MAPP: In cases of disagreement what happens?) In cases of disagreement, they have been very rare because the persons try to reach agreement. The Englishman is different from the West Indian fellow; the Englishmen negotiate until they arrive at an agreement. There is no rowing in Parliament as regards wages because the wages are negotiated for..

I said that the groups of workers should be separated; I said that the time has come when you have to look at the Key Scale in a different light as regards wage negotiations from other people; otherwise, you will find yourself being forced to review your salaries for Civil Servants. The Federal Government has taken away some of your people and when the Federal Government begins to expand, you will find that you have to pay people in a different recruitment group different salaries. That is where you have to take a realistic view of the matter.

If you have a man who is paid by the hour, you will not have a person in the higher bracket telling you that if you review this man's salary you should review mine too. I should like to say that my salary is extremely modest for the type of work that I have to do; you will be surprised to know that we in the Trade Union, do not worry; we go in for money for people. There is no point in having a man who is working in one scale for a good wage, and another man in another scale working for a subsistence wage; but when you make that comparison, some fool will argue that you should make the one do the work of another. Would you ask a man like Dr. Leacock to do scavenging or that the other man should go to the Hospital and do the work which Dr. Leacock is doing? If I said in 1956 that I regard the sum of \$15.00 a week as the wage which should be paid to a man, you will see that today I would be normally asking for more than that. We have an agreement with the Shell Oil Company that a man who washes off a car is paid the sum of \$15.00 a week; and he is provided with a Provident Fund too.
5.35 p.m.

I regard \$15 a week as \$2.50 a day, and I feel that a man working for \$2.50 a day, Mr. Chairman, has to live in a modest house, eat modest food, and has to wear a shirt and a pants, and if he can scrape a suit once a year, that is the most he can get.

If we want to industrialise, we have to pay the poorest man some money in order that we can industrialise. We have a population of 200,000 and it would be interesting to take an analysis and find out how many use toothbrushes in that population. Hundreds and thousands of people in this island do not use a simple thing like a toothbrush because that has been regarded as beyond their income level. (A VOICE: What about pyjamas?) Pyjamas would be out of the question. I am sure that the Premier would not regard a tooth brush as a luxury.

The standard has gone up, but I say that if you take an analysis of the quantity of toothbrushes sold in Barbados and some of my associates on the back-bench, have would see what it represents. I say that because I have been watching things in Barbados closely. The fact that you have some of the employers in this island who can hold on to a large labour force at low wages does not mean

that Government need set the example, because there is nobody in Barbados or in any part of the world that employs as many people as Government. Even the Oil Companies in America do not employ as many people as the United States Government; the same is true in the United Kingdom. The time has come therefore for the Government to do as these other places have done, and it is not a matter only for the Trade Union now.

In the United States of America, the Trade Union Movement is very strong and powerful - it is one of the most powerful in the world - but despite the strength of the Trade Union Movement - and it is not a Labour Government there - it is just a matter of commonsense that you cannot employ anybody in any type of employment under a certain wage as a minimum. Somebody thought I had suggested that you could bring the same wage level of America to Barbados. Nobody suggested that, but there was a time when the United States did not pay the highest wages in the world and many people could not foresee it rising to the point to which it has risen. There is a minimum of \$1 per hour in the United States; that is to say, you cannot employ a man for a 40 hour week for anything less than \$40, but it does not mean that the Trade Unions have to accept \$40 a week as the minimum wage. Even at Macy's Store where it was thought it would not happen, there was a strike in 1957; so it is a question of the richest country having a minimum.

There are some people who are unorganisable; the clerks and people around town are the most difficult people to organise in any part of the world, and even in the United Kingdom that group is not used in this way. The women can work for five or six months and go off and have babies; they are employed in the type of work in which you get a large labour turnover; but employers exploit that class in Barbados, and wherever you turn these people who work in stores and behind counters are exploited.

In 1944 when the hon. senior member for St. Michael was a fledgling trying to get into the House of Assembly, I made a speech for them to the Chamber of Commerce, but the same hon. member said I was a member of the Electors Association. He has no compunction about saying things he cannot prove. I am sure that the Premier, no matter what he would say against me, would never say that. You cannot be a Conservative at such a young age. Let the hon. member recall the years when he and I were young and see whether I had the political bite at that early age.

When you look at these salaries and wages the question of Party does not come up. When you read my speech in 1944 to the Chamber of Commerce you have to wonder if I could have been so courageous, especially since I was working in a store with a man where nobody could come and save me. Are you going to look back and ridicule me for being in that position in those days? Are you saying that a man should not be in such a position or should not rise to the position he is in now? That is the type of Socialism you want to teach. You do not talk about Abraham Lincoln living in a log cabin and how much wood he had to cut up, because, if a man can do that and rise to be President of the greatest nation, you should pay all the more tribute to him.

We on this side of the House who feel that a man is entitled to a living wage are asking Government to underwrite something so that, when we deal with private employers, they cannot tell us to look at what Government is doing.

When the hon. member read out the list of wages, he must remember that there are other people; but I would not use the figures which are in excess of Government's, because I have told many employers that they are sometimes in a better position as private employers to pay more than what a man is getting in Government as it is conditioned by the profits which are made in the particular trade. In negotiating, we are not interested

in how much you made over the past three years; we want to know how much you made in the last year.

When we have these instances, as at the *Advocate*, you get the hon. member saying that it was done for political purposes; so you set up a Board of Enquiry which does not recommend wages, but in the next breath, the hon. member said "we have set up a Board of Enquiry, look what Government has done for you!" A Board of Enquiry is not your Board; it is an independent Board. Some Boards do not make recommendations for workers while others do, so how can Government take the credit (when a Board makes a recommendation) by saying they set up a Board and had it not been for them nothing would have been done? Are they going to take the credit when no recommendation is made? When Professor Beasley said not to pay any more money, did you say it was your recommendation?

Mr. Chairman, you have to bear in mind that you cannot set up a Board of Enquiry over Government wages, because you cannot set up a Board of Enquiry with the Crown; so, on that basis, you should look at the wages in the light of what you regard as reasonable. I would tell the Premier on this occasion that, if Government is committed - and I cannot commit Government to anything to which it is not committed - to paying everybody a cost of living allowance, it is therefore difficult not to do it; but my view of it is that the amount you have to give at this time as a cost of living is so negligible that it is bound to stand in your way and will increase the cost you intend to make the next time you review salaries.

People are going to forget the \$9 you are giving them now, and it would have been better if you had told those in the higher bracket that you are giving those in the lower bracket now, but would later review salaries on the basis of something in relation to the salary they are getting. If a man was giving me \$9 now, I would tell him to keep it until he was ready to pay a better increase. 5.45 p.m.

You heard the Hon. Minister of Trade said that, when I was on the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I agreed to a Resolution for \$50,000. Sir, do you believe that a man who went to school - I do not know how far the Hon. Minister of Trade went - would ever come in here and make a comparison like that which he made on the last occasion? He compared the Resolution of \$50,000 in 1953 with this Resolution for \$776,000 in 1959. This is six years after. The Resolution for \$50,000 in 1953 was for an increase of four cents an hour, and there were not as many people then in the employ of the Government as they are now. You would realise that the answer will be different because today you are multiplying it by a greater number of people. The Hon. Minister does not realise that. More departments of Government have sprung up and you are employing more people. Your quantum has increased; you need more people for more work which you have to do. You have more typists, more Ministers than you had in 1953 and, as a matter of fact, you had no Ministers or Permanent Secretaries in that year. You have a bigger Airport and all of these things have multiplied in proportion. How can you look at the amount of \$50,000 in the same light as this amount of \$776,000? The quantum must determine the amount.

I believe the Financial Secretary has evolved a plan that is an easy divisible matter. The question of getting food forms a very important part of a man's income, and many people accept jobs where they can get something to eat. Do you know why they are so many domestic servants - something between 25,000 and 30,000 - who are satisfied to work for comparatively low wages? They are satisfied to work as domestic servants because they are working on the basis of a guaranteed meal. Those of us who have to provide ourselves with meals know what it represents to us. Those who have servants to pay and to give a meal know that it represents a very important part of your budget. Some women would not exchange the job of a do-

mestic servant for any other kind of job of its kind. Many have gone and worked for a greater wage in some other job but found out that they could not get the food they wanted.

Sir, I believe the Hon. Premier will do well if he would keep the Hon. Minister of Trade from taking part in some debates, because of the type of vulgarity which that Hon. Minister goes in for. It may be all right when you meet people around the market square and you want to give them something to gossip over, but certainly it is not the type of thing to use when you meet people in a Chamber like this. Why should he look upon members like myself and accuse us of siding with employers, or by saying that somebody wants to pull down the Labour Party from power? Nobody can pull it down quicker than the Hon. Minister of Trade; the whole burden of his speech is to try to see how much he can smear you. The only place he has not told me about is where I was born and under what circumstances I was born.

I think it will be well if the Hon. Premier would realise that, in a debate like this in which all hon. members of the House are interested, there is no point your saying that we are playing politics; it sounds as if, when you come in here, this becomes a domino club. I do not play dominoes; I am a politician; so when you talk of my playing politics and some political issue arises, what do you ask me to do? Do you expect that I would have to play politics on this for the people to return me to the House of Assembly? I have been in the House of Assembly too long to pick out this matter to play politics on.

What I do feel is that the Government of any country, not only the Government of Barbados, should be a model employer. Go to Montserrat and you will see. I was sitting on a Commission of Enquiry there recently, and I disagreed with the Chairman and two of its members, and wrote a minority report. I said that the Secretary of State for the Colonies or somebody should subsidise the cotton industry in order to pay the people who work in it a little more money. Those people do not vote for me. Do you think I believe in industrialisation as such? I believe in the improvement of the standard of life for the people.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much confusion payment at the rate of 4 1/2 cents per hour would create if you worked on that basis. I would like the Hon. Minister to look at the old rates in the key scale and, instead of having an increase of 4 1/2 cents per hour, to put it to the nearest cent; that is to say, instead of telling a man you are giving him 35 1/2 cents, make it 36 cents because you are not coming back to this for the next three years. 5.55 p.m.

You should say to them: "If I have to fix these other fellows in two years' time you would have had something already". I feel that you should go on a minimum of \$18.00 a week.

The hon. senior member for the City says that he does not understand Socialism because of what he sees the people on the other side do. Socialism is not a question of getting all you can and keeping what you have; the Hon. Minister of Trade has said that some of us like to give when we have not got anything to give, but has he got anything to give? We are all trustees in here on behalf of the interest of the people. When it comes to public servants, Parliament can speak of public servants but not in the same manner as it would speak of private servants. The Public Servants are the people for whom we say we will pay more taxation in order to meet them.

I quite agree that many employers pay wages which are too low, having regard to the profits which they make. The hon. member talks about having private negotiations, but what private negotiations are there which can compel a person to show his profits? You have to guess at some people's profits; sometimes, a man tells you that he is building a house with borrowed money; well, let the Gov-

ernment help the people to live on borrowed money too.

The Government is forced to take the lead as model employer; in Germany the Social Democrats were the first to talk about social security benefits; after the Government started, then the private employers started with these benefits. There are certain things in which the Government should take the lead. I have given the Premier professional service free of charge; whatever the Government does for the community in which I am living is good for me; when they spend my money wisely, I am satisfied, but when they spend it unwisely, I am not satisfied.

I have pointed out to the Premier that, if you give a good wage at any one stage, it will last longer in the minds of the people than if you give a low wage and then the people come back to you. As to the statements made about me in so far as what I said in 1949 with regard to the Whitley Council, I want to say that I still maintain that view about the Whitley Council. What I would like to say is this: although I am the Secretary of a Trade Union, we do not go out raiding other people; we have not tried to compel the members of the Civil Service to do anything, but there is a bogus law which needs amending so that people in the Public Service can be members of the Union.

That Act, I repeat, wants amending; we want the sort of thing which we have internationally. If the Government would set up machinery whereby these workers can be represented by an organisation, it would be easier for these matters to be dealt with. We meet people from the Housing Board, for instance, and matters can be dealt with amicably. I hope the Premier will accept the advice which I have given him; it is advice which has been gained from my years of experience; it is that if people are satisfied with what you have done, it will last longer with them than an agreement under which people feel that what they got out of it is little or nothing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I started to speak on this Resolution dealing with this cost of living allowance when the House adjourned on the last occasion, and I am glad that I have been able to get back here to continue to add my quota tonight.

I want to say at the beginning that I am not concerned with any of the rehearsal of the historical background and data between the Hon. Minister or the Leader of the House and the Trade Union Leader the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am primarily concerned with this matter as it stands before the House. I must say at the beginning to those of my political enemies who underestimate me, that when I invited the public to attend here a few weeks ago, I did it fully conscious and in anticipation of what would have happened. 6.05 p.m.

I like my friends or my enemies to make fun at me, while the ballot box acts contrary. I enjoy them making fun at me. I enjoy them lying especially in the Press and trying to fool people. I anticipated everything; so, if any member of the Government thought that I was taken by surprise, I must say that I never underestimate my opponents; I allow them to underestimate me. It turned out exactly as I had anticipated, only I thought the treatment would have been a little rougher.

What I am most concerned with, Mr. Chairman, are the remarks about the criticism of the Opposition. You know that the Opposition is really divided into three parts—the Independents, the Left-wing Socialists, and we of the Conservatives. At least we cannot be regarded as hypocrites, although in the first speech by the Leader of the House, the Press carried very glaring headlines "Minister exposes the hypocrisy of the Opposition" or characterized them as hypocrites. The Minister on the other hand described the criticism as wicked and malicious. Those are very famous words.

As soon as you disagree with your opponents upon something, you are wicked and malicious, and then he used his most famous word of all in this House which is "nasty". In his long political speech he thought he was conveying something to the Gallery which I had invited.

If my opponents had invited anybody in the yard and I had been a member of the Government, I would immediately have made arrangements to put loudspeakers and chairs to let them hear what was being said. I would not tell the Police to try and get them out. The first thing I tell hon. members is that I am here because people put me here, so I would put loudspeakers out there.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. The Police are charged with a certain amount of authority by the Law of the land as well as by instructions from the Speaker. No member of this House has anything to do with the people sitting in the Gallery or people staying outside.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not know what the hon. member is defending. I said I would be the last person to do something. He that excuseth himself accuseth himself. I merely said that if I had been in Government's position I would have done so and so. Are you now passing the buck and accusing the Speaker of doing something? You must not catch at the bait so quickly.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member must know that I do not catch at baits. I am stating the facts and law; so those things don't bother me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why has the hon. member caught at the line, hook and sinker without the bait? I am surprised because the hon. member does not catch so quickly. I am perfectly willing to give way to any hon. member who rises.

As I was saying, what I am concerned about is that part of the speeches which deal with the Conservative Opposition. I am more concerned with that than the very long part which centred merely around the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and, I believe, the other members of the Leftwing Opposition.

I am going to put my case and if the hon. member cares to disagree and feels that this is nasty, wicked and malicious, that is a matter for him. I hold my views and I am not a hypocrite; I am not prepared to masquerade as anything less than what I am. The hon. member who just left here said that I do not understand Socialism. Thank God I can read, and I have gone to the extent of asking the member to recommend some books. He tells me that I only understand the type of Socialism that I practise over here.

Now, Sir, this Resolution which Government has before us according to the Schedule says that, in the case of monthly paid employees the rate is \$108 per annum, in the case of weekly paid employees at the rate of \$2.08 per week, in the case of daily paid employees and watchmen at the rate of 35 cents a day or period, and in the case of hourly paid employees at the rate of 4 1/2 cents an hour. Actually, in fact, all it does mean is \$108 per year in all brackets. It is shrewdly put to the not so intelligent mind.

Now, Sir, even my friends in the Leftwing Opposition, and some of my associates on the Back-bench, have seen the point that the necessity for increase in wages must follow an increase in cost of living. I think we all agree with that. Everybody in this country, or in the world for that matter, expects and always asks for more if you offer an increase. The Hon. Premier is in charge of this, but the hon. member who took charge of the Resolution, so to speak, has told us in his very lengthy speech (to justify this increase, which members of the Opposition, especially the Trade Union leader, spoke against) that he feels that two wrongs can make a right.

6.15 p.m.

He has not proceeded yet to show you anything, or to tell you anything, to justify the necessity of this increase and any further increases. He says that private enterprise never pays as well. That is one of the first things I would take him up on. He proceeded to talk about the wages of porters and people of that sort. Is the Hon. Minister dealing with the entire Government Service which includes Civil Servants and other persons employed; that is to say, is he including people from the agricultural labourer at Codrington to the Chief Justice of the colony?

From the Schedule which the Government has brought before us, it would mean that this \$776,000, which is to pay this cost of living, includes from the Chief Justice who gets \$1,000 a month to the agricultural worker at Codrington or at the Lunatic Asylum or the labourer at Dodds who only works occasionally. They all will get this increase of \$108 per annum, that is to say if they work for the year. It does not include, as I see it, the Ministers.

We are supposed to have a Socialist government in power. Is that so or not so? The Hon. Premier has proclaimed to the world that Barbados has the first Socialist government. If that is socialism I am going to set out to show you that, if they proclaim from the hilltops according to the doctrine of Socialism that the greatest good for the greatest number, then this Resolution with the schedule is nothing but a blot and shame upon any Government whether it is a Conservative or Socialist Government. That is how I feel about it.

Why are we offering an increase? Is it because the cost of living since 1956 has so increased that it becomes necessary to offer an increase? No one can accuse the Government that, because it is around election time, they are doing it. Anybody who says that would be dishonest. May be, if they had waited until 1961 to do it, you could accuse them for so doing; therefore, you must take it that, according to His Excellency's speech, it was because "My Government has under consideration measures to grant some relief to the lower paid employees of the Government." This can only be the policy of the Government.

May I ask, are the \$800-a-month gentlemen in the lower income group too? I am going to make a statement which I made in the Lower Green the other night. I know of no man who is getting \$600 a month who can tell you that he is suffering, and that he is meeting things hard, and that he cannot pay his bills at the end of the month. That can only happen if he is a drunkard or a spree boy.

This Resolution which is before us is not in accordance with the terms of the declaration of His Excellency the Governor in his last Throne speech. The Resolution, as it is before us today, is that all and sundry alike will get a cost of living of \$108 per annum, whether you are a labourer at Dodds or at the Highways and Transport or whether you are a person with regular employment or not. It provides that if you work by the hour your increase is 4 1/2 cents; if you work by the week you get an increase of \$2.08. They are sure that, at no time, a man at the bottom will get more than a man at the top.

Sir, I cannot agree with this recommendation, for the simple reason that I believe that what is being done here would not give the people in the lower income group enough lever to cushion the shock of the increased cost of living. The Hon. Minister said that it is all very well to get up and criticise, and he went on to say that the Government was conscious that whatever the Government brings down the Opposition will criticise because members of the Opposition have often said that it is their duty to criticise. He went further and said that members of the Opposition claimed that it is their duty to make it intolerable for the Government and it is the duty of the Opposition to criticise whether that criticism is constructive or destructive. Is anybody going to say what I say today is destructive criticism?

When I read His Excellency's speech I said surely the Government is really making the right approach in this matter and that is how I felt about it then. I took up the revised Civil List of this country for the 1st April, 1958, because I wanted to find out something and because of that, I went through it thoroughly. Now, as distinct from Government employees, you have the Civil Service, which means the people on the Civil List; that is to say, people who work with the Housing Authority or nurses at the Mental Hospital are not Civil Servants.

6.25 p.m.

Taking up this Civil List, I find that approximately 60% of the Civil Servants or a little more than 60% of them are persons who work for under \$200.00 a month. I am not a Socialist; the Socialists of this country proclaim right through and through the island the slogan: "The greatest good for the greatest number." Well, you have 60% or a little more of the Civil Servants as those who are working for under \$200.00 a month and that does not include the Teachers or Warders and Nurses who are Government employees but not Civil Servants. I cannot therefore agree with this Schedule if 60% of the actual members of the Civil Service are in receipt of incomes under \$200.00 a month; the incomes of these people range from \$80.00 a month until you get to \$200.00 a month. When you add the persons at the Hospital and at the Prisons and those who come within the lower income group and you realise that you are saying that they should get a cost of living allowance of \$9.00 a month, just as the others should get, how do you reconcile that with the slogan "The greatest good for the greatest number?"

In order to prevent people from seeing the sham which they are putting up, the Hon. Leader of the House says that the Conservative employers pay less than that. Of course, some of them pay less; but some of them also pay more. That is not the argument; that has not taken with anybody. All over this world Governments set a standard. The Hon. Minister proceeded to say that, when you work for the Government, you have 25% of the wages held back as pension. All of these things the hon. member has put forward as though they were things which the Government of Barbados did not know.

For years and years you worked with Governments and you got pensions; you always had pension rights. The hon. member is saying today, because criticism has been made of this proposal that this proposal does not look right; that private enterprise is paying less than what the Government is paying. Mr. Chairman, I could not allow that to pass unnoticed or unchallenged. I am straightforward enough to admit from the floor of this House that private enterprise pays less than what the Government is paying, but, of course, the same Government pays less than what some people are paying. As regards qualifications today, hon. members may not like what I say, but since the last War, and men have been made to see men as equals, and in a different light, we have had a tremendous lot of changes; there have been changes taking place. In private enterprise? Yes.

The Hon. Minister refers to cashiers getting \$10 a week. Let him go to the Income Tax office tomorrow and he will find that people are paid \$20.00 a week because of their qualifications. You go into the Auditor General's Office and there you will find that you pay people \$80.00 a month and you send them to check the Order Books. Get your Civil List in front of you and you will see the names and ages of people and the duties which they have to perform. It is a question of exploiting the market around the Government; you have young men doing the work of people who should be drawing \$300 or \$400 a month. You go downstairs here in the Post Office and see how much you are paying a boy who is going to check behind the Postmaster General. Let the Hon. Minister challenge these things. Are the Banks private enterprise or not? Why do people leave your service at \$80.00 a month and walk into the Banks at \$120.00 a month? You have coloured people being employed in the Banks, and

hon. members on that side of the House will say that it is Sir Grantley Adams who has caused the Banks to do that.

Let me say this: I find that in your Civil List the percentage which I have mentioned are those who are working for salaries ranging from \$80.00 to \$200.00 a month. Today you enter the Government Service at \$80.00 a month and you go on by increments and you take about 15 or 17 years to reach \$200.00 a month. Some people may ask: What is private enterprise paying? Mr. Chairman, take your sugar factories; take any place which you have—I mean big business.

6.35 p.m.

The hon. member likes to take Swan Street or small places and make a comparison. That, to my way of thinking, does not seem to be the correct thing to do; but it suits him to make that comparison. Now, Sir, let the hon. member say that they are not today exploiting the labour market in Barbados.

I remember two years ago that a young man in a Department in this country wanted a transfer. I do not want to call his name; the Government of this country is famous for attempting to victimise people. This man was receiving \$88 a month, he was doing cashier work and every possible job in the Department, and when he asked for a transfer—I am sure the Minister of Education must have heard about this by now—he was told that much as they would like to see him go up, they could not afford to lose him. He has a school certificate and would have to take 17 years to get a proper salary.

I am not supporting this, and I am going to make a recommendation although I might be butting my head against a wall. Before I came to my decision, I was at pains to make some very diligent inquiries. The suggestion I am going to make today is that, everybody in the Civil Service from the Long Grade Clerk down to the cantonnier, should get an increase; when a man goes into the Service at 20 years, he does not get to a salary of about \$200 until he has reached 37 or 38 years of age; and, at this time, he is renting a house at \$45 a month and has children; but the Government says that it does not matter one bit, he should get the same \$9. I want to say that, for those receiving \$300 or \$400 a month, you can make your revision later. If I make enemies by this, I am prepared to get them.

The hon. member in a *sotto voce* remark said that it was a question of the majority. My suggestion is that the money which you are going to use in the direction over and above the Long Grade Clerk should be used to make a further and appreciable increase. I proclaim from the housetop that I am a Conservative. I am not going to come in here and make the reckless statement that you should give everybody \$5 a day. I am a Director of a firm and pay taxes, and I know what I am saying. I have discussed this with my colleagues and made my position clear, because I know that money passed on in this direction is bound to go around in circles and come back to the business.

I do not mind the fancy things which you have said in the Schedule; the present wages paid by Government now are \$2.40 per day, and Government proposes to increase it by 36 cents. That will give a man at the bottom \$2.76 per day. That sounds good in itself; and if I did not get the facts to go on, I would come here and disregard what the Leftwing Opposition say. I think it is fairly generous of the Government to make this start, but, because I have the facts, I do not think it is right. I think that instead of giving an increase of 36 cents, it should be a 25% increase which would give an increase of 60 cents or a total of \$3 a day. In other words Government is offering 36 cents increase to a man who is working for \$2.40 a day.

No matter where you go, Mr. Chairman, people ask what Government is paying. When they are told that Gov-

ernment is paying 10/- they decide to pay that amount too. I heard talk about private enterprise, but it is the duty of the Government (and more especially of this Government which claims to be the Government of the people) to set an example. I would not come here and make any reckless proposal and agree with the Leftwing Opposition or anybody else or embarrass any Government; I know people will see that you are fooling them. If I said that you should give people \$5 a day, they would know that I am fooling them; but I have gone carefully into this and feel that you should give a 25% increase to those persons who are in the daily, weekly and hourly category.

I do not think that any human being in Barbados - I do not care if he is a die-hard Tory or anybody else - expects that Government would say that \$3 a day is too much. There is no election around the corner: so I am not saying that for political reasons. I know I am going to be told that I am saying this for political reasons; everything I do is for political reasons because I came here as a politician; I did not come here as a Parson, a Marshal or a Reporter, and therefore anything I say is for a political reason.

You only have to take a list of the 7,000 people whom you employ throughout the whole service of whom 60% are Long Grade Clerks. and the others who are carpenters, masons and labourers, and they will benefit from the 25% increase. The minimum of 25% would give a basic wage of \$3 a day to a man, and to a woman you would give \$2.40 a day. You cannot say that I am saying this because I do not pay taxes. I cannot say how much the Minister whom I will deal with later pays, but I know that in firms we have to pay high taxes; and therefore, I am making that statement with the fullest sense of responsibility and a sound knowledge that \$3 a day, or an increase of 25% would be the correct thing.

This is how I would deal with the others. The majority of people in the upper bracket who will receive this \$9 (according to my working it out for the purpose of income tax) is only going to get \$4.50 a month out of the \$9; some will receive more. This is just a sham and a make believe, and I wonder how the people in the upper bracket will take a thing like this. Is it not a sham or a show to make Civil Servants believe that you are giving them an increase? You would be creating no precedent if you came to this House and said it was your intention to give the 25% increase to the daily, hourly and weekly paid workers and, then to say to such persons in the Long Grade bracket, you will offer them 20%.
6.45 p.m.

An increase of 20% on the salary of the Long Grade Clerks would only carry them to \$240 per month. I feel that you should carry them to \$240. In my opinion it is shameful to put them on an incremental basis which will take them 17 years to reach the top. You give a man with a wife and family an increment of \$4 or \$6 per month. That is shameful. An increment of less than \$10 a month is nothing.

I was ill at the time when these \$4 and \$6 increments were made, otherwise I would have broken even with my Party; I would have never agreed with the Turner Report. A large number of members over there at the time were vilely in disagreement with the now Prime Minister of the West Indies when, by the Turner Report, they increased the salary and fixed the rates for people in the higher part of the Service a year or two before they dealt with the people in the lower brackets.

One of the nice things to say here is that neither the Governor nor the Ministers would get any increase. Of course, when you know something is not very palatable, as the Hon. Premier has said, you put in something to sweeten it up. How can you ask the Ministers to take something more, when you gave them \$40 a month more recently for travelling?

I went to about three or four shopkeepers or merchants to get these facts: In 1956 when you carried the workers to \$2.40 a day, they were buying beef at the rate of 55 cents a pound; today, they are buying it at 75 cents a pound.

Mr. Chairman, you have been in this business of shopkeeping for some time; therefore, you should know something about it. Fresh pork in 1956 was sold at 48 cents per pound; today, it is 60 cents per pound. Now, Sir, I am dealing with the necessary commodities; I am not dealing with any fancy things. I know that some people will tell me that whisky has gone up and the price of motor-cars has gone up. There are some people in the Civil Service who would tell you of those things, and even some of the Ministers would tell you of those things, but I am talking of the essential things of life. Let us take another item. In 1956, butter was sold at 84 cents per pound; today it is \$1.14 per pound. In 1956, salt fish was sold at 28 cents per pound; today, it is sold at 54 cents per pound.

In passing, I would say that these are prices from Canada; these increases are not the result of anything done here. Then you tell me that you have given \$9 a month more to the man at the top - even those who are drawing \$1,000 a month, and you ask me what difference does it make. Let me say that the man who gets \$800.00 a month does not buy salt fish at all, but the poor man has to buy salt fish. Thank God, I was not always in this position. I know what a dollar is to a poor man.

We come to another item. In 1956 edible oil was sold at 28 cents per pint; today it is sold at 38 cents per pint. Mr. Chairman, you know these people whom I am talking about use edible oil, they do not use any Crisco. In 1956 kerosene oil was sold at 34 cents per gallon; today it is 40 cents. I see hon. members on that side looking at me. Let me tell them that everybody now has a little oil stove and is cooking on it. I started out by saying that the higher a monkey climbs the more you see his tail! I also said on a former occasion that, if you tied a monkey with a long chain near a piano and he was able to touch the black keys, then one day he would play the Halleluia Chorus!

The price of salt ribs went from 36 cents to 60 cents a pound. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: We will put on controls). It may be that you will put on controls; you can do whatever you like. You can put on controls on the primary products.

Mr. Chairman, we will not worry about what the Government thinks are the most essential items. The price of rum went from 46 cents to 54 cents. (Laughter). The only reason why rum is included is because you wanted the price to go up. I do not want to worry with rum and beer because, to me, they are not essential commodities; I am dealing with essential things for the purchase of which a man has to put money into a woman's hand so that she can go to the shop and obtain these things.

The Hon. Minister made his three-hour speech; his only justification for it was that the Government were still doing better than what private or free enterprise is doing. But for God's sake, if they are doing better than private enterprise, if they are setting the standard, we are asking them to set a better standard. In the United States of America and in England, the Governments have always set the standard. The Hon. Minister of Trade ought to know that the big combines like the Banks and so on, are able to pay better salaries than what the Government pay in certain higher brackets; but we are talking about the average working man for whom the Government has to set the standard. What has the hon. member to say to this? I have given you my reasons

At this stage, it now being 7 p.m., of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention the fact that there is no quorum present. I am asking that the Bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

RESOLUTION re COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion before the suspension of the sitting, the hon. senior member for the City was speaking on a Resolution for \$776,000.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when this debate was postponed I had made the point that I would favour the Government revising the Schedule to this Resolution by saying that they would give the unskilled or the day labourer or the weekly labourer an increase of 25% which would give this class of worker a minimum of \$3.00 per day. I also said that I would like to see the Government put into effect what apparently they had in mind when His Excellency the Governor, in his Speech from the Throne, said that this Government had in mind coming down shortly with assistance for persons in the lower income brackets of Government employees. Surely this is now a departure from the policy which the Government apparently had instructed His Excellency the Governor to make known to the public through the Legislature. I would have much preferred to see that policy pursued by dealing with those persons who are at the bottom and those whom we consider as the lower income group; I consider the Long Grade Clerks in that group.

I am not saying for one minute that I am opposed for a moment to the revision of salaries when the time comes; but with the statistics I have given, which hon. members of this Government could go behind my reason for making this suggestion? My reason for making this suggestion is because of the facts which I have already given to this Chamber, the necessity for an increase for the average working man and the man in the lower income group. Indeed something must be done to cushion this shock as a result of the increase in the cost of living. Of the seven thousand people employed by the Government I mentioned labourers at Dodds and the people at the Hospital and the Prison and they are about 60% who are working for less than \$200.00 a month. I also mentioned that if you went through the Post Office you will find a bunch of Long Grade Clerks who are going up to \$200.00 a month.

7.50 p.m.

I want to make it abundantly clear that, when some people go into the Service at 25, 28 or 30 years, that sounds all right; but most members, even the Backbenchers, are bound to agree that it takes 18, 19 or 20 years to reach the maximum of \$200 a month. The majority of these people, which is about 60%, are getting \$88, \$90, or \$92; and it is surprising that, when you look around, many of them are married and have children and rent a house at \$45 a month. How then can you come to this House with a Resolution for \$776,000 and have the brass and temerity to tell us that this money is to give \$9 a month increase all round, lock, stock and barrel?

Let us take the Hospital as an instance. Are you saying that this \$108 a year must be given from the Medical

Superintendent, Physician Specialist and everybody down to the porter at the gate? Are you serious when you say that your reasons for offering the increase is because you are satisfied that the cost of living has gone up to such an extent that \$9 would help the Director of Medical Services or the Superintendent at Jenkins whose salary is \$800 a month to cushion the shock? God have mercy! I have worked out that they are going to draw less than \$4 a month after income tax is taken out. It is really a shame. What are you doing for the cook and for the porter?

I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Unionist, ask about the 24 cents an hour which you were offering to a washer-woman; but you, as a Socialist Government, consider that she must be satisfied with \$9 a month. I have not reached the stage of getting on a public platform and fooling people by proclaiming equality for everybody as this Socialist Government has done. I have heard all that nonsense of share-and-share-alike from over there.

It takes \$90 for the Ministers to keep their motor cars, but it only takes \$9 to help the poor man cushion the shock of the increased cost of living. I really cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is all Government can do. You cannot have a revision now - you have a revision every five years; it so happens that it coincides with every election year - because it would involve a tremendous lot of money; but are you suggesting that you cannot revise wages and emoluments of persons employed by you in the lower income group at this stage and revise the others later? If you cannot do that, then I would like the Government to answer the public of Barbados how they can reconcile the fact that, at one time, Government sat down under the Turner Report and revised the salaries for people in the higher bracket and left out those at the bottom. I considered it was wrong then. Unfortunately for me, I was not in the House at the time, but I made my position clear on it. I cannot see that anybody working for \$600 and up would be annoyed if Government took it upon themselves to give an increased cost of living at this stage to the ones whom we have suggested.

I heard the Hon. Minister, in answering the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, pointing out that the hon. member had only asked for increases for certain employees of Government. I am making no such suggestion; my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is that I should like to see all persons in the lower bracket and in the middle income bracket - if you can call it that - get this increased cost of living. I go further and say that you should give up to the Long Grade Clerk because although they will get \$200 a month, only the minority are drawing \$200 a month now. The bulk of these people are married or would like to be married; they are not boys any longer living with their parents. The social structure has so changed in Barbados that, even where you find boys living with their parents in this country, with your great unemployment population, the number of youngsters coming out by virtue of scholarships or otherwise, and who come into the Service and work for \$80., \$90 or \$100, are not merely carrying themselves but have the additional responsibility of a greater number of people in that home. He may be the son of a meat-seller or a cane cutter, and his first ambition is to raise his family. The \$80 or \$90 which he is getting is not for him to exist on alone; he may have two or three sisters, a mother and father, and he may be paying school fees for one of his family. That is the real social structure here. You cannot argue the same thing for somebody who gets \$400.00 a month.

The Hon. Minister of Trade would point to the hon. senior member for St. George, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and, a lesser degree, to me, and say that we are Conservatives who want to keep everything we have. You are Socialists, and you work for \$800.00 or \$900.00 but you represent people who work for less than \$90. The Socialists over there say that the Conservatives want a refrigerator for \$800 while their poor starving brother cannot get one. They get on public platforms and

say that the Conservatives want everything. Does the Minister of Trade want to get up and say that he does not have a refrigerator? I am not condemning him for it; if it is your ambition to live well, what is wrong with that? But you deliberately and very often get up and try to make out to the people that you are their friends, and anybody else who refuses to conform to your idea of doing things is their enemy. You refer to us as anything beside gentlemen; you call us touts, pimps and all sorts of things. You come to the conclusion that our motives are nothing but improper if we say that we do not agree that you should give a cost of living from top to bottom. We feel that the person in the high bracket will only benefit in some cases by \$5 a month.

What has been implied here is that, as long as you do not conform to the ideas of the Government in power, you are dishonest and do not mean well. That is the way they look at it.
8.00 p.m.

Sir, I weighed this matter on my bed. What is the practical way? This is the increase which you say you can give, and these are the run of people with whom you have to deal. Let us say that they work for 5 1/2 days a week. That means that you will give them \$16.50 a week. I am not extravagant. You are going to give them \$15.18 but I say make it \$16.50 instead of \$15.18. The difference of \$1.50 means so much to them.

My suggestion would be \$3.00 a day, and if a man works for 5 1/2 days a week it would be \$16.50 a week. That is what I say the Government should offer these people.

You attacked the honourable and gallant senior member for St. George. Do not proceed with that argument; two wrongs do not make a right. If you give \$1.50 more to the average man who may have to rent a house, that would mean so much to his income and so much to his wife. (A VOICE: It would mean peace of mind!) That is a lovely term! I will say that it means not only so much to his peace of mind, but also to his wife's. It would mean so much more to the man who works as a cantonnier, who works as a labourer at the Mental Hospital, the man who works at the General Hospital, the postman and such people; and it will cause more happiness and contentment to hear that they are getting this amount than an increase of \$40 or \$50 would to the man who is getting \$1,000 a month.

Can a Socialist Government, a Government which doctrine is the greatest good for the greatest number say that I am making a political speech, or that I am making a speech to catch votes? Of course, you can say whatever you like. I know what people want; and so long as I know what the people want, I am going to express it. I know the same remarks were made of my friend the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I wonder, if he was over on this side of the Table, if he would have said anything different from what I am saying now. He knows that I will not get here and be destructive in my criticism and talk nonsense.

I have gone through the city and have talked with the merchants. I have asked them this: do you consider in this day that \$3.00 a day which would work out at \$16.50 per week is too much to offer a working man? There is the hon. senior member for St. George sitting on my right. Let me ask him. Am I extravagant? That could not be extravagance when you think of the figures which I have quoted to you just now.

A certain lot of people who work for the Government feel that they work for the Ministers over there. I am not concerned with those people; I am speaking from the depths of my soul. I have already dealt with some of the things which the Hon. Minister of Trade said. I am nothing to do with what happened between himself and the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I have been friendly with

the hon. senior member for St. Peter when neither one of us had anything, and my friendship with him did not end when we came in here.

Whether it was at Weymouth or the Riverside Club, in those days, when we met together debating a matter, he always took a different view from mine. I used to look at him as a fool, but there are times when at least you must try to be honest.

I see the Hon. Premier looking across here. We have publicly criticised him, and have said that he is not a politician; but there is one thing that you must say for him and that is, that he is an honest man in his public affairs outside of his geniality. It is a fact that there are some people who command a certain amount of respect.

As I was saying, Sir, I sat side by side the hon. senior member for St. Peter in early days. He was accused of being a member of the Barbados Electors Association. It was a conversation between a late member for the City, Mr. Pierce, and myself that we happened to speak of the gallant way in which the hon. senior member for St. Peter, when he was a \$6 a week boy at Lashley's Limited, spoke on behalf of the clerks of Bridgetown to the Chamber of Commerce, asking for more money for them. I said at the time "there goes a lot of ability." I said to the late Mr. Pierce, you cannot keep a boy like that in the gutter.

When you say that he was once a member of the Conservative Party, there is not truth in that statement. In those days, the Clerks were a timid lot of people, and not one of them would attempt to go to the Chamber of Commerce. When the hon. senior member for St. Peter at the time made the speech, I told him that he had a lot of guts.
8.10 p.m.

I am not concerned with the historical survey which the Minister gave about the activity of the hon. member inside his Party; that is entirely a matter for them. I am not worried about what the Minister said; I am not concerned about what he said about the Socialist left wing Opposition; I am merely concerned about the attack launched by the Hon. Minister on those whom he feels are employers.

The Minister said that employers should never regard their workers as being mere cogs of the machine in industry. That is marvellous. I am replying to these things because I do not think I should allow the Hon. Minister to get away with them. Let the hon. member smile, it does not matter. I am still here, and I am not getting weaker and weaker; it is very apparent that I am not getting weaker and weaker. (Hon. M. E. COX: What goes up must come down.) It is bound to come down; that is why it is so low down now.

The hon. member spoke about their passing Trade Union Laws, and his speech was characterised as an excellent speech in defence of the Government; but he makes a point and then forgets all about it. He says that they have the best Trade Union Laws, but when did they pass Trade Union Laws? He was not even in here when these laws were passed (Hon. M. E. COX: It was through pressure from Labour). The Trade Union Laws were passed with the Conservative Party in power.

The hon. member wants to get a point taken up; we are not living in the past, we think of the future. Do not let us say: "We have done this for you, take this little bit now." That is not good enough. When the hon. member says that they passed the Trade Union Laws and the newspaper takes that up, there is nothing of the truth in that. The hon. member referred to Sir Grantley Adams; he said that the days were so dark that he had to put Sir Grantley Adams in the bottom of a car when people wanted to shoot him; he attempts to discredit Sir Grantley Adams. He is saying that Barbados began only at that time.

You are talking to young people to whom you think you are telling the history of Barbados and you say that

Barbados only began when Sir Grantley Adams came on the scene. Why did the hon. member not tell the public that before Sir Grantley Adams did this or that, when the Socialist came on the scene in the person of the late Duncan O' Neale and asked for medical services, old age pensions, dental treatment for school children and so on, the members of the Conservative Party used to belittle him? (Hon. M. E. COX: The Conservatives destroyed him). Sir Grantley Adams destroyed him.

Never would Sir Grantley Adams agree with these Socialist reforms. Let the Premier of Barbados get up tonight and say that I am lying. The Premier of this country is no politician, but I preach from the hill-top and from the man in the street to the child which is now born. When Vaughn and Cummins, I mean H. A. Vaughn, stood shoulder to shoulder with Dr. O' Neale - the man who is now Leader of the House says that he had to take Sir Grantley about in a car. Let the Premier contradict me; it might suit him to do that today. I know my politics; you talk about destroying somebody.

The hon. member in his speech tried to justify this proposal today. He said that they caused something to happen here, but who caused it to happen in Russia, in Persia and in India? You have come along and seen minority groups gain respect and the hon. member says that they caused that to happen here; but who caused it to happen in these other places would not say that they caused it to happen in these places. It is just the age. I see that the hon. member is smiling (A MEMBER: The hon. member is not serious.) The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has agreed to many things, among them being that if you were to put a statute in the West Indies of any human being, it should be the statute of the late Marcus Garvey.
8.20 p.m.

The hon. member is trying to tell this young generation, through the speech which he made to justify the increase, what he thinks is right and that they would never have got anything. These things were agitated for when your first Socialists came on the scene in Barbados. You cannot dispute that, when Sir Grantley Adams fought against men like the present Premier who did not have a cent. That does not mean anything disrespectful. (A VOICE: Who did not have a cent?) I am talking about the now Premier. I know what I am saying hurts. You cannot interrupt me by talking, but if you make a loud aside, I will come back at you.

What the hon. member said is not true. He tried to tell the public - and all that is written in a long speech - that the Opposition tried to hold up this Resolution, but naturally he uses all the subterfuge ----

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am sure that when the Order Paper was fixed I was not even in the House. The hon. member knows that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Leader of the House, after he made his speech, came back and instead of taking this first, said that the Opposition wanted to stop people from getting money. I am here to make my contribution. I do not want to waste time but the Leader of the House has done everything to prevent a reply. (Hon. M. E. COX: That is not so.) Oh, yes, that is so. As long as I have breath and am entitled to come here, I am going to speak. The hon. member tries to impress people that had it not been for Sir Grantley Adams we would be nowhere. I would like to ask him who passed the Trade Union Laws in 1939. He further admitted that, in 1937, he had to hide Sir Grantley Adams in his car and carry him places.

I am going to read, Mr. Chairman, from an enquiry which was made immediately after the disturbances under the Chairmanship of Sir George Deane. I never intended to read this, but the hon. member mentioned it here. I paid great tribute to the Prime Minister for what he has done; he has assisted in making constitutional reforms and I have said so publicly, and I am one member of the

Opposition who joined in celebrating everything. I am big; but when the hon. member tries to make out all these things, I am going to expose him.

This is what Sir Grantley said when speaking before the Commission: "Payne came to him with this man Chase and showed him a summons to appear before the Police Magistrate on the charge; he also stated that he had no money and asked him if he would appear for him. He told him 'no'." (A VOICE: He changed his mind after.)

If he changed his mind after, why try to distort history and facts? I am only reading from this to give you the picture.

"When the day for the hearing of the case arrived he was struck to see the crowd which appeared in the Police Court yard to hear the outcome of it. He then realised that Payne had a following."

In other words, he did like some of those over there; he jumped on the he jumped on the bandwagon.

"The case was adjourned"

You try to impress young people that Sir Grantley did so much.

"The case was adjourned and Payne came back to him but he had no money and he did not appear for him. On the day when the further hearing took place Payne drew a much bigger crowd; it was regarded in the same light as any other crowd which might have assembled in the Court Yard to listen to a case on a previous occasion. Payne was convicted and he appealed; his relatives or some one who said he was a relative and others, then brought money to him; he (Sir Grantley) appeared for him before the Court of Appeal and the conviction was quashed....."

Why get in here and try to tell people a lot of nonsense? (A VOICE: What has that got to do with it?) You said that these were dark days and we of the Opposition told you all sorts of things. You said that you had to take Sir Grantley Adams in your motorcar and carry him about because people wanted to shoot him. The hon. member tried to make out that Sir Grantley Adams did all these things after the disturbances. He said that this man Payne drew a big crowd and he was surprised and refused to appear for him because his job was to take money, and the man did not have any.

That should answer your argument about these hard-hearted Conservatives. They are capable of answering, but we have to answer for ourselves when you make out these strong arguments. As a matter of fact, Sir, I am wondering whether Mr. Speaker has seen some of the headlines which appeared in the *Advocate* which to me were offensive.

I do not blame the Minister who accuses the Opposition as being hypocrites. It is true that, among other things, that particular word should not be used in the Headlines. If the Speaker has seen it, something ought to be done about it. I was not present when the Minister said it, if he did, because he himself among other things always objects when you characterise them as hypocrites. You cannot say of a member on the floor of the House that he is a hypocrite. I notice that among other things the hon. member said that, whenever they want to raise money for schools or for the Hospital, we raise Cain and oppose it. That is not true.
8.30 p.m.

In my capacity in the Opposition, I carried the portfolio of Minister of Health, and I would often go over and talk with the present Premier who was Minister of Health. Can it be said that we were not clamouring for a better Hospital? They were opposed to the idea of a better Hospital and better education.

I am sure you will agree with me that the one outstanding thing which you have done for education in your time is the establishment of the Technical Institute, and I pay you great tribute for it. What else have you done? Do you know that nearly all of the secondary schools in the municipality of Bridgetown are turning back children because they have no room? What are you doing about it? You have enlarged Harrison College and a few other schools, but have you built even one secondary school yet? All that you have done to them is to improve them. You have only put up new walls. You have better buildings, but better buildings do not mean more schools.

Sir, it is true that Socialism has changed from what it was at the beginning of this century, but Conservatism has also changed from what it was at the beginning of this century. Of course, one man who prides himself to be a lawyer and who talks so much balderdash—I am sure that some of you who have not been to a law school can teach him law; that happens when you are posing as something when you are really not so. I came in here with the sole intention to say that I do not think that what you are doing is the right thing, and to tell you that you should not make the increase in this way.

Now, the Hon. Minister of Trade also said this: (It is true he made a statement to the House afterwards. I am not dealing with the statement, I will leave it to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy) "The Government had the devil's own job ---"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: From what are you reading?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am referring to notes. He said that the Government had the devil's own job in its fight against income tax by the wealthy. They were saying that it was too high but he had seen some of their returns and they were handsome and yet they were strongly opposed to paying good wages.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I enquire from the hon. senior member for the City whether his quotation has come from notes or from the newspaper?

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is from notes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that you are quoting from notes. I think you ought to know that you cannot quote from a newspaper.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you will appreciate that I know that. Do you want to see my notes? Are you satisfied?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want the Committee to be satisfied that you are quoting from notes and not from a newspaper. Just one other thing. You will appreciate that I was not here when the speech was made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. You are ready to reply to that, but I will appreciate if you shorten your details in reply to that speech and get back to the Resolution proper.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is so unfortunate that you were away when the Hon. Minister made his speech. It is so unfortunate that a lot of latitude was given to the Government; and I do know that, had you been in the Chair at the time, you would not make the remarks which you now made. The hon. junior member for St. James who presided as Chairman gave a tremendous lot of latitude. I know that it is not for you to stifle the Opposition; and I hope you will look aside at times, though you will feel that I am off the track a bit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I realise that you have to make your reply, but I consider that you have gone into other details, and I ask that you get back to the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister spoke for three hours, and he could only have done so by making this historical review. I prefaced my remarks by saying that it

was unfortunate that you were not here. I am coming back to the Resolution proper and I promise you that I will not be as lengthy as the Hon. Minister. Of course, he had a bad case and that is why he had to be so lengthy. He went on to say that they wanted to make money to ----

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I will just like to draw to the hon. member's attention that earlier today the Speaker ruled that an hon. member could not take any speech a member made in the Session and refer to it without its first appearing in the *Official Gazette*. I merely want to draw that to your attention, not with the view of stopping him, because I am listening with interest to his reply.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That was my reason for enquiring from the hon. member as to whether he was referring to a newspaper or not. Referring to notes would not be the same thing as quoting from a newspaper. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member went on to say that they want to make sure that the unborn generation, the greatest grands, will not be able to exploit the underprivileged of the country in order to save money. The Minister said that, now the underprivileged are getting money for the first time - to prevent them from being at the whims and the fancy of people, the members of the Government are abused. The hon. member made the statement that when he spoke about making these returns, he was talking about trade returns. The hon. member made two statements, one was about seeing returns and the other was about trade returns. If the hon. member explains that what he meant was seeing trade returns, that is all well and good. If after what he said about income tax, the hon. member talks about the returns of the wealthy Conservatives, you could only come to the conclusion that he was dealing with income tax returns. Later on the hon. member dealt with trade returns.

I am not a hypocrite; I called upon the Income Tax Commissioner to know how long since a member of the Government, or even the Governor, could call upon the Income Tax Commissioner to break the law. No one is allowed to see the income tax returns; and furthermore, a Governor once called upon an Income Tax Commissioner in order to see certain things and he was told bluntly by the Crown Law Officer that it cannot be done.

Trade returns are things which everybody has the right to see, but the hon. member went on to say that nowadays for the first time you could go and see these returns. If the hon. member said that in the heat of the argument, and he did not realise what he was saying, that is not true either. The hon. member might be a Minister or not; the statement which he made about seeing income tax returns is not correct.

I took up the matter with Mr. Osborne because it would be a great indictment on Mr. Osborne to allow the hon. member to go in there and see income tax returns. It is not true to say that for the first time you can see Trade returns and then you cannot see returns now because they are under the control of the Inland Revenue Department - even I who occupy the position of Mayor dare not see one. I can see mine and you can see it if it happens to go into the Court.

The hon. member made it a point to say how hard the Conservatives were. Today they are dealing with a Resolution for \$776,000.00 and the Premier says that no Minister of the Government or the Governor will get any of this increase. Well, we will save a few dollars by that!

The Hon. Minister of Trade tries to make out to the public that he is a poor man, so poor that he does not want to save any money for any unborn children. He speaks of a man who receives \$720.00 a month and if he thinks that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is jealous or be-

grudging him for that salary - well, I am not jealous of him. The West Indian Premier has said that I am a rabble-rouser and so on. There stands a responsible man saying that these Conservatives are so hard that they want to save money for unborn children - a man who gets \$720.00 a month plus \$90.00 Travelling Allowance.

The hon. member rightly corrects the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the salary is not \$800.00 but it is \$720.00 plus \$90.00 which makes a total of \$810.00; the same hon. member says that it takes \$90.00 a month to keep a car going.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. No Minister draws any \$800.00 a month; the Minister draws what the Treasury gives him back after Income Tax deduction.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a real lame duck excuse! It is like a person going and seeing a duck in the pond with one of its wings broken! The hon. member would not allow me to develop the point.
8.50 p.m.

I know what I am going to say will hurt. The hon. member further said, not only here but in the Press, that it takes \$90 to run his motor car. You cannot say that I am jealous of that, but I will tell the hon. member that I do not understand Socialism. How can I come here and say that I am a Socialist, that my heart bleeds to see how my poor brother lives, and then say that I must have \$90 a month for travelling?

The hon. member says that he does not draw \$800 a month. Do they take out \$100 for income tax? It could not be \$200. The hon. member throw things at Conservatives. If you are a poor man drawing \$500 a month, what about those people who are getting \$15.20 a week to whom we suggest you should give \$15.60? You are a Socialist and you must admit that I came a long way like you. You have come from far down the ladder and have reached the position where your salary is \$720 a month plus \$90 travelling; but I am not so foolish to come here and say that all persons should draw this.

I have heard your speeches on several occasions on your way up, but it is not surprising when Socialists say things; their memories are short. You say one thing today and another tomorrow. It takes you \$500 or \$600 to live and \$90 to use your car, but when we suggest that you give those people from amongst whom you have come \$3 a day, you say we are hypocrites, nasty and that our opposition is wicked and malicious.

Can you tell me how much is taken out of the \$720? (Hon. M. E. COX: Ask Osborne to tell you.) I do not see the returns. I presume the hon. member has not got any children and he is not expecting any either. I saw in a paper

(Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.)

I want people to know that I am not begging to be reported. I can draw a big crowd to hear me. You came and made a speech and thought that I did not know what I was doing. I wanted them to see how people can turn and suddenly decide that \$550 is a little bit on which to exist. How can you say that in one breath, and then say that the \$3 a day which the Trade Unionist and the Opposition are asking for is too much?

Hon. M. E. COX: I would ask the hon. member when \$3 was suggested.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the hon. member saying that this is the first time he heard \$3 suggested? I am sorry that the hon. member did not hear it before; and I am suggesting it now as a Conservative who is paying taxes.

The hon. member said in a *sotto voce* remark that what he is getting a month is only a quarter of what I am getting. I am paying taxes and therefore if the Minister says that it takes him that amount to live, if the common

man or thousands of people employed by Government can live on \$140, \$120, \$80 a month or \$15 a week and they can come today to give 36 cents a day more to people working for 10/- to make their wage \$2.76 a day and \$9 for those people who get \$100, \$150 and so on, then the logic of my argument is that he too is saving out of the \$500 for his unborn generation. That is logic and you cannot get out of it.

If the hon. member agrees that all they need come for today is this amount, then that proves that he is the same Conservative. Actually you are letting economics take first place with you now if you argue this is what they can live on, and we are dealing with the lower brackets. Your argument is that the Conservatives only want to amass for unborn generations, but if you can only give an increase of \$9 to the thousand from amongst whom you have sprung, are you not saying that they can live on that amount? Then you must be saving \$300 or \$400 because all you need is the same as they.
9.00 p.m.

I may not be here for very much longer, or the next hon. member besides me may not be here, but do you think that you are there forever? You see things coming, you cannot stop them, they are just like an onrush. It seems as if you have never studied your politics. You find yourself going good but then you wonder what caused this sudden change? You see, it is because of that that I am prepared. That is why I am perfectly satisfied that you must make preparations for your sons and unborn generations.

Sir, why have I supported the idea of an increase? The Hon. Minister said that some people will only give when they have nothing to give. What the hon. member means by that, I do not know. Perhaps, in other words, he is saying that we over here are not running the Government and, therefore, it is nice for us to say all sorts of things. I do not know if any concrete suggestion was made but I have made one. Sir, I am going to finish my speech tonight but I really will take a little time to answer the nonsense which the Hon. Minister put forward. You must always remember, whenever I get up to reply that steel has met steel. I can answer all of his speeches.

My concrete suggestions are these: In view of the fact that there have been increases in the price of essential commodities between 1956 and 1959, as I have quoted earlier, and which I await the Government to dispute, and in view of the speech which apparently conveys the idea of the Government or the desire of the Governor that consideration should be given to people in the lower income groups for increases, I feel that, under the circumstances, with your minimum wage today at \$2.40 a day for men and \$1.92 for women, a commensurate increase should be 25% which would give a man 60 cents a day more to the men and 48 cents a day more to the women. I do not think that is unreasonable. That would mean that a man would get \$3.00 and a woman would get \$2.40 a day.

I am associated with two capitalists and two big employers, and I do not think that they can say today or any time that this is an unreasonable wage. I go further and say that I do not think myself that the increase of \$9 per month which you propose to give to Civil Servants, that is to say to persons beginning from \$80 per month up to those getting \$1,200 a month is given with a desire on the part of the Government to cushion the shock caused by the increased cost of living. I feel that, instead of your giving them this cost of living now, you should tell them to wait until a little later. I consider that you should in a short course of time increase the salary of your Long Grade Clerks who are in the majority by 20%.

If you go to any Department, let us say the offices of the Auditor General, the Courts, the Income Tax Office, you will find that Long Grade Clerks are in the majority and their salaries range from \$80 to \$200 a month, and it takes them 20 years before they reach the top of the

grade. You take on a boy at 17 years and he reaches 37 years of age before he can get to the top of the grade. Therefore, not only should you increase the salary of the Long Grade Clerks by 20% but you should also change their incremental scale. An increment of \$4.00 and \$6.00 is nothing. I say that you should make it \$10. If a man works this year for \$80 a month, next year he should get \$90. That should be something valuable and something tangible.

Last but not least (and, may be, no one in the service would like me for this) I say to let all people who have reached the maximum get an extra \$10 every five years after that. What I mean to say is that, for every five years they put in after they have reached the maximum, you should give them an increment of \$10 a month. That would be something to cushion the shock instead of your giving them this \$9 cost of living.

Sir, I have made my suggestions. If the Hon. Minister is still of the opinion that my criticisms are wicked, malicious, nasty, dishonest and just for the purpose of wishing to get them out of the Government, that is a matter for him; he can enjoy his own opinion. What I have expressed today, I have expressed from the depths of my heart. Finally, I am not opposed to your doing something for those persons in the upper brackets, but today I am concerned with those in the lower brackets.

9.10 p.m.

Make no mistake about it. If I were working for \$90.00 a month I would feel the position more so than other people in a higher bracket. I have been fortunate today; God has blessed me (*ASIDES*) Where else would you draw \$700.00 a month, you idiot? Where would you be in the Service? (Hon. R. G. MAPP: That is humbugging you!) The hon. member says that that is humbugging me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you should look over there and ask them not to make any asides. The hon. member is saying that God has not blessed him; Well let him go outside and see where he can get \$700.00 a month.

I have put up my suggestion; you cannot say that the Conservatives will shout and say "Don't do this and don't do that." Mr. Chairman, the people who are in the \$600.00 and \$700.00 a month category do not feel the increased cost of living in the same way as the people in the lower categories; if they have an increase they will pass on some of it to their servants. The price of beef has gone up; you can pay 75 cents for a pound of beef and you can do it because you have more money in your pocket; but the other fellow cannot do that.

The hon. member says that cashiers get \$10.00 a week; that is so, but cashiers in private enterprise also get \$200.00 and \$300.00 a month. There was a cashier who was getting \$120.00 a month; he carried away a lot of money and the lawyers said that he could not get locked up; millions of dollars pass through his hands.

We are asking the Government to give those people in the lower brackets \$1.25 more. With this increase of \$9.00 a month you cannot save \$25.00 or \$30.00 a month which you used to save. Where a person has no larder or no ice-box or anything like that, and he has to go to the shop, he is the person who feels the rise in the cost of living. The man who is drawing \$500.00 a month does not feel it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from the Speech from the Throne made by the Governor. His Excellency said this:-

"My Government are aware that there has been some increase in the cost of living since the last salaries revision and have under consideration measures to grant some relief to the lower paid employees of the Government".

If the Government had followed this Speech and had worked through that channel, all of this debate would not have been taking place in this House; but in trying to please everybody they have pleased nobody. As to this \$776,000 for which they have come down to this House, I would suggest that that money be distributed among the people in the lower brackets earning from \$240.00 a month down. If that had been done, no contention or noise would have taken place; probably we would not be here so late tonight.

When as an Independent I sit here tonight, I can afford to say that this cost of living allowance for the people in the lower brackets cannot mean much. Any man who has a reasonable feeling would not say that an increase of \$3.00 a week would be too much for these poor people who are working along the highway in the heat of the day. I have often walked along the street and seen these poor cantonmiers in the heat of the day with the hot tar spilling on their feet. If the Government has under consideration an increase in the pay of the people in the lower brackets, I do not see why that has not been carried out.

I can assure you that there was a woman who came to my home crying and lamenting over the fact that her husband only works for \$13.20 a week and she has five children to maintain and house rent of \$3.50 a week to pay; otherwise they have to go out of the house. We should think of the cantonmiers, the people who build the roads, the scavengers who clean the street and the policemen who guard the island. We should consider all of these people.

9.20 p.m.

The poor people often come to me and say "Homie, remember us when you go to the House of Assembly; ask for more wages for us because we are suffering!" They are eating their bread with tears, they are walking half destitute because the money they are receiving is not enough; so when we think of the poor, God will bless us. He that showeth mercy to the poor, happy will he be; but when we do not regard the poor, I am telling you that God will look down upon us.

The cries have reached the House of Assembly. I hope the Ministers will not allow the cries of the poor to burst through the roof of this Assembly, because when that happens, you know where their cries will go and who will consider them. He heard the cries of the poor once and came down. You hands are on the source and you can give much or little; so whatever you do is well done.

I am not here to argue with anyone; all I am asking you is to let us reason together and help the poor who are suffering. I have no sarcastic remarks to make; I am only asking you to look after the poor because the eyes of God are beholding the good and the evil in every place, and He knows what is going on in earth as well as He knows what is going on in heaven.

When we look at those around the Table, I do not think that anyone of us was born with a gold spoon in his mouth; we have passed through their stage and know the suffering of the people in the field; and while we have the power I am asking you to distribute to the poor what is justice and right, because you have to give an account of your stewardship in time to come. There will be a day of reckoning.

When we come to the pensioners, those who have worked in the Government for a low rate of pay - they have borne the burden in past days and their salaries were small - we have to adjust their salaries because they are very low. They have to pay house rent, they have to buy food and clothes; so I am asking you to think of them. We must realise that if we act right to the poor, God will lengthen the days which He has entrusted to us; but if we act contrary our days will be shortened. You have the power and you know that the small pay which these people are receiving cannot meet their needs. There are people working for \$13 a week who have six children and they have to buy clothes, shoes, pay rent and eat breakfast and dinner out of that \$13 a week. Could that

maintain a family? Could we sit here tonight and not try to make an increase in the salaries of these poor people to save them from destruction? The only defence which they have is a good salary, and I agree with the last speaker that you should give a 25% increase in the lower brackets. I am willing to see the money which you are spending now distributed in the lower brackets since the budget cannot afford any more, because that is the only possible means of helping them.

We are passing through a most critical period, but you do not realise it. Very often I hear members on both sides of this House laughing at good suggestions, but I hold my peace and let it be my wisdom; I know that you cannot see the Maker but He is looking down on us and judging our hearts. He searches the hearts of all men and gives to each according to his ways and the fruits of his doing. If we do not do what is right for the poor, He will remove us and allow someone else to help them. Do not allow the cries of the poor to burst the ceiling of this House tonight.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, at an earlier stage in this debate I really had no intention to join in, but for reasons perhaps best known to myself, I think it is incumbent on me to make a few remarks.

I am sorry that this debate has taken the low turn which it has. A lot of emphasis was laid on what Ministers get as a salary, and I do not think that augurs well for this House. I can well remember that, when I was much younger and I wanted to hear a debate and get some decent argument, I could walk into this House; and it was a delight to see hon. members sitting around the Table and debating to the point without any recriminations, malice and mudslinging or anything like that; but today it is quite the opposite. If people want to see rowdiness, cursing and bad behaviour, then they can come to the House of Assembly; whereas in the old days, it was nothing like that.

Now that we are hoping to build a people, carry them to higher heights and through education and culture make them responsible citizens to love each other and respect humanity and dignity, where are we? What we see now is the most indelicate behaviour.

Now that we are moving forward constitutionally, don't you expect to have Ministers who are really put in a position where they can meet other Ministers and representatives who come from abroad in a manner which is well befitting Barbados and Barbadians? I am not going to press that point any longer. It does not hold water, and people whose minds are not in the gutter will not look on those things, because it is part of the set up in every country in the world. When people get here and decry the idea, ask some of the other members who have spoken

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. senior member for the City is not in his place, and I do not think it is fair for these things to be said behind his back because he referred to the salaries of Ministers. The Hon. Minister has talked about people whose minds are in the gutter, but all the hon. member tried to do.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I may intervene, I would like to tell the hon. member that I did not understand the Minister to make any reference to the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister talked about those people whose minds are not in the gutter, and he could only have been making reference to the hon. senior member for the City because he referred to the Ministers' salaries. Did you hear me talk about Ministers' salaries?

Mr. MOTTLEY entered and took his seat.

9.30 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was not in here. I want to know what has happened.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Philip made absolutely no reference to you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Thanks, Sir.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, this Resolution which we brought here a couple weeks ago is an attempt by this Government to alleviate what is now known as a spiral. The cost of living has increased tremendously and we are very, very conscious of that. We are conscious of the increase, however small or however big it is, and we thought, not now but ever since, that we should do something to remedy it. It is not as easy as some people think.

A lot of what the Opposition suggested, we tried out and discussed. A suggestion was that we should give an increase to people from a certain bracket downwards. We intended that this should be only for people who work in the lower brackets but, when we had certain plans, we were interviewed by the Whitley Council and they put up their claims.

While I expect that the Opposition will always criticise any proposition which the Government brings down - and it is their prerogative - it depends on how far they stretch it. What I thought would have been the real question was not that of the Government giving everybody; this is the first time that the Government has attempted to share and share alike from the top to the bottom. In the past, what was the accusation? The accusation was that you have gone and given so much at the top that now that you have come to the bottom, you have nothing much to give. Now, we have shared and shared alike because all are Government employees.

Hon. members must bear in mind that the Civil Servants are represented by the Whitley Council, and the Whitley Council would not sit idly by and see us give some people and not give the Civil Servants too; therefore in answer to their plea, we said to them that we are not giving you what you ask - they had fantastic figures which we were not able to go as far - but if you say that you want something, and as we are aware that all are Government employees, what we will do is: we will give the bottom and the top the same figure and that it would be a cost of living allowance. That is what we have brought down to the House and that is all we can afford to give at the moment.

The facts are these. There is no hon. member who has spoken on the other side who will have to tell this Government what to do to maintain its position in the House of Assembly. Nobody over here would be so foolish as not to believe that the more we are able to do for the people, the better they would be able to appreciate us. If we had it and we were able to give the people what they would like, of course, that would enhance our position. We are conscious that this is so and we would be ignorant if we did not do it.

Last year, we had a bad crop; we had a short fall and the prices of free sugar were low; therefore, we have not got in the revenue which we anticipated.

I am going to pause here to make this statement, and anything which I say here can be quoted anywhere else and at any time. Some people do not understand the working of the Government; they do not understand how Government derives its revenue. They think that, because it is the word "Government", Government has all the money tucked away somewhere. That is not so. On the other hand, they think that the Government possesses a mint which just spins off dollar bills whenever the Government wants them; therefore, the Government has money galore and in unlimited quantities.

They think so because they do not understand that the revenue of the country comes from the sweat of the inhabitants; that it comes by way of taxes and commodities. Who produce the wealth of the country? It is the people in the country. There may be certain hidden things as people from overseas who send pittances to their families for which those people who receive them do not have to sweat; nevertheless, that is not the real revenue of the country. As I have said, those are hidden things.

The people should be told the truth. We have a one-crop economy; we have sugar and sugar only. We were hopeful that we would find oil in this country but it does not seem so, and we have sugar only and we have to fight in world markets in order to get a price for our sugar.

Sir, I am going to make a statement here and I hope this would not be taken with any prejudiced view. So far as the world price of sugar is concerned, let me say that the more sugar we manufacture in Barbados, the cheaper the price would be, because we have a guaranteed price for a certain amount and what is above that is sold into the free market and we have no control over the free market. It is a very sad blow to me to learn that in Cuba they are getting ready to up their production of sugar to three million tons. If that was thrown on the free market, what will happen to the other countries who produce sugar, God knows.

The economy of a country is based on what it can produce and what it can make; it does not come by some politician saying this to get a vote and some politicians saying that to get into power. The stark facts are what is in black and white - that is to say, figures; so this is not sentiment; this is not vote-catching; it is the business of the country; therefore I want you to disabuse your minds from the political and sentimental things which have been told you from time to time.

Sir, we are in the unfortunate position where those of us who hold the reins of Government have to be actual, factual and above board. We cannot come in here and make wild statements to you. The others need not be factual; therefore, they can make wild statements. If we are incompetent and do not know what we are doing, they would be the first to say that we are incompetent and do not know what we are doing and the Government is burst. They are in the position where they can jockey us into a position and then say we knew those people were incapable of running a Government. The one thing which they would say is this: at one time this Government was solvent and it did not have to go to the British Government to get grants-in-aid, but now we are on the verge of being a Crown colony.
9.40 p.m.

There is no member on that side of the House who would have in his heart the desire to uplift the people of Barbados or the workers more so than anybody on this side. The real organisation started on this side and it is going on up to today. The Opposition can make you feel that they have the people more at heart than we so as to get over here. It is a game, that is all. When they get the reins it will be a different thing entirely. This Government is committed to so many things - we have got to tax the people of this country in order to find money to lend the Civil Servants to buy or repair or build their homes; we have had to borrow 1.8 million dollars to lend them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Am I to understand that the Government's Spokesman is saying that the Government has to tax the people so as to find money to lend Civil Servants for the purchase or repair or building of their homes? (Hon. D. D. GARNER: Yes) The Civil Servants are paying interest on the money themselves.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: For the benefit of the hon. member, if he does not know, all the money which the Civil Servants have had before come from general revenue; this is the first time that we are making a loan

which will have to be serviced; whereas we have to borrow at 5 1/2% or 6% the Civil Servants will get their loans at a cheaper rate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is what Trinidad is doing.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member will have his opportunity to talk. I want to say that we are now busily engaged in a matter which is a social matter; we have the aged and the poor and the Old Age Pensioners and we have to decide as to these people in one way or the other. We have to consider whether we will lower the age and pay out more money. We want to find out how much money we want. Immediately after the consideration of this Resolution we have to give the Pensioners an increase. All of these are services which we are bound to have today and we are working on them. And they are recurrent; they go on from year to year; they go on all the time.

This is no easy talk. Hon. members over there are trying to make out that we are not doing anything, but this is the first time that a Socialist view has been taken of the matter. When I was in the Opposition, the people who are at the top got as increases more than the basic salary of the people at the bottom.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. There were grades of 25% on the first £100, 7 1/2% on the second £100 and the people at the top got 5%. That is true.

Mr. GARNER: The point which I was making is this: by the time that you were through with the increases, the ones at the top got an increase which was more than the basic wage of those at the bottom; and this is the first time that an attempt has been made to give one and all alike. We are saying that we intend to do more for the people at the bottom.

All of the Government's employees are our employees and our servants; therefore if we are doing something for one we have to do something for another; we cannot discriminate or ignore the Whitley Council. We are not moved by your figures; we intend doing more for the people at the bottom. As I have already said, His Excellency the Governor did not say what he said by chance; it came from this Government. We have been working on the matter and trying to arrive at an equitable situation. When the Whitley Council came into the picture and we were faced with the fact that they were trying to discriminate, we thought that that might have led to bad feelings. We therefore decided there and then that the best solution is what we have done and I feel that what we have done is the best way out. I understand every word that comes from certain people's mouths; they are looking forward to election time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Can't you take it that somebody is sincere in saying something?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I said some people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, I am included in the "some people." Cannot the hon. member still believe that I am sincere when I say that these people in the lower brackets should be given \$3.00 a day? I do not accuse the Government of being dishonest, but I say that I disagree with their point of view. I object to the Minister saying that we were spiteful and malicious and that sort of thing. I could have been foolish enough to say that these people should be paid \$5 and \$6 a day and do not mean it. Don't you think that I am sincere when I say that the people should get \$3.00 a day?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I know that the hon. member is in a humorous mood; he has made his points and I have to make mine. I have to defend my Government and make my position clear.
9.50 p.m.

We cannot play politics with the finances of this colony to the extent of the Opposition. They can be most

irresponsible and get away with it; and if people are gullible enough to take it as factual, that is their business; we have to be careful and businesslike; we have to be like what Directors of offices happen to be and see that everybody is rightly served.

Having heard some of the points made here tonight, I am saying, before I discuss it with the Premier or any other fellow Ministers, that we will have to see to it that rigid controls are re-introduced in this island because we have to bear the brunt of the burden of all these things. We have no control over what salt fish or flour costs in Canada. We in Barbados are asking for higher prices for our sugar, and we want that because we want to pay our agricultural labourers more money. When other people have to pay a little more for our sugar or other commodities, naturally they ask for more money too. So it is a vicious spiral. There must be controls because this Government is getting the blame when prices go higher.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I got up here tonight and gave prices of certain commodities, but at no time did I accuse Government for the rise in prices. (Mr. CRAWFORD: Man, sit down!) Don't tell me to sit down. The hon. member said that I accused the Government for prices going higher. When he talked about controls the little nit-wits over there started clapping.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the hon. senior member for the City, I must say that the hon. junior member for St. Philip did not accuse you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He said that we over here accused the Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member said that Government is being blamed for the soaring in prices but he did not say that you said it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the only person who referred to prices and cost of goods was myself ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member did not say that you blamed the Government for it. You referred to the soaring of prices in making your point on the comparison of cost of living.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not so dishonest as to say that; that could only come from Government's members. How could I say that? It would be dishonest. I have never said so and I would not say so.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: When the hon. member spoke I listened carefully to him. Well, Sir, let them take that for what it is worth. As a member of this Government I know that this is a campaign which is being built up for 1961, and politics is just like War. It is a strategy; you form yours and I am going to form mine too. You are not dealing with nincompoops over here. All this chat about Government not doing this and Government doing that is all politics. It takes two to play at a game; so if you say that we have the power and are not doing enough to keep the cost of living down and raising salaries to the height, we have got the answer, and the answer is "controls".

I did not intend to say anything along that line, but since I have been in the Ministry I have had deputations asking me to allow them to raise the price of local commodities, and I have refused to do it. I tell them that as long as I have that office they should not come back on that question. I tell them that they are making enough on canes and can subsidise the other things. (A VOICE: What about fish?) Since you have mentioned fish, I should like to say that this Government has to look for \$1 million now to keep fishermen going, to stabilise the industry, and to get a better supply of fish in this country. We are engaged in that and soon from now you will be asked to vote for nearly \$1,000,000.

This Government has to look for money to develop this country, not only material resources but human re-

sources also. It is not everything that we can do overnight. In the Scotland area alone we have a tremendous problem in reclaiming the land. If we do not do it, the people in that area will find themselves without land. We are dealing with and tackling these problems, and it takes money to do these things. (A VOICE: How about development?) Thank God we are dealing with development in a wonderful way. I can tell the hon. member that I have had the opportunity to go to a few countries and every time I return, I am a proud Barbadian. Every time I land back at Seawell, I am proud to see what a wonderful job we are doing in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to remind hon. members on both sides of the House that there is a Rule which says that when a member is speaking he should be heard. While the hon. member is speaking, it is very difficult for me to hear unless you keep quiet. You can rise on point of order, or speak after, but you should let the hon. member be heard.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, another thing in which this Government is engaged is the Pig Subsidy in this colony. Last year we spent \$84,000 in that Scheme; if we did not do that, we would have had to allow people to get a higher price for their pork. Everybody knows that pig-rearing is not a lucrative thing; so we had to subsidise the people so that the poor people could get a piece of pork. The price of pork in Trinidad is 85 cents as against 60 cents in Barbados; so that you can see that this \$84,000 with which we are subsidising the Pig Industry in this island is doing a good thing. More people are interested in pig-rearing, we are getting a certain amount of pork, and nobody is short.

Another thing which I am going to ask the Minister of Trade is to see that no more imported pork is allowed to come into this island because we have a pig industry now. If we did not do these things, then people could say that we are not doing anything; but we know that we are subsidising, not only for the people who work with Government, but for all the inhabitants of Barbados. 10.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Subject to the wishes of the Committee I would like to be relieved for a short time. I am asking if you will agree temporarily for the hon. senior member for St. James to deputise for me.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. HOLDER took the Chair.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, this Pig Subsidy is helping the inhabitants of Barbados; this is a service which the Government is doing to the inhabitants of this colony. Pretty soon we will be embarking on beef rearing to augment the supply in this country. All these things call for development.

Some of us do not remember that this Government is subsidising rice; we are spending thousands of dollars to subsidise rice for all and sundry because nearly everybody eats rice. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not eat rice.) I said nearly everybody. We are also subsidising local brown sugar to the tune of \$266,000 a year.

When people hear of these accusations against the Government this afternoon, they will say that this Government is not doing anything. But they must hear all sides. You cannot spend all on salaries for the people in the Government employ and leave out the other inhabitants. You have a certain amount of money and it is to share all around. That is the point I want to make.

Everybody must have a little latitude to speak on every aspect of this matter, and Mr. Chairman, I am asking for the same latitude given to other members. What are the facts? Last year we were caught in a strike. Who caused the strike? It was not the Government; it was private employers. The workers asked for a little increase

and the employers said they could not entertain it. Bloodshed would have happened in Barbados, yet they would not pay one cent more. The Government had to beseech and beg and pray that law and order be maintained in this colony and to let justice be done. Who was responsible for that? The Hon. Minister of Trade and I.

Sir, it is all right for one to make sport, but this is not sport. Do you know why it is not sport? The same people who refused to pay higher wages are the very people who are buying two, three and more plantations.

What we really need in this colony is an association of the Union and the Government. They should work together; they should work hand in hand. You should have the Government to pass the necessary legislation to back you up. This Government has always asked that the profits derived from industry in this island should be shared in greater measure among the workers. We are not asking fantastic things or prices to pay people out of private business, but, personally, I know that a lot of people who pay low wages today can do a lot better because they are doing better business than they have done at any time before. The prices for sugar have gone up and the spending power of the people has gone up.

I walk around sometimes and I see people who are supposed to be poor going in the Serve-yourself shops and they are not asking for prices; they are taking down this and that from off the shelves. I saw a fellow taking up a tin of Milo and Ovaltine. Things are different today. The purchasing power of the people has increased and the people are living a higher life today. We are not ashamed of that, nor do we want to depress them, but these are things of which you should be aware.

On the other hand, if we did not make these conditions possible, the people could not live up to it. When you get people with a higher purchasing power, the grocery stores must make more money. When you get mechanisation of the land and of the factories - it is true that you have to put in more capital - in the long run, it pays bigger dividends and that is what is happening in Barbados today. We are changing certain social aspects of the people but we are not changing the mental outlook of the people who control the wealth of the country. We are trying to make bricks without straw.

Every time we come down here to raise money, the Opposition says that you are doing this thing and the other thing, yet they say that you should do this and do that. But can we do it without money? (Mr. MOTTLEY: Which side of the Opposition?) So far as I am concerned, all are one; there is no difference. If you mark X on the forehead of one, you can mark it on the foreheads of the others.

Mr. Chairman, I go further. This Government has to find money for the Development Board. People are looking forward to the Government today to lend them money to help their businesses. The Government is faced with the task of finding capital for development - perhaps, personal development. Now, we also have a Tourist Board. Years ago, I had a great prejudice against this sort of thing; I do not know if it is so strong today as it was then. The only thing which I have against it today is this: although we are spending money to develop the Tourist Industry, yet the people who are employed only receive a pittance.
10.10 p.m.

Whereas we are trying our best to develop these things, yet the mental outlook as regards salaries and wages has not changed; it is still the old school of thought: when this or that is to be sold they can buy it over! In the long run the workers will lose because the employer is trying to create capital out of everything he has in order to take over new business all the time. As soon as a plantation owner gets one thing he goes in for another.

When you make suggestions like these, I think that the Opposition should make their comments and criticisms in a more factual manner. To hear all of this stuff (Mr. MOTTLEY: Which stuff?) stuff to which I do not care to refer. If the members of the Opposition were reasonable they would say: "All right, you have made a good try now; I hope that in the near future you will come back and do something more; you may have a surplus". I had hoped that hon. members of the Opposition would have said: "We are not satisfied with this try" although some of them are satisfied that we have done a good job, but they dare not say so.

I thought that the Opposition would have said: "We expect that you will come back later when you are better off and have a revision of salaries and consolidate what you have already done." Then the worker at the bottom will be much better off. If he gets this \$9.00 increase now, we will consolidate that and give him a further increase. This is all because everybody has his eyes on 1961, but in 1961 many of us will be cold; so why not let us do the right thing today? (Cheers). (MEMBERS: Do the right thing now!) As to this amount of \$3.00 a day for these workers, today is the first time I have heard that and it is from the hon. senior member for the City.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. In that correction, I did not make a specific rate of \$3.00 a day. All along I said that in 1956 I felt that the minimum amount should be \$15.00 a week and with the increase the amount should be \$18.00 a week today. I said that more than once; I was speaking in terms of a weekly allowance being paid to people.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sometimes the hon. member speaks in a manner in which I do not always listen to him. Sometimes he quarrels, sometimes he makes a point, and sometimes he does not; but for the first time I have heard this proposal put forward by the hon. senior member for the City today. I have not accused anybody of dishonesty; I am saying that this is the first time that any Government in Barbados has done the right thing. You have employees who have to go in the shops and buy commodities at the same price as anybody else; you say from the Civil Service Branch you want so much on the first £100 and so much on the next £100; well, we cannot entertain you. We have not got the money to do that; we have a limited amount and that limited amount we want to dispose of at a certain level.

If you say that this is discrimination then we have to find a solution to the problem. The solution which we have found is that we are treating all as one and one as all. On the other hand, I must say this: when you hear that a man is working for a certain amount of money, well, certain people have to employ people in their homes and when you hear that a person gets this money he does not bank it as some people believe. A man has to employ people; he has to do his employer's work and if his servant does things in his home he has to pay for it. We were not able to do all of these things; when a man's employees hear that he is getting a little more money those employees will want a little more money too; but we cannot do what has been suggested at this time because we have not got the money with which to do it.
10.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we are busily engaged in developing this country to the extent that we would have to be continually borrowing large sums of money. (A VOICE: You should develop the people too.) You cannot develop the people by putting food in their mouths. You give them a living wage and an opportunity to buy food and clothing, but the real development of a country is not only its material resources; we have to think about higher education, school building programmes and about many things in this country.

We are busily engaged with another Five Year Plan. All these things call for brain-work and proper planning so that we cannot be irresponsible. You do not like the em-

ployees of Government any more than we do and I challenge some of you to say that you love them as much as we do. (Mr. WALCOTT: They are public servants and not yours.) If we could satisfy them to the point where they could be absolutely contented you do not know what a fillip it would mean to this Government? We are not so foolish as not to know that, but we cannot run a Government by mere political expediency. It might be an urgent matter for us to try and make our positions secure, but in the long run it does not pay.

There may be those of you who, perhaps from time to time, have played a game of whist and you might have won every trick but you have not won the rubber! We are not going to be jockeyed into a position of irresponsibility for mere vote catching, and ruin the people of this country by doing foolish things. We intend to do these things in a businesslike manner; and I can tell the people of this country consciously here tonight that this Government, of which I am a member, intends to stand by them at all times; but we must give according to the resources we have at our disposal, taking into consideration the development of the country.

I have in my Ministry alone about four or five projects for which you will soon be asked to vote money. These projects will mean something to the people of Barbados, but they call for money. The average Barbadian now does not believe that he should take a venture into anything unless Government lends him money or begins it. Having said what I said before, you have to tip your hat to people who took the plunge in the dark, went into business, tried to develop the country and keep money in circulation in Barbados; too few people in Barbados have that spirit today. If people want anything today they believe that Government must give them and stand by them. (Mr. WALCOTT: That is a joke; investigate the Barbadian capital.) That is a fact and I know whereof I speak.

In countries where capital is more easily had, people go into business themselves, but today the urge here is that, if people are going into business, Government must subsidise or give them money. Well, Sir, if Government has to do that, it certainly has to get money by way of taxes, - income tax, customs duties, excise duties and so on; but we are not here, Mr. Chairman, to deprive the employees of the Government, Civil Servants or others of anything which is rightfully theirs.

We thought at the time when we said 4 1/2 cents per hour for certain categories, which would work out at \$108 per year, that it was a fair thing at this moment, because it is only a cost of living allowance to help them tide over. There are other people I feel in certain brackets who perhaps have certain luxuries which they can do without, so they could curtail some of their expenses in that direction. If they find it hard and smoke two or three tins of tobacco a week, they must stretch it a little or smoke less. If a fellow has other indulgences, he may have to reduce them. (A VOICE: Two girls instead of one!) because Government cannot at this moment, with the amount of development we are undertaking, carry out all things at the same time. We feel that we should try to alleviate the employee's lot; yet we are committed to a certain amount of development, and in order to do these things we have to be very, very careful.

I am going to take the opportunity to say that the salary which Ministers receive should not be constantly repeated. My appeal to hon. members is to stop that mean chat in the House of Assembly. (A VOICE: Why?) It is low and mean, and does not show good training or good breeding. Directors of business firms receive fabulous amounts. (Mr. MOTTLEY: If they have money in the business.) You should know the salaries paid to managers on plantations.

It is not because I happen to be a Minister that I want to make this statement now, but I can employ myself and have been employing myself and have employed others;

and because of being here seeing after Government's business, my own private business is going down. (A VOICE: You are not to have any private business.) I have land, my friend; do you want to take it away from me? It is foolish, childish and mean to be constantly getting up and referring to Ministers' salaries. The hon. senior member for the City receives more than we do. I am happy that he can make it, and I would never throw it in his dish. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What difference would it make?) I would not be dignified. It is below the dignity of the House for members when they get up from time to time to throw these things at the Ministers as if they were dogs in the streets.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not know what the hon. member is referring to, but in my speech I was replying to the Minister of Trade who said that Ministers are getting this little salary to keep them. The Minister himself made reference to it and I spoke after him. Let him say that he did not say that.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I was referring to remarks made by members over there who said that Ministers were drawing this lot of money. I was replying to the dirty remarks made by members who throw things at us.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Would the hon. member say which member?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that he was referring to dirty remarks. What does he mean by hon. members who throw dirty remarks? You are working for the money; you are not stealing it. It has been passed by the Legislature of this island and you can draw \$720; so what is wrong with referring to it? I do not grudge you for it but I was only making a comparison of the salaries which they receive as a Socialist Government as against what the other people are getting. Nobody is saying that it is too much. I work for my living and I agree with the hon. member when he said that possibly I work for more than that. Maybe I do; that is my private business; but when the hon. member himself makes references to the fact that they are working for this, reference will always be made to it.
10.30 p.m.

Just let me say this and do not take umbrage at my saying it. Anytime this matter comes before the House, I must make a comparison. I am in a position to say that I happen to know that there are certain Ministers, at least three, who as a matter of fact, lose money by accepting to be a Minister at \$600 a month. That is a fact; but that does not prevent me from referring to them and comparing their salary with the salary of the man who works for \$15.18 a week.

The Hon. Minister made reference to Conservative members working for money and putting it down for their unborn children. If I make money, I want some of it for my unborn children but do not create the impression that only Conservative members do it. When I make the comparison, it is not that I grudge you for it. As I have said, they are certain Ministers who have lost money by accepting a Ministry.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: It is all right for the hon. senior member for the City to say that he refers to it by way of making a comparison, but they refer to it in a derogatory manner. If that is the only proposition of appeal, that will go to the wind. So far as I am concerned, I do not care how much mention you make of it. I know that if you had to come in this Government, and if the chance ever comes for a change of Government, I hope it will never come for you. I know that somebody will take over some day but I hope the Opposition as it is now will never take over.

We have not been put here on favour; we know that as long as we do the right thing for the people, you can do all you can to upset them; we will always prevail when it comes to a general election. We know what we are doing now and

what we have done in the past to bring these same people up from where they were. (A VOICE: We, who?) This Government. (A VOICE: You were working against them.) Where am I now? I have left Egypt's sands! I am not like some of the others when they got a certain place and were shown the promised land they said they cannot pass there!

Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough on this matter. I promised hon. members that I would not get into the gutter. We have a strong case without getting into the gutter. We feel - at least I personally feel - if we can do anything to increase this cost of living allowance which we are passing on to the people that it would mean we must have the strictest control over the prices of things and we will have to start to do it at once. We have many, many projects in hand which will help the people of Barbados in finding work and which will mean more money circulating in the country, and we intend to follow that spirit to the letter.

Sir, I am going to close by telling the people of this colony not to mind some of the sayings of the Opposition; too many people in the Opposition do not realise that what is said by the Opposition is said not in a practical way, and in some cases not sincerely, and in some cases not honestly, and in most cases just only to catch votes.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has said that what is said by members of the Opposition is not said sincerely and honestly. If the hon. member is imputing dishonesty to some hon. members, or if he does not clarify what he means, I will have to ask that he withdraw those remarks - not sincerely, not honestly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, definitely the hon. member is a friend of mine and I am going to ask the hon. member this. Surely, he cannot feel when I got up here and suggested that you should give these unskilled people \$3.00 a day instead of your giving them \$2.76 that what I said was not said honestly and sincerely.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I did not say that I meant you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am a member of the Opposition. I feel \$3.00 a day is what you should give them. Dare you to say that it was not said honestly and sincerely. I will tell you this: If you had come here and talked anything of giving them \$5.00 a day, I would say that you are not sincere.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member was not listening to me. He is taking things out of the context. I said that I want the people of the colony to understand that they must not take all that the Opposition says to them. There are certain members who are not honest when they say certain things. That applies to anyone when he is in that category.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must now rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister is not talking to members down in Suttle Street; he is talking to hon. members in this House; and he is saying that certain members are not honest and sincere. He is making specific reference to hon. members in this Chamber. If he is saying that he can say that, we will have to say that we can have a free-for-all fight. I do not have to quote him because earlier he said so far as the Opposition is concerned all are one; there is no question of a difference.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the remarks; but anybody who was listening to me would know that I did not say it in that context. I did not accuse everybody of doing the same thing. This is a time when the General Elections are coming up and the ground work is being laid now for 1961; so they think that it is good strategy to tell the gullible public, those who do not think for themselves, and those who are too far removed from the nature of things, what they would like to hear. I am saying to those people that when we do things we have to be factual and to see that figures are correct. We have to balance our budget and we have to look out for certain things such as a calamity which may arise.

10.40 p.m.

With all of our commitments, it is absolutely impossible for us to do more at this time. I know that something more will be done when we can do it and at the right time. From 1956 until 1959 it would not come with good grace if we had a revision of salaries. It was the intention of this Government to do certain things, but we got to a point where we were faced with a difficult situation, that is to say, that all the employees say that they should be taken care of. We have to take care of our Old Age Pensioners; as a matter of fact, I will say this now, and when I say it a lot of hon. members will rise to their feet: If this matter had not been filibustered in this House for so long we would have had the Resolution passed for the Old Age Pensioners already. (MEMBERS: What is filibustering?) I mean by filibustering, spending four hours to make a point when you could make it in a few minutes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister spoke for half an hour the first time and three and a half hours the next day. Who is filibustering? The Government waited and waited until they came down to this time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I sit here and I do not interfere with anybody. If I have to smile, I smile; I heckle a bit but I do not get up and interfere with any hon. member, except I am speaking on a point of order. I want to keep the record straight, that all the accusations made were not factual; they had no relation to things as they are. We have done what, in our minds, is the best we can do and we intend, when we are a little better off, to do something again. Apart from what the hon. member has said, we know that this amount will help to a certain extent; it will not help people to put more money in the bank, but it will help to buy a little more meat, and it will help to buy a pair of shoes for a child. Nobody would have to coerce us to do this, but this is all that we can do at the moment.

This Government is saying that we have a great task before us; we are not thinking of the employees of the Government only, we are thinking of all the employees in the island. The employees of the Government are our first charge, but we still have to take care of other people. We must have schemes to promote work and other schemes which will help the inhabitants. If that is not the opinion of the Opposition, it is the opinion of the Government, and we will work on it.

Mr. Chairman, I think that I have said enough on this matter. Because the year 1961 happens to be Election year and some hon. members may feel insecure, they feel that they will jockey us into a certain position; but they will not jockey us into a position where we will become madmen. We will try to run this Government in a level-headed manner and we will see to it that the people of this colony get the benefit and experience of a Socialist Government. We will see to it that nobody in this country or in any other country will be able to say that this Government was incompetent or incapable of running this country and now we are bankrupt and ready for Crown Colony status. We have another Five Year Plan coming up and that will call for millions of dollars to develop the country and the people, and we hope that as soon as we can develop the people and the country salaries and wages will go up. I see that the hon. senior member for St. Peter wants to get me out of my stride but he will never succeed in doing that. I want to see to it that the profits in private enterprise bear a greater relationship to the upkeep of the employees.

I would like to advise the hon. member that he should not only use his vitality and energy to pounce on the Government on Tuesday after Tuesday; he should also do something to help the employees of this country by really educating them as to what their true position is in this life. Let the hon. member really do trade unionism and work on the heart and soul of the working class people; let the hon. member make them see to their position in the community so that they will be able to make good demands upon those for whom they work. If the hon. member has ability, and I understand he has some, do not let him work destructively because all that hon. members on that side do destructively will not destroy us.

10.50 p.m.

I know that in this country right now, agriculturally speaking, every plantation is mechanising, and from what I know of it, they must make money. Now that they have nearly fully mechanised..... (A VOICE: Stop them from doing it.) God forbid! I want to see the Trade Unionist organise the people to the extent that they would derive more from the industry. Instead of mixing up politics in the Trade Union, try and work among the workers and see to it that the mental outlook of those who own the wealth of this colony takes a change for the better. Do not blame us; do not use all your energy by coming here and trying to break down the Government.

When I was over there, you were over here; and now I am over here you are over there. Who is right and who is wrong? When I was over there you abused me for not being over here and now I am over here.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member says that when he was over here I abused him for not being over there. Well, I would not repeat what the member by his side said of him.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was speaking, he said "when I was over there and you were over here" and he could only be addressing you, so you were the person to whom he made reference. He could not have been addressing the hon. member for St. Peter, and he is too old a Parliamentarian not to know better than that.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and I do not take him seriously; I know he said it with the best intentions. What I was saying, Sir, is that there are things which we have to do in this country if we want to change Barbados and Barbadians. It will not be done by abuse or by mud-slinging; it will be done when we get together and see the people's problems in the light in which they are.

So often I hear it said that the rich are getting richer. The workers are not organised to that extent. I am not saying that the hon. member is not trying, but I am telling him that he can come to my office or invite me to his at the Union and let us have strong discussions for the benefit of the people of this colony. While we are abusing each other, the people who have the wealth are laughing and trying to keep the rift between us; so no wonder the rich are getting richer. We are not united; we are divided and that should not be so. (Mr. WALCOTT: You are running the Government.) We would like to see a healthy Trade Union in this country. (Mr. WALCOTT: We have one of the best in the West Indies.)

The Trade Union in England backs the Labour Government, and I make this bold statement that anything which has occurred in former days should be sunk for the interest of the people of this colony. (Mr. WALCOTT: And your men are abusing me each week in a newspaper?) It is not in the interest of the workers of this country to have a divided Government and a divided Union; we should work hand in hand if we want to do something for the workers of this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what is the matter before the Committee?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, the very thought of seeing him hurts me.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is a song "The very thought of you".

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not take what I have said lightly. It is a serious question. He is charged with a mission in life and if he fritters away his golden hours now when he should be really doing something constructive for the people of Barbados, it will be a sad thing. I want him to know that anything the Union wants us to do so far as legislation is concerned, we are willing to back it. We are willing to do everything to help the Union of this

country to further the lot of the working-class people. If a man brings in something on his own and which has nothing to do with the financial bearing of the people, that is a different matter. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What about the Trade Union Bill?) That is a different matter. Did you vote for it?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would never vote for it because I am a Conservative.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: So what is the argument?

Mr. MOTTLEY: You said you would do anything the Trade Union brought in.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, some people do not like facts. The moment you talk facts some people forget.

Mr. HOLDER left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I was on the verge of finishing when you took the Chair. I was saying, Sir, that I want the members of the Opposition to realise that we gave this matter very serious thought. We thought also at one time of some of the suggestions which they made, but they are not workable and would not be in the interest of the Service as a whole. We would have discriminated against certain sections of the Public Service and that is not the best thing. (A VOICE: What happened with the Turner Report?) I am not responsible for what happened in Mr. Turner's time; I am saying what we have done now.

Since the cost of living has gone up for one, it has gone up for all although there are those in the higher brackets who can take care of other families besides their own, but we did not take that into account. We felt we had so much to spare and gave that to all alike. 11.00 p.m.

If we had not been interviewed by the Whitley Council we would have taken the lines as we thought at first but, having been interviewed by the Whitley Council, it would be discriminatory to have done otherwise. There are hon. members who know what the dissatisfaction will be, therefore, to save these unpleasant things, we acted in a candid manner. We had a certain amount of money to do the job. We could not give anyone; therefore, we did what we could with what we had at our disposal.

I appeal to hon. members to see us in the light as they would have seen themselves if they were placed in our position.

Mr. STRAUGHN, Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. CORBIN rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see the hon. junior member for St. Joseph first.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rose when the previous speaker rose. We rose simultaneously.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I did not recall your rising just now.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, following the remarks of the last hon. member and indeed of the other remarks of this House concerning this Resolution, I think it is the depth of feeling that everybody would have wished that more money was there to be allowed to this Resolution; but it has been pointed out from the Government Benches that this \$776,000 is all that they can make available; and if I may, Sir, I would just like to dwell a little bit on an aspect of this Resolution which I do not think have been touched particularly because it does not touch the money aspect; it concerns the Civil Service in a fundamental manner.

Before, however, I get talking about the Civil Servants with regard to this Resolution, I just want to say

that I notice that the hon. senior member for the City said - and he was making a suggestion which came from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - that the salary at which this cost of living should be paid should not be over and above those who are getting \$240 a month.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. I said that if the Government decided that they could not allocate more money than this \$776,000 to this matter, they should have thought of dividing that exclusively on those whose wages were from \$240 a month downwards and nothing above that.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I was saying the same thing. I said if you were making a division you should give those below and not above \$240 a month. I think that argument sounds quite good on the surface and can be built up into a strong sentimental argument so to speak when one recalls the last paragraph of the Governor's speech from the Throne. I think that has been pretty clearly explained by the Government Benches.

I have not been able to work it out, but I wonder how much really would redound to the benefit of the remaining people in the lower brackets. I believe it can be worked out; and if we work it out in figures, I believe it would make a fiscal argument. I think it might only come to ten cents a month. I think the Government might have had time to work out the figures and I think they should. I certainly expect some reply from the Government Benches that they can give some answer to that argument.

I turn my attention to another aspect of this matter which I believe is important, and it is as regards the Civil Service Association as such. Now, I noticed when the Hon. Premier introduced this Resolution he did mention that the Whitley Council had met on this question, and it was clearly brought out in his opening remarks that there was some kind of misunderstanding as to what the official side of the staff meant. I cannot help feeling that some of this might have been cleared up if they had done their work in an unprejudiced manner; so I want to make an appeal to the Civil Servants as such to have themselves moulded into a strong and self-respecting Association so that they would be able to get the hearing which they deserve; and, in getting this hearing, I do not think misunderstandings, as what the Hon. Premier suggested, would arise when you put your argument in a more cogent manner. You can only do that when you organise yourself in a better form of Association.

I have discussed this matter with some of them and one gets the impression that all they have done is to almost throw up their arms in horror about this matter; and yet they are admitting that they are not getting the representation which they would like from their own Association because they do not have faith in it. In their annual Report the President of the Association said that the members of the Civil Service were not showing enough faith in their own Association. That can be a great factor in the bargaining power of this Association; and that can be easily the influence or certainly the contributing factor why they got this misunderstanding.

I think if you can get these matters handled at the Whitley Council level in a reasonable manner, it would not be absolutely necessary for the House of Assembly as such to spend all this time on a question which is a matter which can be settled by negotiations between the Whitley Council and the official side. I think it is certainly something which they should take in mind.
11.10 p.m.

I have heard members of the Civil Service say that the Government is in a sort of way hindering their organisation; I do not know if those remarks are completely justified. These members of the Civil Service believe that they do not get as much sympathy as they should get; and the Government should pay some attention to that matter. I would not like any of the charges of members of the Civil Service to be justified from the point of view of saying that they are not getting the support which they want.

I believe that that is one of the fundamental causes for the protracted debate on this Resolution; I believe that there is more to this matter than the mere getting of \$9.00; I believe you want the Civil Service Association to get the respect they deserve on the Whitley Council so that you will not have to get a protracted debate on this matter.

Finally, I want to say this. On the last occasion when the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke in this House (I do not know if he meant exactly what I have written down in my notes) he said that this cost of living allowance was not the thing you want, but an addition to the basic wage, because when you go on vacation you will not be getting this allowance. It may have been meant otherwise, but this is what I have the hon. member as saying. I am wondering if that is a fact; I would like that to be explained by some member of the Government in reply. It might not have been meant in that way, I repeat, but those are the notes which I took.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of correction. I spoke on two matters; I also spoke on the question of pensionable emoluments. I was not sure of it, but I made the point that the law relating to holidays with pay makes reference to the basic wage. The law deals with basic wages and not cost of living allowance.

The other point I made was that if this is a non-pensionable allowance it means that it is not pensionable and if an officer dies before it becomes part of his pensionable allowance, he would lose that part of his pension. I was referring to the people in the Key Scale.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I am glad that the hon. member has made that explanation, because the interpretation must be something to which consideration must be given by the members of the Government. I do believe that there is a strong sentimental argument about giving only the people in the lower bracket this increase; but if one brings it down to a financial argument, I believe that it is a weak case and it can easily be disposed of by members of the Government with figures which they have at their disposal. I have made a special appeal to the Civil Service Association that if they had an organisation or an association, this sort of thing would not arise again and you would have better conditions in the Service.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Opposition and the Government are so diametrically opposed on this issue that it is hardly worth while prolonging this debate. (A MEMBER: And still you are prolonging it!) To begin with, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in my experience that I have heard that a cost of living allowance must, of necessity, apply right down through the ranks of the Service. This Cost of Living allowance originated away back down in the 1940's when the War was a few years old, in order to provide a little extra allowance to Civil Servants so as to meet the rising cost of living. It was then called a War Bonus. Now, the terminology has been changed to a Cost of Living Allowance.

When it began in 1942 in British Guiana, it only applied to a Civil Servant who was drawing \$60 a month and under; then in Trinidad it was first applied to salaries of \$120.00 a month and under, and then it went to salaries of \$200.00 a month and under. As a matter of fact, in Trinidad in 1954, when the Government disbursed something like \$4 million as a cost of living allowance to Civil Servants, that \$4 million was distributed only to a certain point in the Service; it did not go right through the Service. I repeat, it did not go right through the Service. (Hon. M. E. COX: Be careful!) I know about what I am talking.
11.20 p.m.

Even although they distributed \$4 million, people above a certain level in the Service never got a single cent. Well, now, this is where we are diametrically opposed to the Government. We were told by a Minister not long ago that they believe in the principle of share-and-share alike, and therefore if they had an additional cost of living to be given out, everybody should share and share alike.

Let me remind the Committee that we are now paying our Chief Justice \$12,000 a year; we are paying the Attorney General \$10,320 a year; we are paying the Solicitor General \$8,160 a year; we are paying the Accountant General \$7,680; we are paying the Commissioner of Police \$8,160; we are paying the Director of Agriculture \$9,360. We are paying all these comparatively high salaries to the Department Heads in the country, salaries which the Opposition has contended from time to time are beyond the capacity of the country to pay, but that Government has found it possible to pay these salaries to these Department Heads.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the cost of living has increased. The hon. senior member for the City has disclosed today that the price of many important commodities has risen by as much as 30% or 40% in the last three or four years. Are you going to tell me that this principle of share and share alike must be applied to the extent that a man drawing a salary of \$8,000, \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year must get the same cost of living allowance as your cantonnier at \$13 a week will get? That is the basis of our argument. The man at the top is in a better position to cope with the increase in the temporary cost of living than the man at the bottom.

We know, and they know, that in 1961 which is around election time, they are going to come in with a salary revision. That is the usual practice; that is what they did in 1956; so you can assume that in 1961 they will come in with another salary revision.

Our contention, therefore, Mr. Chairman, is that you should give the money which you can spare to give now to people in the lower brackets and let those in the higher brackets who are better able to take care of themselves wait until your general election salary revision. We know that is what they intend to do; and the Minister, perhaps unwittingly, let the cat out of the bag by saying that as soon as they see what they can do, they will do something more. They are not going to see what they can do until 1961.

It was since 1957 that the hon. member for St. Lucy and myself presented a Resolution for an increase in the cost of living allowance for the lower paid brackets in the Public Service. The debate initiated by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is still fresh in our minds and in the minds of the public; and none of us expected that, when at long last after this agitation on our part the Government did pay some attention to implement the suggestion, they would come in with a proposal to give this cost of living allowance right down through the entire Civil Service.

We heard tonight from the Government's spokesman, that, to give these people in the lower brackets an increase of 25% as proposed by the hon. senior member for the City, we would be running the risk of making the country bankrupt and losing our Constitution. We were taken all over the world, even down St. Andrew where we heard about the Conservation Scheme; even the Pig Subsidy Scheme and the next Five Year Plan five years from now, were excuses for not paying a few cents more to people in the lower brackets.

It is evident, Mr. Chairman, that when you were raising the salary scale for Department Heads to the fantastic heights as they are, nobody thought we were going to lose our Constitution or run the country bankrupt. Nobody thought when we were spending \$75,000 a year for the same Department Heads and senior officials that we were running the risk of losing our Constitution or running the country bankrupt. (A VOICE: How do you pay your staff?) Better than you pay yours and better than you pay your printing staff too!

It is remarkable that that same Government can afford to pay Department Heads salaries almost to the same level as those paid by Trinidad with six times our revenue without fear at all of losing the Constitution or running the country bankrupt; but, as soon as you talk about something

approaching a living wage to the lower ranking Civil Servant, we are going to run the country bankrupt, lose our Constitution and become a Crown colony. That is the same kind of nonsensical argument that one would expect to hear if we had the most reactionary die-hards running the country.

You can find money, Mr. Chairman, for luxuries, because, certainly, leave passage is a luxury. You can find money for allowing well paid Civil Servants to retire at 55 instead of 60; but you cannot find money to give a 25% increase to underpaid workers in the Government Service.

When a few weeks ago they increased the price of beer to 38 cents a bottle, or when not so long ago they increased bus fares, apparently they were under the impression that the purchasing power of the Department Heads drawing \$10,000 was the same as the cantonnier drawing \$12 a week; because, now that they are going to increase the cost of living, that allowance is the same, Mr. Chairman, for the man drawing \$800 a year as it is for a man drawing £1,000 a year.

This principle of share and share alike which we heard initiated tonight never appealed to us at all. When you have the spectacle of other Governments in the area providing a cost of living allowance for its employees all down through the years since the War, and in almost all cases only allowing these allowances to be applied to salaries below a certain fixed level, then, Mr. Chairman, you have to ask yourself the question: why, in Barbados, Government should allow itself to be bamboozled by the officials at top into taking up money, which it says it has not got, to give them a cost of living allowance on the same level as they pay to the lower members of the Government Service?

Of course, the answer is easy to be worked out. We know that this Government is very beholden to the Civil Service; we know that in actual fact the officials run this country; we know that no Minister dares say "no" to a request from a senior official like that; because in almost all cases, the official is the king-pin in the Department. And if he is disgruntled, well, then, woe betide the Minister. May I submit, Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Nothing could be further from the truth than the statement which the hon. member has just made. It is not true, and it is giving the public a wrong impression and really making this Committee feel that something exists which does not exist.
11.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is the general expressed opinion in the Service. I will put it this way. There are some Ministers who command the respect of officials in their Departments but, I repeat, there are not many Ministers who command the respect of officials in their Departments for the simple reason that too much of the work which should be executed by the Ministers is done by the officials in the Departments.

I know of one Ministry in which the public servant actually formulates the policy; I myself have gone there on more than one occasion and that official suggested certain proposals. If the Minister who is responsible for formulating policy has no ideas and is dependent on the Service, I say, God help this country. If the Minister cannot formulate policy, he should not be there. I know of no other country in the world in which the Civil Servants have responsibility in the direction that Civil Servants in Barbados have.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Will the hon. member go further and say to which Minister he is referring? Call the names. Let us get the truth.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Hon. Minister wants to amuse himself, I will do it. I am saying that, with the limited funds at their disposal, the reason why they had to carry on this Cost of Living Allowance right from the top to the bottom

is because they are afraid of the officials. The officials said that they wanted it to apply to them and the Ministers dared not say no.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said something about a disgruntled Service, but the tail does not wag the dog. The officials in the higher part of the Service are reasonable people; and they will have to admit that their need is not as great as the others. It was a simple matter for the Government to say to the people 'beyond a fixed salary: "We feel at this stage that you should not share in what we have to spend, and ask that you wait until we make a further revision. I am sure that there could not be so wide a dissatisfaction in the Service as there is now.

All of this jargon of what happened thirty or forty years ago is of no use to a man who has to pay increased bus fare, or who has to pay 38 cents for a bottle of beer. What the Minister should be concerned with is the present cost of living, and with the agricultural labourers who worked for one shilling a day previous to 1937. When that man gets \$13.20 a week now, he has to pay 30 cents for bus fare.

Nothing has been said here tonight which is of any evidence that the Government cannot pay a 25% increase as was suggested by the Opposition for this type of work. Are you going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that because we have a scheme in St. Andrew, or because we want to spend some money on a pig subsidy scheme, that the lower grade workers in the Government Service should be more under-paid? It is just as if the Hon. Minister said to you that he wanted to give you a small increase in your wages, but he could not pay you because he has a girl friend in St. Andrew and he wants to give her a pair of shoes.

We are taken from one end of the island to the next with many kinds of irrelevant (and in some cases) illogical arguments to prove that because the Government has to spend \$776,000 on cost of living allowances, every employee in the Government Service must share and share alike. The Opposition has rightly asked of what practical use is \$9.00 a month to a man drawing \$900 or \$1,000. It is neither here nor there to such a man, but it certainly means a lot to the man who is getting \$13.20 a week. 11.40 p.m.

It is high time that the Government realise, as has been demonstrated in recent elections, that the people of this country are no longer to be influenced politically by unearthing ancient history; especially when the facts of present-day existence are so intolerable that people are being forced to live mainly on credit because the remuneration paid to them is manifestly insufficient to cope with current living costs. When the hon. senior member for the City tonight quoted the comparative increases in the cost of certain essential commodities, from the howl of surprise which rose from the Government Benches, one would have thought that the Government members were foreigners from the Antipodes, that they were there for the last ten years and suddenly came back here tonight to be presented with these facts for the first time. You could not have thought that they control the Government; that they should know what is going on in the country and keep their fingers on things. They confess ignorance of the current cost of living and that is one reason for the insufficiency of the increase which they are going to foist on the lower paid workers in the Government Service. In other words, if they were more conversant with living conditions in the colony they would not have to wait for the Opposition to suggest what, in effect, would be a little nearer to a living wage than the figures which they propose.

Mr. Chairman, it is really amusing to hear the Minister prattling about the development of Barbados when this Island, to a lesser extent than any other of the bigger islands in the Caribbean area, shows evidence of no attempt at fundamental development. You compare the increases in revenue in Trinidad and in Jamaica between 1949 and 1959 with the increase in revenue in Barbados; you compare the economic and industrial expansion in

any of these islands with ourselves. Within ten years Jamaica had had nearly eighty industries; we have not had eight and you will see the reason why, with a stagnated economy, it is impossible to pay a better living wage to the Civil Servants.

There is nobody else who would share the sentiments expressed by the Minister and in the manner in which he has expressed them. If we left Barbados and returned to it, we are in it because it is our home, and, because the country has certain characteristics and physical charm which appeal to us; it has certain climatic and living conditions which we like and therefore we are pleased to be here.

Only somebody who is blind or who is lacking in perception to see what is going on around us, could fail to deplore the condition in which this island is. The unemployment figure in Barbados is higher than it is in any other island in the West Indies. Let anybody in this Chamber go to Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, or Kingston, Jamaica, and compare either of these towns with Bridgetown; he would see that we are in the doldrums, and these islands are bulging with economic activity; they are getting somewhere and we are getting nowhere; if he does not see that, then something is wrong with him.

To think of comparing the economic activity and economic expansion of this island with what is going on in the other centres in this area, is like comparing a donkey with some English racing thoroughbred. It is because a false sense of values and inability to see what is going on outside, that this country is in the position in which it is. Ministers go out at Government expense and they come back here, and there is no real benefit from the trip.

Mr. Chairman, you have had the opportunity of visiting some of the leading cities in the West Indies and I am quite sure that you would not echo the sentiments which have been expressed here tonight. If people appreciate being quiet and regard that as being more desirable than activity in the sense that you starve peacefully and you starve in idle surroundings, that is all well and good; but we have to employ the maximum number of people in the community and provide them with the necessities of life rather than have a depressed economy, creeping slowly forward with unemployment figures and what not. If that is so, well then, I cannot, for the life of me, fail to be concerned over a statement which professes the zenith of economic aspirations and not seeing the country as it really is.

There is no point in replying to the irrelevant remarks which were made during the debate this evening. This remark about the Opposition being all one does not worry me at all. Most of us sat here a little over ten years ago when the present Government was in actual coalition with the Conservative Government, when two members from their Party and two from the Conservative Party sat on the Executive Committee and ran the country in actual open coalition. 11.50 p.m.

It is, perhaps, an attractive political usage to label the Opposition as "one" purely because they have to vote against the Government as "one;" but that does not mean that the people in this country are so gullible as not to appreciate the fact that, if you are not in the Government, you are out of it; if you do not belong to the Government and you belong to one of the other Parties which vote against the Government, then you must all vote "no". If tomorrow morning circumstances compel them to form a coalition with the Conservatives again, they would be the first to do it.

Anyhow, Sir, I am not concerned with the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph as to whether or not the difference between the total which we are now allocating to this matter and the amount which will be required if the cost of living allowance was tacked

on to salaries of only \$600 a year would be enough to give the required amount to the employees below this level. That does not concern us at all. Our proposition is that the minimum for now should be around \$3 a day; and whether it costs \$7,000 or \$8,000, the Government should find the money because this increase is by no means a reasonable increase.

Many times before this current financial Session is ended, the Government will come here with proposals calling for the expenditure of reasonably large sums of little or no value to the country, and they will find the money to do it, and there would not be any talk about running the country bankrupt, losing our Constitution, and becoming a Crown Colony. This bogey is only raised now because Government knows that the arguments of the Opposition are well founded. They know that they have been taken for a ride by the upper brackets of the Civil Service, and they know that the correct procedure in this case is to provide this cost of living allowance up to a certain level in the Service and then in 1960 or 1961, when they have a revision of salaries, to give any increase that could be afforded then to the upper brackets of the Service.

This share and share alike is their brand of Socialism, but it certainly is not the socialism which the lesser paid people would like to see implemented; because it is not a question of equalising things; it is a question of giving more to those who really have and giving less than you should to those who have not.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I regret that you are placed in the position at this late time of night to have to listen to the result of what was started by the Hon. Minister of Trade. My speech now will be divided into two parts, the first part of which may be considered unparliamentary and in the same manner as the Minister for Trade. The second part of my speech, Sir, I hope will be based on my original speech, on factual arguments about this particular Resolution.

As far as my memory serves me, I have not yet spoken since the Minister made his harrangue on the 26th May, 1959. It is extremely regrettable, Sir, and that day, the 26th May, 1959, must always be a black mark on the records of this Honourable House. It must be a black mark for more reasons than one.

In the first place, the Hon. Minister was allowed to use veiled insinuations, mere speculation, and vague generalities based upon evidence that would not stand up in any court of law. It contained most unparliamentary language; and while he is not in his seat, I must say that the hon. junior member for St. James is as much to blame as the Hon. Minister of Trade. He can leave now because he knows that when he is in the Chair he cannot stop them from doing anything, but I hope that you have learnt a lesson while you were away, and that you will bring this House to respect the Civil Service and the public.

The Hon. Minister who should be setting the example lowers himself to the mud. When you are down in the mud, can you bring anybody out of the mud? (A VOICE: You are in a quagmire!) The hon. junior member for St. James sits there with two faces. I regret he is not in his seat and wish that somebody would call him. He has one face with a grin on it for those over there, and he has another face for us over here with a serious expression; and, whenever anyone on this side attempts to speak, he has the attitude of trying to stop him. Let me say now that any attempt to put him back in that Chair is an insult to this Honourable House. If one is incapable of undertaking any job, let one remove oneself rather than bring this Honourable House to ridicule.

12.01 a.m.

A VOICE: What is the indictment?

Mr. DOWDING: Let me finish one point first. I am going further. I have spoken about the Hon. Minister of Trade already and I have spoken of the Chairman who

was acting at the time. I regret that the Hon. Premier is not in his place, but I have told him exactly how I feel about it. He said at the end of his speech that he does not enter into acrimonious debate, but I say that he is unable to control the Hon. Minister in his acrimonious, insulting and depraving speech. I feel it is my duty, as long as I am a member of this Hon. House, to point out to everyone concerned, in spite of how the *Advocate* may twist it, in spite of the permission of the public, that the Government has an Information Officer now and they should have the speeches of hon. members recorded so that they should be put over the Radio. I have suggested that already. Do you think they will put loud speakers in the Public Building yard so that the public will hear the Government's Business? Oh no. They talk about if they have no straw, they cannot build bricks. No truer statement could be said referring to their ability.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. Referring to a remark which the hon. member made in my absence, I wish to tell him that I may be a fly but a very dangerous one. I want the hon. member to understand that what he is indulging in today, I had the pleasure of refusing.

Mr. DOWDING: That, Sir, is the type of point of order which is far from being a point of order. As I have said, I hope you will try to raise the standard of debate in this House. Do not let that hon. member for one minute think that I am afraid of him or anyone else at all. I will repeat that, for him to sit in that Chair at all. I will repeat that, for him to sit in that Chair and allow what he did to go on on Tuesday, 26th May, last he would be an insult to put him back in that Chair.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. In reply to that statement of the hon. member, I have as much right in here as he has. I am here at the will of the people. Let me tell him that I am not afraid of an election; I can face an election tomorrow.

I want the hon. member to understand that his voice does not frighten me. I can be as loud as he is. Let it be clearly understood that my being in the Chair and even allowing any little privilege one way or the other is something to which I am entitled; but if an hon. member wants to resort to violence or to unparliamentary language, I have a perfect right as long as I am in the Chair to speak to him and I will do it again. I want him to clearly understand that a man's voice is not the semblance of his intelligence.

Mr. DOWDING: I wonder what he thinks the semblance of intelligence is. He gets up on a point of order and says that the people voted for him and he has a right to be in here. Has that anything to do with him in the Chair? If there were anybody else, he would not have gone in it. Nobody else would take the Chair so the hon. member had to go into it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat my indictment. The first is that I would like a Chairman who is able to take that Chair and fill it with dignity. The next thing is this. When the Hon. Premier was addressing the Committee, at the end of his speech, he said that he does not take part in acrimonious debate. If that is so, I feel it is still his duty and his particular job to ensure that acrimonious and unparliamentary debates do not go on in this House and that he should insist on not letting it go on. The Hon. Leader of this House is the one person who should be able to satisfy all persons of this House in a debate and it is his duty to assist and to compromise this Hon. House in debate and he should not have used the type of debate which he used on the 26th May, 1959.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say something as regards the irrelevancy which the Hon. Minister of Trade brought into his speech on that date. We were told by him that Sir Grantley was running a horse and buggy through the Government. He took us to Ghana and then came back to British Guiana, then to Trinidad and then came back here and talked of the hurricane. At the same time we were

afforded a great deal of abuse by him. When I say "we", just allow me to say that I regret that it has been accepted that "we" and "they" can be used in here in reference to hon. members; and I hope when I turn to the latter part of my speech that I will not refer to hon. members as "we" or "they" but shall refer to them as hon. members, learned or otherwise.
12.10 a.m.

All kinds of veiled accusations were hurled at the members on this side under the pretence of the use of the word "they". There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever that such a debate could only have come not from a statesman but from a "misstatesman". (Hon. R. G. MAPP: What is that?) Add on "ship" at the end and you will get there eventually.

The debate hurled vague generalities and insinuations around and I would like to give a bit of advice to the hon. member, which I gave to the hon. member who sits on my right. I appreciate the problem - and it is that he can disagree without being disagreeable and that is the gift of a diplomat. You should be able to disagree without being disagreeable. The taxpayers' money is wasted on Tuesday after Tuesday and this vendetta is usually started by the Minister of Trade. You can check the records and find out who starts it off at the beginning. The hon. member, who sits on my right, makes a point, and he resorts to the same situation to which I have to resort to bring a matter forcibly to the public.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I appeal to the hon. member? I think the hon. member has cleared the air with regard to the speeches which have been made before. The hon. member will recall that in his opening speech he said that he would divide it into two parts - one was to reply to speeches which had been made and the other was to be on the Resolution in question. Now that the air has been cleared, may I appeal to the hon. member to come to the second part of his speech so that we can get on with the Resolution.

Mr. DOWDING: I will do as you have requested very shortly because I myself am rather tired. I appreciate your point, Mr. Chairman, but you must also appreciate my position and my point. Listening to a speech of the sort made by the hon. member is of no use to the debate. In the actual debate the hon. member tried to substantiate - and it is interesting to see that the "Advocate", that newspaper which they say is run by Conservatives, was said to carry what is called a defence of the Government; but there was no defence, because there was no debate about the Resolution at all.

The hon. member told the House what private enterprise was paying, and this afternoon I heard him qualify that statement by saying that it was the bulk of them. That again is a remarkable statement, because the hon. member has not given any check other than the one which he wanted to give, and it is this particular list where it was possible for the wage figures to be obtained. His source of information must have been his own, because I do feel that in any debate any hon. member of this House would be entitled to be told exactly what category of worker was mentioned, whether that worker was entitled to a pension or any other grant, and exactly the particular type of person to whom he was referring. That has to be verified. Private enterprise is still the strongest enterprise in the world today, and in spite of the hon. member's attempt at vilification, it will continue to be the strongest enterprise in the world because it does not work on "I take from you what I can get".

Speaking of the sugar industry, I do not know what are the wages to which the hon. member was referring, but I will ask him to tell me if people in the sugar industry employed in factories who are "A" class men receive \$5.28 per day. I would like to ask him at which factory "B" class men are getting \$4.40 per day and "C" class men \$3.20. (ASIDES). If the hon. senior member for St. Philip thinks that I am making fun, I would be perfectly willing to show him the persons who are paid

and he can interview them and find out if what I am stating are facts. Factory mechanics get from 57¢ to 66¢ per hour, from 42¢ to 55¢ an hour, and from 32¢ to 40¢ per hour.

12.20 a.m.

Now, Sir, I have heard some hon. member on that side of this House say that the sugar industry employs the most persons in this island. He said that there are a number of factories, but he did not tell us whether he was referring to in-crop or out-of-crop wages; he merely generalised to suit his particular speech. Apart from that, Sir, there are certain increments which automatically obtain during the course of service amounting to something like 44¢ per hour or something like that. Now, Sir, the hon. member quoted various figures of the lowest paid persons around the town. It is my experience that counter clerks are paid \$21 and over at a number of places, and that the lowest paid is \$10; that is the female counter clerk I am talking about. I know that in other parts of the town much higher salaries are paid than what I am quoting and a woman gets as high as \$18.50.

The hon. member did not worry to tell the public - and he was purely talking to the public on that day and not debating - that he knew that counter clerks, cashiers and all such are given a Christmas bonus which, in some firms I have known, amounts to six months' salary. That was not mentioned, nor did he mention the other amenities supplied by some private firms to the effect that their employees are allowed to purchase goods with a 10% discount. He did not mention that at a number of private employers' places they run canteens for the benefit of the workers, counter clerks or otherwise. He merely quoted the lowest possible figures in order to try to substantiate that two wrongs make a right; that is, because private enterprise is wrong and Government is wrong, then they must be right.

We on this side, Sir have pointed out that we disagree entirely with the principle adopted. Now, Sir, masons are getting as high as \$4.48 and more, and carpenters get the same thing; and what would have been interesting was if the hon. member had quoted the figures added on to the sugar industry crop time wages.

I have here in front of me a sheet which shows what private enterprise pays. Let me say at this juncture that there is existing in this island today a strong Trade Union; thank God, politics has been removed from it. (hon. M. E. COX: Hear! Hear! You thrive on it!) I would hate to see the day return when the Government will again have to do what they did. (A VOICE: What is that?) They acted against their own principle during a strike to protect the public.

Now, Sir, an "A" class man working for nineteen weeks in one crop time; would it surprise the hon. member to know what private enterprise pays? Well, Sir, with total wages and production bonus - I did not hear him speak about production bonus or holiday with pay - that man works for \$2,602.50. A "B" class man during the same period works for \$2,267.74, and the lowest paid worker in many a factory during the crop does not go under \$40 a week. That is private enterprise working in conjunction with a sound Union. Now, we have to deal with Government who is working in conjunction with what seems to be - and a very good point was made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - an unsound Union. I could go on quoting these figures which the hon. member failed to give and which would really unfold the whole of private enterprise and numerous other jobs.

If we are to be successful with our Civil Servants, the first thing we have to do, Mr. Chairman, is to see that the Ministers and members of this House demand respect from the Civil Service. The second thing we have to do is to ascertain, as I said in my first speech, that proper work studies are made. The only point which the hon. member made in his debate was towards the end of it when he said that, in order to increase, we must produce. We know that we can only pay increased wages if we have increased production.

2457.
Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied that the production of the Civil Service is, up to a point, any more than the production of this Hon. House of Assembly. What is produced in here is negligible in comparison to what we are paying; and the suggestion that was made from this side of the House by hon. member after hon. member was a sound one based on the fact that it is incorrect to give the same thing at the bottom as at the top.
12.30 a.m.

Sir, I am also under the impression that this is not a Cost of Living Allowance. It is an increase in the basic cost of living and therefore the basic wage of the workers must be increased. Those two points have been stressed by members of the Opposition but instead of their being a debate on those two points, we were led far and farther astray until the Hon. Minister of Trade himself was so far astray that he had to come back into this Hon. House subsequently and make a statement as regards what appeared in the *Advocate* with reference to the speech he made.

On that point, I want to warn this House that it is time that this Hon. House take note of its privileges. No newspaper has any right to print matters which are degrading to this House, particularly that newspaper which is referred to as the Conservative newspaper.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make my final point as regards this Resolution. The hon. senior member for the City has replied to a number of statements made by the Hon. Minister of Trade and I will not deal with them any further, as Your Honour has asked me not to do so. There are an awful lot to deal with but I will leave them out.

Sir, you know that it is our right to be industrious, but when you have an industrious man who is incapable at the helm, it is a very incapable thing for the rest of the army to be capable. That was said by Lord Montgomery. If we can keep a debate on the subject matter we will do much better, and we will raise the level of the production of Civil Servants and the production of this Island.

I cannot possibly agree with the unworthy debate by Government in this matter, and, using the hon. junior member for St. Joseph's argument, figures can be produced to show whether it is fiscally possible or not to make this allowance a more reasonable sum to give to the workers at bottom by not giving it to people over a certain bracket. Figures ought to be produced to show whether there is \$100 or \$1,000 which could be made available from this source for further division among those in lower brackets.

I do not agree that you should give this cost of living allowance of \$9 to the man at the bottom as well as to the man at the top. The principle is wrong and I will never agree with it. It is not practicable. The Civil Servants in the upper part of the Service are not going to look at it as anything, and it is only going to further affect the production of the Civil Servants. That is the main point of the debate in a few words. Surely this Government ought to realise that at this stage of the game it is unnecessary for us to talk about votes, when election year is so many years behind.

May I, at this stage, pause to say that the first real effort that was given to this debate by a Minister was given by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in the first part of his speech; but then he lapsed into the same mistake as the Hon. Minister of Trade. He certainly did give us in the first part of his speech some facts on which we could go, and I must compliment him and must confess that I was somewhat surprised; but I hope to hear more like that from him.

Sir, it is of no use your telling the Opposition about what you want to do; it is the duty of the Opposition to tell you what you have done; that is what I am about to do now. It is not sufficient for you to say that you cannot pay this money and that you want to develop and that you have to

give an amount to development and all that sort of thing. It is not good enough to say that when you are losing \$100,000 per month and more on subsidising buses.

I am going back to the last hurricane as a result of which this Government lost over one million dollars, or it was taken away. All that is not good enough. At the present moment several hundreds of dollars, if it is not million of dollars, are out on outstanding loans due to the old Housing Authority; therefore it is not good enough to tell us because of all these things that you cannot afford to put more money to this cost of living allowance.

Do not say that to spend more would obviate any particular development that is being done today. The development of this Island was recommended by the Conservatives away back in my first election to this House; that was in 1946.

Sir, this matter affects the Civil Servants of this Island. A dissatisfied Civil Service is, in my opinion, like a wheel of a modern motor car without a proper greased bearing. Taxpayers of this Island will suffer if the hub of this country is not properly paid, properly satisfied and properly supervised. I repeat what I said in the beginning. As far as I am concerned, whether it be at the top or at the bottom, every man must be made to understand that he has to produce and this where the Hon. Minister comes in.
12.40 a.m.

I am just waiting for developments because I have worked day and night in order to find out what is going on in this particular Department. I know of instances where production is not forthcoming from this Department.

Mr. Chairman, I regret and I apologise for having been unable to contain myself sufficiently in order to allow you to stop listening to me earlier. I do hope that from now on, this House, after this debate, will return to proper debating and not political harangue.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an appeal to hon. members to come back here on Thursday. I will repeat what I said on the last occasion; that is, that this is a matter which we want to get finished as soon as possible. We also have to pass a Resolution dealing with an increase of pensions and another Resolution in respect of Civil Servants' Housing loans and they are very important items. The Civil Servants are very anxious to get these loans for the purpose of building and repairing their homes, and I am therefore appealing to hon. members to come back here on Thursday. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 11th June, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to move that the words and symbols "Thursday 11th" be deleted in order to substitute the words and symbols "Tuesday, the 16th". I would like to point out this. We have intimated before that it is impossible for us to re-arrange our business when we have only a short notice, and in this case, a few hours' notice.

The fact of this matter is that today is Wednesday, the 10th June, and we are notified that we have to meet tomorrow which is Thursday, the 11th, without our even given the interval of a day. That, Mr. Speaker, would only be possible with the most extreme inconvenience not only to ourselves, but to the various persons whom we serve in our vocations. We are being asked to meet tomorrow, and this is the first intimation that we, on this side, have had that the Government had been proposing to meet again tomorrow, Thursday.

It is not like the Leader of the House to deal with such discourtesy, and I trust that he is not being prompted by anyone either on his right or on his left. One wonders what may have caused the Leader of the House to suggest that today, being Wednesday, we should adjourn to meet tomorrow being Thursday. The matters which the hon. member has mentioned to us are important, but if it is a question of three years and one week in respect of the housing loans, I do not think that will make so much difference to the Civil Servants. I suggest to the hon. member that he re-consider his motion and that we meet six days instead of seven days earlier on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would like to say that the Hon. Leader of the House cannot be serious with his motion. He has allowed the debate on the Town and Country Planning Bill to intervene on two days in the discussion of these Resolutions.

A meeting on Thursday will not suit other hon. members who already have other meetings arranged for that day. The hon. senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for Christ Church and myself already have engagements for that day. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member has spoken already.) The hon. member is always interjecting some stupid remark. The fact that we have already spoken is not enough; we have to vote on these matters.

If they persist in this ridiculous proposal, we have to record our vote against it; and it would not be fair at the last moment to deny at least four members of the Opposition the opportunity of being able to record their votes because of previous public engagements.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, in support of the amendment, I must state that I am a member of the Southern

District Council and important business has to be done by that Council. As far as I know, the majority of the Councils meet on Thursdays. I do feel that the Government would appreciate that a number of their members and members of the Opposition should attend the work of these Local Government Councils which is very far behind hand.

I, Sir, cannot support the motion for Thursday at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I should just like to refer hon. members to Standing Order No. 23 "Method of putting the Question on Amendments" paragraph 3, which reads as follows:-

"Upon an amendment to leave out words and insert other words instead, a question shall first be proposed from the Chair 'that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question', and if that question be negatived the question shall then be proposed 'That those words be there inserted'".

I hope hon. members have followed on.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER and Mr. STRAUGHN - 10.

NOES: Mr. DOWDING; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 6.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Thursday, June 11th at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER and Mr. STRAUGHN - 10.

NOES: Mr. DOWDING; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 6.
12.55 a.m.