THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 11th 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)*; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. R. G. MAPP, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing)*; Mr. T. O. BRYAN, *(Chairman of Committees)*; Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services)*; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)*; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education)*; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 2nd June, 1959, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. *(After a pause)*. There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 14) Order, 1959.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 15) Order, 1959.

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Statement of Post Offices Advances for the payment of Money Orders to 31st March, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1959".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 14) Order, 1959".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 15) Order, 1959."

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to consolidate and amend the law making provision for Government Scholarships and Exhibitions and for other purposes connected therewith.

QUESTION

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

Will the Minister state whether it is the intention of the Government to have the printing of the proposed revision of the Laws of Barbados done locally?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to consolidate and amend the law making provision for Government Scholarships and Exhibitions and for other purposes connected therewith, be now read a first time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members must stand in their places and their voices must be heard when seconding motions.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As far as I remember, I stood up and seconded the hon. member's motion. Your Honour may not have noticed it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not.

The question that a Bill to consolidate and amend the law making provision for Government Scholarships and Exhibitions and for other purposes connected therewith be now read a first time, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

EXEMPTION FROM PROVISIONS OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I beg to give notice of my intention to make a motion to the effect that Orders Nos. 1, 3 and 5 on the Order Paper under "Government Business" be exempted from the provisions of paragraph 8 of Stand-

ing Order No. 5. I must apologise for not giving notice of that before.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister to make the motion.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1, 3 and 5 be exempted from the provisions of Paragraph 8 of Standing Order No. 5.

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

The question that Orders Nos. 1, 3 and 5 be exempted from the provisions of paragraph 8 of Standing Order No. 5, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first 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. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

12.25 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE No.1
COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House adjourned on the last occasion, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, speaking on this motion at one stage, was making an appeal to me; but in dealing with the Resolution, he said that it was the duty of hon. members who did not agree with this Resolution, as it stands, to make it clear for the Ministers' own consideration. He spoke of the commitments of the Government and made the statement that those of us who do not agree with this Resolution seem to be more willing to force the Government, or in his own words, "jockey the Government" into a position in which we would be coming near to a Crown Colony. The hon. member came into this House in 1944 when the new enfranchisement came into being, and I do not believe you have had more trenchant criticism of anything done in relation to raising the standard of living of people than by him. He has said that since becoming a Minister .....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. When the hon. member refers to "trenchant criticism", does he mean for or against?

Mr. WALCOTT: I will explain. He made these criticisms against any question of a low standard of living. He came to this Chamber on the professed Socialist ticket of that day, the West Indian National Congress, and he was one of the shining lights.

There is no question that the money at the disposal of the Government in the days when he came was far from what it is today; in those days he insisted that the wages, and what was being done, were far from what should be done. Now, today, he is a member of the Government with a Budget nearly three times as large as what it was then, and he is suggesting to members who today ask for a figure approximating to a minimum wage of $16 or $18 a week that we are doing something to make this country a Crown Colony.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, what happens to any person who can make that complete metamorphosis by saying that our suggestions would cause this country to lose its Constitution. I am wondering if he is suggesting that the only way we are to maintain our Constitution is to have wages which must be admitted on all sides are below.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think the hon. member is taking things out of their context. Among other things I said that, if we prove ourselves to be incompetent in running the Government and anything happens, they will say that we are running this Government into a Crown Colony.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to give any false representation of as to what the hon. member had said. It is my intention to deal with the argument which the hon. member used, because, in my humble opinion, the argument which the hon. member used is the type of argument that has been dominating the minds of the Conservative element both in Government and out of Government in this island for many years. When it comes from an elected Minister it means that it is given more publicity; and employers can use it for the purpose of showing that things cannot be so bad with them since you find that, in Government circles or in Government itself, these propositions are made.

The hon. member should bear in mind that one of the first charges on any business or on any Government is wages and salaries for the people whom they employ. He spoke about the development schemes, building a hospital and many other things; but all these things have to be done by the people who work for the Government, and unless you are going to give satisfaction to them, you are not doing anything.

I make no idle boast, Mr. Chairman, when I say that the Government today cannot - and I emphasise "cannot" - justify the minimum wage of the amount which they are asking us to agree to. They have to admit that that minimum wage is below what can be regarded as anything approximating to a decent standard of living in a civilised community. They have to admit that a man getting $15 or $16 now, with what he has to purchase, is living a minimum decent standard of living, knowing that it is not a wage in which he can look forward to any increase. It is not the wage of a boy who is now entering the service; it is the wage for a class of worker who enters in that class and dies in that class. Do you expect, therefore, that class of man to live a life in Barbados comparable to the other people who are employed in the service? That is to say, do you think it is reasonable that a poor man should not be able to buy food, rent a house at a decent standard of living and buy clothing? When you ask that question, Mr. Chairman, why then is there this resistance to giving a man what can be regarded as a proper wage? And when you make a comparison you are told that you grudge somebody. Does any of us grudge anybody when we ask for something on which a person can live?

12.35 p.m.

I have brought instances here to show that the Trade Union has had difficulty in getting private employers to increase wages; but in many sectors of private employment, you will find a higher wage paid than what we have here.

In 1956, I asked the Government to give a labourer the minimum wage of $15 a week instead of $13.20. It is not that I am coming now and asking for $15 a week for them: I can produce one of my electioneering pamphlets to justify the stand which I took then.

Sir, if you divide this wage into seven, you will see how little it is. A man has to eat every day and he has to pay rent; and when you have this wage rate, how do you expect him to live? What do you reasonably accept as a minimum to give a man per week?

The Hon. Minister appealed to me to show more lines of co-operation. It is the same as asking me to be a hypocrite. What is he asking a private employer to pay when Government is paying out these low wages? Sometimes we are forced, in private employment, to accept less than what Government is paying; the argument which a private employer sometimes puts up to the Union is that he has now started a new business and that the business has not paid dividends for the last five years; therefore, the position is not the same as with a company which has been able to pay dividends over the years. When an employer brings an argument like that, you do not want to appear that you want to force people out of business; the cry would be that, because the Union forced them to pay such rates, the company was unable to operate any longer.

It is a different thing with the Government. The Government taxes the whole community: and it is that money which the Government uses for its expenditure. The Hon. Minister was not speaking to this Chamber whe n he said: "where did we think the Government got its money from?" I wonder if he seriously made that statement to this Chamber. I do not think he would dream of making such a statement to those of us who spoke on this matter. Let him look through the records of this Chamber and he will see that, whenever there is a question of increase in wages, I do not have to make politics out of it.

I am a man in public life who believes in truth. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture should be aware by now that, I can stand up to the attacks of that Party to which he now belongs, and when I was in that Party he was outside; you could not want a more violent critic than he. I have been through a lot at his hands.

If the law of that day was what it is now he would have been charged before a Court; therefore, it is not a question that I am a newcomer. If he now says that he has left Egypt's sands, I will only say that he has taken a long time to realise that he should have left Egypt's sands. If he has entered the Promised Land at this stage of his life - which is not an early stage - it is tantamount to saying that he has entered public life when he is matured.

Look at the speeches which the Hon. Minister made on this side of the House when he was asking for more money to be spent, and look at the speeches I made when I always said that the Government should introduce a system dealing with salaries on a more scientific basis, so that it would not mean that every time you touch one you have to touch all irrespective of the structure which you have. I have always insisted that members of the Key Scale should be put in a category to be represented by themselves. When the Hon. Minister said that he appealed to me for more co-operation, he should look to his immediate left and right.

The Hon. Minister talks of the Trade Union working in harmony with the Government. The Government runs the country, but it does not run the Chamber of Commerce nor the various voluntary organisations which exist. Why should the Government run the Trade Union? Only in Russia you find the Trade Union being run like a Department of State; and it is because the State decides what should be the salary of the people, because in truth and in fact the State supplies the money. When he asks for my co-operation he should look to his immediate right and see the vile language of which his colleague made use during this debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I cannot allow these remarks to go on. What vile remarks have I made? Why should we let him say that?

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you want a more violent remark than what the Hon. Minister called me? He called me a thief. He said that I had stolen Trade Union money. Of course he said so in *sotto voce* remarks. What more violent remarks can you have than to accuse someone of stealing Trade Union money? He means to say: how can you have confidence in a thief? If he had said so on a public platform he would be aware of what would be his position. He is saying something which he knows is absolutely not true. He knows that I have never in any way misappropriated the funds of the Trade Union, but it suits him to say that because he likes to tell the public that I am a man who steals Trade Union money. Fortunately for me, I am blessed with the temperament which I have.

I asked the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, when he appealed to me for co-operation, how can he expect any man with any self-respect to co-operate with a man who calls him a thief in *sotto voce* remarks. The only man who would do that would be a thief; not an honest man. When he speaks of my co-operation, let him look at his files and see what things are in his Ministry relating to industrial matters in which the Trade Union made statements and see whether he can say that those statements are unco-operative.

It is the duty of the Trade Union to co-operate with the Government as a Government of a country. If you put a proposition to us as a Trade Union, we have a right to give you our views on the matter. The Trade Union has never passed a Resolution telling the Government that we do not believe in your political stand. We pass Resolutions saying that Acts, like the Trade Union Act, should be amended and that you should pass legislation for things which relate to the industrial section. What do you expect a Trade Union to do? Would you call that non-co-operation? 12.45 p.m.

We can pass a Resolution saying that we would like to see the Workmen's Compensation Act amended so as to provide a better system of social security and things which relate to the industrial sector. Speaking about myself, personally, there are measures which come before this House with which I do not agree; and are you telling me that I have not got the fundamental right to speak on measures with which I do not agree?

When the hon. member hears his colleagues say that I am joining with the Conservative element to pull them down, do you want co-operation in those circumstances? If I wanted a seat in this Assembly at all costs I would get it, but it is not a question of pulling them down; it is not a question of non-co-operation; it is a question of reality. I have passed the stage where I would allow any filthy remark from anybody who is trying to besmirch my character to worry me; and I have been living long enough without having to go to any Court as a man of an improper character.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture should bear in mind that, when it comes to a question of the wages of people engaging the attention of this Assembly, he would not expect that certain hon. members would not speak on that matter. It is not a question of playing politics; what is playing politics in relation to these meagre salaries? This is purely a question of drawing something to the attention of the House.

When I spoke about the Whitley Council, I am aware that there was some disagreement between the Government and the Whitley Council, and earlier I made an appeal to the Premier to reconstruct the Whitley Council; you can clearly see that if you were to reconstruct the Whitley Council, you could give some authority to one of your officials, somebody of importance.

I understand that in the United Kingdom the Postmaster General is the person who sits in on some of these matters, so as to be able to put forward the Government's case. In this case before us, it has been drawn to my attention that the Official side of the Whitley Council - and not the Staff side - is the group which suggested that the Government should go right through and through. I would like the Premier to check up on that and see if I am wrong; but it has been drawn to my attention that the Official side of the Whitley Council is the one which put forward this idea of giving all or none. That is nothing to worry about because in all negotiations you will get

one side putting through one thing and another side putting through something else.

Countries are asking for improved Constitutions; countries which are grant-aided are asking for independence. Imagine those of us who are living in Barbados do not want to maintain our Constitution in the same manner as some of our forbears said they maintained the Constitution ! If they maintained the Constitution on the basis of low wages being paid, they yet maintained it. Jamaica and Trinidad were grant-aided colonies; they did not have grants in aid in recent years, but they had them at the beginning.

In Barbados and in the West Indies we want independence, but that does not mean that we do not want assistance. I do not know if the hon. member who has spoken is aware of the general situation in Barbados. I sat down for two hours around a table this morning trying to get employers to pay an increase to a sector of workers, the equivalent of 5%. It is true that 5% in that context means a different figure in money, but that only gives you an indication that the task is not such an easy one.

When the hon. member talks about co-operation, if there had not been a powerful and respectable Trade Union in Barbados, the Government could have carried out a situation in this island in protecting the plight of workers who would have been largely unorganised. It is a fact that they have mentioned a few workers who are not organised, and the wages which they are getting; but let them take a picture if those who are organised had not been organised.

I should like to say that a Minimum Wage Bill cannot take the place of negotiated wages; in the Shops Act, you passed a minimum wage and that minimum wage becomes the maximum. I feel that we should put this question beyond any shadow of doubt. The Trade Union exists so as to represent the interest of the workers. The Trade Union is not in competition with political parties; the Trade Union is not rivalling political parties. I am the General Secretary of the Union: but if the members of any political Party want to dictate to me as to what I should say in this House, that will never happen. Bills have been brought down here, Bills with which I did not agree, and if I do not agree with them, nobody can flog me. I go to a place for which I am paying rent; I am an independent man and I work for my living.

The hon. member must remember that in spite of these political intrigues which are being used by members of his own Party - and the very newspaper which is owned by the Trade Union is the same newspaper which carries out a weekly concerted attack upon the General Secretary of the Union intentionally to try to discredit me. If the people had taken any notice of that, the building up there would not have been going on; people would not have entrusted an amount of money like $35,000 in the hands of other people like that; they would have discredited the whole organisation and we would not have been able to get the building started. We are going to construct an edifice, or we have been able to construct an edifice, to the credit of the workers. Far from showing any lack of improvement, we are not only erecting a monument for people to see, but we are providing them with the facilities by means of which we can advance the interests of the people.

12.55 p.m.

We did not go and borrow money from employers for them to say we are asking them for money to put up a building; we asked other Trade Unions to lend us in order that we can work and pay it back. I think I know enough of the Trade Union Movement to know what is good Trade Union behaviour; but if hon. members feel that, because I am a Trade Unionist I have no right to come here when they introduce a Resolution for wages and say that I do not agree, then I would not be fit to represent the workers. I cannot agree to a minimum of less than what I suggested. In 1956 I wanted a minimum of $15 a week, but do you think that if I asked employers for $15 in 1956 that I would ask for that in 1959? I would ask for more; and I have done so. One of the things we asked the sugar industry for its workers was $3 a day, and it was turned down; so it is not a question that we are asking Government to do something and have not asked the employers to do it.

If I could show hon. members the number of proposals and requests which we have submitted to employers over the years, they would realise what is the situation. I need not remind hon. members that, though industrial relations have been generally good, whenever there has been a break with anyone on salary - because in industrial relations there have been breaks on the question of wages - it was because the Union has been asking for more money. That is proof that we are not satisfied with what employers are doing.

But what is the attitude of Government? Have you not heard publicly on public platforms how I had been criticised for the stand I took? Today you are saying that there is some association with the employers. I have heard speeches in this country backing the employers against the Union, but now you hear, in the House of Assembly, that the Union supports them.

I hope the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would realise that, if in matters such as these you have other things to do, and we ask for a minimum wage, that is where you have to look at it; and that is why I told the Premier that he was not reviewing the whole service but those in the key scale. You should not give the key scale a cost of living; you should give them an increase which you are satisfied relates to what a poor man can live on; and no man can deny the fact that $16 or $18 cannot turn a poor man into a rich man. If by giving them this amount you are going to bankrupt the Government, then I say we are very near to bankruptcy. If this Government with $21 million budget -and hoping to increase that budget and have millions to spend in future - cannot afford to give a minimum wage of that meagre amount, then I say that our poor people are living without hope.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think I will take this opportunity to speak. Most of what I will be saying now will just be a recapitulation, but there are certain members in the House now who were not here when I spoke. For their benefit especially, I will say again what I said on that first occasion.

The first thing I want to clear up is the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter relative to the discourtesy with which the Government treated the Civil Service Association or the Whitley Council. I stated then, and will state again, that it was not intended to be discourtesy; it was a misunderstanding. I explained then, Sir, that my information was that the two sides of Whitley Council met, bargained and talked for over three hours and could not reach any agreement. The Staff side of the Whitley Council got up and left saying that they could not reach any agreement, and would let Government give what they could afford or words to that effect.

Since that occurrence, and before the introduction of this Resolution, I met the Civil Service Association. They admitted that they did say that, but meant that, when the Government had fixed what they wanted to fix, they should come back to them. I admit I have since learnt that that is the correct procedure; but, as I have said, I was told then by the Official Side that they felt that what the Staff Side meant was that since they could not reach an agreement, Government could go ahead and do what they could. I have spoken to them since and I think they are perfectly satisfied that it was a misunderstanding. It was not intended to flout or bypass the Staff Side of Whitley Council.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that this Government intended considering the lower grades of the Civil Service; the hourly, and weekly paid workers and people of that category. But as soon as the announcement was made in the Governor's Speech, the whole Civil Service said that

they too must be considered. They, at first, put up a ridiculous figure and then they came down to a smaller figure on which the two sides met to bargain; but as I said, they could not reach an agreement.

The point has been made that this should be approached by way of an increase in salary instead of a cost of living. Surely, nobody would expect Government to have a salary revision at this stage when the ink had hardly dried on the former 1956 revision. By that, I mean that - and hon. members ought to remember - it was only a matter of weeks since the Government passed some salaries which were the decisions of the Anomalies Committee, especially in the case of secondary teachers; and since that, we have passed certain Godsall recommendations in connection with the Police. When we had therefore started to consider a cost of living, the Resolution in connection with the Police had not yet passed this Legislature, so that we could not have thought of a salary revision before the recommendations of the most recent salary revision had been passed by the Legislature.

When the Government started on this cost of living allowance, we certainly did consider the lower paid workers first. We decided that, in the case of those workers, they should be paid a cost of living of 4 1/2 cents an hour.
1.05 p.m.

Now, Sir, if hon. members will remember and look back, they would see that this has been the most generous treatment ever accorded workers in that category. I think the highest rate before this was either 4 cents, or between 3 3/4 cents and 4 cents, but on this occasion we have decided to make it 4 1/2 cents on the wages they are getting.

This $9.00 a month cost of living is incidental. The Government did not start to think of a cost of living so far as the Civil Servants are concerned. It is only that this 4 1/2 cents corresponds to the $9.00 which will be given to the monthly man but, as I have said, the Government did not start out to give consideration to the monthly man.

The point has been made, why did you not consider the Civil Servants up to a certain grade? We certainly did give consideration that way; but there were ramifications with regard to the fixing of the salaries of the Civil Servants. What I mean is this: At first, we considered giving it to people up to $150 a month, but there are some people who are getting $142 a month, therefore, if we gave them the $9.00 a month they would get $151; we would only be able to give them $8.00. Things of that sort would have meant disappointment to members of the Service.

It would also have an effect on the incremental scale of members of the Civil Service if you just brought it to a certain level. Let us say that you brought it to the level of the man at $150 a month; the next increment which he would get would be less than $9.00 a month and that is so in many cases, and that would prove a disappointment to those people. I wish to make the point that that was not lost sight of by the Government; but it did not work out in the way which we wanted it, and we had to abandon it.

Now, Sir, we have heard certain suggestions made by hon. members of the Opposition that the cost of living which we are giving should not be a cost of living allowance. But it is very, very easy for them to make statements of that sort because they really have nothing to do with the finances of the colony; so they can get up and say any sort of thing.

I admit that, in one or two cases, the amount mentioned as regards increasing this allowance has been moderate; but members of the Opposition do not know the effect their suggestions would have on the finances of the colony. Hon. members ought to remember that, when the Annual Estimates were considered, in my budget speech, I happened to mention the difficulty in which the Government experienced in trying to make our revenue and expenditure balance. We had to take out and remove from the Estimates quite a few suggestions of expenditure; we did not want to come down with a deficit.

I want hon. members to believe me when I tell them that, even with this amount which is now suggested and recommended for the cost of living allowance to the Civil Servants and the Secondary School Teachers and to Government Pensioners, as far as we can see now, we know it will be more; this increase will extend to those people working on the Deep Water Harbour and to the people who will be working on the new Hospital. As far as we can see, it is going to be a deficit in the vicinity of $700,000. We even expect it to be more than that. That is the position as far as I have been made to understand.

I do not want to sound a pessimistic note, but I think it is my duty to inform hon. members that we still rely on the sugar crop. We have not yet found anything else to take its place, or even to yield a similar amount of revenue. We had hoped at one time - and I would say we had high hopes - of finding oil; but I think hon. members ought to realise that that hope has been abandoned. (A VOICE: Yes, gone with the wind!) Yes, that hope has gone with the wind!

We do not want to tell the people that we can spend a lot of money which we do not have. We cannot promise them high heaven, but we promise them to do our best. We are hoping that some day, in the not too distant future, I hope, that tourism will at least assist to a great extent; but that is to come, and this increase which is recommended now is a yearly thing.
1.15 p.m.

Sir, bearing that in mind, the outlook for the future -- I should also mention this: I know that this is a thing which the average man would not know, but we have to keep abreast of all that is happening in the sugar world. Up to yesterday, I think it was, I saw some figures with regard to the world price of sugar, which are not very rosy. It is true that there is a guaranteed price for a certain amount of our sugar and the rest over that certain amount is sold according to the world price. That does not look too rosy as I said before. In addition to that, Cuba is one of the world's largest suppliers of sugar, and in that connection we notice that the policy of the present Government of Cuba with regard to the production of sugar, is different from the policy of the former Government.

Whereas the former Government had agreed to limit its supply of sugar, the present Government has said openly that it is going to manufacture more sugar. As a matter of fact, I saw just a week or two ago that the United States of America will buy about three million tons of sugar this year, and the amount which the Cuban Government has offered to the United States of America because of the change of land policy, is about eight or nine million tons.

With these facts before the House, I cannot tell hon. members that we can promise to take these figures here to any high heaven, or to any heaven in the clouds. The fact as we see it now, as far as sugar is concerned, is that the outlook for the future is not too rosy. Since we depend almost entirely on sugar, it would be a rash man who would promise this Committee any unreasonable or any greater increase than what we are proposing at the moment.

The workers ought to know - and we have been telling them for years - that we are prepared to do the best we can for them with the amount of money which is at our disposal. We have been fulfilling that promise for years, and we mean to continue to fulfil that promise; but we cannot get bread out of stone. We must see what we can do for the future. If we get more revenue than we see at the present time, we will certainly redeem every promise we made to the workers.

There have been all sorts of estimates given on this year's crop estimate and that has been increased from

time to time; but, up to yesterday, nobody could give any firm estimate; therefore, as far as sugar is concerned, the future remains in the lap of the gods. We do get a guaranteed price for a certain amount of our sugar, but all of that must depend upon the world price of this product. As to the Agreement which we make with Great Britain which will pay us a little more than the market price, that also depends on the world price of sugar.

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind hon. members of this Committee that the Government has been,and still is, prepared by way of services etc., to contribute to the comfort of this community. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, on Tuesday last, hinted to this Committee the schemes which the Government has on foot -- schemes which are actively under consideration and many of which will come into fruition during next year. These again will take money. Taking everything into consideration, I want to assure this Committee, and the community generally, that this Government is doing and has been doing and will continue to do all we can with the money at our disposal to make the community a happy one.

We can raise more revenue, but that would mean that it would be at the expense of the people; that is to say, by introducing increased taxation in certain fields. We do not want to do that. Certain sections of this community have recently benefited as a result of certain changes in income tax. As I mentioned in my Budget proposals, we have made a reduction in the rate of income tax in certain categories. I have also mentioned increased allowances being granted to parents according to the ages of their children and also according to the way in which they are being educated. These figures,I will mention, have had the effect of an expenditure of $300,000, as small as that might appear. The implementation of that policy has had the effect lowering the revenue, as compared with last year, to the extent of $300,000. Therefore, the members of this Committee will realise that while we are doing all we possibly can by granting this Cost of Living Allowance, we are also trying to relieve sections of the community by increased allowances in the rates of income tax.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose speaking at any length again, but I think I should, for the purpose of the record, set one or two things straight. Either by design or accident, I was apparently misinterpreted in the Press by someone who claimed that I said that the majority of the people in the service would only get $4.50. That could only have been done by design; and the person could only have done it wickedly. I said, and I repeat again, that some of the people in the upper bracket would only receive $4.50 out of the $9. Only an idiot would have reported that I said otherwise. It is not that I worry about being reported, but I do not like to be made to look like an absolute fool in certain things.

Mr. Chairman, two hon. members caused me to reply today; one is the Hon. Premier who has just spoken and the other is the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I will deal with the Minister of Agriculture first. The hon. member in his speech labelled the entire Opposition as being reckless in any observation or suggestion which it made.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. I never used that word at all during my speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What word?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Reckless. I never used that word.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not said that you used it.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: You gave the inference that I did.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture made a speech in which he apparently characterised the entire Opposition, leaving out no one, as being irresponsible in their utterances or speeches on this matter. I think I am correct in saying that. I do not think it is altogether fair; there is one thing which I think he should have got from my speech, and it is this: that I agree that they could not have a revision of salary at this stage. I think we are at one on that.

I agree with Government that there was a salary revision in 1956, and unless something catastrophic happened, you could not have a revision so soon. How, then, can the hon. member characterise everybody over here who made a speech as irresponsible? On the other hand, I would go on to say, for the hon. member's benefit, that it is a question of what money you have to spend.

Knowing the finances of the country, the Government has come to the House and said that it can spend $776,000, a little over $3/4 million. You say you can only spend $776,000, and I have said that my Party agrees; we did not say you are irresponsible and should go and find $2 million. No responsible person is going to say that. I am not saying that, like members of the Government, to win an election. I am still an honest, solid Conservative; but I know that there are Conservatives who masquerade as Socialists. I listened to the speech of the Hon. Premier which, in my opinion, is sound; but I have no training as a Socialist or anything of the sort. I wonder how the hon. member can attempt to say that we are irresponsible.

You have come to this Chamber, and according to the economy of the island, said that you can only afford a little over $3/4 million. I have given chapter and verse the price of certain items; and believe me, Sir, if I had seen no justification in your bringing this $776,000, I would have said so. But I have investigated on my own; I keep my ears to the ground because I am not removed from the people ....*(To an Aside by Mr. Garner)* You make fun, man; you say things that are not fair! You said people make irresponsible statements when in truth and in fact that is not so.

Mr. Chairman, the Government came with a proposition to distribute this amount among all employees, Civil Servants and other employees; but there is a difference of opinion. Up to now the members of my Party have not told them to go back and bring $1,776,000. You yourself seemed to have been on the right track because the Governor expressed your view when he said that his Government was considering giving a cost of living to people in the lower income bracket. We felt that that was a sane thing for Government to do, and we still feel so.

The time will come when you will have to make a revision in salaries; sufficient unto the day when that time comes. What I am saying is that prices have increased between 1956 and 1959 and, in order to cushion that impact in the lower brackets, I would prefer you to take this money and pass it on from the Long Grade Clerk down.

The Premier said that he went into this matter carefully. I have no doubt that, in the minds of some of those members, they feel that is the correct approach and that they should not be bamboozled by the Civil Service and what they tell Government. If the Whitley Council made unreasonable demands upon the Government, they have the right to stand up on those demands; if they make reasonable demands that is all right; but I am not arguing the Whitley Council's case.
1.35 p.m.

You take the view, admittedly now by the Hon. Premier, that before His Excellency the Governor delivered his Speech, the Cabinet thought it should be done this way; that is, to pay it to those in the lower brackets; but since the wranglings between the Council and the Civil Servants - which I am not interested in at all - according to the Hon. Premier, they found that they could not go along with them and they could reach no agreement, therefore they have put this up. I brought figures in here and said that these

are the prices for the essential commodities of life, and I also said that the wages you now pay are $2.00 a day for a woman and $2.40 for a man. I worked out this thing and, in working it out, found out that those persons who can least afford to bear this should be the persons to benefit from this limited amount of money with which you have come down in this Resolution.

You said something about the island only depending on sugar. You have people who are getting from $1,200 a month down to $200 a month. The Hon. Premier said, only a few moments ago, that they thought of paying this cost of living to people up to $150 a month only; but in giving consideration to it, they found out that if they paid it to the man who was getting $142 a month it would create an anomaly in so far as the man who was getting $150 a month. Let us face facts. Can this increased cost of living, which has taken place between 1956 and 1959, so adversely affect persons in the upper brackets as it would those in the lower brackets? If you have a limited amount of money, to whom must you pass it? You could only pass it to people in the lower brackets.

Sir, I would not have replied to the Hon. Premier if he had not indicted the entire Opposition. We are more conscious, Mr. Chairman, of the economy of this island than the present Government. There is not another hon. member over on that side who would make the speech which the Hon. Premier made; you can only characterise it at a stateman's speech. What other hon. members over there would say instead, is that the Conservatives are starving you and keeping you in bags, and we will get this and that for you. They would say that, if we get into power, we have £60 million waiting there for you to spend. The Hon. Premier may not be a politician in the strictest sense of the word, but there is honesty and integrity in that speech.

He went on to talk about tourism. I was in the House when you dealt with the Town and Country Planning Interim Bill. I ask again, do you believe that tourism will ever take the place of sugar? Let me say that planters may err - and so may our planters - but people have come from all over the world to see how we grow cane. We have inherited something; therefore, I say to the Hon. Premier that no statement I have made was irresponsible.

I believe that, down in the Hon. Premier's heart, practising a profession which brings him into touch with the man in the street, he must have realised how the cost of living has gone up for the poor man. He must have realised how it has affected persons below a certain income group. I say to him to distribute this money to those persons only. If the Hon. Premier does that he would be on the right track. He should say to the other people: "This is our policy; we are distributing this money to cushion the shock to people in the lower income brackets. Now, you come in and say that everybody is sharing and sharing alike. Are you really sharing alike when you give me $9.00 cost of living allowance and I am getting $900 per month as salary and you are giving $9.00 to the man who is only getting $60 a month?
1.45 p.m.

Even if you were a Communist Government you would not be doing the right thing. What is the reason for giving a Cost of Living Allowance? The reason for giving a Cost of Living Allowance is because since you last revised salaries, you are satisfied beyond any doubt that the persons whom you employ throughout this island have been faced with an increased cost of living due to the fact that the price of the essential commodities has been increased. Having satisfied yourself with that fact, you take the next step and you say: "This is all we can afford." The next step is that you have met the Civil Servants and you cannot reach agreement; there were wranglings taking place and then you finally decided to depart from the course which you had adopted. No Governor could have made that Speech from the Throne merely by himself.

I am coming straight home now; do you really think that this cost of living allowance of $9.00 a month matters to those people who are getting between $300.00 and $800.00 a month? In my opinion, the correct thing to do would have been to distribute this money where you had first suggested it should have been distributed. In his reply to hon. members, the Hon. Premier said that he thought that it should be distributed from people in receipt of $150.00 a month down.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I also said that, having seen the effect on the $150.00 a month man, we went a little higher. In short, we would have been creating further anomalies.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not care what you do, you will create anomalies. My argument is that you should not start with the big-salaried people. Your salaries in the Government start from $80.00 a month up to $200.00 a month. If you are not stopping somewhere, then use your own judgment. I am not speaking and just feeling that I can make a speech. You have your labourers and you should start from them. Then you should go to your Civil List and look for those people who are in the lower grades. The vast majority of these people are in the Long Grade class, and then you ask how many people are up to the $200.00 a month mark. In that way you would not create any anomalies. As soon as a man reaches the top of a Long Grade he goes up; you will see what a small percentage of these people are at the top of the grade. If you decide that you are working on the Long Grade Clerk plus all the day to day employees, you would be doing the correct thing to distribute this money among these people and it would be expended in the right way.

The Hon. Premier has made a very statesman-like approach to this matter. I did not hear his speech when he introduced this Resolution, but from what he has told us today about our position as regards sugar, well, I do not think that he really meant what he said to the Party to which I have the honour to belong, because we are all very conscious of that position. The Premier's approach to this matter, to my way of thinking, is the right approach from the point of view of reminding hon. members of the financial position of this island. I must say that while the Hon. Premier has done that, while he was speaking, I was wondering if he were really settled in his mind. Is he really comfortable in his mind when he says: "I am spending this $776,000 in the right and proper direction?"

I hope to hear the same thing from him just before the coming elections. The Premier is older than I am, and therefore would not get around as much in the campaign. But it is going to be a boomerang. If the Premier read his speech, and could get a tape recording of some of the reckless promises members of his Party have made to people, he would certainly have to wonder how members of his own Party could make such reckless promises-especially when he has to come here and say we must have all these reforms and social improvements carried out but we must look at these things as a responsible people.

We are not outside; we are in Government. Indeed, I am more than conscious that it is one thing to stand in opposition anywhere - whether in this Government or any Government, or whether we were in Government and they were in Opposition,- and make speeches, but when we get in here it is a different thing, although some of them over there say we may never run the Government. We may never run the Government, but we have brains enough to know how to run a Government; at least we have brains to know how to run a home.

Business is business, and running a Government is business. You are not going to run it with the hope of pulling money out of a tree or from the gutter.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m. 2.00 p.m.

On Resumption

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was formed.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Private Members' Business was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter to resume debate on the McKenzie Report.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON McKENZIE REPORT

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion of dealing with this matter, I started to show by comparison that, with reference to the letters read by the Hon. Minister of Trade in relation to the Board of Inquiry by Mr. Lewis - and I think I had proved that - the Union did not receive the terms of reference as was stated by the Minister. As was said, provisional terms of reference came to the Union after meetings were held between the Minister and the Sugar Producers' Federation. My contention to that is that, even if the employers approached the Ministry, it was the business of the Minister - if a dispute was drawn to his attention between parties - at least to call the other party to the dispute in order that he would know from both sides what was the difference existing between the two before terms of reference or provisional terms of reference were sent out.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I cannot allow those words to go unchallenged. No dispute up to then was reported to the Government from either side.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, out of the Minister's own mouth he said that this matter had been going on and no settlement had been reached. In replying to me he said that the employers approached the Government and had two meetings.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not true. I did not say that two meetings were held. He seems to have a convenient memory. What I said is that the employers asked to see the Minister and I said that, out of common courtesy, I would see them. They came and asked whether it would be in order for them to pay the 6% increase without prejudice to anything that would happen. I told them it was a matter for them. I have made that crystal clear. I am not going to have him get away with any nonsense.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, he said that the employers asked to meet the Minister, and the Minister met them on a disputed matter. Do you need a Solomon to see that the employers would not have wanted to see him if there had been no dispute? You do not have to ask a Minister anything if you are going to pay wages to an employee. You met them after there was a dispute. It was said out of the Minister's own mouth that they met on more than one occasion.

2.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I repeat again, that I did not say that. In so far as the 1958 dispute is concerned, the Sugar Producers' Association met at my Ministry on one occasion; that was long before any dispute was officially represented to the Government or that there was a deadlock between the two parties concerned.

Mr. WALCOTT: That makes it worse. Imagine the Hon. Minister accepting a delegation on a wages matter when that matter is before the Labour Commissioner.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a point of order. It is not my business to tell him how I must conduct my affairs; nor can I tell the Sugar Producers' Federation or the Barbados Workers' Union how to conduct their affairs. If either side or both sides decide to see the Minister, surely, common courtesy desires that the Minister should see them.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the Hon. Minister wants to say is that he met the Sugar Producers' Federation on a point of courtesy.

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no reason why you should go any further on that point.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with this thing calmly. The Hon. Minister took three hours on it. I know when this debate is printed in Hansard it will show the Hon. Minister as saying that the Sugar Producers' Federation met him when a deadlock had been reached; and not only did they meet him, but told him of the dispute and what it was about.

How can the Minister of Labour meet somebody on grounds of courtesy when the alleged matter he is meeting them on is a matter before the Labour Commissioner? How can the Minister of Labour meet you when you are discussing a matter before the Labour Commissioner?

Hon. M. E. COX: You cannot tell me how to run my Ministry.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Ministry is a Ministry of this colony; it is not your Ministry. The behaviour of Ministers is a matter for public concern. You could run it to suit yourself if it were a personal matter in which you were at the helm.

Mr. Speaker, you can see that a Trade dispute is on and one party to the dispute is going to see the powers that be, that is the Minister, to deal with the dispute. The Minister is saying, out of courtesy, he is meeting someone who is a party to the dispute. He does not know that if you are meeting one party to a dispute you also have to hear what the other side says, too.

I am only bringing forward these things to show you that the Sugar Producers' Association met at the Ministry and discussed the matter with them, and the Federation asked the Ministry if they could pay the 6%. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister is going to negotiate with a private employer as to whether the private employer can pay 6% or 5%!

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. And I will rise a million times. The hon. member is just twisting things. The Sugar Producers' Federation did not meet me to negotiate anything, nor did I negotiate anything.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member must withdraw the word "twisted". He cannot accuse me of twisting things.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that I am not going to allow the hon. member to twist anything.

Mr. WALCOTT: That can only mean that I twisted something.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no, it is not the same thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not going to allow him to accuse me of twisting things. He can rise not only a million times, but a billion times and I will still be here. The Sugar Producers' Federation met him to discuss something which was a disputed matter; and, out of courtesy according to him, he met them and he did not call on anybody else. He could even advise them on the terms of reference, the terms of reference that was sent to us!

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no question of terms of reference being discussed at that

meeting. We had not gone to Government House yet on anything of the sort. There was nothing official represented to the Ministry that there was any deadlock.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Now, Sir, if the employers met the Union and then told the Minister what they would like to do, and the Union received from the Ministry a letter which contained provisional terms of reference - and that letter was dated 23rd April, 1959 - what would you expect? I have established beyond a shadow of doubt that the employers met the Minister. The Minister subsequently sent to the Union provisional terms of reference which contained the same things which the employers wanted the Union to agree to.

We rejected those terms of reference because, out of the horse's mouth, whatever conclusion you draw, you met the employers and they gave you their side of the dispute. Now, you are saying that officially, you were never informed that a dispute existed; but you knew that the Labour Commissioner was meeting the Union on these matters. I have a letter from the Labour Commissioner which was sent to the Ministry of Trade on 18th April, 1958. The same hon. member is going to say.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I was not here at that time, I was in Trinidad.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Is the Hon. Minister going crazy? When you send a letter to the Ministry of Trade, to whom have you sent it? He is the Minister of Trade.

Hon. M. E. COX: He is assuming that it reached me.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member referred to the Ministry, that is not you.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about a letter sent from the Labour Commissioner to the Ministry of Trade. At one stage the Minister is stating that this was done in the Ministry, and was done by him, but when something is going to the Ministry he is saying that it has not come to him. I am not concerned with him as he is.

The letter which came to us did not come from the Minister; it came from the Ministry of Trade. As a matter of fact, I have no letter from the Minister.
2.45 p.m.

This letter from the Labour Department went to the Ministry. If the hon. member was in Trinidad and knows nothing about these things, why is it that he said he knew about these things, and that the Union did not reply to the letter of the 19th April until the 26th of April? He said that seven days had passed; he said that, with reference to your letter dated so and so - he does not realise that you could write three letters in between and another one after - you did not reply to the first one. I have established that the reply to the letter of the 21st of April stated our views about the Board of Enquiry and our views as to the composition to the Board. There is no doubt in anybody's mind about his behaviour in this matter; this is something which would not have taken place in the United Kingdom or in any country like that. But when you get this behaviour, "that I am running a Ministry to suit myself," you would think that it is the business which the hon. member runs in Marhill Street, the business called M. E. COX. *(ASIDES)*. I should like you to behave your common self.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is more.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made some remarks which I would like him to withdraw. He has used the remarks: "I should like you to behave your common self."

Mr. WALCOTT: I withdraw those remarks, but it is irksome to see that the hon. member can behave in a common-place manner in this House and one not be hurt. That common-place behaviour should not be perpetuated.

Mr. SPEAKER: When an hon. member is addressing the House and speaking in Parliament it is very embarrassing to other hon. members when such remarks are used.

Mr. WALCOTT: I withdraw those remarks. I was making the point that a Minister's conduct is not the conduct of a private individual. A Ministry is a Government affair; but he is running it as if it is his private affair.

I do not want to go into the long history which led to the dispute in 1958, and as to what the Union said was its view in so far as negotiations where the Commonwealth Wage Index Figures are concerned. The Union stated in relation to the Board of Enquiry, and in a letter, that any future negotiations as to wages should take into consideration the factors other than the Commonwealth Wage Index Figures. That was stated in 1957.

Even in the Courts of Law, all sides go before the Courts. Sometimes the Court makes a decision with which one side agrees and with which the other side does not agree; and sometimes neither side agrees with the decision; but you have to abide by the decision of the Court. It does not mean that your point of view is invalidated.

The Union said that figures, other than the Commonwealth figure, should be taken into account when you are negotiating wages. The Union's point was well taken with the same Commission of Enquiry: that the very market price had reached an exceptional figure in 1957 and that the crop was an extraordinary one. In view of these factors the Union stated that the price which was paid in 1958 should bear some relation to those factors which had existed in the year which had gone by. That was subsequent to the letter which the Union had written.

As a result of that, the Commissioner made a recommendation for the payment of an *ad hoc* bonus to the workers. What seemed to have urged the Hon. Minister more than the debate on this issue was the fact that a bye-election took place in the parish of St. John around the same time, and the Minister, although he had asked the Governor to set up a Board of Enquiry, elected to go on a platform and say what the Union had done. I happened to be at the meeting, and I reported the matter to the person who was to set up the Board of Enquiry. I said that it was improper for a Minister, who advised the setting up of the Board of Enquiry, to speak on a platform on matters which the Board of Enquiry had to investigate.

The Minister says that he can run his Ministry as he likes. He says: "I can advise the Governor to set up a Board of Enquiry because I am the great Pooh-Bah; I can say something pertaining to the same matter of which I have asked the Governor to set up an Enquiry." Now, the same Minister is saying that I cannot carry on any discussion of this matter because the matter is *sub judice;* but when he advised the Governor to set up the Board of Enquiry, he did not regard the mater as *sub judice;* that he should not speak on it. He thought that he would get up on a platform and slate the Union (Hon. M. E. COX: What did you say?) I told the Governor in front of you at Government House; you were present. It is not what you did say but what you did not say with all the vulgarity included.

That is only an example of the kind of person who would do that to debauch the tenets of good Ministerial Government by getting up.....
2.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I must object to those remarks. While, perhaps, I do not care how he curses me - he does that all the time - yet he referred to the Ministers as debauching the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member objects to those words. I think hon. members would do well to address themselves to what they want done. The hon. member is objecting to the words "that is the type of conduct by Ministers that would debauch the Government".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you had better ask the Reporter to read the words. I do not think he has quoted me correctly.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is out of order. The words I have which have been taken down are "That is the type of Minister that debauches the Government". The hon. member is asked to withdraw those words.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you should be the person - if you are satisfied that I used those words - to ask me to withdraw them, but I am saying that I did not use those words.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is perfectly correct; he did not use those words. I do not think the Hon. Minister's memory is clear. The hon. member speaks at a very rapid rate, and I think it is very difficult to remember his words. I remember he did say something, but I think on this occasion he is going to get away with it. The hon. member may continue.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member did use the word "debauch" in referring to me. That is the word to which I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that the hon. member speaks at a very rapid rate and it is not very easy sometimes to pick out a particular sentence; but the words certainly did ring of an unparliamentary flair and would ordinarily have been offensive. This House cannot condemn the hon. member because, keeping strictly to the Rules of Procedure, the exact words have not been taken down. I have to stick to procedure; so, as I said, the hon. member is free not to repeat what may have been a similar charge. I shall ask him to proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if the words.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member need not go back to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not keeping on it, but I want to get it clear so that, as you have advised, I would not make the same mistake; because, you used the phrase that I would "get away with it". Usually, when a person gets away with anything it is an escape from justice.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member might not have to be freed from justice.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what I do want to know is whether "debauch" is one of the words in May's which is regarded as unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: "Debauch" is not one of the words, but anything associated with "debauch" in a context may be of offence to hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: In proceeding, what I said about debauching is that, if a Minister who advises the Head of the Administration or the Queen to set up a Board of Inquiry is going to speak on the same matter before that Board of Inquiry sits, he cuts across the tenets of good Ministerial Government. There is nothing wrong in saying that. A Minister should not set up a Board of Inquiry and at the same time elect to speak publicly during the course of an election on the matter. (Hon. M. E. COX: What did I say?) The hon. member asks what did he say.

I wonder if the hon. member knows that, if a Minister sets up a Board of Inquiry, all he can say is that a Board of Inquiry has been set up to investigate the matter. He cannot proceed to show what one side has done in relation to the other on the subject matter which the Board has to investigate. What he did say is immaterial now, but I told one of his fellow Ministers what he did say.

What I am saying now is not anything I have waited until now to discuss, Mr. Speaker; it is something that he said one night; and I reported the matter to the Governor on the following day, and told the Minister. That is to show that the Minister elected to speak on a matter on which the Union had to meet the Board of Inquiry. (Hon. M. E. COX: What did I say?) I do not have to satisfy the House that he did act in a manner that is beyond the dignity of what Ministerial conduct should be.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object strongly to that. What I want the member to do is to say what I said, and the House will be able to see whether or not it was improper conduct. If I got up and said that Mr. So-and-so was a good man, is that something to condemn me for? Why is he afraid to say what I said?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to comply. I am going to say that I have already spoken in reply, Mr. Speaker, but I am only saying why. I want to portray to this House that a Board of Inquiry was set up by the Minister and the Minister elected to speak on the subject matter. 3.05 p.m.

That is where we objected. It is just like your agreeing to set up an enquiry into this Chamber but you go publicly before the investigation takes place and speak on it. It is not good parliamentary conduct to do that. When someone wants to pooh-pooh this sort of thing, you can see what we are in for.

Hon. M. E. COX: Let the hon. member say what I said.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister is asking me to say what he said. I am establishing the sort of situation that led up to this enquiry. The Government wrote the Union a letter informing it that they intended to proceed with this Commission of Inquiry. The Union agreed and from the letters which the Union received, a letter was received on the 8th September, 1958, informing us that it was their intention to institute the Board of Inquiry into the sugar industry.

The Union replied to that letter on the 12th September, which was four days after, stating that it had received their letter with reference to their proposing to institute a Board of Enquiry and to have comments of the Union on the terms of reference. The Executive Council of the Union gave consideration to the matter, and stated that 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 (i) of your letter state: "the method of remuneration and the wage structure in the industry for (a) field workers, and (b) factory workers."

The Union also stated that the Inquiry should be conducted on a three-man basis. The Minister said that it was nonsense to talk about a three-man Commission. You will really believe he knows something of what he is talking about. You will believe that a three-man Commission which the Union was asking for was something which was not granted before, was something out of the blue. Far from there being a three-man Commission before, there was also an eight-man Commission. They had Commissions in the United Kingdom before comprised of three men, of four men and even of eight men; it just depends on what you are investigating. This was not an investigation into an aspect of the sugar industry; it was an investigation of the whole industry; therefore, what was wrong of the Union asking for a three-man Commission. And the reply from the Minister was that they had already agreed to a one-man Commission.

Now, Sir, we have a letter which was written on the 19th September by us. It states:

"Further to the meeting between the representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union and the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture in connection with the proposed inquiry 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."

You can see that this meeting was held before the 17th September; this letter was written on the 19th. The meeting was held on the Wednesday, 17th September; and, at that meeting, we informed him that we considered the inquiry should be conducted by a three-man Commission. We only met the Minister once on this matter. I cannot understand why the Hon. Minister said that a delegation from the Union met him and told him that they should give evidence. That is another matter which has been drawn in because, when the Union met the Minister, there was no question then of how the Inquiry should be conducted. We were discussing the composition of the Inquiry and the terms of reference. At that time Mr. McKenzie was not here, so we did not know how he would have conducted the Inquiry.

There was no dispute as to whether it should be three-man or a one-man Commission, although our view was always that it should be a three-man Commission. The Council still maintained that an examination into the sugar industry requires an investigation on a broader basis than that of a one-man Inquiry. According to our letter, we stated that the issues to be considered are varied and require the broadest representation to meet all the interests in volved. That was stated to the Hon. Minister in writing; so it was not a question, when the Union met him, that the Union was satisfied with a one-man Commission to conduct the Inquiry.

The Hon. Minister said that it is nonsense to talk about a three-man Commission because, in 1945, Professor Shephard came here and conducted an Inquiry into the sugar industry and that was a one-man Commission. Now, Sir, in 1945 the Trade Union did not represent the sugar workers in the manner in which they are represented in 1958; in 1945 the request for a Commission of Inquiry into the sugar industry came from the House of Assembly. It was in this House of Assembly that the matter started.

There were two Trade Unions at the time appealing to the sugar workers, but the Trade Unions did not ask for a Board of Inquiry. The Government did not write anybody stating that they proposed to do this or that; nor was there any accredited representation of that type of worker. There was a big break-down in the industry because those workers were unorganised. In this situation, the Trade Union had been in negotiations with the sugar employers in the same year and, as a result of the dispute in the sugar industry in that year, the Government wrote the Union and said that as a result of that, they were setting up a Board of Inquiry to deal with the dispute and they proposed later to set up a Commission to go into all aspects of the matter.

You cannot tell a Trade Union it has no right to say what type of Commission the inquiry should be conducted by. Which Minister in any part of world, even in Africa or Turkey, would say to a Union that it is nonsense talking of a three-man Commission and that a one-man Commission would do. It is the fundamental right of a Trade Union to suggest of what type the Board of Inquiry should be, and what its composition should be.

Hon. M. E. COX: It was not a dispute.

Mr. WALCOTT: It was as a result of a dispute. Go and read your letter. The dispute started in May, and you set up this Board of Inquiry to deal with those matters arising out of the dispute.

3.15 p.m.

It is the right of the Trade Union when you are consulted in a matter like that, to be able to state what is in the best interest of what you want. We heard only today that the sugar industry is that by which we have to live; it is the most important industry in the island. Therefore, can you say that, where the most important industry in the island is having an investigation made into it, the Trade Union was not in order to ask that this investigation be done on a broad basis and that you should get the views of people?

We suggested that you should have a set up, may be including the same person who was the sole investigator but with people from the Economic Development Department of the University College of the West Indies, to go into all aspects of the matter; you would then have a report, not of a single man, but of collective wisdom. I do not think that anybody would say that the collective wisdom of that Board was at the disposal of the community.

Professor Shepherd came here to investigate a dispute. The Trade Union was not then organised on its present basis. He was asked to investigate the price for cutting canes and for plantation wages later on. You can go through the annals of this island and you will not see another investigation. There is no Mr. Duffie which this House ever brought down here. As a result of a debate in this House of Assembly about the price paid for peasants' canes the discussion which took place was to the effect that the peasants' canes were not paid for at a proper price. Sir Alfred Savage had just come here as Governor of this colony and the Governor undertook.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have never mentioned anything about any legislation in connection with Mr. Duffie.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not accused the Minister of that.

Hon. M. E. COX: He has insinuated that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member spoke and rambled; he never dealt with the Report. I am replying to the ramblings. He is now anticipating me, but I have not got there yet. I was saying, Sir, that after that debate, Sir Alfred Savage undertook, - it may be on the advice of the Leader of the House and so on - to carry out an investigation. I understand that a Mr. Duffie - who was a personal friend of the Governor - who was living at Government House and who was an Accountant, was asked by the Governor to undertake certain things for him.

In answer to the question about Mr. McKenzie, it was thought that we should vote money to bring him here so as to conduct an investigation into the Sugar Industry. The House of Assembly knew nothing about Mr. Duffie; the hon, member would know about Mr. Duffie because he was a member of the Government at the time. From the way in which the hon. member spoke about Mr. Duffie you would think that the Government had got Mr. Duffie to carry out an investigation.(Hon. M. E. COX: What does it matter?) The hon. member asks what does it matter?

If the Hon. Minister got somebody to give advice privately in relation to anything he is going to do, is that the same thing as if something is paid for out of the public purse? The hon. member cannot understand when an analogy is made. It is my job to show that no Mr. Duffie has ever been asked by this Legislature to carry out any investigation, and this Legislature has absolutely no knowledge of Mr. Duffie having carried out a one-man enquiry.

It was as a result of Mr. McKenzie's investigation that we have this Report which is the Report of an inquiry into the sugar industry of Barbados by Mr. McKenzie. He could not have carried out this investigation unless we had decided to do it. There is nothing like this in the case of Mr. Duffie; this was a public enquiry, not a private enquiry. When the Union said that it is

our intention to give evidence and that our evidence should be given in public, here comes the Minister and asks:- "Why should your evidence be given in public? Are you afraid of giving it in private?" Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear such foolishness? That a man who is going to give his evidence publicly is afraid to give it privately? The conclusion is that people have not got any confidence in you and you want to give your evidence privately. 3.25 p.m.

Why should the Union undertake to give evidence in private on what the Premier described today as the most important industry - our mainstay? The Royal Commission came here and evidence was given in public. If a person is willing to give evidence in public and you say they are afraid to give it in private, that is a conundrum.

The hon. member is famous for quoting members of the Union. You will remember that on one occasion he said that the members of the Union did not want a Bill, forgetting that, ten years ago, he supported the Bill which the Trade Union members wanted; but he did not want this Bill subsequently and was trying to put someone on the spot. He said that a delegation from the Union met him. The Union never sent a delegation to the Minister on the question of whether or not to give evidence; and I am saying that it is a positive lie to say that a delegation from the Union was sent to the Minister to say that evidence should be given in private. If he is meeting members of the Executive Council of the Union in a private capacity to ascertain from them if they are prepared to give evidence in a court case and, among other things, asked something about Union affairs, that is a completely different thing from saying that a delegation from the Union was sent in connection with Mr. McKenzie to say that they intended to give evidence in private. It is absolutely untrue and without the slightest foundation of fact.

I have said those particular things, Mr. Speaker, to establish the reason why we would not agree with the Report. The Report is not the Report of the Government; the Report is that of Mr. McKenzie, and anybody in this community is free to make any comment or criticism he likes on the Report. The Government itself set up Commissions and Committees to investigate things, and after they reported to the Government, Government turned down the Reports. You are not bound to accept the Report. When a Board of Inquiry is set up, it is an independent body and has nothing to do with Government. After the inquiry either the Union or the employers can say that they do not agree with the Report. What is the point in the Minister saying that a Board of Inquiry was set up and we would not give evidence before it? Inquiries like these are public inquiries; and there is no question of the Minister saying now that because a Board of Inquiry was set up and we did not give evidence, there is something of which we are afraid.

It is stated in this Report that you should have an increase based on cost of living. We said we could not accept that. The Inquiry was set up to say that the differential in the industry should be on a 75:25 basis, but we say we do not agree with that.

It is not my intention to bring into the House certain matters. I do not think that the question of private negotiations with employers, and how they are conducted, should be the subject of Parliamentary debate; what people say in negotiating around a table is said in good faith, and it should not be repeated. When the Union met the Sugar Producers' Association this year on this matter, the Union put forward specific proposals. Among them the Union asked for $3 a day for workers, which is something like a 12 1/2% increase. Last year, before the Commission sat, the Union put forward one type of increase for the sugar worker as a percentage increase, and a different type of increase for the factory worker as a percentage increase as against what the amount of money would be; because, if you are asking gor 10% for a man who gets $100 and 10% for a man who is geting $10, you are asking for two different amounts of money. In 1958 we were endeavouring to get wages on the amount of money received; that is to say, if you gave each man a certain amount of money and they were in the same category, you were not doing any injustice to them, and we were aiming at that.

This year's negotiations were on a completely different basis from what existed in the past. The Sugar Producers' Association, for the first time, presented information in relation to the amount of money the industry was going to receive as a result of the increase based on the figures submitted and on all of the facts we could acertain at the time.

Now when you hear the hon. member in one breath - and this is why you have to be careful when you are speaking things you are not clear about - decry the hon. member for St Philip on the grounds that he was asking for more for the peasants, and when he quoted figures to show the price that.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That statement is grossly misleading. I never said that. What I said on the floor of the House is that the hon. member, at a public meeting in St. Andrew on the eve of the elections, said that he was not prepared to allow one cane to be cut or one peasant to send a ton of canes until he was sure that they were given a satisfactory price for their canes, and a substantial increase.

Mr. WALCOTT: Now, Mr. Speaker, you see how I can prove to the hon. member that he does not know what he is saying. The Hon. Minister got up here on a point of order and said the opposite to what he has just said. He said that I said that the hon. member said that, as a result of the publication of this Report, that is why the peasants did not get any more money.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I remember as well as ever what I said. The hon. member for St. Philip said that it was as a result of the publication of Mr. Kenzie's Report that the peasants did not get an increase for their canes. I quoted dates to show that the McKenzie Report was published after the final payments were made to the peasants.

Mr. SPEAKER: I remember the hon. senior member for St. Philip saying that.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The hon. member is saying that I produced figures to show that the people could not pay any more. I do not know anything about the people's business.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you see, Sir, how he lies and says something different from what he said that I intended to say? If the hon. member rises on a point of order, he cannot say that I said something that I have not even said. He tried to decry the hon. senior member for St. Philip. 3.35 p.m.

He said that he could produce figures to show that the price of sugar in the free market had dropped; and even the price of molasses had dropped to justify that the price of canes could not have been as high as it was the previous year. (Hon. M. E. COX: That is nonsense.) It is not nonsense when we say that the same factors existed in the same year. They were not different factors.

I would not say that I understand figures compared with the Hon. Minister. I leave that for the judgment of the other people. It is true that some of us are living in our education, but some of us try to improve our education by reading and other ways. However, some people read too quickly and when they read that way they cannot understand. I do not know if the Hon. Minister can understand figures. If you can get him to do a unitary sum, the legibility of his handwriting will show that it is something like a cockroach walking across the paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should not deal with anything personal. *(LOUD ASIDES)* The Hon. Minister

is taking advantage of the Rules of this House. There is a Rule which says that a member must be heard in silence.

Mr. WALCOTT: Woe to whom the offence cometh from! If the Hon. Minister can sit there and speak in such an audible manner, I can give reply to the type of commonplace behaviour with which he is getting on.

I was pointing out, Sir, that what the Union negotiated in 1958 was based on factors arising in 1958. Any arrangement reached in 1959 was in the light of factors arising in 1959. We could not accept the McKenzie Report; the Union as a whole objects to a basic increase on cost of living because, if you base an increase on cost of living, we are admitting that the standard of living for such workers is a standard which we accept.

There are other things in the Report which we spoke about. We said that the differential is not a matter for you. You cannot lay down a law why the differential should be 75-25 because you do not have all the facts, and because some of the factories are closing down gradually. It means that these people who work in the factories now will be fewer; and the people will not receive higher wages in proportion to the factories being fewer. That is to say, if you had 200 plantations and 20 factories and you have now 200 plantations and only 10 factories, you cannot expect the same number of workers in the same factories would receive the same wages as what all the rest in the 20 factories got.

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

There are two different entities from the point of view of negotiations; therefore, when you get a situation like that, you cannot expect any one man can come to you and say that this is the basis on which to negotiate wages for those two different entities.

We have heard the Hon. Minister of Trade reading out figures about cost of living to show that you only gave a percentage of .09 to the people at the top while you gave a percentage of 18.75 to those at the bottom.

The Hon. Minister said that he was dealing with the McKenzie Report, but I think he was dealing with me. Reading the McKenzie Report, Sir, the peasants will have to give back to the factories money, because this Report shows that the factories are paying to peasants too much for their canes. This is what the gentleman says in his Report:-

"The value of sugar to the industry in 1957 after allowing for preference and levies was $213 per ton. Thus it will be appreciated that if the capital assets necessary for the production of a ton of sugar are to earn only 5%, a very modest return for such a risk-carrying industry, it will be required to earn the sum of $17.25 for each ton of sugar produced. This will necessitate a margin of 8.1% of the price of sugar in 1957 to cover this very modest return on capital invested."

This is the highest year which Mr. McKenzie is dealing with in his Report. Then he goes on to say:

"A five per cent. return on capital invested may seem satisfactory to some but would only be acceptable where conditions are such that this return was assured each year. If there is any element of risk, such as applies to all agricultural enterprises, where production cannot be adequately controlled, and is at the mercy of factors such as climate, a much higher return on capital is expected and indeed obtained. It is generally accepted that something in the region of fourteen per cent is the usual figure, as this will enable the industry in good years to accumulate adequate reserves to meet the bad years which occur from time to time. It can be calculated that a profit of $46.50 per ton of sugar is necessary to provide interest at 14% on capital, at the 1957 price of sugar it requires approximately 22% of the price as the margin to meet this interest."

There it is, you have stark facts. He says that they are only making 5%. Only a blind man on a trotting horse would say that a man on a plantation is making only 5%. There are going to accept that because Mr. McKenzie comes here and say so. Do you think that a man in Bridgetown would lend money to an industry which makes only 5%? How would they be able to pay back the money? The sugar industry does not borrow money from the Sugar Industrial Bank; they are borrowing money from the private banks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are in business; do you believe you can carry a balance sheet of your business to any bank in Barbados and say that you want to borrow money for your business at 6% when according to your profit it is only 5%? Where would you get the other 1% from? 3.45 p.m.

If they are only making 5% and they have to pay 9% more, and they say that they cannot pay it, would it not mean that the cane growers would have to pay it back? Mr. McKenzie comes here, and as one of the Ministers has said, "This is a man from the University" - as if to say that, if this is a man from the University who comes here, you must accept whatever he says. Professor Shephard came here from a University but the hon. member was not a member of the Government and in the Luncheon room....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. The hon. member cannot quote me. I have not yet spoken on this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot speak now; you have lost your chance. In one part of this Report Mr. McKenzie says that the peasants get a reasonable price for their canes and they have nothing about which to complain. Mr. McKenzie made no recommendations.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. The hon. member has made an accusation against me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not make any accusation against him. I thought that this was Mr. McKenzie's Report; I did not know that it was the Government's Report. The Government is a collective body. I remember the Minister of Agriculture in connection with a similar matter to this when Professor Shephard rejected - this was in the Luncheon room... When I was in the Executive Committee nobody could force anything....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. The hon. member knew the stand I took in the matter when he was over here and I was over there. The hon. member cannot say what I felt in this matter because I have not yet spoken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a speech.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: What the experts told you, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not what they told me, it is what you want to do! *(Laughter).*

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Do not let the hon. member judge me before I have spoken on this matter. He does not know the stand I have taken.

Mr. WALCOTT: The stand I have taken in this matter is not any different from the stand which the Hon. Minister took when Professor Shephard reported I say that my attitude was this; Professor Shephard was told that it would not pay the peasants to grow canes on this basis. I said that you will pay this rate but you will not get any canes. That was in 1948; and, as a result of the stand that people took, the Report could not be implemented. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was one of those members who were insisting on an over-all price for canes all over the island. I think it was the Congress Party's platform that there should be a flat price for peasants canes.

The hon. member accuses the Union of being reluctant to create modifications in the factory when you have to

expand the factory. This is what Mr. McKenzie says:-

"I am given to understand that a three shift system would be welcomed but understand that any reduction in average take home pay of the factory workers would be resisted. Under these circumstances factories find it impossible to institute such a change. It is further complicated by the problem of enlarging factories which come about by the closing of uneconomic units, and the general reduction in the number of working factories in the island. The suggestion that if a factory is enlarged the rate per ton of sugar should be reduced to a level, which give the worker no less than before, but based on the new expanded output, has been resisted."

This man is crazy. Nobody ever discussed with the Union the question of a three shift system; we have not had any discussion with the factory:therefore, there cannot be any question of the people in the Union resisting something. I do not think that it would suit Barbados, with its 16-week crop, to have this three shift system. If you have that system you will probably have to reduce the wages of employees by one third.

3.55 p.m.

Let me ask any member of the Government this: Can you go to anybody and tell him you are going to have a sixteen week crop, and you are going to bring in another shift, and that he will have to carry home two-thirds of the money he originally got? Do you think you can carry that to any worker? You take things that are practical, not moonshine. You talk about a three-shift system when you are not working on a production basis. Then you can tell a man that you are going to bring in another shift, because it does not affect his earnings. But, when his wages are geared to production and you bring in another shift, you would be reducing the man's earnings by one-third or increasing the employer's expense by one-third. Mr. McKenzie said the Union would resist it, but he did not say if the employers would resist a three-shift system and paying one-third in addition to the two he is already paying. This is what he said:

"Under these circumstances factories find it impossible to institute a change."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how could we agree to this when Mr. McKenzie makes the statement that, under these circumstances, factories find it impossible to institute such a change, as if the factories had asked the Trade Union to institute a three-shift system and we have said we did not want it? No such thing ever took place. Had it been a public inquiry he could not have made that Report. This is a serious indictment to make. No Employers' Organisation has ever asked the Union to have a three-shift system at a factory.

You are getting changes now, Mr. Deputy Speaker; they propose to close down Sandy Lane factory, and the closing of that factory would put about 60 or 70 people out of employment; but the sugar that comes from Arch Hall and the various other places will be distributed at two factories, one at the border of St. Thomas and St. Michael and one in St. Michael, namely, Vaucluse and Warren.

At present on my files in the Union I have requests from Vaucluse Factory and from Four Square in St. Philip; I had requests last year from Haggatts and, in 1950, I also had requests from other factories. In view of the fact that wages are tied to production, when the factor of production changes you may have to modify the rates which you have. It is difficult for any worker to understand if you increase the productive capacity by 20%, you are therefore going to get more things being made in the same hour; that is, if you were doing 20 tons per hour you can do 40 tons. If a worker gets 10 cents per ton and he is producing 4,000 tons per week and then production goes up to 6,000 tons, he feels that you should not reduce the 10 cents per ton. If the factory is doing more and you reduce a man's rate, then the rate is not indicative of his earnings.

If the Minister of Labour was here I would deal with these involved matters which he does not understand. If the ratio of production increases and the rate is tied to production, for you to change the factors for the cane grower and the people who invest money, you cannot say that, because the amount has gone up by 20%, the whole thing must be absorbed by 20% and the rate remains where it is; you are not working by the week. If you were working by the week and production went up, you would use a different argument; but, because you are working on a production basis, you have to say that 20% production does not mean that the man can distribute the whole 20%; he is not getting 20% on his investment capital out of the same size factory; he is not carrying the same bundle of canes; he had to put in different mills; therefore from the Trade Union's point of view the argument which the employers should use is that, if you are computing wages on that basis, you have to see how you are going to distribute the increased production which is taking place so that the total wages would increase by the percentage figure of the production in relation to what the labourer should get. That is to say if the increased production was 20% and I say of this 20% increase I want 10%, you therefore have another 10% dividends to distribute; but it is no greater because the total wage Bill would increase by 10%, and the man would receive more money in the same factory than if you had to increase the price of sugar.

Working on that basis, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the factories which the Union has taken into consideration in the sugar industry. Are you asking us to say that this Report is satisfactory in the terms of how it was written? I am the one in the House of Assembly who should be able to speak on this, and I do so because I feel it is my duty.

The other serious matter - this is a matter which I never intended to speak on because it is matter which should be left for negotiations - is the Provident fund. Mr. McKenzie has made a recommendation concerning the Provident Fund in which he said that a man should not get it if he is less than 32 years old. What kind of man is he at all? If a boy went to a factory at 15 years and did 17 years' service, must he go through the eddoes? Must he remain at the factory until he is 50 years? A person can get infantile paralysis at 32 years. Do you think that strokes have ages on which to work? I would not go further than that. This is a subject for negotiations. The Minister of Agriculture knows that we have submitted a memorandum on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it became necessary for me to raise these points as a means of airing to the public that we are not satisfied with the Report. I do not think there is any harm in doing that. In the olden days in the House we would have had to move an adjournment because it was a public matter; we do have a different method of dealing with it now. I was forced to deal excessively with the Minister of Labour, and I believe everyone can understand why I had to deal excessively with him. It is evident that, in such matters in the House, he tries to discredit me, or in any matter which he feels he can. He dealt with none of the points I said the Union was dissatisfied with; he went in for a long history as to why I was not made a Minister, and did not touch the question of the McKenzie Report. I believe it would be a good thing for him to write a biography of my life, because that seems to be a source of worry to him.

4.05 p.m.

I am sure that if we implement this Report in the manner in which Mr. McKenzie suggests that it should be implemented, it would be a detriment not only to the workers but to the peasants of this island because the wages now being paid to the people in the sugar industry would remain at that rate for the next ten years. He says that you should only pay them a cost of living allowance. That means that a man working for $2.52 a day would never get $3.00. Mr. McKenzie says that you should give them a bonus after the crop.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this was a means of discussing this matter. It was not a Government Report; it was Mr. McKenzie's Report; so it is nothing which the Government is responsible for despite what the Hon. Minister has said.

It is nothing which the Government has to implement, and, as a matter of fact, it is a Report which the Union can ignore. With these remarks, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

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

RESOLUTION re STATEMENT OF HON. PREMIER ON 14TH APRIL, 1959.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: to resume the debate on the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution re statement of Hon. Premier, on 14th April, 1959. On the last occasion the hon. junior member for St. John was speaking when Government Business was resumed.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when this debate was adjourned about two weeks ago, I had outlined the historical background of constitutional development in this Island. I had made certain observations as to the unaltered nature of our Constitution from as far back as the year 1891 up to the time that I mentioned that certain modifications took place. Your Honour will also remember that I made a statement on that occasion to the effect that, although we had enjoyed from the year 1891 a large measure of representative Government in Barbados, we had had a limited franchise, and that the Governor as he stood today, enjoyed, the whole of that period, the absolute power of veto on any legislation passed by both houses of the Legislature. This is a fact which has even been suppressed by people in authority, and by leading politicians in Barbados; and we have also flagged, so to speak, before our sister colonies in the Caribbean the question of the absence of reserve powers of the Governor in our Constitution.

I also pointed out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it was merely a distinction with a difference; that it was a highly debatable matter whether it was better to have a constitution with a Governor holding reserve powers or a constitution in which the Governor had the absolute power of veto over any legislation which was passed by the elected representatives of the people, of course, with the approval of the Other Place. In the one instance, the Officer administering the Government of this island would be in a position, if he had reserve powers, to put on the Statute Book of the island such bits of legislation as, let us say, workmen's compensation, social security legislation and matters over which there is a broad general agreement, but on which at one time in our history there was much acrimonious dispute.

Let us say that at one period of our history we had gentlemen in the Legislature who were opposed to anything in the way of social legislation. If the Governor of Barbados had had reserve powers, these matters of social legislation would have been enacted notwithstanding the opposition of the people who may have happened to be in power. And with the veto which the Governor of Barbados still enjoys, let us say, that we passed a Resolution for an increase of salaries of members of the Government Service, the Governor of Barbados could legally and constitutionally refuse to give any sanction or approval to the same. That is our constitutional position here in Barbados up to the present day.

That the power of veto has not been exercised recently is purely a question of the directives which the Governor may have received from time to time from the central authority in Whitehall. In these days of colonial unrest, it is not always advisable for a Governor to interfere too much with the Legislature. Most of us were shocked - I think in the year 1958 - that in these days of enlightenment and the march towards self government, an Attorney General in a neighbouring colony was able to do what Lt. Col. Davenport in the House of Commons described as the impossible: that is, to draw up an indictment against the whole people and to take away the whole constitution in the middle of the 20th century without there being any clear authority for removal of the constitution, or bringing such an indictment against the electorate of the country. Do not be surprised at my saying, Your Honour, - if, in the year 1959 in view of the fact that there is such legal authority and sanction for a Governor to exercise the power to veto - that the Governor of Barbados would not have to save the Government from its own folly. Let us not fool ourselves that we are anything different in the eyes of the colonial masters than what is called the Queen's citizens and colonial subjects.

4.15 p.m.

You will also remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I drew it to the attention of the members of this House that, in 1939, the Leader of the Government Party advocated that we, in Barbados, should be relegated to the status of a Crown colony. In the face of the protestations now made, the professions of interest and the advancement towards independence made by the members of the Government Party, in the light of their resentment of the slightest exercise of any check and balance on the abuse of political power, it is a very difficult thing to understand today - by those who do not either live in the presence of history when it was being made or take any interest - what was going on in the West Indian Islands as recently as 1939.

I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to something which is very germaine to the subject matter of this debate; and that is the evidence given before the Royal Commission in Queen's Park on the 8th day of its sitting as reported in what is already a document of this House, I believe. This is very, very important in the light of the recent objections and expressions of horror displayed by the members of the Government Party in a recent so-called Constitutional crisis. Mr. Morgan Jones, a Labour Member of Parliament, was a member of the Commission. The Leader of the Barbados Government was giving evidence on the 25th day of January 1939, and you will find it on page 85 of the Report.

In the first place, Mr. Morgan Jones asked the opinion of the Leader of the Barbados Government as to the appointment of a Labour Officer. This is what took place:-

"Mr Morgan Jones: I want to have your opinion on the part of the appointment of a Labour Officer.

Mr. Adams: None has yet been made.

Mr. Morgan Jones: Would you take the appointment of a Labour Officer as a useful step in the direction of safeguarding the interests of the workers if they can be organised.

Mr. Adams: Yes, Sir; provided he comes from England and he is a strong man. No labourer is going to accept a Barbadian of any race."

The Leader of the Barbados Government will have a Labour Officer provided he is an Englishman and he is a strong man. He says that no labourer is going to accept a Barbadian of any race. Let us go on to examine the Constitutional position. Under the heading "Parliamentary Constitution" this is what took place:-

"Mr. Morgan Jones: That answer leads me to the next question. I am a great believer in parliamentary constitution."

Like myself, Sir.

"I am rather grieved to hear your tone this morning. I rather gather from your evidence that you are so pessimistic as to the view of keeping your representative government to do work that you want to add the power of the Colonial Government."

Directly after that,

"Mr. Adams: I think that is needed if we are to get social legislation. I believe if you lower the franchise in the space of three, four or five years you will get a wider representation. Until that time hap-

pens there will be none. With regard to the recent disturbances the reaction was more police officers, more bullets, even more police. There is absolutely no good putting pressure on anyone. You only excite them; you only make them resent it, instead of listening to them."

Now, Sir, this is the interesting passage. He was talking about the ballot, not about bullets.

The report goes on:

"Mr. Morgan Jones: I want to speak to you of one particular side only. I am surprised that as a labour man, you as a progressive body, should seek to move in the direction which you suggest. You have a parliament of sorts. Because you feel that it does not function in the social sense as I understand it, - if I am wrong, please put me right - you are suggesting that the power of the Governor should be increased. In short, a Crown Colony Government?"

Where is the hon. member over there? Last week when I drew to the attention of the members of this House - I cannot say that it was the attitude of the Government Party in 1939 - but the person who is recognised as and is still the leader of the Government Party is asking us to go back to the Crown Colony position and the Labour Member of Parliament had to ask him in so many words, whether he was in his right mind.

"Mr. Morgan Jones: You are suggesting that the power of the Governor should be increased. In short, a Crown Colony Government?

Mr. Adams: I suggest that the Colonial Office should be responsible for the estimates of revenue and expenditure."

You will remember that I said that I regard the day to day function of any Government as the handling of the financial resources of the Colony. Here you get the Leader of the Government Party saying that the Colonial Office should be responsible for handling the estimates of revenue and expenditure. The leader of the Government Party went on to say this:

"I suggest that this should be so for five years or at least until social service is put on a proper basis. At the same time give us Adult Suffrage during which period the people will be sufficiently educated in the exercise of the vote and we would have a wider representation..."
4.25 p.m.

"I believe if we had Adult Suffrage overnight you will get a predominant Party in the next Election. I am sure not in the one after that. Until such a time there is a job to get progressive measures through the House of Assembly."

That is not the end, Sir. You will remember I said that we were the last West Indian colony to get universal Adult Suffrage; that is, we came behind St. Lucia, St. Kitts, Montserrat, Antigua, St. Vincent, Grenada, Dominica and all the rest of them. Do you understand the social thinking and the constitutional approach of the people who were responsible for shaping the destinies of the people of Barbados during the past ten or fifteen years? Unless you understand history, you cannot understand yourself; you cannot understand your friends or your enemies, nor do you know where you yourself stand.

Now, Sir, what the Leader of the Government Party was saying at that time is that we could not trust the hoi polloi, the riff-raff, the man in the street in Barbados; it would take him five consecutive elections before he really knew what to do with the vote, and in the meantime, therefore let us have a Crown Colony Government in Barbados, let the Colonial Office handle our revenue and expenditure; that is the only way that things can be done. That would have brought us to World War II; and at the end of World War II we still have Emergency Regulations and Defence Regulations - fourteen years after; so you cen very well see that in the emergency which is still prevailing that they would have said it is too close to the end of the War, so let the Colonial Office go on running the show.

If you understand this, you understand why the Federal Government has got the Crown Colony constitution it has today. People who are supposed to be working in one Crown Colony wants to run up to England and say "Massa, give me this." The alternative is that they could hold the treat of a battleship over the Trade Unionists or over the members of the electorate who may want to march or demonstrate; they could always tell them: "We have an English battleship put in the Harbour. That is the level of thinking of the people who now describe themselves as the protagonists of labour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is in the light of that way of thinking that we must try to brand what is happening to us today.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 o'clock p.m., this House will now revert to Government Business.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY ON COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, when this debate started, it will be recalled on the first day - I think you were out of the Chair at that time and absent from the island - that I gave notice of a motion which, I gather, applies only to that particular day. It is therefore necessary, Mr. Chairman for the purpose of clarifying the records and regularising the point of view of the Opposition as expressed by our motion to move formally again that further consideration - I am, so to speak, renewing the motion - of this Resolution be postponed, in order that Government may consider the point of view which we have put forward and so much more fully and comprehensively than when the motion was made on the first day.

Mr. Chairman, I take rulings from the Chair only, or whoever is in the Chair irrespective of what Party he is or the Party to which that Chairman belongs. If you rule as I have suggested that the motion should be made again, because the former motion applied only in respect of the day on which it was made - you do not have to look on that side for guidance or counsel or to be misled - Mr. Chairman, I would be the last person to address the Chair if the Chair is at the same time listening to an aside.

Even if we conceive for the purpose of argument that the Government can only afford $776,000 for this matter, if that is the view of the Finance Minister, then we are saying that that amount should be re-allocated so that no one in receipt of more than £50 per month, $240 B.W.I. should receive any of this cost of living, for the obvious reason that they do not need it, and for the more obvious and necessary reason that it is essential for the persons in the lower scale to receive the benefit of the small increase which this will allow them.

Sir, it was interesting today to hear the Hon. Minister of Finance making his second speech on this subject. He said that they won elections on truth. I wonder if by that he was referring to a bi-weekly newspaper, whether he was speaking of the antithesis of prevarication or what! I wonder if he has so conveniently forgotten the 1951 election victory which was won on untruth; free hot meals for elementary school children, free secondary education for

children whose parents were unable to pay for them. He then said, Sir, that after the Governor's speech and the Civil Service understood that the mention was to help only those at bottom: - and I quote him exactly - "The whole Civil Service said, here we are we must be considered, and they at first put up a ridiculous figure."

After all, one does not think very much of this Government or hold it in respect, merely to say that the upper Civil Servants came along and said they must be considered and put up a ridiculous figure. Who were they? I do not mean the names of the individuals, but the category from which they came. Was it the $1,000, $900, $800, $700, $600, $500, $400 $300 a month Civil Servants who said that they must be considered for a cost of living? I know it was said, by the Hon. Minister of Finance in the first speech, that the cost of certain essential commodities had gone up for people in all categories. It does not matter if oil and beer have gone up for those receiving $600, $800 or $1,000; they were provided with ample means to pay them. It matters only to the person who is not in receipt of enough for providing essential commodities and articles of life.
4.35 p.m.

The Government, of course, does not know what is going on in the poorer circles. They are in their exalted circles and, for a short while, will continue to be in the position of brief authority; so they just have to be excused for being unaware that people in other classes are feeling the pinch of the shoe. We are advising them, but it is for them to act as men and take courage to act as we say - although we do not have any intention to save them for too long - in order to save the people. Let them accept the advice we have given them. Let them confine it to those persons who are not in receipt of a salary of more than $240 a month. Even if they come down lower than that amount, we will praise them more. If they want to pay it to those who are getting not more than $180 a month, that would suit us better.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance said today that surely nobody would expect a salary revision at this stage when the ink is hardly dry on the recent salary revision. Certainly, none of us would expect a salary revision at this stage; we know the year for the next elections is 1961; therefore, we will expect a new salary revision in the middle of 1961. Of course, those who will be getting it will not be fooled. They will take it and they will also reap the benefits of the change of Government which, salary revision or no salary revision, is not going to prevent them from doing so the next time.

The Hon. Minister of Finance said that they considered the lower paid workers first; that 4 1/2 cents is the most generous offer ever given by the Barbados Government. That is nothing to be patting one's self on the back for; over the past the increases have been scandalously, if not criminally inadequate.

Lastly, the Hon. Minister of Finance said that the $9.00 to the monthly paid workers was only incidental. He explained that they decided on this most generous offer for the people at the bottom first and, incidentally, it worked out at $9.00 a month: so they decided to share the increase to people in all ranks; therefore, the $1,000 per month and the $800 per month people are all getting lined up to receive this $9.00 per month which they regard they are entitled to. That is the reason why I am asking whether the poor janitor who is getting $2.30 a month is entitled to this $9 per month. If it is otherwise, I get up formally to repeat my motion that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed in order that the Government, with the further information available to it since the first day, would even at this comparatively late stage be moved to a change of heart.

They had the passionate appeal of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew trying to let them see reason, trying to bring the warmth of compassion to them by explaining that he went through a bye-election and saw how the poor people were feeling and suffering. Of course, on that side, they have the vote; and you, Mr. Chairman, should be thankful that, so far as 1961 election is concerned, you will be able to tell the people that you were in the Chair when this Resolution was passed. Sir, I renew my motion on this Resolution and I take it that my motion will require formal seconding again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I inform the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that his former motion was moved and seconded and recorded in the Minutes. We, therefore, cannot have a similar motion again on the same Resolution.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, you know that I take no chances. There is a point of view that the motion having been made on one day, it would apply only on the same day that it was made. Anyhow, your ruling stands.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I was very glad that the Hon. Premier spoke. His attitude was rather more considerate, although nothing was given away. There is one note which rang through his speech of which I do not believe he was quite aware. He said that he did not want to be pessimistic. In the early days of his political career, about 24 years ago, that same statement was made; and it was made as an excuse for not advancing the standard of living. It was based on this same idea that we have to depend on sugar alone. It is the type of statement which I have come along hearing all the time.

I have already pointed out in this House, and made it quite clear, that you must not accept the inevitability of a low standard of life and unemployment as something which mankind cannot deal with. He said it is a challenge to Government and to the people to eradicate. The Hon. Premier should not get glued to the idea of what Fidel Castro of Cuba is doing. I read today that the U.S.A. has rejected, of necessity, Castro's offer to sell Cuba's sugar to them because the U.S.A. Government is a member of the World's Sugar Council. The whole idea, as I have said in this House before, is that a man like John Keynes has saved the world from this type of disaster; because, had they not used their brains at San Francisco, they could not have got the monetary funds and what various international agencies they have to deal with such problems as exist.

Do not let us become clamped to the idea that that is all we can do because the amount of sugar which we manufacture in any one year is not enough to stop people from drinking tea for one day. What we produce is an infinitessimal part of the world's production of sugar which is about 34 metric million tons; we produce only 160,000 tons per year. The Principal Designate of the University College of the West Indies is also a Deputy to Mr. Hoffman of the Special United Nations Fund for International Development.
4.45 p.m.

If we are thinking in terms of that broad term, in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, there are special agencies set up to deal with territories, like Barbados, all over the world to intensify this industrial development apart from being along the lines of sugar. There is no point in saying that we are dependent upon sugar; we did not find oil and we looked at tourism. You must not think that tourism will take the place of any of the other staple industrial developments; tourism is a luxury trade, and the type of distribution which you get in money from tourism cannot trickle down to as many people. I believe that, of all the primary products in the world, the International Sugar Agreement gives greater protection to the sugar-producing territories than any other. It should be brought to the Premier's attention that the Government here, in the last Agreement, has come under it; and that has made the world's situation for sugar more stable.

What I was expecting to hear from the Premier is that he had reconsidered the matter and that the question of giving a cost of living allowance in the Key Scale would have been abandoned. I mean that you should regard this as a fixed amount. I brought to the attention of the House already certain aspects of the conditions of employment.

You have some people in the Key Scale who would do over time work. That applies to the people at the Deep Water Harbour and the people who are building the Hospital. If a man is working for thirty cents an hour and his cost of living is another four cents an hour, when you compute his overtime, are you going to compute it on the basic rates? Do you not see that you are causing people to lose money? If you intend to give a man an increase of 4 cents or 4 1/2cents an hour, why is it to be a cost of living allowance?

The Minister said that you could not expect them to have a revision of salaries because the ink has not long dried on the best salary revision; he was wrong because the ink dried on that salary revision three years ago. The hon. member is talking about anomalies which arose and they arose out of the Godsall Report. When we dealt with the Civil Establishment Orders, they were apart of the anomalies which arose out of the Godsall Report; they were not the result of a new revision of salaries.

Hon. members talk about vote-catching; would it be vote-catching for me to say that any man who is getting from $400.00 a month to $600.00 a month could not expect the Government to review his salary every two years? If you give a man a salary of $400.00 or $500.00 or $600.00 a month he must expect that, if you can only give him a cost of living allowance of $9.00 a month, it is not time for his salary revision because he can absorb that $9.00 a month; if it is a question of revising his salary, it is because so many things have taken place that you have to give him a salary revision. The same argument cannot apply to the people in the lower categories. I have just got $2.00 a week for some people, and that was not anything extraordinary. Last year the port workers had an increase of 5%; in fact, the port had three increases, and there are other private sectors in which you can get increases because it is on an easier basis. We know that it is not easier for other people. I think that the Premier was asked about making the increase for the unskilled people a fixed wage.

When a cantonnier is doing over time work he is entitled to his full over time on the earning which he is going to get. As to this cost of living allowance, you must calculate it on the basic wage. You have to make a special order in this connection; you should say here and now that the rate will go from so much to so much. If you have a flat minimum for a man in the lower scale, there could not be any question that you are not going to do this. You could say to these people that if you have to review the salaries of the doctors at the Hospital in another two years, they would have had their review already.

As to the election, look at the contribution which some of us make in the House as compared with what other people make. You do not apply that to the elections; you can rake up anything in the elections. I am not dealing with this matter from a political angle; I am dealing with it purely from the point of view that I am a citizen of Barbados. I say that if you spend more money, when you do not fix salaries and wages on a proper scale, people will come back to you and you will have to deal with them bit by bit.

4.55 p.m.

Do you realise, Mr. Chairman, that since 1945 the Government of Barbados has been reviewing wages on a continous basis up to now, notwithstanding the interim arrangements which it had to make for doctors and other people at the hospital, teachers, and people in the Agricultural Department? Government reviewed salaries in 1945, 1948, 1951, 1953, 1956 and 1959; why is that? The Minister of Agriculture gave a list of the other things which Government has to do, but he was off the beaten track because he got mixed up with capital works as against this. If you borrow money and you are working things on a capital basis, you would not include that in this argument because that money ....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am sorry the hon. member has said that. I never got mixed up. When I am in here I am most level-headed. I cannot get mixed up with capital works.

Mr. WALCOTT: He must have been mixed up because, when we were dealing with the Resolution for more money .....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I was replying to certain remarks which they made which were absolutely out of the context of the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Capital Works, cold storage and certain other capital works are things which will come in the next Five Year Plan or Development Plan; but those things would not be reflected in your Current Budget until such time as they fall into that category. That is why you have Estimates based on Capital as against Current.

Some of the idiots in Government do not understand these things. If in the whole Civil Service you add something to a Department, after a time you must have a reorganisation of offices, not for greater economics but for greater efficiency. You do not want people where they cannot find enough work to do. When you give serious consideration to this, I would ask the hon. member to go anywhere in Barbados and find out whether anybody is paying a cost of living. Do not encourage employers by telling them that they can give money out of basic money.

What is the use of saying that you are going to take off this cost of living? If you are going to take it off, why not put it on? Why call it something separate and distinct from a basic wage?

Ignorance must not be the excuse for anything you do. If somebody is advising the Premier, who is Minister of Finance, that this must be a cost of living allowance, and if it is not we are going to lose our Constitution or ruin the country, some of us must get up and speak against that. I think everybody now is satisfied that the stand that many of us have taken in this matter is that this, as cost of living, to a man who is a cantonnier or key scale worker on this basis, is rank injustice to him if you say it will not be on overtime work. The majority of people who work in town do overtime work. Hon. members have given you so many examples that you need not worry. I am sure that the amount of money that is distributed among the other people is not much money on a comparative basis, because there are not many Chief Justices or Puisne Judges. If you take a vote in the Service you will find that any man receiving less than $400 or $300 a month would tell you that, if you give him the $9 he will take it, but if he wanted a review in salary he would not accept $9.

The majority of people who work for $300 and up receive increments. If you look in the Estimates you will see what is the increment for a man at the salary point of $300. In many cases the incremental figure is above the point of $9 a year. The increment on the salary for a teacher at $2,760 is $120 a year; then you have a salary at $2,880 and the increment is $144 a year, so even this in itself as an increase is an addition. Nobody would refuse an addition, but a comparative statement would show that this is even less than an increment.

You have not even increased the salary for those people by the equivalent of what they regard as an additional increment to their salary; so it does not represent what a man would get without negotiations, because in a salary scale he goes from one point to another. When a man is not on an incremental scale, like a labourer, and he works for 30 cents an hour, you say you are going to give him 34 1/2 cents, 30 cents basic and 4 1/2 cents cost of living, so overtime is going to be on 30 cents and not 34 1/2 cents. Why? Isn't that a clear case to show that the thing needs revision in these brackets without costing you anymore money?

The Hon. Minister made a plea about money, but I have been in this Chamber long enough to say - and take my word for it, the Premier may say that he cannot afford $1, million, that is another $200,000 to give satis-

faction to these people - that before the end of this Session the Premier will come down here with an extraordinary vote of an increase greater than the amount of money he is now asking for, although he cannot foresee how he would get it back, and which will not give the same amount of satisfaction to the people who work for Government.

There is no taking a plunge in the dark by giving something to represent satisfaction because they are always with you in the sense that they are working for the public. If you came down here maybe with a Resolution for more than $200,000 would you expect us to reject it and say that you did not give enough to the people at this time? That is only to show you that it could not bankrupt the country. I heard the Minister today asking if we want them to prove incompetent so that somebody would say that they are running the country to ruin. That is the same kind of nonsense that was used in connection with Ministerial Government.

When I heard the Hon. Minister, who is part of the old school, say that if you wanted to hear a good debate you could come to the House in the olden days, but if you want to hear "cussing" you can come here now, I must say that it is true; he is from St. Philip, and when he came to town it was usually on Fridays, so he never really came to the House. If he used to frequent this Chamber before he would find that the debate was so high-class that the whole thing was finished by this time, having started at 12 o'clock; they had so little to discuss. The debates now are a reflection on us. There were decent debates then, but there was a lot of poverty, and a lot of roads to be done. Do not mind when we discuss these things we curse each other as the hon. member said; we have a lot of people to represent.
5.05 p.m.

I think I have heard the Hon. Minister of Agriculture holding forth on matters when he was on this side of the House. As a matter of fact, we could stay outside and hear him.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I did not curse anybody personally; I dealt with the matters before us.

Mr. WALCOTT: The only thing you did not call Sir Grantley Adams in those days was a gentleman! Do you want me to go and read the debates? I do not know what happens to some people's memory. I have seen a look upon the hon. member, on one classic occasion, that, if looks could cut a man in half, the look of the hon. member would have cut Sir Grantley in half. I think the Hon. Minister will remember that historic meeting which was held at St. Marks.

What I want to say now is this: are we now representing these people? There was a time when the people who was elected to this Chamber represented only about 6,000 people of Barbados. Today, many of us have to meet more than 6,000 people to be elected. Do you expect the atmosphere that prevailed then in this Chamber could be what it is now? You did not have then the clash of interests to represent. The 50 or so voters you had to represent then lived in a certain area and they would always get their representation. At that time, the representatives only represented those who had the vote.

Look how many times you have heard this statement before: "do not mind them, they do not have the vote." Nowadays, the interest which we represent is a different one. You say that we are playing politics. Do you think that there would be a debate like this 25 or 35 years ago?

What do you find today is that, whenever anybody raises a point which pleases a crowd of people, or whenever the people agree with what we are doing, you hear this same Government accusing those people of being gullible; but, whenever they agree with what the Government does, members of the Government say that they have the confidence of the people. Let me tell the Hon. Minister that any man who comes to the House of Assembly to listen to the debates and who is unemployed should not be looked upon with derision, because any unemployed man in Barbados is a man who needs your sympathy. You should not say that all we are doing is playing politics. We represent people; and if an issue arises that you have to represent them and speak on it, tell me what is wrong with that.

Those of us who sit in the Trade Union Movement throughout the world have brought to the attention of our colleagues in other parts of the world that depressed wages and low commodity prices cannot raise the standard of life. I am going to attend a meeting in Berlin next week, and one of our questions to be discussed relates to people in under-developed territories. When we come to these things, we deal with them; we do not tell anybody that we brought you out of the mire and muck and that sort of thing. When the Hon. Minister talked of bringing the people out of the mire and muck, where was he in 1925? Tell me from where has he brought somebody? The Hon. Minister cannot call a friend whom you can say the two of them were contemporaries together. Can you tell me of anybody who can call the Hon. Minister by his Christian name? Tell me if Abraham Lincoln ever said that he brought people out of the muck and mire, or whether Mr. Clement Attlee or any of the big Socialists ever talked of any such thing? You live in a world where men are men. The Hon. Minister talks as if he has brought somebody out of Gadarene slopes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I appeal to the hon. member to get back to the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: The time should come when you should speak in terms of your people having a right to live and to live in a decent way. It is not something to be extended to us. We should all aspire to it.

The Hon. Premier should realise that it is a false argument to say that, when you give them the 4 1/2 cents per hour increase, it is the highest yet offered. We have given other people higher increases than was given to them before. You are about to build a Hospital which is going to cost you between $4 million and $5 million. Twenty-five years ago, you would not build a Hospital for $5 million; that would represent the whole of your budget then. You could not do it for that then, and twenty years from now you will be able to do things which you may not be able to do now. I think in your own private capacity you want to know that you grow in wisdom. When you came in here for the first time you did not understand things as you understand them now.

I do not know how much thought the Hon. Premier has given to this matter which is his responsibility, but I say that the structural arrangement for this salary revision is one which he should examine in order to see whether these points which were raised are valid.
5.15 p.m.

There is a fear amongst Civil Servants that if they say something about what the Government does, somebody will tell somebody else and they are likely to lose their jobs. Some people keep out of the Civil Service because, when they talk, some Departmental Head is likely to keep them down. I would like to see Civil Servants being in a position to negotiate wages, but not in a manner in which Parliament is forced to debate things as a result of which the Civil Service in itself is dissatisfied. The time has come when the Premier should look at the matter in the light of what has been said; let him give the matter the consideration which it deserves and bring down something which will give satisfaction not only to the members of the House but also to the Civil Servants who happened to work for the whole public, and not merely for the people who happen to be here.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, some time in September, 1958, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, who is now on my right, tabled a motion asking for a minimum wage for the unskilled workers of the Unestablished Staff

at the Department of Highways and Transport, the Waterworks Department and the Public Works Department; a minimum wage, I believe, of $18.00 per week. We know that at present there are unskilled people who work for as little as 24 cents an hour. It is perfectly true, although it may not be a matter of public and general knowledge, that a Money Resolution can only emanate from the Government benches; therefore, the machinery which a member on this side of the House has to employ in order to bring about any amelioration of the conditions under which the unfortunate people or the majority of the people of this island have to exist, is to do it in the form of debate by a Resolution or motion, asking that steps be taken to increase the wages of these people.

What I am trying to establish right here and now is that the initiative for an increase in wages, and not for a cost of living allowance, is something in connection with which, if you did a limited amount of research, even going back over the past two or three years, you will find at some time or other that there has always been, since the Godsall Report, some kind of Resolution tabled by a member on this side of the House seeking to bring about an increase in the wages of Government employees in the lower brackets.

We do not strongly support the idea that it is the province of any Government to do anything about industry outside of its own employees; we feel that the Government should set an example. We do not believe that the Government, either through the machinery of Wages Councils or otherwise, should try to usurp the collective bargaining machinery of a Trade Union. We believe that the best people to decide the wages in private industry are the industrial workers themselves, and that the most effective way of making wage demands is by the vehicle of the Trade Union wherever it may exist. That, as a theory, has been created quite recently in local politics: that the Government must interfere or pretend to interfere with private industry and make the workers believe that, by setting up things such as Wages Councils or Wages Boards, as they used to be called, the Government is responsible for any improvement which the workers may get not only in their conditions of work but in their actual take-home pay. That is a theory which is inimical to the development of strong Trade Unionism; but here we have the sincerity of the Government being put to the acid test.

If the Government is in a position to do anything about wages at all, it is in respect of, and in relation to, their own employees in the Public Service. That is why I said that the Government should set an example. Instead of setting an example we have this kind of thing existing in the colony today; a new undertaking is set up and the workers are paid a wage rate no higher than the subsisting Key Scale rates in the Government Service.

When the workers make demands - whether it be Richard Costain or the Soap Factory or any other place - the workers are told that employers do not want to upset the Government wage structure although they would be ready and willing to pay more. We have it on fairly reliable authority that the private industries actually take the time from the Government, as a rule, in respect of wages which are to be paid to their workers.
5.25 p.m.

That is the reason, Sir, why we choose to attack the problem from the angle of the people. Now in the light of that, Mr. Chairman, you will then see that the Resolution which was then in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was one which would have had far reaching ramifications in the industrial economy of this island and in relation to the general standard of living of the people who need most attention.

The hon. senior member for St. Michael, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, maligned the hon. senior member for St. Lucy stating, some weeks ago in the course as far as I can remember of this same debate that they, the Government, were doing more than what had been asked for by the hon. member; they were casting the net wide and giving all and sundry $9 per month; not as a wage increase, but as a cost of living bonus. In other words, not only the key scale worker working for from 24 cents an hour up to 54 cents an hour would get this $9, but the Heads of Department working for $1,000 a month. Their new conception of equality seems to be this: that you use something equal for everybody, the rich man in his palace and the poor man at his gate. That is their idea of Socialism. The rich man in his palace drawing $1,000 a month who has not agitated, asked for, desired - unless he is particularly avaricious- and it is true that we live in an inquisitive society - is getting the same thing because you are giving everybody. They would not complain.

Well, Sir, it would be almost a state of socialism which no one envisages if they were prepared to elevate the man who is getting $13.80 per week and give him the same $1,000 that the Head of Department was getting; but if you have a certain section - the large majority of people in this country who are fortunate enough to have and retain a job - working hard, bringing up families and living on less than a subsistence wage, - nobody would be able to convince me, Sir, that $13.80 a week or 24 cents an hour is a living wage for a man and his family or for a man alone; because you give everybody the same thing, would you really say that you have done justice, and that that is equality? Why not send them each a handkerchief for a Christmas present and forget the $9? The rich man would have his ward robe full of handkerchiefs, and the handkerchief which the man who gets $13.80 receives would turn into a head-tie for his madam.

Because we say you should not give Heads of Department, you say we are partial, limited in our vision and in our application of principles. To show you how liberal and generous you are, you are giving everybody regardless, although you profess that you are short of money. I have never been able to follow the logic of that. What really surprised me, Sir, was the statement made by the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to the effect that we would sort of burst the Estimates if we attempted to spend any more money on revising the salaries of the lower branches of the Civil Service in the manner in which we have advocated from this side of the floor. He pointed out, in the course of his remarks, that our estimated surplus was $574,000, let us call it $575,000 this year; that if we more or less expended $1,000 more of this, the Public Treasury could not take the strain.

Now, Sir, I made this simple analysis of the Revenue and Expenditure from the year 1951, but I decided to take from 1953-1954 to give the House an idea of the financial situation of the colony, and let it draw its own conclusion. In none of those years, Mr. Chairman, was there any suggestion at the beginning of the financial year that we would have as healthy a surplus as the one which was anticipated in the Estimates for 1959-60. In the year 1953-54, the actual surplus at the end of the year after the Heads of Department s had committed their grades by way of supplementary demands during the course of the financial year - these are not surpluses over our estimated expenditure, but surpluses over our actual expenditure when all the time our brilliant Financial Secretary was saying that we would get a surplus of $300,000 or $400,000 or in some years as little as $260,000 or $270,000 - was $2,068,681 left in the Treasury, after the poor citizens of Barbados had been overtaxed. In the year 1954-55 it was $2,604,000.
5.35 p.m.

In the year 1955-56, you will remember, the Mission to Whitehall had failed. This is the Mission on which Sir Grantley Adams, the Governor of Barbados and the Financial Secretary went up to get money for hurricane relief; and, to use the picturesque language of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy...

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Nobody from this Government ever went up to

the Secretary of State for the Colonies to get money for hurricane relief.

Mr. BARROW: Well, Sir, the next thing he will want to tell me is that he does not have on a red tie! We have the records of the House to prove it. I am saying that the former Premier of Barbados, the Governor of Barbados and the Financial Secretary went up to Whitehall to get money for hurricane relief. If they got money and if they did not say so, then the former Premier was a liar. Everybody in Barbados knows that. Do you have the temerity and indecency at your age to say that it is not so?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking that those words be taken down.

Mr. BARROW: You can ask that those words be taken down if they are not withdrawn. You cannot ask that they be taken down.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking that the word "indecency" be withdrawn.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the word "indecency" and would say the "audacity". He has the audacity to come in here and say that - when he knows that it is an established fact. Because of the economy of Barbados, though we got the worst of the hurricane, Grenada got $3 million while we only got a taken gift of $50,000, and out of that some of it disappeared over night.

In the year after we had the hurricane, we had a surplus of $3,152,000. That was money which was left over in the Treasury; I do not mean money accumulating, nor do I mean that was money added to what we had the year before. In 1956-57 we had a surplus of $2,908,273 and in 1957-58, the surplus was $1 1/2 million; that is the back-ground. It had nothing to do with the General Revenue Balance, or anything to do with the Revenue Equalisation Fund, or with the $10 million or $11 million under the Stabilisation Fund.

Now, it is very significant to have heard the Hon. Premier say this: "We have made income tax concessions this year." To whom has he made income tax concessions? You have not made income tax concessions to the small man or the man who is working for $50; that man does not pay income tax. You have made concessions which you think would cost the Treasury about $300,000 a year, but it is fairly safe to predict that, at the same time, you are going to collect another $2 1/2 million although you have made those concessions. The Hon. Minister of Finance can write that down and check it at the end of the year.

All you are saying is that if we did not give these concessions to people who have children at the University - and those people are really the heads of the Departments - you may have collected $3 million, because you have the P.A.Y.E. system; and, because of that, the dragnet spreads a little wider than it was before and there is no time lag in the payment of your income tax. As a matter of fact, although you have said that you are giving up a year's income tax, you will not be losing a year's tax; you will only lose it if the world comes to an end; but as long as the history of mankind goes on, as it is now, the Government is collecting money from income tax in advance. Sir, I do not want to go too far above the head of the Hon. Premier because I can go on to say that this is money on which normally, they would have had to pay 6% if they wanted it.

If you are a person who is representing poor people, although you represent rich ones as well, I believe, you might consider primarily that your interest is in the lot of the poor. I do not know if you ever considered the difference it would make between giving the Key Scale Workers a living wage and taking off income tax from middle class people or people in the higher and middle income brackets. If it were a question of a social or a financial alternative, which would you do? I do not know if anybody connected with the Government who has children abroad made the request, but there was no public outcry for a reduction. It seems as if you chose to make that reduction yourself, which might amount to $18 or $20 reduction in tax from people in the middle income brackets, but nothing from the man in the street who is suffering all the time.

I understand that up to today, the Police were chasing people off the streets from selling salt meat at 10 cents per pound, which is cheaper than how it is sold in the Roebuck Streets shops. We have people in Busbey Alley selling tomatoes at all sorts of fancy prices but, as soon as you see them doing something to bring down the cost of living, they become public enemy No.1. Sir, I do not want to talk too quickly but I think a word to the wise is sufficient. If you scrutinise the Public Acts, you will find that, of all the commodities which human beings consume, the only one which the laws of Barbados do not prohibit you from selling on the streets of Bridgetown is salt meat. I am only dropping a hint.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. Godsall suggested that it was an affront to Government employees to give them something in the way of a cost of living bonus or allowance because there was no prospect in the immediate future of the cost of living coming down; therefore, you were depriving a man of his pensionable emoluments and there should be a basic wage. It was for that reason that the Salaries Commissioner recommended that the cost of living bonus, along with the rent allowance and the laundry allowance which the Police, the workers at the Hospital and so on used to get, should be consolidated into their wage structure.

On page 22 of the Godsall Report of 1956, Mr. Godsall said this: "The present cost of living system was introduced in June, 1951," The Government gave 25% on the first $40.00, 7 1/2% on the second $40.00 and 5% on the third until they got a maximum of $156.00 per year, or $13.00 per month. Mr. Godsall went on to say this: "and since then, after a rise in the latter half of that year, the cost of living has, as I have pointed out in paragraphs 39 and 40, remained relatively stable for over four years. Such movement as has occurred in the Index of Retail Prices shows a very slight tendency to rise."

The Government discussed the Godsall Report and they never disputed paragraph 56 of that Report. This is what that paragraph says: "The only justification for further retention of the present cost of living allowance as a separate item in the emoluments of Government Servants would be the likelihood that prices would fall in the reasonably near future." I hope you have digested that, Mr. Chairman.

A cost of living bonus is something of a temporary nature which is supposed to alleviate an extraordinary situation which might have arisen and could not have been anticipated by any reasonable foresight or planning on the part of the people who had been responsible for the island's finances. Mr. Godsall goes on to say this: "In present world conditions this seems to be most improbable and the best that can seriously be hoped for is that the value of money will continue at its present level. Barbados is largely dependent upon imports for its necessities of life and even an internal slump due to a fall in the sugar price, while it would no doubt sharply bring down the standard of living, would not be likely to have much effect on the cost of imports. In any event, if prices should fall as a result of a future world wide depression, the salaries of Government servants could, as I have pointed out in paragraph 35, be in the last resort reduced and this possibility therefore does not form sound ground for continuing the existing cost of living allowance at the present time. If once accepted, such an argument could clearly be used indefinitely against any increase in the pensionable salaries of Civil Servants."

That is the whole structure and argument against this iniquitious cost of living allowance which the mem-

bers of the Government are trying to introduce today. It is a fraudulent way in which to deprive the Civil Servants of their pensionable emoluments. If the cost of living has risen since 1956, I give my solemn undertaking that it is not likely to come back down. The cost of living has gone up, and is presenting a perpetual struggle between wages and prices - wages trying to keep up with the price of commodities. It is not necessarily a good thing that goods should revert to the price at which they were in 1900 when you could get a pound of sugar for a penny. We are responsible for the Civil Servants, and there is no point in hoping or dreaming or praying for a reduction in the level of prices. We are dependent on imports, as Mr. Godsall has said, and all over the world trade unions are asking for increased wages; and a wise trade union tries to keep wages ahead of prices.

The cost of living in Barbados has risen by 68% over 1940. That does not mean that prices are high, but the wages should not lag so far back that they lead to starvation and privation amongst the masses of the community. Our plea was for an increase in the take-home pay of employees. Must a man go on from this year until 1978 when he retires, getting a cost of living bonus and not be able to draw two-thirds of that as a pension after being 35 years in the Government Service? If the cost of living has gone up, I want any one of the members of the Government to satisfy me that it is going to come down. A fall in the price of commodities would be the only justification for introducing a bonus, which, we have reiterated and stressed, is a temporary measure and nothing which we regard as a solution to the economic ills which are confronting the Government workers in particular in this island.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the hon. member, who is the Minister of Agriculture, to say that if prices rise, they are going to put on controls; but why did they not put on controls when they allowed the price of beer to go up two or three months ago? What they mean is control of the working man so that you do not have that freedom of control of your money with the liberality you had before.

Never in the history of this island have the purveyors of merchandise, the sellers of foodstuffs, and the shopkeepers been moving out the small retail man - I mean the big provision merchants who are in the same category as the Minister of Agriculture and enjoying the financial reserves, the magnificent buildings and the plurality of house ownership which they have been enjoying under this present Labour Government through the persistent rise in prices ... What controls have they put on? They have only put controls on things like fish, just stifling the local industry, but where anything is imported, what kind of controls have we got? The only controls we have had is to increase the duty and put up tariffs so as to increase somebody's business, so that the prices rise above the means of the poor man all the time.
5.55 p.m.

I want to issue a solemn warning: The people will come to breaking point and get to the stage, after we have got here and talked for them and they do not see any results, where they will begin to believe in the law of the open trench. Mr. Chairman, you know what I mean. There are many on this side of the House who believe that we are seriously heading to a position in Barbados where the law of the open trench, perhaps, would be the only solution to the suffering people in this island.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that we have had to come back here today to speak on this cost of living. I heard the Hon. Premier say in his remarks that he could not give any more money; the Budget could not afford it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is hard to think that a man who has come into this House to reason should come with such a hard heart. On the contrary, we should come with a level mind to reason together. We are not asking for a greater amount of money; we are asking that the Government, which has the power, take this amount of money and distribute it among the lower brackets. It is useless to come here and speak on this cost of living every day. While the grass is growing, the horse is hungry; the poor people are waiting. I am not saying that this money would not be of some help because it would help against starvation and poverty. If the Government has the power in its hands to distribute this amount of money why not look after the poor people first?

If a man today had four children wearing shoes and two of the children's shoes wanted repairs, I would repair the two pairs which needed repairing. I am certain that those people in the higher brackets are willing to wait for a further increase later on, and would be satisfied if this amount of money was distributed among the poor class of people.

Members of the Government cannot expect an independent man, who has been sent here by people to weigh their grievances before the Ministers, to be catching votes. I have heard a lot of talk about industries and other things, but we do not need that today. Let us get ahead with the task which is important of dealing with the poor and helping them out of their distress. In the same way that you take stock of your larder and grocery department, you should take stock of the poor.

I am not here to go into the history of any person; my object is to speak concerning the poor. They are in need, and there is a time coming when you will go back to the poor and ask them favours; so if you do not remember the poor now, they are not going to remember you with all your loudspeaking, chat and charming bait. These people are going to forsake you when you go to them again if you do not remember them at this time. $16.50 is not too much to give the poor working class man, but because you have come here with a concrete nature mind, you feel hard to break down.

Some time ago you said you were willing to distribute money among the poor; what would it take off you now to distribute this amount among them? The only man who does not make a mistake is God Almighty; so if you have made a mistake, why not try and correct it and distribute this money among the lower bracket? I am sure that if you have good counsel, my dear friends, happy are you; where there is no counsel the people fall, but where there is a multitude of counsel there is safety.

I have been in conversation with several people in the higher bracket and they are willing to wait and allow you to distribute this money among the poor. They say that it is an insult to give them $9 on $1,000 or $800 a month. If they are willing to wait, why are you not willing to distribute this money among the poor? Many a day I cannot be private at my home because the poor people come and say "Mr. Corbin", or "Homie", the last has gone and today is Thursday; my husband only works for $13.20." I usually give them some of what I have. They always remind me to remember them when I come here.

If you look at my hands, you will see the soil on them. I am ashamed to beg, but I am not ashamed to dig; I can go back and dig tomorrow. I sit at present between the Government and the Opposition, and if I live and my people send me back here, I would like to have the same seat because my mouth would not be tied. I do not like to fight for a position; all I want to know is that I live and that my poor people live, and it should be our desire to see the poor live along with us. How do you feel when you are eating your beef steak, dolphin and ham and eggs, and you think of the people who cannot get salt fish, people with a slice of bread-fruit, a few potatoes and a little coffee without milk? Do you think about these people when your dogs can eat meat from the market, and you yourselves have a big refrigerator and can eat and drink from it?
6.05 p.m.

As I have said before, the cries are going up to Heaven and when you see the cries have reached heaven, God takes over, and He appoints whom He wants. Now that you

have the opportunity and privilege, why not yield to what is right? I am not exaggerating; I am only expressing the feelings of the people. If you have power now, make much of it. The time has come when you should love in your heart but, deep down in your heart, there is sorrow because you know that what you are doing is not right. The time may not come again. I exhort you to give the poor man a chance now.

Sir, I hope by the multitude of pleadings, this Government would consider the poor and do its duty. Think of the poor pensioners who have worked so hard and who have resigned and are getting only $5.00, $6.00 and $10.00 a month. Think of these poor policemen who have resigned and who draw these low wages. Think of those poor cantonniers and scavengers, those poor people who work at the Hospital who are drawing a pittance! Those who are rich, they do not want looking after. Remember what Joseph of old said. Joseph said "do you remember me when I was still with you?" Do you remember the poor only when voting time comes around? Remember them now, and save them from dying. When that particular time comes around and you remember them now they will get stronger and they will be able to give you their vote. (A VOICE: That is politics now.) If you are saying that I am making use of a political stunt now, I say it is you who are making political stunts; it is not I. There are gentlemen on my left and on my right. I am an Independent. If the two sides come together they will squeeze me! It is only "Homie" or John Wesley Corbin between the two sides!

Sir, I want to see the Government do justice though the heavens may fall and that will be a consolidation to man and God. Hon. members may laugh at what I say, but their laughter does not affect me. I am certain that if hon. members on that side yield to their hearts and do good, God will extend their days; but if you continue to do evil, He will shorten your days.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put.

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

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

The question that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:–

AYES: Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 4.

NOES: Hon. F. E. MILLER, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SEARLES, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. T. W. MILLER, STRAUGHN and L. E. SMITH. - 12.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ORDERS NOS. 1 - 4 POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1,2, 3 and 4 and that No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE TERMS HOUSING AUTHORITY MAY BORROW $1,800,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution: 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, 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will see from the Addendum to this Resolution, this Resolution seeks the approval of the House for the borrowing of this sum of money and the terms under which it should be borrowed for the purpose.
6.15 p.m.

Section 20 of the Housing Act 1955 (1955-40) as amended by the Housing Amendment Act 1958 (1958-35) provides that the Housing Authority may (1) from time to time with the approval of the Legislature borrow money upon such terms as may be approved by the Legislature for all or any of the purposes of the Authority, (2) the Government may guarantee, in such manner and on such conditions as it may think fit, the repayment of, and the payment of any interest on, any money so borrowed by the Authority.

Some time ago, we transferred the Public Officers Housing Loan Scheme to the Housing Authority which is now the responsible Body for administering that scheme. As I told the House then, it was proposed that we borrow this money which is mentioned in the Resolution from one of the Banks, and that that would take care up to that time of the outstanding amounts for which respective borrowers had applied under this fund. It was always meant to be set aside and used for this purpose, but it was always falling short of the amounts necessary to meet the requirements of public servants in this respect. We are hoping that this amount which we are getting from the Bank will be adequate to meet all outstanding applications for loans.

The Addendum sets out quite clearly the terms on which we are obtaining this loan. It will be operated as a fluctuating overdraft at 5 1/2% in the first place, which will make it much cheaper than if it is operated as a straight loan; and, after that, we will exercise the option agreed to by the Bank to change to five per cent on a loan account. I regret that this matter has taken such a long time to reach this House but nothing better could be done.

We had to negotiate with the Bank, we had to meet the Authority, and all the legal paraphernalia had to be gone into, and we know all the delays that take place in these matters. I am asking the House to deal with this matter as quickly as possible so that we can satisfy the outstanding loans as soon as we get through with this Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to revert to Order No. 1.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is to resume Committee of Supply.

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

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO STAFF OF GOVERNMENT-AIDED SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution in Committee of Supply is a Resolution for the sum of $32,000.00 to pay a non-pensionable cost of living allowance to members of the staff of Government-Aided Secondary Schools on the same basis as the Resolution which we have just passed. The schools affected are set out in the Schedule to the Resolution. They are: Combermere School, Alleyne School, Coleridge and Parry School, Alexandra School, Boys' Foundation School, Girls' Foundation School, St. Michael's Girls' School, Harrison College, The Lodge School, and Queen's College. In the case of monthly paid employees, at the rate of $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; in the case of hourly paid employees at the rate of 4 1/2 cents an hour.

As I said, Sir, this Resolution is on the same basis as the Resolution which we have just passed. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The next Resolution Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for $67,500 to pay a cost of living allowance to Government Pensioners. We have been hearing for the last two days that this Cost of Living allowance, which was passed in the first Resolution, will not be included in the pensionable emoluments of any one who happens to resign now because it is a cost of living allowance, and is not attached to the pensionable emoluments of salaries and wages.
6.25 p.m.

I want to say here that that was taken into consideration. This Resolution for $67,500 includes any pensioner now or any pensioner who happens to resign as long as this cost of living is in force. It is not calculated on a percentage basis; the calculation is that, since in pensionable circles the maximum pension is half of the emoluments, $4.50 would be the amount of cost of living paid to these pensioners. That is, half of the cost of living granted to those people in active service will be added to their pensions.

There are several reasons why it was not done on a percentage basis. One reason is that it is hard to get in touch with pensioners; it is not an organisation as in the case of the Civil Service Association. From the time I took up the office of Premier I have been receiving anonymous letters from pensioners, and I have seen anonymous letters in the local press asking to help pensioners since the cost of living has gone up.

Another reason is that, in the lower bracket, there are resigned Government officers who are receiving less than $10 a month. Some receive $4 and $5 a month, so naturally a percentage basis would not be effective in their case. Government concluded that they would work on the basis of a maximum allowance of 50% to the pensionable emoluments of the officer when he comes to retire.

There is a total of 1,091 pensioners. The highest number is in the grade $25 to $50, so that is the basis on which this was computed. Now we are seeking permission of the Legislature to use the sum of $67,500 to pay a cost of living allowance to these Government pensioners.

I beg to move that the sum of $67,500 do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Premier and it seems as if the Government was really looking for a reason and a basis on which to calculate these pensions. Well, that reasoning is ridiculous. It is wrong to say that the maximum pension is $50%; pension is calculated on the gratuity also - but you say that you will give a maximum of 50% to a man's total emoluments when he comes to retire. You are giving everybody in the service an increase of $9 and you decide that you are going to give 50% of the $9 to pensioners. Actually, Sir, you are working on two different figures, one of which does not relate to a man's maximum salary, because...

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. When I said 50%, what I really meant was 50% of the cost of living which is now applied to people in active service.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know that is what you meant. You said that the reason why you arrived at a 50% increase was because the maximum pension that a man gets is 50% of his emoluments, so I say that that could not be any logical way of arriving at it; you are dealing with a cost of living which was calculated on the basis of giving a man 4 cents an hour as an increase. What you are saying in fact is that every pensioner must have an amount of $4.50; and, as the percentage of his maximum amount is equivalent to 50%, therefore the amount of the increase must be 50% of what you are giving the other people. That means that if you are giving a man a cost of living allowance on his pension and he is now getting $30 a month, he will then get $34.50, and if his pension is $10 he will get $14.50. You can call that a cost of living because you have arrived at a ready made figure to give you the amount of money; you have so many pensioners and you are going to give them $4.50.

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that I am satisfied in my mind that the Civil Service administration lacks the quality of people in it to do a job which is involved and complicated. This is a very serious thing for a colony; it shows that if you ask for a serious analysis and break down in the Service on a complicated matter, you are not going to have it. I can now understand why we have been delayed so long in things like Workmen's Compensation and other involved matters which need calculation.

All you have to do here is to multiply $4.50 by the number of pensioners and get the answer; that is an easy third standard matter. It would be easy if you have Workmen's Compensation and a Provident Fund and you are giving $4.50 to work out how much that would be; but when you are dealing with a situation in relation to an economic matter and you want to arrive at something, you must arrive at something which would approximate to justice. When you give everybody $4.50 it is only a sop.
6.35 p.m.

What does the amount of $776,000 mean on your active wage bill as compared with this amount on your Pension Bill? What relation does that bear to this? It seems to me as if you were not ready for this. If you give a Pensioner $4.50 per month as an increase when the pensions are so low, I will say you are not yet ready to deal with pensioners.

It seems to me as if the Financial Secretary does not have the time to work these things out; and, as this is, it seems to me as if you are only adding insult to injury. I believe that some of these pensioners will not even know that their pension is increased by this amount. Some of them do not read the newspapers, some are blind; and it would not surprise me if some when they get it give it back thinking that they have made a mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I do feel that it is time that the Financial Department gets down to its job because this increase as it is is not a job. If you can give pensioners only $1.12 per week at any level, that is not good enough. I do not want to be ridiculous but what does that mean to the Minister without Portfolio who is drawing a pension of about $300 per month? Do you mean that you are giving him an increase of $4.50 per month too?

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when I listened to the speech of the Hon. Premier as he introduced this Resolution which deals with an increase to pensioners, I felt like laughing. It was the only thing possible that could be done at that time. I wondered whether it meant so little to him as it appeared to, or whether, from his speech, he meant that the subject could really be dismissed and discussed by him in less than five minutes.

This matter before the House involves a grant of what is called a cost of living bonus to Government pensioners but, if this Committee searches its memory, it will recall that this Committee and this House have already had this matter - not this one but a similar matter - before it when this side of the Committee pointed out then that what the Barbados Government was doing to its pensioners was to rob them. I stand here to repeat that same charge today.

I will go further and say that, apart from any consideration given to them, whether it is $4.00, $5.00 or $6.00, the Barbados Government should be ashamed to come in here with this unless it were prepared, if nothing else, to give to those people what it intended giving to them in 1956; and, far from saying that this little $4.50 per month which you are now going to give them should only be backdated from the 1st April, 1959, if the Government had any conscience, it would be backdated to the 1st April, 1956.

Before I go so far down into the argument, let me see if I understand the attitude of mind which prompted the Government to bring the Resolution before us and according to these terms. First of all, I am glad to hear the Hon. Premier say that, ever since he has assumed the office of Premier, he was receiving anonymous letters from pensioners. I also have received two this week which I propose to make documents of this House. I feel that, in the interest of keeping the record straight, these people's - although they did not have the courage to sign their names - and I am sorry they did not think of appending their signatures - points of view are worth while recording in the documents of this House. Sir, I am very glad in this matter that, even if the Hon. Premier is not my colleague, he is enjoying the same experience as I; I will even venture to say I believe that almost every hon. member of this House has received letters from pensioners over the years. 6.45 p.m.

As to the Minister of Trade, it would amuse him, I suppose, if he were to read the warning and the struggles which he put up years ago, when he discovered that a police horse was getting more than the wages of a postman. If he searches these Estimates now, he will see that a police horse is getting just as much or nearly as much as a cantonnier (Hon. M. E. COX: That is not true.) The hon. member says that it is not true; they are not now feeding the horses apparently. If you turn to the Current Estimates on page 41 under the Head XV - Police - you will see Items 35 and 36. Item 35 is "Forage" and the note is: "For purchase of fodder for Police Horses." Item 36 is "Upkeep of animals" and the note is: "Includes provision for food and medicines for dogs; repairs and replacements of saddlery for horses; shoeing of horses etc.,"

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thought the hon. member was only making a passing reference to that matter. I suggest that that is nothing to do with the pensioners.

Mr. TUDOR: You suggest that but I do not agree with you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will have to convince me that that is something to do with pensioners.

Mr. TUDOR: Well you will have to listen to me; I cannot do it otherwise. Assuming that there are about two dozen police horses, there may be more, these two dozen horses *(SIDES)* I do not mind the interruptions, but I would like them to be sensible ones.

If you divide that money among these two dozen horses, that would take out of the taxpayers' money nearly $2.00 a week. The point is that you think you are doing a lot by giving these pensioners $4.50 a month. I want the hon. member to understand that the problem is the same today, as when he first drew attention to the principle of giving police horses more than people.

The second point is this. A retired Government servant is not just a pensioner and nothing more. If, as a worker in the Government, he was a man with a family before he retired, he has still got some family and domestic responsibility after he has retired; and you must remember too, Mr. Chairman, that, apart from the other difficulties, he faces a drop in his income. That may not make so much difference with a man who retires on a salary of one thousand dollars a month. He finds himself with a pension of $500.00 and the chances are that he might have been living on $500.00 before; but when a man who has been working for all his years and who, perhaps, did not get beyond a maximum of $80.00 or $100.00 or $120.00 a month, finds himself with a pension of say $30.00 or $40.00 or $50.00 a month, he feels it more than a man who has dropped from a top salary of $1,000.00 a month to a pension of $500.00 a month.

It is a curious argument of democratic principle which says that, if you want to do justice to everybody, you have to give everybody the same thing. We have spent the better part of four Tuesdays in arguing this principle, and it is the cause of a very bitter cleavage between the Government and the Opposition. How are you going to promote equality by giving every body the same thing? It would be difficult to see how a pensioner who is getting $500 deserves the same thing as one who is getting $50. I can see that the man who is getting $50, or $100 or $120 deserves all the consideration that you can give him, especially if he has retired before 1956. It is probably the 1956 pensioners who are suffering the worst of all the pensioners. It was their grievance which was brought to the attention of the House on the last occasion, and it was not looked after at all.

According to the Government's point of view, the $500 a month pensioners will get $4.50 and those who are getting $14 will get $14 plus $4.50. That is the Government's policy. How they have arrived at that figure is the most ludicrous part of all. They have decided to give everybody $9.00 and they have argued that, since the most and highest pension a man can get would be one-half of the salary at which he left off working, the highest pension revision is one-half of the present cost of living allowance. Have you ever heard such an argument? That argument assumes that because a man is a pensioner, the cost of living hits him one-half as much as it hits the man who is working, and his comforts must be one-half as much as is required for food and shelter; and the education of his children should be one-half as much as is required; therefore, all he deserves is one-half of the cost of living allowance!

You may argue that your wages bill as a Government will go up by leaps and bounds every year because you employ more and more people every year; but you cannot argue that the pensioners increase in the same proportion. The Government may employ 11,000 people now in all branches of their service; they may have a programme of capital works which may cause them to give employment to a couple of thousand more people, but it does not follow that if you have 10,000 pensioners now, you will have 11,000 or 12,000 later on. The number and increase of pensioners work according to certain clearly established and defined rules.

If you do not want to increase the number of pensioners, you should change the rule affecting them. You

have not got so many pensioners relying on you so that you have to provide an increased number with what you have promised them; you have a number which can be regulated to a certain extent. We object to this contention that because we cannot pay more than $9.00 a month as a cost of living allowance, therefore we must only pay one half of that to all pensioners, especially when we pointed out that all pensioners are not equal and that some are better off than others.
6.55 p.m.

If you take, for instance, the hon. senior member for St. John who is a retired Government worker and is now a member of this House and a Minister of the Crown, or if you take the Minister without Portfolio in the Other Place, I do not think any of them would ever work themselves into a frenzy about getting the extra $4.50 a month; and I do not mean that they despise money or do not think it worthwhile to get any more, but they, in their situation, will understand that $4.50 extra on their pensions even now cannot make much difference to their standard of living, their ease, their comfort, or their enjoyment of life.

If you go lower down the scale among the pensioners, the retired Hospital porters, scrubbers, policemen, some of the retired elementary school teachers who did not become Headteachers, Civil Servants who left the service in the Long Grade category and did not become Heads of Departments - those are the people who, like those who are working, find that the cost of living touches them very severely. Whatever arguments you use, the half argument must be rejected because, if it is hard for those who are working to eat and drink, it must equally be so for those who are not. You cannot argue that, because a man is retired, he needs less food or less clothing or looking after than the people who are working; so, on the basis of dividing the cost of living in half and giving it to every pensioner irrespective of his condition, is a wicked and detestable thing to do.

I want to emphasise here and now that I am more concerned at this juncture with the plight of those Government servants who retired before 1956. Those who retired after April 1st, 1956, are in a slightly different position. When, some time ago, this House and its Committee made an attempt to adjust the grievances of the pensioners, we did not do what was right then; the Opposition argued that Government was doing wrong to offer pensioners only 75% of the cost of living.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 o'clock p.m.
7.00 p.m.

On Resumption

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

COMMITTEE RESUMES DEBATE ON COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE FOR PENSIONERS

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension of the Sitting, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was speaking.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when the House was suspended for dinner, I was on the point of dealing in some detail with the grievances of the pensioners who retired before 1st April, 1956.

Now I know, Mr. Chairman, that a lot which will be said here on this side of the House will be put down as vote catching. When the Opposition is not accused of vote catching, it is accused of playing politics or bringing off political stunts and things like that. My answer to these charges when we are dealing with matters like these is a simple answer. The people who are elected to this Chamber have to represent all sorts and conditions of people, and Government servants and retired Government servants are included among these sorts and conditions.

In a democratic society, Mr. Chairman, whether you are on the Government side or on the Opposition side, everything you say and everything you do ought to be done with a view to impressing upon the electorate how right you are and how wrong your opponents may be. So the charge of vote-catching does not affect us in the least; we feel that we at any rate, on this side of the House are really voicing the grievances of these people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will remember, it was on the 15th April last year when a Resolution came before this House to pay a cost of living allowance to Government pensioners; the House voted then $150,000. The whole purpose of the Resolution, as set out in the Schedule, was to pay all pensioners an additional cost of living allowance at the rate of 75% of the allowances payable in accordance with Resolution No. 80/1951.

Now you will remember, Mr. Chairman, that last year when we were doing this Resolution, the cost of living allowances had already been abolished in consequence of the Godsall Report, so Government decided then to take into account the cost of living allowances which had been paid to pensioners before 1956 and to award that 75% or whatever those allowances were; therefore a pensioner who was getting $16 a month basic pension and $4 cost of living allowance up to that time got 75% of the of the $4 cost of living, and he got an extra $3 and that gave him $23. That very sitting of the House, if I am not mistaken, was the first day the hon. junior member for St. Thomas became Premier, or the day immediately after; and there was a big lot of argument in this House on that day as to whether or not the member presenting the Bill was at that time a Minister.
7.50 p.m.

I think two Ministers from that side spoke, and we pointed out then that we believed 75% of the cost of living which you were giving them was nothing; and we proved it by figures. One of the Ministers said - it may have been the Hon. Minister of Trade - that much as Government would have liked on that occasion to have done more for the pensioners, the Accountant General, the Financial Secretary and all the other Civil Servants had gone into the matter most carefully and nothing more could have been offered them. He also said that the problem which Government had to face in dealing with pensioners whose pensions were small, was to discover whether the pensions were small due to people not having a long period of service, or whether it was small because a different person may not have got a particularly good salary. There was a further disclosure that the personal files of some of these pensioners could not be found; and, for that and other reasons, Government had worked very hard on the matter and had arrived at the conclusion that 75% of the cost of living allowance of 1951 was the natural thing to offer.

We gave our support, but it was qualified. We made it quite clear that those persons who retired before 1956 were the people of all people who had the worst case. That is the argument which we put up tonight.

We regret the nonsensical arguments of the Hon. Premier to give half of the cost of living allowance which is now given, because a man who retires at the maximum only gets a pension that is almost half of his salary. I know that Government has a moral obligation to give pensioners even this little bit as from 1st April, 1956. In 1958 you told them that that was the best you could do then and you left them hoping and believing that the matter was not closed and, sometime in the near future, you would give something more to them. If the time has now come for further consideration to be given them, you should carry out the intention which all of us - Government and Opposition alike - had of doing what best could be done under the circumstances. The circumstances now are that you owe them a 25% increase. Are you arguing now that this basic increase of $4.50 a month which you are giving now to the $16 per

month man, to the retired Chief Justice and to the other persons, is the remainder of the 25%? (A VOICE: Indeed not.) If you are not giving them the other 25%, what are you giving them at all?

It has been pointed out by the hon. senior member for St. Peter in his speech before mine that, in all cases, you are offering $1.12 per week per pensioner, and you are giving that to the retired Chief Justice, to the retired Head of a Department, to the retired Headteachers and even to the retired Headteacher of the St. John's Mixed School and to the retired Auditor General who sits in the Other Place. I only mentioned those names because they happen to be pensioners and they too, if they had the chance to speak for themselves, would speak a word for the pensioners; they know better than most of us what it is all about.

This Government has committed themselves more deeply because the very arguments which they used in this House were used on all sides of the Other Place when the matter was debated there. About four hon. members - and one of these was a supporter of the Government - pointed out that the Government had a moral obligation to these pensioners to see that what was withheld in 1958 from them would be given to them at the earliest opportunity; and the Hon. Minister without Portfolio said that he would draw what they said to the attention of the Government. Read the *Advocate* of that date and read the Official Debates of the Other Place when they are printed, and you will see the Hon. Minister without Portfolio giving an undertaking to the Other Place that he would bring to the attention of the Government the strictures passed on Government's policy as regards these pensioners. It was said there openly that when you gave them 75% of the cost of living of 1951, you were taking away from them what was their due, because it was given to them when they retired and you had no right giving them only 75%.

If that is so, is it vote-catching to say that you are robbing them when you only give them $4.50 a month? Is it vote-catching to say that you are robbing them further when you refuse to give them what was left over from last year? And far from giving them this little bit from April, that you should give them from April 1956? The pensioners are the people who suffered most. Sir, again I must plead guilty of the charge of vote-catching when I say that the majority of the pensioners are those whose pensions range from $20 to $60 a month.

I heard expressions from hon. members on that side of the House to the effect that some people can retire early and get another job; but I say that it is the working class men who cannot hold down another job after they have retired. They are the people whom you have promised to look after. You will find, Mr. Chairman, if you take a census of all the pensioners in this island, that the ability to hold down a job after retirement and the success in finding one comes more easily to the better paid pensioners than the ones at the bottom. As a matter of fact, the work which the pensioners at the bottom did was too hard for them to be of any use after retirement.

When you have walked off the feet of postmen for the better part of 40 years and they retire, their physical condition cannot be as good as that of a retired judge, or a retired Director of Public Works, or people like that; therefore, if it is a case of supplementing incomes, the better paid pensioners have a better chance than the more poorly paid pensioners.

8.00 p.m.

It is only a lack of vital information which has prevented a full assessment of the whole situation. The Government should be more realistic to honour what is an implied promise to these people. It does not matter to me whether a group of pensioners support this Party or that Party; and, as far as that is concerned, we should be able to do our duty to these people without fear or favour, without our eyes being placed on the coming election. I want to say that there are worse ways of vote catching than asking for more money; Mr. Hutson Williams has promised that he will remove a hut from Seawell and take to a cricket club all on his own. On the last occasion when anything like that happened at Seawell there was a lot of confusion over it.

If we stand on the floor of this House and say that, in our opinion, these people are not being fairly treated, we know that we cannot make the majority of them over there change their minds about it; but we know that the majority of people who are pensioners of this Government who retired before 1956, support our point of view and they have been prepared to say so.

The Premier said, and the Minister laughed loud and long, that he had received anonymous letters from pensioners. I quite agree with him. Not only myself, but a lot of members on this side of the Table are always receiving such letters on behalf of these people. If there is one matter among the many matters which are being brought to the attention of hon. members, it is the plight of the pensioners. Scarcely does a month pass by that we do not receive complaints either in writing or by word of mouth from people who say that they retired in 1956 and they do not get what they should get in 1958. They say quite openly that, if the Government wants to be fair, however little they get - they cannot make the Government give what they do not want to give them - but whatever little is given them they are asking that it should be enjoyed as from the 1st April, 1956.

Pensioners, by definition, are people who, for the most part, are advanced in life; and, if the Government sits down on this matter and considers it carefully, it is difficult to see why the grievances of these people cannot be met. Here is one letter; I do not mind if this letter becomes a document of the House because the Premier has received similar complaints. I am glad to say that the members of my Party receive full praise for what we have done for these people.

"Dear Mr. Tudor,

We are watching steadily how you and the Opposition (D.L.P.) are fighting our battles for us in the C.O.L.A. which is now being debated in the House.

This is the point. Those Government servants who are getting $300.00 and over a month can well be left out from the C.O.L.A. which is now being debated. Those who should be considered are those Government Servants and older pensioners in receipt of less than $240.00 a month. That is the point.

But here is a most important point. Older pensioners had to wait for some time before Government considered their claims; when eventually our claims came up for consideration they gave us an apology for an increase inspite of the stout opposition you and other D.L.P. members put up."

If the people mention my own Party, it is the truth. The letter goes on:

"Any increase voted for us shortly will only be a portion of the bigger increase we should have got before and which D.L.P. fought for without avail. For this reason try to get the small increase now coming for us Pensioners before 1956 - paid retrospectively from April, 1956. This is logical, and only just. We depend on you and your D.L.P. friends championing this matter for us. Thanks in advance."

Hon. M. E. COX: Signed?

Mr. TUDOR: He signs it "Old Pensioner".

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman. It is only fair to ignore a letter such as that. That letter could have been written by anybody. Who can tell that the hon. member has not written that himself?

Mr. TUDOR: I object to that most strongly. The hon. member says that this letter might have been written by myself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet. 8.10 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, let us have this clear once and for all. The hon. member has made an imputation.....

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

Mr. TUDOR: The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order if I get up to object to an imputation which he cast on my integrity. I am asking him to withdraw the words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you objecting to the remarks "who can tell that the member did not write that letter himself"?

Mr. TUDOR: I consider them offensive.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is objecting to the imputation made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Hon. M. E. COX: What did I say? I said that the member told us that the letter is an anonymous letter; that means it is written by nobody because nobody has signed it.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is nothing to do with your business.

Hon. M. E. COX: All I am asking is who can tell if it was not written by the hon. member. It could have been written by anybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw the imputation that it could have been written by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will withdraw, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: With regard to the letter, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy intimated from the beginning that he was making it a document of the House. It has been written by somebody but the person, whoever he is, did not sign his name. I have instructed the Clerk to collect that letter and make it a document of the House.

Mr. TUDOR: Now, Sir, with respect to the other one, this too can equally be a document of the House; it does not matter to me because they were received by me just as the Premier received his anonymous ones. I have only decided to make these documents of the House after hearing the Introducer of this Resolution say that he has received many of them.

The other letter says exactly the same thing except that, in this case, the writer draws attention to the fact that Government, when it gave 75% of the cost of living last year, did not do sufficient; and that all these things should be retroactive from 1956. So, Mr. Chairman, I must resent, and I do most strongly, the imputation that because somebody does not sign a letter it is written by nobody, and all that sort of ignorance; as the hon. member said, that is the meaning of anonymous.

Mr. Chairman, it is a sad commentary of affairs in this island that people are so afraid of the Government's members that, even when they are laying genuine grievances and complaints, they have to hide their identity because of what they think they - Government - can do them. There is this fear which causes people not to be able to append their signatures to things when they write to politicians. (A VOICE: They are afraid of you.) Who would be afraid of you? Only somebody more silly.

I would like to enjoin all those persons, whether Government pensioners or not, who have genuine grievances not to be afraid to speak them. Certainly let it be known, whether by writing to the Premier, any Minister, Backbencher or member of the Opposition. I am sure that in this matter, at any rate, if not in any other, the Premier would agree with me because he would like to know who his correspondents are so that he can favour them with a reply acknowledging the letters.

Our point is simple and it needs very little emphasis to get it understood in this House or anywhere else. We cannot make them consider pensioners more than they are inclined to do. (A VOICE: You are wasting time.) I know it is a waste of time; it must be a waste of time so far as they are concerned because they have at least two more years to hold on at most. Next year, or two years from now, they can hope that the pensioners will forget what they are now doing to them or that they will be dead; there will be fewer of them but what they do then will be expected by the rest. (A VOICE: St Lucy is a most uncertain parish.) You do not know what is holding over you.
8.20 p.m.

I want to say to those hon. members who are competent enough to speak on these matters that, if they use the argument that the persons who are higher up the scale need not to get this equal treatment so as to keep them satisfied, that is to say, those Civil Servants who are now in the employ of the Government - if that were true, all the pensioners at the top have nothing to complain about. What grievance have they against the Government that you must do something for them in order to keep them satisfied? If a man draws a pension of $400 or $500 a month and because of his position or his qualifications he can get another job bringing in the same amount, what has he to complain about? He is not complaining about the cost of living, except for the sake of making his voice felt to help the large number of retired Government servants at the bottom of the pension scale who need assistance; therefore the Government should be most concerned about them and the same argument which we used in the past debate, we use now. If your money is short and you cannot do more, we would tell you as we told you then.

To those pensioners whose pensions are more than $100 a month, you can leave them out for the time being, and to all of those persons who receive pensions of less than $100 a month, give them the added increase. I know, and all hon. members of this Committee know, that the majority of pensioners are those who get less than $100 a month. That is why we say, if it is little to be shared out, what you have, share it to those who need it most. Abuse does not mean one thing. Personal attacks on our integrity for speaking for these people does not mean one thing or another; what matters most is what the people themselves who are concerned in the matter think of what the Government is doing for them and if I judge their moods and desires correctly, they are far from being satisfied and Government has not the slightest justification for withholding from them what is due to them or offering them so little after so long a period.

Again as in the case of the Civil Servants, are these old pensioners going to wait until so many conflicting claims are presented in election year before they are properly attended to? We are looking forward to the revision of salaries of Civil Servants in 1961. It is safe to say that, if the hints that we hear are true, they would also be an increase in old age pensions then, if not before. All of these are claims on the Government to be met by the voting of money out of the Public Treasury. If you are going to give to pensioners then what you are not prepared to give to them now, the Public Treasury will not have so much money to meet all these needs at the same time; therefore, would it not be wisdom to start with pensioners now so that whatever greivance they may have, they cannot emerge as early as 1961?

Do not make a stopgap now, feeling that you will come to it in 1961; by then, you will have so much to

do that you will not be able to get through with them. That is why after the elections, you spend two years straightening up anomalies which arise from these hurried increases of salaries. You can help them without political controversy because, luckily for the pensioners, they are not so numerous-although everyone counts - and you do not have to wait until election year to attend to them.

Last year when the Government decided that something would have to be done for them, it was as a consequence of terrific pressure. You would scarcely open the daily newspaper at that time without finding at least one letter focussing on the plight and distress of the pensioners. After so much pressure, something was done; and, fourteen months after, something is being done, but it is not what was left over to be done; it is not the finishing up of what was started, it is something different. That is why the people claim that the only way you can do justice is to give them this increase from further back; they argue that, since they retired before April, 1956, they are the ones who got the dirty end of the stick.

Justice is justice, whether you do it for one person, three people or four thousand people. Nearly two weeks ago, this House made right something which was considered a wrong when we adjusted the salary of three officers of the Police Department and gave them back pay from 1956. Their case was hanging fire for all those years and we acknowledged it was due to them.
8.30 p.m.
If you can show justice to Superintendent this and Captain that, why can't you show justice to a couple of pensioners? Much as the Government may claim that they have not got the money to do this or that, when they come here with a good case for individuals, this House to its eternal credit, rarely ever criticises the righting of a wrong.

If your pensioners tell you that they have a case and you admit that they had a case last year - because you are belated with the little which you had to do for them - then you should see what you can do for them. See if you can go back from 1957, if you cannot go back from 1956. At least the pensioners should be given their amount as from April, 1958. If that can be done, you will be acknowledging that you are at least making an attempt to right this wrong.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is a point which I wanted to make relative to the structure of the pensions. It is really an addition to what I have said. The Premier said that it was based on 50% of the maximum amount, and that is why the pensioners got one half of what they gave these other people, and that one half is $4.50. If you are taking a scientific view of these pensioners it should not be a sort of blanketing thing like this.

A person who resigns on the 1st April, 1959, is in a better position than a person who resigned on the 1st April, 1949. With a person who resigns in 1959 you will find that, with the variations of the pension and changes of salary, his pension is likely to be 25% higher than that of the man who resigned in 1949.

If a man resigned on a salary which was in existence in 1939 and he is still living in 1959, if you give an increase on this blanketing change, you give him something near to the salary at which he retired. A man who has retired in 1940 *(ASIDES)* Mr. Chairman, you should deal with the common place things over there; if hon. members think that they can laugh out when an hon. member is speaking, well, we can do that too. Why do they not go to the Market or to some other place if they do not want to be in this Chamber? The hon. member thinks that he can ignore this House all the time; he is not responsible for decency. Even when they have moved up they behave in the same common place way as they behave in the ordinary places.

I was making the point that, if you make an over-all settlement as to pensions, you are not really dealing with these people because, what you are giving them bears no relationship to what you should pay. You are likely to increase salaries by the rate of 30% from the time when a man retires; and you want to treat that man in the same way as you want to treat another who is retiring from the office which he is now holding. If you say that you want to give a man something to approximate the relief, then it must bear some relation to the position from which he now retires.

Pensions are wasting things. If a man holds an office you should see that his pension should not drop further than a certain point below what the office from which he got his pensionable emoluments was, unless you are going to put a ceiling and say that it will not apply to posts above a certain amount. The people who are in the $300 bracket are very few; if you have 5,000 people in a service you know the number of these 5,000 people who will reach the top of the Department and otherwise. I regard that the pension should always bear some relation to the post which a person held so that the money value of the pension would not fall so far below what it was ever intended to be. That is the real point.
8.40 p.m.

I have seen it done in England with War pension some time ago, because they felt that some of the people who retired from the War were old, and were drawing pensions that bore no relation to what was going on; so you can see here that if you give a man $4 and he retired twenty years ago, or when you give $4.50 to a man who retired on the 1st April, 1956, the man who retired fifteen or twenty years ago is in a worse position than the man who retired last year; so $4.50 cannot mean the same. That is where it calls for close thinking, since pensions mean bringing the value of something so that when the man first retired this is what it related to under present day standards; he is drawing no salary and cannot expect any more increases from you which would bear some relation to present day conditions, since the money value has gone down.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I have risen mainly to ask the hon. member who has just sat down to give me a sort of demonstration of what he was saying. Suppose let us say that twenty years ago a post was worth $20 and, at this present time, the same post was being paid $60; I am very interested indeed in all he has been saying, and I want to satisfy myself that what he is suggesting is workable. Can he compute a pension which should be paid to a man who retired when the job was paid at $20 a month, now that the same job is paid $60 a month?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman what I mean is this: a job today is worth $60 a month but, when a man retired say fifteen years ago from the same post, it was worth $20. The man who retired 20 years ago is at a lower rate, but the man who retired on 1st April, 1959 at $60 a month will have a pension which bears closer relation to the post at $60; and, if you give now the same $4.50 to the man who retires in 1959, he is going to be better off in relation to what is given than the man who retired fifteen years ago. That man's pension is still at a low rate and remains there.

The time has come when it will call for negotiations for people with pensions at certain levels; that is to say, with a person who retired below $300 and that sort of figure, his pensionable emoluments should bear some relation to whatever the pensionable emoluments would be as a sort of continuing scale. A man's pension should not always remain at the point at which it was when he retired, though he might have lived fifty years after; when the job he did in the community had the same value as it has today. Money values then were not the same as they are today. We ask you, in these circumstances, to give him a greater rate of pensionable increase than to the man who retires now. If you work on the basis that a man who retires now stands at 100%, the man who retired ten years ago stands at a level of 50%. He should not therefore suffer that difference.

If you take the teaching profession, a man who lives long enough may find himself for many years being the same schoolmaster drawing a pension which is not, in the eyes of the community, anything, unless he has children to keep him to the right dignity. You have a very wide gap. I have seen pensioners who have lived long enough that the money value of their pensions has reduced them far from the position of dignity they held before; the money they get now cannot maintain them with food.

It is along those lines I was thinking that, when you are granting increases in pensions, it should not be purely on money, because $100 does not mean the same thing; it is $100 in relation to present day standards. If a man retired ten years ago at $100, you cannot say that because it was $100 that he would not be deserving of something more; the same post today may be carrying a pension of $150. Pension should bear some relation to the present day salary.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have to continue speaking on this cost of living allowance. I am sorry, too, that the poor pensioners who are bearing the strain cannot be given the same $9; it is only because of their decent minds that pensioners who resigned at a low rate are not walking the street and begging alms. If those who are receiving the whole loaf are crying, what do you think of the ones who are receiving half loaf? They have borne the burden of the day and before we were born they worked to keep this country in existence, but today they have been put aside or are in their little cottages awaiting the dropping of a blessing; they are waiting every day for the month to end. Sometimes when they credit they cannot meet their expenses and the Government which has the power in its hands should consider these poor pensioners.

People in private enterprise are looking to you for guidance, so whatever you do they will follow. If you do not do what should be done, you cannot command another man to do it.
8.50 p.m.

I am supposed to be the last hon. member who came into this House of Assembly; therefore, I think I am the least among the hon. members of this House; but when I look around and I see hon. members of this House laughing despite what other hon. members are saying, I am saying that it is a bad example. I sit and listen. A fool laughs at what is good as well as at what is evil. It is hard to believe that our Ministers fail to set forth a proper example for other hon. members to follow. How would you be able to control if you do not set forth a proper example?

Mr. Chairman, I am still waiting and hoping that the Ministers and those that form part of the Government would think and do something better for these poor pensioners. Let them give these pensioners the same $9.00 that they have given to those who are still working in the Government Service.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the same principle applies in respect of pensions as applies in respect of salaries, that is, if the Government has decided that they can only spare a certain amount for these pensioners, that sum should be re-allocated so as to ensure that those who are most in need will have the entire amount divided exclusively among themselves. We are asked to vote $67, 500 to this matter, and our view is that, if Government is not prepared to re-consider this matter with a view of increasing the amount, then let the amount stand; but let them consider the revision of it so that only the lowest paid pensioner - those in the most dire need - would get the benefit of a greater amount than the $4.50 proposed as a result of the savings effected by not giving those who are in the higher brackets.

Mr. Chairman, I formally move now, that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed for the purpose which I have just mentioned, that is, to reconsider the adjusting of the amount by excluding those on the higher brackets. Those whose pensions are above $1,000 a year should be excluded from the benefit of this Resolution; and the amount thereby saved should be divided among the people whose pensions are below four-figures. That would certainly provide, within the framework, something slightly more reasonably for those persons who are at the bottom of the scale and those people whose pensions are $205.20 a year, $281.05; $493,92, $105.30 and $108 a year. People like that are the ones who obviously are meeting it real rough.

If you divide $193.96 by twelve which is the amount of pension for one of them for twelve months, you will see what little effect this increase of $4.50 would have; therefore, if you leave out those who are getting more than $1,000 per annum, it would provide though a small amount yet still a helpful amount to those who are really in dire need. We conceive that all Government can give is $67, 500 and we are saying that you should make a different distribution. I am sure hon. members will see, even the backbenchers, the justice in what we are saying. It is so manifest.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure you regret that you find yourself in that position instead of being able to give us the benefit of your powerful support from your chair around this Table.

Again, I move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed for the reasons which I have given briefly, and which have been fully lucidly expressed by my colleagues.

Mr. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The question that further consideration be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. CORBIN, WALCOTT, TUDOR and BRANCKER. - 4.

NOES: Hon'bles Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, R. G. MAPP, L.ST.A. THORNE, F. E. MILLER, Messrs . HOLDER, SEARLES and STRAUGHN - 9.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

HON. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 16th June, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 16th June, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.