

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th May, 1959.

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

PRESENT

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

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 31st March this year from the Vestry of St. Philip.

I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure in connection with Tenantry Roads of the said parish for the half year ended 31st March, this year;

Also:

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
TO
THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Bill intituled an Act to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill.

H. G. MASSIAH,
President.

Also,

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Bill intituled

an Act to amend the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1956, which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill.

H. G. MASSIAH,
President.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Report of the Barbados Statistical Service Special Studies No. 2 Census of Tourism: 1957.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Reply to Question No. 7/1959 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James regarding the width of road at Bay Woods, Near Orange Hill, St. James.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$24,545 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1959-60, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-60 No. 4, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I am informed that copies of this Resolution have been circulated amongst hon. members with the understanding that permission has been asked to deal with it in all its stages today.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1959".

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

Whereas the question of public access to the sea has been engaging the attention of the Government for some-time, but no concrete proposals or steps have been made or taken towards the improvement of such essential facilities;

And Whereas in the opinion of the House it is considered imperative that appropriate steps should be taken by the Government, at this stage, to protect and provide reasonable access to the Beaches of this Island for the use of the general public;

Be it Resolved that a Committee be set up to investigate such rights of way and access facilities with a view to acquiring existing private rights of way at present utilised by the Public, and of creating new public rights of way, thereby providing reasonable access to the beaches of this Island, and in particular, in the parishes of Christ Church, Saint Michael, Saint James and Saint Peter.

MR. SEARLES APPOINTED TO ACT AS
CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

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

AMENDMENTS CONSIDERED TO HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
(REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) ACT, 1949

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before I make a motion that Your Honour leave the Chair and the House go into Committee, I am asking that the House deal now with the amendments to the two Acts which were returned from the Other Place to this Honourable House. They are typographical errors and if perhaps the Clerk will pass the amendments around, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and other hon. members will readily accede.

I beg to move that these amendments be dealt with forthwith.

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

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

12.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Amendment of the Other Place to the Bill intituled an Act to amend the United States (Oceanographic Research Station) Act, 1956, be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT TO THE
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF
MEMBERS) (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the Amendment of the Other Place to the Bill intituled an Act to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) Act, 1949, be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in moving that this Amendment be now read a second time, I should mention that the Amendment is just the omission of the termination "ing" from the word "following".

I beg to move that this Amendment be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, what one notices about both of these Amendments is that they rather suggest that there is no adequate proof reading system in force at the Government Printery. You will recall that in the case of the first Amendment, the word "therefore" was used instead of the word "therefor" and in this case now we have the word "follow" instead of the word "following". There are such obvious things to jump to the eye that I wonder if there is any proof reading system in force at the Government Printery and if so, why is the proof reading not efficiently done. It is tiresome to have these things continually being referred to by the Other Place and it is a good thing that the Other Place keeps such a vigilant eye on these matters. Obviously, it is to be assumed that the Government Printer's educational standard is of the av-

erage and I would commend to the Honourable Leader of the House, if the matter comes within his range, or to the Minister who is responsible for the Government Printery, to have a word with the gentleman in charge of the Government Printing Office and advise him to advise the proof reader or proof readers, if there is one or if there are any, to do their work more efficiently than how it is being done now.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit tiring to hear these accusations being made *ad nauseam* by certain hon. members of this House when the matter should be dealt with in the appropriate quarter which is responsible for it. The Government Printery has nothing to do with these errors; surely the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should know better than hurl an accusation of this sort against the Government Printery without going into the facts.

Mr. BRANCKER: I assumed that the printing was done by the Government Printery, but the Hon. Minister is assuming that the Government Printer has nothing to do with it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member has assumed that this error is something to do with the Government Printery and that is definitely wrong. It is unfortunate that this responsible machinery in the Government set-up for which the hon. member has urged should be subjected to these attacks on an occasion when they are not merited as on this occasion. That is not good enough. This is a matter of a public servant or of public servants who try to do their jobs and they do feel it keenly when they are subjected to these attacks in such a responsible quarter as this House of Assembly. It is very obvious who is responsible in this matter if you check up with the Leader of the Opposition himself; but it is certainly not the fault of the Government Printery.

Mr. GODDARD: Surely, by insinuation the Hon. Minister is saying that this is the fault of the Clerk of this House; but certainly before the printing left the Printery, the proof reading should have been checked and an error like that should have been corrected before the printing got here. Therefore, what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said has brought the matter forcibly to the House again, that the proof reading at the Printery is not being properly done, if it is being done at all. It is a minor matter, but we are drawing it to the attention of the House that there needs to be a tightening up of the printing done at the Government Printery.

Mr. TALMA: I would like to know if the copy as handed to us here, is the identical copy as passed by this House.

The question is whether the Government Printery has issued several copies of the same thing. However, the objection which has been raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a timely one because, in the first instance, the Government Printery should have somebody responsible to print what they have been asked to print, properly and accurately; and provided it passes them, you should not put the blame on the Clerk. This is an error which could arise with the Government Printery; it is a question of spelling correctly or not spelling at all. It is not a typographical error; it is a spelling error. It is not that the Clerk has overlooked anything; it is an ordinary spelling error, the use of the word "therefor" for the word "therefor" in one case, and the omission of the termination "ing" in the other case.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I will put an end to all of this. It is the Clerk's responsibility to read these proofs and the Clerk has admitted that it was his oversight and not that of anybody else.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this Amendment be now agreed to.

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

The question that this Amendment be now agreed to 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. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:— To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

12.35 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction when in Committee of Supply to deal with the money Resolution for \$24,545 of which notice has just been given and which has already been circulated over the week-end to hon. members.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1959-60, NO. 1

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution deals with the cost of living allowance proposed by the Government.

Before entering on the mechanics of how we arrived at this Resolution, I think I should say first that in order to quell certain rumours that are going around relative to the Government by-passing and treating in a disrespectful manner the Civil Service Association, it would be well to quell that rumour by giving the history of these negotiations. The Government, which is the official side, did meet the staff side of the Whitley Council, and that meeting lasted for over three hours without coming to any concrete proposal, and it was reported to me that the staff side said to the official side "let Government fix it".

On Friday morning I met the Civil Service Association and they admitted that those words were used; but they took it to mean that the Government would fix it and then come back to them, whereas the official side by whose Report I am guided said that they took it to mean that they had talked as much as possible and had come to no conclusion and they could go ahead and let the Government fix it. So it was really a misunderstanding, one side contending that it should still be referred to them, and the other side reporting to the Government that, as I said earlier, the Whitley Council thought that they had done all they could and made all the suggestions they could make, and in the absence of some definite and concrete proposal, the Government could take care of it and send down something.

I mentioned that first, Sir, so that it may be understood at this stage that I met the Council on Friday morning and these matters were ironed out. There was a definite misunderstanding as to the procedure, and in consequence we are going on with the proposals which came down two weeks ago.

Now the Whitley Council, before they met the Government, proposed as a cost of living allowance 40% on the first hundred pounds, 30% on the second hundred pounds and 20% on the third hundred pounds. That was their first proposal before the two sides met; but at that meeting they reduced their proposals to 15% on the first two hundred pounds, 7% on the second two hundred pounds and 3% on the third two hundred pounds. That was their second proposal.

Mr. GODDARD: Would you please repeat that?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I repeat, Sir, at the meeting which took place they reduced their proposals to 15% on the first two hundred pounds, 7% on the second two hundred pounds and 3% on the third two hundred pounds. Other proposals were put up by the official side, but as I said earlier, there was no agreement. The cost of these proposals, that is the 15%, 7% and 3% would result in a sum of \$1,378,683 per annum. The 15% on the first two hundred pounds alone would be in the vicinity of \$1,077,264, the 7% would amount to \$285,450 and the 3% to \$15,969. The Government did not agree with these proposals. As a matter of fact, we were not in favour of a percentage increase for one main reason and that is, that the persons whom these proposals were designed to help, as is usually the case, when there is a percentage increase - the hourly paid workers - would not have fared as well as Government would like to see it.

12.45 p.m.

We took into consideration the fact that these hourly paid workers were suffering because of the high cost to them of basic foodstuffs. We realised that that was the position and we consequently came to the conclusion, as I have said earlier, that the percentage increase would not be so beneficial to them as probably a flat increase would be. At this stage, I would say that the 15% increase which was the second proposal of the Civil Service Association would work out to the hourly paid worker at an addition of three and three-quarter cents per hour; but, as I have said earlier, we were thinking of the increase in the basic cost of foodstuffs as it was to the workers in that category. On further consideration the Government agreed that in the interest of that category of workers we would grant them four and a half cents. We hear all of this amount per month which the Civil Servants would get, but as I have said earlier, we did not set out to calculate this thing on the monthly basis. It so happened that the 4 1/2 cents per hour as applied to these people would mean 35 cents per hour, \$2.08 a week, \$9.08 per month and roughly \$108.00 per year. These figures are purely incidental.

Perhaps, at this stage, for the enlightenment of this House I should quote some figures on the cost of living in other West Indian Islands with regard to the basic foodstuffs which they consume and which are used by us here. I think it would be interesting to hon. members of this House. These are figures for the last quarter of last year.

We start first with flour. In Barbados it is 9 1/2 cents per pound, Jamaica 11 cents, Trinidad 11 cents, Antigua 11 cents, Montserrat 13 cents, St. Kitts 12 cents, St. Vincent 11 cents, Dominica 12 cents, Grenada 12 1/3 cents and St. Lucia 13 cents.

From those figures you will see that flour in Barbados is sold more cheaply than in any other of the areas in the Caribbean.

These are the figures with regard to rice:

In Barbados, it is sold at 13 3/4 cents per pound, Jamaica, 18 cents, Trinidad 13 cents, Antigua 17 cents, Montserrat 16 cents, St. Kitts 17 cents, St. Vincent 17 cents, Dominica 17 1/3 cents, Grenada 15 2/3 cents and St. Lucia 16 1/3 cents.

There again with the exception of Trinidad we are still the cheapest in the area.

In Barbados, dried salt fish is sold at 39 2/3 cents per pound, Jamaica 37 cents, Trinidad 45 1/3 cents, Antigua 40 cents, Montserrat 48 cents, St. Kitts 41 cents, St. Vincent 40 cents, Dominica 44 cents, Grenada 42 cents and St. Lucia 37 cents.

With the exception of Jamaica and St. Lucia, salt fish is sold cheaper in Barbados than in the other areas.

In Barbados, pickled pork is sold at 36 cents per pound, Jamaica 71 cents, Trinidad 69 cents, Antigua 66 cents, Montserrat 54 2/3 cents, St. Kitts 64 cents, St. Vincent 72 cents, Dominica 66 cents, Grenada 52 cents and St. Lucia 52 cents per pound.

These figures speak for themselves. Pickled pork as sold in Barbados is the cheapest in the area.

In Barbados, stew beef is sold at 54 cents per pound, Jamaica 24 cents, Trinidad 77 1/3 cents, Antigua 60 cents, Montserrat 42 cents, St. Kitts 48 cents, St. Vincent 75 cents, Dominica cents, Grenada 65 1/3 cents and St. Lucia 50 cents per pound.

I would just like to mention that local stew beef is sold at 24 cents per pound in Jamaica but I am informed of two things as regards that price. First of all, cattle is reared in Jamaica and, secondly, the law legislates the price at which beef is sold to certain categories of people, that is to say, I understand that the price of 24 cents per pound is only for working-class people. As a matter of fact, it is illegal to sell stew beef at that price to people who can pay more. They import beef just as we do from abroad which is sold to the people who probably are in a position to pay more for it than the working-class people.

Condensed milk in Barbados is sold at 26 cents a tin, Jamaica 30 cents, Trinidad 27 cents, Antigua 44 cents, Montserrat 36 cents, St. Kitts 32 cents, St. Vincent 40 cents, Dominica 36 2/3 cents, Grenada 34 cents and St. Lucia 35 cents.

Barbados according to these figures is still the cheapest. Condensed milk is sold more cheaply here than in the other areas. I have been just reminded that in Jamaica as well as in Trinidad, condensed milk is manufactured and their prices are still higher than ours, Jamaica being 30 cents and Trinidad being 27 cents as against ours of 26 cents although it is made right there.

Edible oil in Barbados is sold at 39 3/5 cents per pint, Jamaica 58 cents, Trinidad 38 cents, Antigua 36 cents, Montserrat 28 cents, St. Kitts 38 cents, St. Vincent 62 cents, Dominica 60 cents, Grenada 56 cents and St. Lucia 60 cents.

With the exception of Jamaica, edible oil in Barbados is cheaper than in the other places.
12.55 p.m.

Kerosene oil is six cents per pint in Barbados; five cents in Jamaica; 4 1/2 cents in Trinidad; six cents in Antigua; eight cents in Montserrat; 5 1/2 cents in St. Kitts; five cents in St. Vincent; ten cents in Dominica; and four and a half cents in Grenada and eight and two-thirds cents in St. Lucia. There are similar figures in respect of laundry soap; it is 20 4/5 cents per pound in Barbados, 21 cents in Jamaica, 22 cents in Trinidad, 30 cents Antigua, 30 cents Montserrat, 23 cents St. Kitts; 12 cents St. Vincent, 32 cents Dominica, 22 cents Grenada and 50 cents St. Lucia. As far as cigarettes per package of ten are concerned, the price is 15 cents Barbados, 20 cents Jamaica, 15 cents Trinidad, 20 cents Antigua, 15 cents Montserrat, 16 cents St. Kitts, 18 cents St. Vincent, 11 1/2 cents Dominica, 10 cents Grenada and 17 cents St. Lucia. And then we come to rum; in Barbados the price is 19 cents a gill, 40 cents Jamaica, 39 cents Trinidad, 10 cents Antigua, 12 cents Montserrat, 24 cents St. Kitts, 52 cents St. Vincent, 24 cents Dominica, 30 cents Grenada and 16 cents St. Lucia.

Mr. Chairman, my reason for quoting these figures is for the purpose of edification generally so that this House and those who read the newspapers will see the figures quoted and they will readily understand that although the cost of living is high in Barbados, yet most of the basic items are still lower in price here than in other parts of the Caribbean.

I return to where I left off with regard to the increase of 4 1/2 cents per hour for the hourly-paid worker. I repeat that that is the basis of this \$108 per annum. Why should this Government decide that these figures should run throughout the service? Well, it was felt that inasmuch as everybody more or less uses these same things - the items which I have quoted - if the price has increased for the working man it has also increased for the general service and this principle should apply equally throughout the whole service. There are some people who feel, I know - and I will probably hear - that this amount is not enough and we should do something more; there are some

who feel that we should still work on the percentage basis. I think I have made it quite clear as to what actuated the Government in coming to this conclusion to give this increase of 4 1/2 cents per hour; I know that there are those in the service who still think that they should get more, but to that I say that the Government was considering the price of basic foodstuffs and not that of luxuries. As to those in the higher brackets of the Civil Service, I want to remind them that the Government has just given relief by way of lower income tax rates in certain categories from which they will benefit; also the Government is considering further relief in respect of education. That has been mentioned in this House already in connection with the Estimates. Those people whose children will be going to Secondary Schools locally will get a certain concession and those who have to send their children abroad for further education will get a further concession. When you take all of these things into consideration you will realise that the Government has tried or is still trying to assure these benefits to all classes of the community; and as to those who think they will not benefit as much as they would wish from this 4 1/2 cents per hour, we want them to remember that they have got concessions in other ways.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to sound any pessimistic note but only a few days ago I was reminded of the falling price of sugar. I understand that the world price of sugar is very low at the moment, just over a penny a pound. Fortunately, there are other provisions made for us in another way, that is by subsidisation, but what I have mentioned is the trend of the moment. While we wish to make all sections of this community as happy as we can, to treat them as generously as we can, yet we have to bear in mind that in Barbados today the trend is ever-increasing expenditure and the revenue is more or less static. We have to bear in mind that this 4 1/2 cents an hour increase not only applies to the people who are regularly employed in Government but such increase will also send up the cost of our capital works.

1.05 p.m.

The Deep Water Harbour will cost us more and the Hospital when we start to build will cost more than we estimated for. All these are factors which we are asking you to bear in mind and to realise that under the circumstances we have done as best we can for our Civil Service.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am putting it mildly when I say that we of the Opposition were astonished when we first read these Resolutions which were circulated to us some time ago in respect of this cost of living, and then we realised after a moment's reflection that the present Government has fallen into the same error as its other Conservative and reactionary predecessors in office in arriving at a method of trying to alleviate the economic plight of the people in this country, when we heard from the speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance just now how he let the cat out of the bag by saying that the principle on which they acted was that in as much as everybody more or less used the basic items, flour, oil, etc., and it was an increase for the working man, then it should apply equally to the whole service. But, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is that the persons who are getting \$400, \$500, \$600, \$700 or \$800 a month will not be benefiting to any worthwhile extent if at all by the extra \$9 a month. That \$9 could be saved and applied to those in the lowest category. What use is it to some one getting \$800 a month to give him the cost of another bottle of whiskey? As a matter of fact, if he wanted that other bottle he would buy it anyhow. \$9 a month is nothing appreciable to him and in the case of those people who are getting from \$400 a month up, it is not necessary at all. It is no real help to them and it would be money available if the Government decided to work on this basis of so much a month for everybody - at least for everybody up to a certain figure, and then in respect of those beyond a certain figure let that amount be applied to those lower down, because really, Sir, when the Hon. Minister of Finance tells us that the Government was not in favour of a percentage increase and then went along to explain the reason why, as I understood it, the persons that these proposals were designed to help would not have

fares as well as Government would like to see it, that all depends on the amount of the percentage increase.

I have not had an opportunity to work out these figures, but it would seem to me that if the Government had accepted the figures originally proposed by the Whitley Council in respect of the lowest paid, and given them 40% on the first hundred pounds and 30% on the second hundred pounds, that would have been a reasonable increase for these people, and they are the people who are really the ones feeling the pinch of the shoe, because the basic items, flour and oil, Mr. Chairman, are alleged to be used by all and sundry, by persons in every walk of life and in every economic class of the community. It must be realised that those persons above a certain figure, say £600 per annum are in a reasonably adequate position to meet the increase, and certainly those who are receiving £1,000 - over \$400 a month - are in a position to do without that extra \$9 a month, for \$9 is the abracadabra of the Government. The figure could be arrived at, see how many monthly employees they are who would be getting the \$9 extra and then deduct the \$9 from all those who are getting over £600 a year, and apply that \$9, dividing it equally amongst those who are getting below £600 per annum. It is an affront, Sir, to offer \$9 cost of living to a \$600, \$700, or \$800 a month salary man.

It would be interesting to hear from the Hon. Minister of Finance what Government calculated it would work out at if they had awarded 40% on the first hundred pounds and 30% on the second hundred pounds. In doing this the highest bracket should not have been considered at all unless there was enough money available to provide an adequate increase for those in the lowest category. You should not consider those at the top at all unless you have enough money left over after you have given an adequate increase to the people at bottom. I would make this qualification, Sir, because I am not quite sure if I understood the hon. member correctly in connection with the Whitley Council's recommendation. If it was 40% for people working up to £100 a month or even up to £200 a month, I would say that they would not be justified in receiving an increase of 40%; for those who are getting salaries not exceeding \$60 a month, it is amply justified and absolutely necessary to give them an increase of at least 40%.

We are in favour of a 50% increase for the people in the lowest brackets - the casual workers, those at Public Works, Waterworks and the Highways and Transport Department. They cannot live reasonably unless they get 50% more than what they are now in receipt of. I hope you know that; I wonder if you do! The people between \$60 and, shall I say, \$120 a month are justified in getting an adequate increase which would enable them to meet the basic cost of living as it is today; but there is no reason at all to worry your head, Mr. Chairman, even although they are having to pay a little more, about increases for those who are getting over \$300 a month, and certainly you are giving them very little help if you give them only \$9 a month. What is the difference, Mr. Chairman, in giving an extra \$9? What is the difference between \$800 and \$809 or between \$700 and \$709?

1.15 p.m.

Would \$9.00 a month make any difference to you? What is the appreciable difference between a man getting \$600 and \$609 or a man getting \$700 and \$709? But, Sir, if you are getting \$15 a week, and you are getting 40% on \$15, you can very well see how appreciable that would be. How would the shopkeeper benefit? How would the home benefit? How would the people in the homes of these working-classes benefit? Look how the medical service would not be so hard put to deal with cases which originate from inadequate food!

I am saying that you should forget all the \$9.00 per month for all those people above \$300 a month and then you would be doing something worthwhile for the sections who are in need when you add that to this \$9.00 which you are giving to them. You are not putting yourself in the favour of those people in the higher brackets by giving them an increase of \$9.00. I refer to those people who are getting more than \$300 a month. As a matter of fact, you hear people who are drawing above \$240 a month saying that

this increase is not worthwhile and you hear them saying that they are not going to draw it, although I doubt that. But from the standpoint of an increase to them, it is so unappreciable as to be negligible and not worthwhile.

Indeed, there have been increased exemptions under the Income Tax Act to the man of modest means although I would say that these increased exemptions are far below that of Trinidad, and they do not apply to people in the lower categories at all. If a man is getting \$15 a week and has a family, there would be no question of his paying income tax at all. The one thing from which he would benefit would be a 50% increase. It would be interesting to see how many people there are in the Government service who are drawing over £50 a month, and how many \$9 per month you would save if you did not put that on to the salaries of those people. If your principle is to give everybody \$9 a month more, and if \$9 a month is the magic figure you have decided on, I am saying: scrap it to those people whose salary is over \$240 per month, and what you save from that, put it on to those people at the bottom.

As to the misunderstanding of the Government side and the staff side of the Whitley Council, as regards the statement which the Hon. Premier made: "I met the Civil Service Association and they admitted that the words 'let Government fix it' were used, but they took it to mean that the Government would fix it and then come back to them," one would expect that would have been understood. One would hardly expect after they had submitted a memorandum, after pursuing their discussions and negotiations that they would throw up their arms in disgust and say to let Government fix it. That statement of theirs would imply that before the matter comes down to the Legislature it would be referred to them so that they would have a further opportunity of discussing it. It would seem to me as if those persons representing the Government really do not understand their fellowmen - I would say their fellow Bajans. I do not know who were acting on Government side, if they were all Bajans on the Government side; but surely I think the average Bajan to be the same with whom he is negotiating and that the term "let the Government fix it" when used would imply that before the matter comes down to the Legislature, they should have the opportunity of perusing it again. You, Mr. Chairman, is a Barbadian - I would say a Caucasian Barbadian - and you would have understood by that phrase that the Government was asked to fix it, and that what they did expect was that after the Government had fixed it subject to consultation by people from the Government side of the Whitley Council that the matter would come back to the Whitley Council: that is to say, to the same people themselves for further comment. That is the reason why you hear all of this hullabaloo from persons in the Government side who felt that they were completely disregarded. Sir, you may have heard that they were complaining that until the Resolution was printed and circulated, they did not hear anything more of it.

Sir, our attitude in the matter is to advise the Government to give further consideration to this matter; to recommend to the Government that if the finances of the country are limited as they claim, it is unnecessary to give this \$9 increase to those people in the higher category of the service. Therefore, we recommend to Government to scrap this amount to those people and to apply that amount to the categories at the bottom of the ladder. Therefore, we are asking Government to postpone this and come back to us next Tuesday or as soon as possible, even Thursday this week, with a feasible proposition from which the people at the bottom who are really not merely feeling but are suffering from the pinch of the shoe would get some appreciable benefit.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the little increase will be regarded as better than nothing; but there is no excuse for this little increase which is only 35 cents a day, which is \$2.08 a week or \$9.00 a month for those who are getting \$50 or \$60 a month. There is no excuse for that to them when you are throwing away the same \$9.00 a month on people who are at the top and who cannot feel any appreciable benefit from it. To those monthly paid workers who are in the highest categories, I say, scrap this \$108 a year. We recommend that Government give further consideration to this matter in view of our cri-

tisms and then come back to us with that amount allocated to the lowest paid workers so as to give them the opportunity of meeting the present cost of the basic items which are flour, rice, oil and so on. The people in the top scale are well able to meet the present cost of the basic items, but the people at the bottom cannot meet them at all. In view of what I have just said, I am asking that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that motion and in so doing, I regret to say that the Government has committed a similar error to the one which was committed when the Godsall Report was considered. If Government can only afford to spend in so far as public servants are concerned \$776,000, if that is all which can be spent, by all means spend it in the right direction. Give it to the ones who need assistance and not to those who are fairly well provided for.

1.25 p.m.

The ones who are suffering and bearing this strain are the ones who are in the lower brackets - the cantonniers, workers of the Department of Highways and Transport, the Waterworks Department, the Public Works Department and so on. Those are the ones who really need assistance most, those who are in receipt of a weekly wage of \$15.00, more or less. I am suggesting that if the Government can afford to spend this \$776,000 and nothing more, then they should deal with those who are in the lower brackets first. If you spend one half of this money in dealing with these people, then you should allocate the other \$300,000 roughly in dealing with the next category of workers. You should start from the bottom. What this proposal amounts to is that the authorities, whoever they are - the financial experts or the ones who see after increasing or regulating wages - appear to be self-centred and to be seeing after their own interest; this money is being spent on the entire service but not on the people who really need assistance. If you go about the matter in this way you will never remedy the plight of those who are really in need of assistance. If you spend one-half of this money in remedying their plight, then I say you should spend the balance of this money or allocate it to public servants and civil servants who are in receipt of salaries which are less than \$200 a month.

This Resolution is a Resolution dealing with the general cost of living for everybody employed in the Public Service; it is not really attending to the category of persons who find it very difficult to eke out an existence. I repeat that this is a general cost of living allowance for everybody in the Civil Service. Our contention has been and still is that the ones who need assistance most are the ones who are in receipt of \$15.00 a week or the monthly earner whose wages are under \$200.00 a month. This money is being voted and it is going into the wrong people's pockets so that the relief which we hope to see the underprivileged people get will not be afforded. It seems to me that unless some other system is adopted in allocating wages and granting increases, there will always be a repetition of what has happened in the past because the so-called authorities who see after these increases seem to be self-centred and to be seeing for themselves and after their own benefit in any suggestion of an increase of salary. This should not be a cost of living allowance for Civil Servants generally; if you are going to give any increase to employees you should start from the bottom first. If you start from the top and come down to the bottom and say that this amount is ample, that is the wrong approach to the matter. I repeat that this money should be going to the ones who are in receipt of wages ranging from \$15.00 a week to \$30.00 a week; it should be going to them, and to them alone; in that case you would be doing something to remedy their plight; but if you are allocating this money throughout the entire service, you are really not doing anything. All of this money is being voted but as to the financial experts, whoever they are, they are putting one on the Government. Although I believe that the Government is well intentioned and would really like to see relief granted to employees generally, this is another case of entrusting the relief of conditions into the wrong people's hands. If you persist in this method, the people who are really in need of assistance and relief will never get it. The ones in whose hands you are entrusting the working out of this matter will see after their own interest first

and then there will be no money left to give to those who need assistance most.

This is the Godsall Report all over again in that the same old authorities are still there; they are feathering their own nest. But the ones who cannot make two ends meet, the ones whom the Government are anxious to help, are not getting any assistance out of this \$776,000. I repeat that this money should be given to those who are in receipt of about \$15.00 to \$30.00 a week. If you entrust this money in the hands of people who want to feather their own nest and give it as a cost of living allowance whereby everybody will benefit, when that has been done, the casual workers and the unestablished staff will be in the same position as they are in now. This is a good attempt to give relief to Civil Servants generally; it is not an attempt to relieve the plight of the lower paid workers in the Government Service and those who have been waiting for this relief for years.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you would not believe in 1956 when this question of wages for the Unestablished Staff and the poor men in the Service was discussed that you would have had before you after three years, a Resolution such as this one. The hon. senior member for Christ Church made some very good and important points but he also made the apology about the Government and their intention. I want to say that the Government is in power to carry out its intentions and it is not a question of the Government being fooled. Can you excuse anybody that he has been fooled into doing a simple act? The Government were not being fooled when they added increases to other people's salaries and to their own salaries; are they going to be fooled now? Three years ago I said that the minimum which you could expect a man to be given was \$15 a week. Can you imagine Ministers drawing top salaries and the travelling allowance which they are drawing, now asking a man to buy food on \$12.78 a week?

1.35 p.m.

You have people working in the service for 24¢ an hour, so on a forty-four hour basis all that man can get is 45 shillings a week. These are the people: female labourer - Cleaners at the Public Works Department, the Caretakers at the Public Works Department, Attendants at Civil Aviation, and Scrubbers. What do you expect when you give a man 30¢? What industrialisation are you going to find? Can you sit down with your mouth wide open and ask somebody to live on \$10.80 a week? I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, are you not perpetuating what is worse than the old Conservative days? What kind of human beings are you? You are paying a man \$10.80 a week and now you are adding \$1.98 to make it \$12.78 a week. We have a doctor as Premier who would ask this man to pay a fee of \$3. Imagine this man having to pay \$3 out of his week's pay and for a prescription in medicine! He is the same doctor who says a man should pay 25¢ when he goes to the hospital. That is the type of leadership we have. At every stage he is extracting money out of a man's pocket who cannot provide himself with a subsistence level of wages.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member not to bring the Premier into this thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Whom do you want me to bring? The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Menzies? Are you asking me not to bring him into this although he introduced it? Do you want me to bring a man from South Africa? What do you want me to do? If you do not understand the Rules, ask for leave and leave the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you will not be governed,.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Governed by what? I am not going to be governed by any monumental nonsense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must have respect.

Mr. WALCOTT: Respect for what? Nonsense?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the Premier's private business to do with this?

Mr. WALCOTT: What private business am I asking for? Do you understand common English?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know English, French and Spanish. (Cheers.)

Mr. WALCOTT: That is the sort of nonsense we get in bringing into the House people who do not understand the common Rules of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can be dignified.

Mr. WALCOTT: Dignified my neck! If you do not understand the Rules of the House, why not get out of the Chair?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am here and you cannot put me out.

Mr. WALCOTT: It seems that you want to put me out. If you are going to be in the Chair, you have to be there with impartiality.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must deal with the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am dealing with the Resolution, and if you do not understand what it means, I say that you should ask for leave and leave. Old age does not necessarily bring sense. If you do not have it when you are young, you do not get it when you are old. I really do not want to raise my blood pressure especially since the Chairman does not even understand. If the Chairman does not understand an analogy, I am not responsible. The Premier introduced this Resolution today for people getting 24¢ an hour - that is \$10.80 a week - and is increasing that by \$1.98 on the basis of a 44 hour week making the amount \$12.78, and I want to ask what you expect this man to do when he has to pay 25¢ on going to the Hospital. Now I want to ask these questions: what kind of rent do you expect that man to pay? What kind of food do you expect that man to eat? He will never be able to aspire to normal life, that is to say, to marry; therefore it means that you want a large number of the community to live in abject poverty. Do you think a man should get \$12.78 a week after 300 years of colonialism and after a period of over 100 years from the abolition of slavery? The Government is asking the lowest paid worker in Barbados to receive \$12.78. Can you industrialise on that? Can this man buy a toothbrush? Can he live a normal, clean life? Would he be able to do any of the social amenities which you are talking about? You are suggesting that you are giving him \$12.78 because you know that he can live on it.

What you are doing is this: as an employer, you are preparing the way for Conservatives, because you are underwriting low wages as a mark of policy of your own in that you are not coming here today and saying that no matter what past Governments have done, you are satisfied that any man working for eight hours in the Government service cannot live on less, and this is the minimum wage. It is not a question of what work he is doing. Even today the minimum wage of \$15 is still below what a man can live on.

Now a cantonnier gets 30¢ an hour. Here you have male labourers - Cleaners at the Markets, Labour Gangs, Yardmen, and Caretakers at the Education Department getting \$13.20 a week and they will now go to \$15.18. You are saying that the wage for these people in the low bracket of the Service is tied to the increase which you propose to give to a man in the whole Civil Establishment. Look how this Resolution reads:

"In the case of monthly paid employees at the rate of \$108 per annum."

That is equivalent to 4 1/2 ¢ an hour.

"In the case of weekly paid employees at the rate of \$2.08 a week."

Again that is equivalent to 4¢ an hour because if you multiply 52 by \$2.08, you will see what figure you would get.

"In the case of daily paid employees and watchmen at the rate of 35¢ a day or period."

You can very well multiply 8 by 4 1/2¢ and bring it to that figure.

"In the case of hourly paid employees at the rate of 4 1/2¢ an hour."

So whatever you have done, you have tied the lowest wage in the Service of 4 1/2¢ with that of the highest paid worker; you are now saying from the point of view of equity that the man at the bottom should get the same as the man at the top, and in view of the fact that you give the man at the top \$108 a year more, you propose to give a man at the bottom \$108 too. What is also disgraceful is this: imagine paying a man by the hour and then having the effrontery to tell him that this is not a basic wage, it is only a cost of living! That means that if any of these poor brutes should die tonight, two days or two years after, as long as this cost of living remains, it is non-pensionable.
1.45 p.m.

Imagine your bringing down a non-pensionable amount for a man who is not getting \$12 a week! You are saying that he cannot get a pension out of that which you propose to give him. Do you not believe that these people of the Government should be licked out of this place? Imagine your saying that these people are not eligible for a pension on this increase! You are saying that this is cost of living allowance, therefore it is non-pensionable; therefore, you mean to say that this is up and above what you regard your basic wage should be. That is to say, these Ministers in 1959 regard the basic wages of these people are the old time wages of 24 cents and 30 cents an hour and that what they are giving them now is only a smile; it is cost of living; it is non-pensionable. Can you imagine such disgraceful conduct being meted out to these people? I am saying that if these people were better organised, you would not get any work from them tomorrow. You give cost of living for extraordinary circumstances. During the war time, you talked of war bonus, but there is no war on. Whatever a man is passing through today, he is going to pass through in a general way for the next ten years. I do not know if anybody has watched the economic trend of the world, but for the last ten years it is not on the downward trend. In the United States and in Europe, although there has been a recession recently, it has not brought lower prices. You will see that although the automobile industry was hard hit in the United States and in Europe, the price of an automobile is not reduced from the point of view of the production line.

When you get a situation in which you have a cost of living bonus based on a subsistence level, what can you expect? Look at a man. He has to live in a house; he cannot live in a cave; he has to buy food. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy brought the prices of some items in this House to portray why you should give these people in the lower categories a better wage. What do you find? They are getting now what should have been the basic wage in 1956 because I argued from this table in 1956 that I considered then the minimum which you can pay a man is \$15 per week. The reason why I say that is because the hon. gentlemen on my left who is one of those who employ people is still wedded to the idea that \$12 per week is good enough for the biggest man. They are still looking at these low wages.

Cantonniers and people like that are little paid people. They are not University men; they are poor working class people. They depend on this type of employment and they will work until they die on it. A man who is a cantonnier cannot move from that job because owing to the educational system and economic situation in which he was born, it enforces him to be a cantonnier for life. If he begins at eighteen years as a cantonnier, he will end there. There are more people in Barbados who find themselves working for lower wages - what I would call subsistence wages - than those who find themselves working for what can be regarded as a living wage. What I cannot understand is how in one breath the Hon. Premier can come down here with a Resolution telling you that in order to get a doctor at the Hospital or somebody at the Public Works or somebody in a professional position, it is necessary to pay them such and such a salary, but when it comes to people in the lower brackets of life because they happen to be in the position in which they compete for work among themselves, you give them this low wage. Any man who is working for \$400 a month can buy food every day. I have seen in this Chamber recently that you increased people's salaries which are over \$400 a month, and with justification. Is it right for a Government of Barbados to say in this day that they regard \$12 a week at

any level of employment as a living wage to be paid out? Do you realise that for some of the houses which this Government is building - 18' x 9' houses - the people are asked to pay \$3.00 and \$4.00 a week rent for them? These people have children to support. How can we sit here and continue to underwrite low wages in Barbados? What type of industrial development can we look forward to when some of our people do not have money to buy some of the things which you want to industrialise? I do not know, but it seems to me as if you want people to walk barefooted, because any man who works for \$12 a week cannot afford to buy shoes for himself or to buy them for his children. Is it that you want people to send their children to school barefooted and you are drawing a line between those who are barefooted and those who wear shoes?

You pay these poor wages to these large number of people and you tell us that this amount which you are giving them as an increase is a cost of living allowance. You do that when I know that when you were dealing with some of those people in another salary structure through some anomaly you increased their wages by £100 a year. I have seen that happen; yet you are suggesting that these persons should only get \$108 a year and that is to be a cost of living allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if hon. members will remember the Governor's Speech. Of course, perhaps, from what the Minister said about the Governor, the Governor may not have been speaking for them. This is what the Governor said:-

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

Now, in February, they said that they were going to grant some relief to the lower paid employees and that means that they were satisfied then when they made this statement that the higher paid employees were not in need of this treatment as the lower group was; but you come along now and have put into operation that you are giving the whole group an increase, that is to say, you are giving the higher paid employees the same sort of consideration which you are giving to the lower group.
1.55 p.m.

That is to say, four and a half cents per hour for the man who was getting 24 cents an hour and four and a half cents an hour for the man who is getting £1500 a year. Mr. Chairman, if you had read the Resolution you would have had to query it; You do not talk about a cost of living allowance when you are dealing with subsistence wages; you talk about a cost of living allowance when you are only making an adjustment, but we have to review the whole thing now. Whatever you pay a man is his basic wage. You will go and tell a man that his weekly wage is 24 cents an hour and his cost of living is 4 1/2 cents; that is what you are going to tell these people. The male labourer who is getting 30 cents an hour will have an increase of 4 1/2 cents and the cantonnier who is getting 31 cents an hour will also get an increase of 4 1/2 cents an hour; can you not see the nonsense of it? If a man goes out of the service tomorrow, and this thing is in operation, you are telling him that he cannot get a pension on this four and a half cents per hour - because it is a cost of living allowance. What is emerging in Barbados is this, that you have a smugness about your own people evolving a social structure based on something which we have found, but which we want to change in the matter of pigmentation. The Premier has the same outlook as the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for Christ Church when it comes to this matter.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I object to that statement. The hon. member has not heard me express my view on this matter yet.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a fact that they practise to pay low wages.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I object to that. The hon. member has no proof whatever to be able to say that.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a fact that all the employers in Barbados with them included practise paying low wages.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have not raised my objection, but in that statement the hon. member includes himself because he is also an employer.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have not been elevated to that position yet.

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

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

On re-assembling,

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. (After a pause) No questions are ready and the House will proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION re STATEMENT OF HONOURABLE PREMIER

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion of Private Members' Business, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking on a Resolution in connection with the Statement of the Honourable Premier on the 14th April, 1959.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the adjournment last week we were discussing this Resolution which has been tabled by the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition with reference to the Statement made in the House by the Premier relative to the extension of the Island's Constitution and the purpose of his forthcoming visit to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Resolution expresses the amazement of the community at the Statement because there had not been any previous announcement of such a proposal, and urges the setting up of an "all Parties" Committee to make recommendations for the extension of the Barbados Constitution prior to the visit by the Premier to England.

Perhaps it would be good at this stage for me to recapitulate what I said last Tuesday in order to be able more easily to keep to the trend of what I want to say today. To begin with, as the Resolution states, nobody in the island knew about this projected constitutional conference to which the Premier had been invited by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. As is well known, we had the Local Government Elections, and following on them there was this row over the appointment of Aldermen; the Federal Premier came into Barbados and at a public meeting in the Lower Green got a very small percentage of the people there to support a Resolution. (Laughter) I repeat that he got a very small percentage of the people to support the Resolution; as a matter of fact, when he asked them for a show of hands, a few Party hacks showed their hands, but the majority of the people were indifferent to the situation. (Hon. M. E. COX: Organised indifference?) You cannot organise indifference; how can people be interested in something in which they are not interested?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member get on with the debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The fact remains that a very small section of the crowd supported the Resolution and the Federal Premier went off like some Sir Galahad to England armed with that document.
2.35 p.m.

We do not know exactly what happened there, but it is easy to understand from reading between the lines that he was told that it was none of his business and that the Barbados Premier had been invited to come to England for constitutional discussions. Immediately after that, the Federal Premier issued another statement in which he said that the Barbados Premier had been invited to England for constitutional discussions, giving the impression that the Barbados Premier would be going to England to take up where

he left off and to carry on and to resolve this problem of the Governor of Barbados having acted contrary to the Constitution with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Barbados Premier decided to have none of this nonsense and gave the lie direct to any suggestion that this visit of his to the Secretary of State was in any way connected with the Aldermanic issue.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, I want to correct that. It is not a question of giving the lie direct. I do not think anybody ever said that the invitation to go to the Secretary of State involved anything Aldermanic or with reference to the appointment of Aldermen; so I could not have given the lie direct to that...

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member apparently is incapable of following sequences of events. The Federal Premier left here with a Resolution which he said had been accepted by a Lower Green Meeting to protest against the action of the Governor in non-acceptance of the Government's proposal to appoint the Aldermen recommended by them. That is the issue with which he left here and went to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. He had to issue some statement after leaving here armed with that Resolution and going to the Secretary of State. He would not let it appear that the Secretary of State had refused to see him, but in order to save face, what he said was that the Barbados Premier had been invited to come to England to discuss the Constitution with the Secretary of State. In other words, this is the implication of his remarks: "the Governor, Sir Robert Arundell did as he liked and we are protesting against it. I as Federal Premier went to the Secretary of State and now the Barbados Premier has been invited to come to the Secretary of State." And he was very shrewd; this is what you call lying by implication. He did not say that the Barbados Premier was coming to England to discuss the normal constitutional advancement of the colony. He did not say to the contrary either; but the implication was that he went on a certain issue and whether or not he had succeeded was none of our business, but what has happened is that the Barbados Premier is now going to discuss it. He tried to deceive the West Indian public that he had actually initiated these discussions with the Secretary of State for the Colonies and that the Barbados Premier would go to finalise them.

Well now, apparently, the Barbados Premier gave him the lie direct without appreciating he was doing so. If the Premier wants to get up here today and say that he did not give the lie direct, all I can say is that his innocence is amazing and is comparable to that of a newborn babe, because when he got on the floor of the House and said that he was not going to England at all about the Aldermanic issue but was doing so because Jamaica had an advanced constitution and we wanted one too, if he does not realise that he was calling the Federal Premier a liar, then he does not know what he is doing; and to get up here today and say that he was not giving the lie either directly or indirectly is an admission that he did not consider the effect of his statement in the Assembly, or did not consider the only deduction which could be made from it.

He said "I have been invited to come to England on a further extension of the Constitution." Since the Jamaica Constitution had been advanced, he had raised the matter with the Imperial authorities and had been invited to come over to England and discuss it. Well now, there again, he puts his foot in it. Had the Federal Premier not made the statement and blown his top over the Aldermanic issue, the Premier would not have said on the floor of the House why he was going to England, and up to now the colony would not have known that there were constitutional talks going on. That is why the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, who is the Leader of the Opposition, in this Resolution now before the House has taken the strongest possible exception to the fact that constitutional talks were actually in progress and neither the Opposition nor the public had been informed. I am here today to add

my quota of the strongest possible condemnation to such an attitude on the part of the Government. I do not care what they think. They may as well get it firmly in their minds that the constitution of Barbados does not concern them alone; it concerns the entire island; and I do not care how much Premier he is, if he goes to England to discuss constitutional advancement with the Secretary of State for the Colonies without previous consultation with the other Parties of this House, he can make no progress. I do not care what he thinks. This is an accepted principle all over the Colonial Empire - in Jamaica, in Cyprus, in Ghana and in Trinidad. As a matter of fact, it ought to be fresh in the public's mind that a Trinidad Government delegation to the Secretary of State for the Colonies was quite recently almost chased back home by the Colonial Office because of the fact that they had no previous consultation with the Opposition, and I do not care how firmly entrenched Government thinks it is or what they believe to be the relationship between themselves and the Colonial Office, on a matter like this progress is made only after consultation with all Parties concerned, and I go so far as to say that there would be no advancement of the Barbados constitution unless and until the Barbados Government has proceeded along this line.

It is the Governor's obligation and his solemn duty to report to the Colonial Office the remarks made by the Opposition on this issue. He has to tell the Colonial Office that in the Barbados House of Assembly the Opposition has condemned the Premier and the Government for refusing to take it into their confidence in discussing this matter, and he is duty-bound to take note of our objection. They are not the beginning and the end of the Barbados Government. Only month before last there was an election in which the Government did not soar so high, and even without that, even in colonies where the Government is unmistakably in the saddle, it is a matter of constitutional procedure and common decency that where fundamental alteration to the Constitution is concerned, all Parties are invited to discuss the matter.
2.45 p.m.

As a matter of fact, Sir, in support of my contention I should like to read from the Despatch in May, 1957 which was sent by the same Governor, Sir Robert Arundell, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Lennox-Boyd, informing him of the changes he proposed to make in the constitution of Barbados. Sir Robert said: "These proposals were the proposals for advancement of the Constitution which were framed in consultation with the Premier and agreed to in the Executive Committee. I have also discussed them separately with my Executive Council, with some members of the Legislative Council and with the Parliamentary Leaders of the political parties represented in the House of Assembly."

In other words, before the present constitutional advancement was effected, the Governor himself discussed the proposals with the members of the Executive Council, with members of the Legislative Council, and with the Parliamentary Leaders of the political parties in the House of Assembly. That was in 1957. In 1959, the Hon. Premier thinks that he can proceed uni-laterally to consult with the Secretary of State for the Colonies without previous consultation with the political parties in this House.

Well, the Opposition wants to make it clear that two things must happen. We are in agreement with further constitutional advancement. In so far as I personally am concerned, I would say that my views are more intensely nationalistic than all of them put together because when I on the floor of the House spoke about self-government and I criticised the colonial status of this colony and the fact that for so long we had to toe the line with the Imperial Government, their views were silent. From away back in 1944, even previous to that, before the first Federal Conference, on the floor of this House I consistently argued that the future progress of this country is bound up with its political autonomy and you never heard a word in support from them; so that it can hardly be argued by any that I am not in favour of self-government as they tried to

argue last week with reference to hon. members on this side of this House.

We are saying today we are more nationalistic than they. Self-government means more to us than to them. But in spite of all of that, we are not agreeing to any further constitutional advancement at this moment except on two conditional grounds. The first is that there must be previous consultation and agreement with regard to the framework of this advancement. There must be agreement along the path which we are to proceed. This question of full internal self-government envisages a lot of things, not merely the question of more power to the Cabinet, but there is the question of the Other Place and its powers to be regulated. I am not prepared today to say in detail what the Opposition feels should be done; that is a matter to be discussed at the appropriate time and under appropriate conditions. All we must do now is to register the strongest protest to the manner in which this is done. We are laying down the conditions as essential prerequisites of any further advancement: (1) that there should be previous consultation with us and, (2) that there should be no further advancement until a General Election intervenes. We are not prepared to countenance any further constitutional advancement unless this term of office of the Government is further ratified by the electorate. In other words, a General Election must intervene between any fundamental change in the present Constitution because we are sure of two things. In the first instance, if we give this Government further power, they are going to abuse it more than they are doing now; and, in the second instance, we cannot see the people of this country returning them for a future lease of power. Therefore the Official Opposition wants to make it perfectly clear that while we are in perfect agreement with further self-government for Barbados, we say no more self-government until a General Election is held; and when we say that here, His Excellency the Governor is in duty bound to report our remarks to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The despatch which I quoted just now under which the present position of the Barbados Constitution was established sets out clearly the powers of the elected Government of Barbados.
2.55 p.m.

There was no question of any ambiguity or misunderstanding when the contents of that Despatch were sent to the Legislature, and therefore I, personally, must confess my having been at a loss when this matter arose over the appointment of the Aldermen after the recent Municipal Elections. On the floor of this House last Tuesday the hon. senior member for St. Michael was very caustic in his attacks on the Governor claiming that the Governor had broken the Constitution by not accepting the advice of his Ministers with regard to the appointment of Aldermen; the hon. member also attacked the hon. senior member for St. Lucy saying that he is subservient to the Imperial authorities and what not, and he was not nationalistic as the Government Party is. Of course, that is so ludicrous that it hardly needs any comment; but merely in order to set the record straight, whether we agree with self-government for Barbados or not, it is important that we should make public that part of the Constitution in which this matter was resolved.

In the Despatch from which I quoted just now, the Secretary of State for the Colonies made reference to the transfer of power from the Governor-in-Executive Committee to the Cabinet. This is what he said: "One of the basic conventions that we have accepted is that in arriving at his decision in Executive Committee, the Governor will, except when it appears to him that grave or exceptional circumstances compel him to act otherwise, accept in legislative matters the advice of the Ministers. It can thus be seen where responsibility lies."

Note the three conditions. Even although the Governor is bound under certain conditions to accept the advice of his Ministers, he can refuse to accept this advice under three conditions (1) if grave circumstances compel him to act otherwise (2) if exceptional circumstances compel him

to act otherwise and (3) only in legislative matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is not now debating what is referred to as a Constitutional crisis at one time; he is now debating the Resolution to set up an "all Parties" Committee to consider the Premier's Statement in connection with the extension of the Constitution and his forthcoming visit to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I would not like the hon. member to go back into what would be quite interesting in relation to something which is not under consideration by this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I am doing, Sir, is supporting the Resolution moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and at the same time to express the views of the Opposition with regard to the statement made by the Hon. Leader of the House that the Governor deserves to be censured and that he, for one, would censure him.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion, the Deputy Speaker took a certain course of action and I intend to pursue the same line of action as he took, because I do not want the House to be bogged up in any history concerning what may or may not be a Constitutional crisis - not as far as this Resolution is concerned anyhow.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With regard to the intervention of His Honour the Deputy Speaker in this matter, Your Honour's point is very well taken; but apart from that, certainly we are justified in this Resolution, in my opinion, in compassing every point of the Resolution itself.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case I will have to make a ruling. If the hon. member thinks that he is justified in including such points as in my opinion, are not justified, then I will have to make a ruling in the matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to explain my reason for supporting the Resolution. One of my reasons for doing so is that while we are in agreement with complete autonomy for the country, we are not prepared to have any further advancement of the Constitution unless a General Election intervenes. If I make a statement as broad as that, I am attempting to demonstrate why I think the Government Party should not be entrusted with more power. As I said earlier, if they are abusing what power they have now.....

Mr. SPEAKER: While reference may be made to that matter, I am not allowing any discussion on the subject.

Mr. CRAWFORD: At any rate, I think that the position of the Opposition had been made quite clear on the other issues in that several times the Government has demonstrated to the country as to how very cautious we must be in entrusting it with more power; and that is the more reason why all members of the House should view this matter in an unprejudiced manner and give support to the Resolution as has been moved by the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition.
3.05 p.m.

When the Government accepted the present Constitution, it pledged itself to ratify all the conventions included in that Constitution. I remember distinctly when the former Premier came in here and reported the Despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and how gratified the Secretary of State was that we were proceeding with constitutional advancement by convention rather than by legislative enactment, I said on the floor of the House in the same debate that while on the one hand it might gratify the Secretary of State to see that we are adopting the method in force in Great Britain and proceeding in implementing constitutional proposals by convention rather than by legislative enactment, we had to bear in mind the fact that we were a Colonial country emerging from Colonial status, that our situation was entirely different from that of Great Britain, and that while proceeding by convention might suit them, it did not necessarily suit us. If any hon. member pleases to refer to the debates, he will see that I urged that these proposals should have legislative force and not merely be implemented by convention.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, look at what has happened! There was a public protest just about two or three weeks ago against the appointment of Ministers of the Cabinet to Local Government Boards, and you had the Premier himself getting up here on the floor of the House and saying that he had got the Ministers to agree not to serve on these Boards but there was no law against their serving on these Boards. In accepting the responsibility for carrying out the new Constitution, the Government pledged itself to abide by the conventions. The entire transfer of power from the Executive to the Cabinet was effected by convention. The former Premier boasted that they were effected by convention and the Secretary of State for the Colonies expressed gratification that they were effected by convention; but now the new Premier comes here and tells you he has told his Ministers not to break the conventions but there is no law to prevent them from breaking them. Where are we? Not only did he make the statement but the Leader of the House also got up during the same debate and repeated the same nonsense and stupidity.

In no part of the world, Mr. Speaker, except where other than school boys are in control of the country could you find such a demonstration of absolute irresponsibility. It is almost unheard of and would be unheard of in any of the countries in which a Constitution is based on a convention for a Premier to get up and say that we have decided not to act contrary to the convention but there is no law to prevent us from acting contrary. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have this sort of tommy-rot, it means that the basis of acceptance of constitutional advancement by convention, which is based on morality, is entirely beyond the conception of the Government, and therefore for the future the constitutional proposals must have the force of law; they must have legislative enactment. The Opposition is not prepared for the future to accept further constitutional advancement by convention. We are not prepared to hear the Government say that the conventions say one thing, but since the law does not say anything, they can do what they like. The statements of the Premier and of the Leader of the House were to the effect that Ministers were told to come off the Boards, but there is no law to prevent them from staying on them.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I should like to correct one misleading statement. I said there was neither convention nor law and I am sure that I am right on that because the convention does not say that a Minister cannot sit on a Board, neither does the law say so. I made my position crystal clear when I was discussing that question and the hon. member should include "convention", because I said that we were not prepared to break the convention.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is only making a fool of himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must desist from any personal reference.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member must not talk that kind of tommy-rot. The convention does not say that a Minister cannot sit on a Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members are entitled to say anything that does not conflict with the Rules of Parliament.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The conventions, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, cannot specifically refer to a matter like that. There are about 16 or 17 main Parliamentary conventions which apply in England. There is a lot of misunderstanding with regard to the word "convention", and this innocence reaches up even to the Cabinet; and perhaps I should clear the atmosphere at this stage. The conventions that we are supposed to follow are the same as those that apply in England. The Cabinet is collectively responsible to Parliament; that is a convention. The Leader of the Majority Party is entitled to be called a Premier; that is a convention. A Ministry which has lost confidence must

resign; that is a convention. What the hon. member is talking about could not be a convention. There are about 16 or 17 main conventions which apply in Great Britain and in countries like Canada, New Zealand and ourselves which have decided to proceed on the basis of advancement of constitution by convention; so we adopt *in toto* the conventions which apply in Great Britain.

3.15 p.m.

So when you say that, you do not know what you are saying.

We are pledged to follow British conventions. It is a British convention that no Minister should sit on any Parochial Board. When the former Premier initiated government by Cabinet System, he made every single Minister under him resign from every single Board which he was on. The hon. senior member for Christ Church was on several Boards. Ask him if he did not have to leave out serving on the Christ Church Boys' Foundation School Governing Body. It was not because it is written in the law or the Executive Committee Act or stated that a Minister must not serve on the Foundation School Board, but he had to leave it because it was contrary to British conventions. It is not a case of whether or not a Minister must go on a Board, but you proceed on the broad lines that if you are going to occupy a position where you are the final Court of Appeal you should not occupy a position to which you will be appealing to yourself. That is the broad line. It is not a question of getting in here and saying that because there is no special law which says that a Minister cannot sit on a Board, therefore, they are doing us a favour when they tell us that no Minister will be sitting on a Board. It demonstrates one or two things: either a desire to swallow the conventions or ignorance of what the convention means. For the Ministers to get in here and say: "We are not doing so and so not because we do not feel like doing it but because the convention does not say so" is contrary to practice. Bear in mind, these conventions almost have the force of law. They are very stringent. Can you imagine a British Government defeated in Parliament holding on to office? Can you imagine the principle of collective responsibility being flouted on the floor of the House in the Mother of Parliaments and the Government still holding on to power? They would not do that. As a matter of fact, the country would not stand for it. In a country which has been always sovereign, which always had its power vested in itself and in which there was a question of struggle between Parliament and the Crown and then you get the final emergence of the sovereign power of Parliament, it is very well to proceed by convention; but in a country where you have conflicting views and, on the other hand, all the difficulties and complications involved through a colonial territory trying to evolve to autonomy, it is infinitely much better to have every facet and phase of the convention based on law. That is why in Trinidad, Jamaica and Cyprus and all the countries which proceeded like ourselves from colonialism to self-government you find that they have written Constitutions.

The next step, of course, for this country constitutionally speaking would be to find ourselves at the same stage at which Ghana was just prior to the granting of self-government. And no political power in Ghana would have sat down in Accra and accepted a Constitution granting semi-independence from the Imperial power without having anything in writing. It is sheer making a fool of the community. It is sheer vanity that caused the former Premier to say that we were willing to proceed by convention. We know the story: "Go ahead, Great Britain; Barbados is behind you." We are saying that as a basis for agreement between ourselves and them on this question of further advancement we should have a written Constitution. I am not saying that the Government which will succeed them will neither be capable or desirous of respecting all the pledges of a conventional Constitution. I am not saying that for a moment. I feel sure that almost any Government would be willing to respect all the dictates of a conventional Constitution.

We have made our position quite clear. Do not let them delude themselves that this is such a totalitarian state or that they are so omnipotent or that the Secretary of

State for the Colonies feels that their Party is so firmly entrenched in the minds of the electorate, even making allowances for recent examples; let them clearly understand that the requests contained in the Resolution before the House are very well founded. We resent very strongly the fact that we have been treated in this back-handed manner by the Government, as if the present Government of Barbados will be running the Government for the next three centuries. What really has happened, of course, is that all of this haughtiness and all of this foolish pride comes just before a fall. It can very well be seen that a candle burns more brilliantly just before it goes out; so they are trying to secure themselves more power before their power goes. But they seem to fail to understand that all the tricks, all the bluffs, all the strategy which have been used to give them a majority in the past cannot work forever. People are going to arise who will not be willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage and, therefore, do not think that if you get more power, you can proceed along the same lines as that on which you were proceeding and that you would keep that power for a little longer than you really should.

3.25 p.m.

Sooner or later these tricks are bound to fail; sooner or later the tide will turn. We are not prepared, especially with the situation as it is, to agree to any further autonomy except along the lines reached in previous consultation with ourselves and except after the intervention of a General Election. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the remarks which will be made on this side of the House in connection with this matter will reach the proper authorities in due course, and once again there shall be a demonstration by the Imperial power to put the Government Party in its proper place and to make it perfectly plain both to them and to the public that this is a democracy, that all aspects of democratic procedure have to be observed and only in the totalitarian, in the Fascist or Communist countries does the Government proceed on a one-party direction.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in this matter because when it comes to constitutional matters, I believe I have made myself clear on them a long time ago. Like the hon. member, I feel that when it comes to Constitutional matters I am an out-and-out nationalist; I believe in governing myself badly rather than have somebody else governing me, and I have been elected to do that. I do not even belong to a Party where these Party people can boss me; I believe in nationalism; I believe in nationalising myself and not allowing anybody to tell me how to vote and how not to vote. I am glad for this opportunity to have come so that I can make some reference to certain things. I will make reference to the Premier who introduced this matter at the beginning, and I will say that he is not a nationalist; he is an order taker. He has now reached the stage where he is taking orders from the least of backbenchers even within his Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to enjoin the hon. member not to lower the tone of this discussion by making too much of a personal reference. I think there was a specific rule, in fact, there still is a specific rule dealing with personal references; and where such references are concerned, the tone of the debate will be considerably lowered where these references are unsavoury to any hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: What have I said that is unsavoury?

Mr. SPEAKER: That has not happened yet.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, it is very unsavoury for the Speaker to anticipate that an hon. member is going to make unsavoury remarks about another hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. member began by saying that the present Premier is an order-taker. That is not complimentary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Taking orders is not complimentary?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am absolutely sure that the hon. member is not doing anything complimentary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is that a remark which I cannot make? I will continue to make such remarks and if you can say something about the tone of the debate, even before I begin to say anything, well, I do not know if I will make unsavoury remarks by making a comparison as between a backbencher and the Premier, and the position of the Premier *vis-a-vis* other hon. members. I do not think that anyone who really believes in self-government would not doubt or wonder if you should grant this colony self-government in 1959, because all around us we have the Premier showing that this is an unsavoury action. I repeat, the Premier said when he made the statement that he proposed going to England or that he had been invited to go to England, and that part of the Constitutional discussion would be on the question of bringing Barbados into line with Jamaica. I thought that the Barbados Constitution was the best in the whole British Commonwealth. The Premier before the present one said that the Barbados Constitution was the best barring none; it was the best Constitution in the whole British Commonwealth barring none. The present Premier agreed with that; it is the best Constitution which Barbados had since 1898 and the difference which has been made in the Constitution is that more people can vote and you have a Ministerial system.

Mr. Speaker, that is not strange to me. Barbados was the last of the big colonies to get Adult Suffrage. Jamaica was a Crown Colony ruled by the Imperial Government and in 1944 Jamaica had Adult Suffrage and a quasi-Ministerial System; Jamaica had Ministers before Barbados had them; Trinidad had Adult Suffrage and Ministers before Barbados had them, and British Guiana had Adult Suffrage and Ministers before Barbados had them. All of these changes in constitution took place before the changes in Barbados, and, as I said we were the last of the big territories to have a Ministerial system and Adult Suffrage, yet our Constitution was the best, based on what Sir Conrad Reeves got by fighting the Imperial powers in those days when they might have been even more liberal to the people than the Powers-that-be in those days intended to be; but after the situation was handed down to us and we could change over to Adult Suffrage after a bitter struggle, that was the Constitution which was stated as the best. We improved it and I would say that it is not the best. When we were talking about Ministerial Government, I wrote a separate Memorandum on the question and I went further than any of the Ministers.

3.35 p.m.

I wrote a separate memorandum on the question. I went further than any of the Ministers because I was not afraid of the Secretary of State for the Colonies or the Governor knowing my views.

On the question of Police, I said then before Ministerial Government that in the same way that Great Britain can control the Police, I did not see why in Barbados the Ministers could not do it. The then Premier said that he did not want control over the Police because if there was a riot he did not want people to believe that he called out the policemen. I have heard the same Premier saying that he is the first man in the territory to control Police. It is not a matter of control; if you want self-government, you want it; but if you want to use police against people like in an election where there were more policemen at a meeting one night than audience, it is a different thing. (Mr. CRAWFORD: Where was that meeting?) That was in my constituency; I only have one. That goes to show that if you want constitutional advancement you will ask for these things and fight for them and show your reason.

Now I do not believe that the present Premier is enamoured about constitutional matters, and the point I made in the beginning was that you cannot talk about conventions. What do conventions mean? I believe some members should read "A Grammar of Politics" by Harold Laski; it would be a good exercise for you too, Mr. Speaker, in your spare time, and you will see.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not accept the hon. member's offer.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a matter for you; you do not

have to accept. Any good offer can be made to anybody and I do not think the Speaker is above good offers in good reading unless he has reached the stage where good reading does not matter. Laski is an authority on this matter, and it would be a good thing if hon. members would read his book, in which they will see the relationship between the Parties, the Government and the Constitution, and there would be no more nonsense of the Parties being different, the Government being different and the Governor being different. As soon as you begin to talk about constitution within the context of the British Commonwealth of Nations, you begin to talk about the Party system and how Parties are run.

What do you find here? You find here that a Party is in power agreeing to the British conventions, and that Party which is in power passes a Resolution condemning the Governor; but the same Party sits and refuses to resign its seats although they say there is a conflict between themselves and the Governor on constitutional lines. When you talk about constitutional questions and conventions, what do you mean by conventions? Is it not a classic and accepted convention that if the Queen in Great Britain today refuses to accept nomination of Ministers by any Leader, the Leader will refuse to have any and would not accept? There was a classic occasion when Mr. Attlee wanted the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be Foreign Secretary. Both of them are dead now; one was Sir Stafford Cripps. He preferred Sir Stafford Cripps to be Foreign Secretary, but the late King George VI had preference for Mr. Ernest Bevin. Mr. Attlee agreed and therefore there was no constitutional crisis. There is also a case with the Queen and the late King Edward VIII. Mr. Baldwin did not agree with King Edward VIII and told him quite plainly that it would either be a question of the King going or their going. He did not hold up on the regal position and cause a revolution and he left and went with Mrs. Simpson. Similarly in a matter where the Premier and his Ministers feel that the Governor has acted wrong constitutionally, the best thing to do to prove it to the public is to resign and have an election, and there would be no shadow of a doubt as to whether the Governor was right or wrong constitutionally.

You have reached the stage in which a Minister made a statement in this House, out of this House and in Trinidad in the Newspapers, and then sits within the same Executive Committee over which the Governor presides. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is here that I make reference about taking orders. If the Premier is not to be an order taker but is to be Leader, he must unequivocally in constitutional matters say what is his Government's position and not allow the youngest backbencher to pass a Resolution and use strong language about the Leaders of the Party, and then can present the same Resolution to the Governor in the name of the Party which is the Government - which is the National Executive of the Government in power at present - saying to the Governor that he must go immediately; but the Premier is sitting in Executive with the Governor next day, and therefore you have a constitutional "coughblepot". How are you going to reconcile that with the normal constitutional position in the United Kingdom?

You will find in one of the despatches from the Governor to the Secretary of State on the constitution that it was stated that what the Barbados Government required of the Secretary of State for the Colonies was that the powers of the Barbados Government should be the same *vis-a-vis* the powers of the Cabinet Ministers in England and the Queen; that would be within the context of the Barbados setting, Barbados not being a Sovereign country but England being a Sovereign country, and the parts that apply to a Sovereign country would not apply to us, but the other parts would.

Now, Sir, what I believe has got people afraid of this unwritten Constitution and working on convention is the attitude of the present Government in a test case which has arisen in which there is no question of a written Constitution. There is no question of anything being in writing, but

there is a question of the Government's intention to flout the wishes of the public in a general way under the pretense that something is wrong with the Constitution. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those persons who is never too clear on what grave and exceptional circumstances mean, but for the first time in my life I heard somebody explain that grave and exceptional circumstances were a question of riots. I was never told that before. The question of riots was one of those wild and vague phrases at the time it was used, and I said I did not like it because it could cover a wide area of things which I could not even foresee; but I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Philip that these constitutional matters should be made matters of wider public interest rather than letting them believe that they are so narrow in themselves that it is something which is being done for a person.

3.45 p.m.

I remember writing a note on that same matter and I stated that the attitude of the Colonial Office is sometimes to look at us here as if they are granting a Constitution to a particular person and not a Constitution to people; and that is why I wanted a Constitution in which we would have a Minister taking charge of the Police.

Now, Jamaica has gone that step further and at that time nobody raised no protest against the phrase "grave and exceptional circumstances." It was accepted and agreed to; but what is not accepted now is outside of legislative matters which is specifically defined. You are now saying that you want wide powers in all matters. That was pointed out here and the question was raised that if you had all that power in all matters, why then should you retain the Executive Committee? I went so far as to make a speech in here pointing out that if you are having seven, eight and nine Ministers, what is the point of having an Executive Committee. There was a lot of legal argument brought forward to show the reason why the Executive Committee Act was never repealed or amended. But although you are proceeding by conventions and you have taken over internal government and are governing by the Cabinet System, yet the Executive Committee has retained all the powers that it always had.

I say if you want an advanced Constitution, get it. You say you want it. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Philip that if the stage is now being reached for us to have an advanced Constitution, the Hon. Premier should tell us what are the proposals. There is no point going to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and having him either putting the ball to you or you putting it at him with members of Parliament here knowing nothing of what it is.

What I want to clear up first of all is that from whatever side you prepare to work it, whether you agree to a written Constitution or an unwritten Constitution just as what we have now, if you agree that we should proceed by conventions as that which exist in Great Britain, I am saying that not only should you agree to them in the sense that you acknowledge them, but you should adhere to them whenever the circumstances arise. What conduct is this that you have a Minister saying publicly that the Governor who is the administrative Head did something with the purpose of helping the Conservatives to get back into power? That is a serious statement for a Minister to make; and yet you still have the Minister and the Government to which he belongs still existing! If you say that you adhere to the conventions, you should resign. Imagine a Minister of the British Cabinet getting up and saying that the Queen did something and that what the Queen did was tantamount to helping the other side of Parliament to get into power, and still retaining office of a Minister! He would call immediately upon the Government to show dis favour to the Queen's actions by resigning. Here, the Governor has more power than the Queen, because he has power as a person and not as a constitutional monarch. I am saying that whatever constitutional advancement we proceed to, it should be on the basis that the people in Government know how to honour these things.

So far as what are the constitutional proposals for

advancement, we do not know. The Hon. Premier's statement was to the effect that it had nothing to do with the Aldermanic elections and that the question of this advancement came up before. He said that it is purely a matter of coincidence that that matter occurred at the same time but that further constitutional changes were necessary and he went as far as to say that the changes were to bring us in line with what is taking place in Jamaica.

Are these changes such that you are not going to have any more Executive Committee? Will the Executive Committee be abolished? I do not believe you will need to go to the length which Jamaica has gone in having forty-five members. I do not think in Barbados we need to have more than the same twenty-four members we have now to satisfy our electoral needs because we have a population of 250,000 people and I do think that twenty-four members are quite representative of that size of community. What are we going to do? Are we going to rid ourselves of the Chief Secretary? I have already said that the Government of Barbados can be run quite easily with even less Ministers than what we have now. I believe the Minister without Portfolio has a very easy and simple job. One of the things which has been slipped up in this House was on the occasion when the Minister without Portfolio was appointed. That was a constitutional breach, because an occurrence like that has never taken place in England. You never had an instance in England where you got a man who ran for elections in a constituency, failed to gain a seat, but then within the same session that man was made a Minister of the Crown. That is why I said that I am afraid when you talk of working by conventions and many people are afraid because today you have a lot of young men looking to politics as a means of employment, and they will do anything short of murder to get a seat because going in for politics seems to them something in which you are working for easy money.

As a matter of fact, some young men today have no intention whatsoever of working hard, and making one's self mischievous is the sort of thing which is now appealing to the younger generation. You get thugs and people whom totalitarian states collect around them in order to beat up people whom the state has a spite against. Some people are of the opinion that you are going to abuse the Constitution if it is not written and they are of the opinion that you do not intend to adhere to any of the conventions which are in practice by the Mother of Parliaments and which you say that you have chosen to follow. Let me say that all the dictators in all the totalitarian states used the democratic system in order to ride to power and then rid themselves of it. If you read anything of Germany before Herr Hitler came into power, you would have realised that prior to Herr Hitler's rise to power, Germany was as democratic a state as any of the powers in Western Europe; but after he rode to power, every semblance of democracy became only a memory.

3.55 p.m.

With that system which you operate as a Cabinet System in which you have the Leader of the System not being the Leader but the order-taker, you get others from behind, vulgar or otherwise, using some of the most peculiar methods in order to get something done. You have this pressure from behind and therefore you get the order-taker going on, but is it not a peculiar thing that with all the Constitutional improvement which has been going on within his Party, the Premier has not had the courage to make one single public statement making it clear as to whether his Party agrees with the Statement which he has made, leaving people to pay him the credit that he does not agree with certain things? His Deputy can make a statement in the House and in an interview in a newspaper published by a Political Party criticising the Governor for his action in the Constitutional issue. Anybody who reads the "Nation" printed by the P.N.M. would see that it was a stupid statement to make without saying that you intend to tender your resignation, which is going to be helpful to people from the other side. That statement was published in the "Nation" on the 14th April. When you get statements like that, if the Premier had not been in the island and you are leading the Party.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to revert to the subject matter of the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Resolution is in connection with the Constitutional crisis.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution is not simply that; I will read it. I will not read the Preamble, I will go straight on.

Mr. WALCOTT: You have to read the Preamble.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot tell me what I should read.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, if you are reading it for my benefit.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is what the Resolution says:-

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT, before consultations are commenced orally with Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies in respect of amendment to the local constitution, an "all Parties" Committee be set up to make recommendations for extension of the Barbados constitution."

That is the part dealing with the Resolution; that is the part which has to be resolved; the Preamble part of the Resolution will not be resolved. What is going to be resolved will be that the House will decide that before consultations are commenced orally with Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies in respect of amendments to the local constitution, an "all parties" Committee be set up to make certain recommendations.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will read it for myself now. The Resolution states this:-

"WHEREAS a Statement has been made in the House by the Honourable Premier on 14th April, 1959, relative to the extension of the Island's constitution and his forthcoming visit to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies;

AND WHEREAS the said Statement has been received with complete amazement in this community as no previous announcement of such proposals has been publicly made...."

I can say what I like.

Mr. SPEAKER: That part of the Resolution is not to be resolved.

Mr. WALCOTT: Whether it is to be or not I can speak on it. As long as a Statement is made I can deal with it as I think fit. I can say that it is a waste of public funds, if I feel so, if I am being challenged by one that I should not say that the Premier should not go to England. I have a perfect right to say whether I feel the Premier should go to England or not and whether the island's Constitution should be extended or not. All of these things are within my province in speaking on this Resolution; I am not deviating one millimetre of an inch from it. As long as I am a member of this Chamber I will debate the subject which is before me. The Preamble goes on:-

"AND WHEREAS the question of an extension of the Island's constitution is a matter of fundamental and paramount importance to every section of the community irrespective of Party....."

What I am saying is this; whatever I agree with in so far as the Constitution is concerned, it must be the best, but what I have seen is not the best. Is there anything wrong in saying that if your conduct is such and such before I agree to grant you something further I should be prepared to offer my comment? On a matter like this should I not be entitled to comment on what has transpired as far as Constitutional advancement is concerned? Is there any-

thing wrong in saying that the Constitution in Great Britain works on a certain basis and if you are saying that it was your intention to adhere to the British Constitution, am I wrong in saying that there are instances in which you have done something contrary to the British pattern? Is it something unparliamentary if I make that comment? If I agree that the Constitution should be advanced, I agree to the advancement of the Constitution on these lines.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say on what the hon. member should speak or on what he should not speak. I have simply reminded him that he should revert to what, in my opinion, is the subject matter of this Resolution. The hon. member is not the first hon. member to whom I have had to say that during the course of this debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have been speaking on constitutional matters and the whole Resolution is based thereon. Suppose that I did not agree with an "all parties" conference! I could still speak on the Constitution, as to how it should work. What I was saying when I was stopped by Your Honour was in reference to the placing of a member in the Other Place; and I was saying that that is something which does not take place in Great Britain. Am I not at liberty to say that? Am I not at liberty to say that a man who has lost in an election has been taken and placed in the Cabinet? Let us have some examples; if I am wrong, the Government should bring the last example and show what has happened in Great Britain. Let them say that Mr. Creech Jones lost in an election and therefore they took him and put him in the House of Lords or something like that.

I saw the Hon. Minister rise to correct the hon. senior member for St. Philip on the ground that in connection with the convention there was nothing at law. When we talk about a convention, we are not talking about something which is written; we are talking about your conduct and what you are going to accept as good conduct. 4.05 p.m.

That is why I say you get people who were believers in the unwritten Constitution because it gave more flexibility in order to deal with circumstances as they arise rather than being forced each time there is a circumstance to change the Law, which is more cumbersome, and therefore you agree on conventions; but when you find that people are prepared to abuse conventions, you must make Law. For instance, if you do not tell a man that he has to pay his rent by the end of the month and he does not do so, you have to write him a letter to let him know. By Law, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister for Education being a representative of the parish of St. John is entitled to sit as a member of the Lodge School Board; but are you going to tell him to sit on the Lodge School Board under somebody who is Chairman of the Board when he is Minister of Education in the whole island? Would you need somebody to tell you that? It is a matter of commonsense. By Law the Minister can sit on the Board; but you have now amended the Law because nobody foresaw that a Minister would come from St. John as Minister of Education, and therefore he would find himself in a completely different position. Would it not be incompatible for him to find himself as Minister of Education sitting on the Lodge School Board sending a letter to the Minister asking him to agree to give a grant to put up a sign-board in the dining-hall? That is a stupid position. Would you need a Lawyer to tell you that? So in all these things you require judgment and thinking, and not somebody getting in a huff and passing a Resolution calling on the Governor to resign on an issue on which, when it comes to pure and basic commonsense, you had absolutely no leg to stand on if you believe that the will of the electorate should prevail.

You bow to the electorate whether it is right or wrong; you do not fight it when you believe in democracy. The Government came into power by the electorate. You do not count all the votes in the other parishes and say your votes mean more than the others. You do not win an election that way. You do not count how many votes you have and then say if you had some of the others you would not have lost. It is just like a man who buys a ticket and

says he has just missed the first prize by two numbers, because somebody would have bought the other two already. It is also like a man running a hundred yards race saying if he had ten more yards he would have won the race; it is not that he ran 100 yards while the other man ran 90 yards.

This is a simple thing in which members should see that they have done - not as persons - an injustice to what we all aim at, advancement of the Constitution. I have reached the stage in my life, Mr. Speaker, where it does not matter to me, in the sense that whoever wins an election must rule. I am one of those people who, God forbid, would not like to see the hon. junior member for St. James become Premier of Barbados, but if it so happened that we ever had that affliction through an election, I must suffer that affliction.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must desist from making personal reference; it might affect the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: He took it with a smile.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is good that he took it that way and gave that outward sign.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, do you believe it would hurt him?

Mr. SPEAKER: If you refer to the hon. member as a would-be affliction, no matter what exterior he wears, I think he is bound to be hurt.

Mr. WALCOTT: But there are political afflictions; I do not mean physical afflictions. Sometimes these are things which we have to bear when we come into politics.

Mr. SPEAKER: In politics?

Mr. WALCOTT: As a Parliamentarian, if I had to suffer that affliction, I would have to accept because the will of the people would have done it. I was only emphasising, Mr. Speaker, that I respect the will of the people even in extreme cases where I do not agree with what is the net result of the elections, and I believe all of us who enter politics have to be in that position. I am not a disbeliever in constitutional development; I am a full believer in nationalism to its height. I do not like this follow-pattern business of being in Jamaica's position. What is Jamaica's position? Why not create our own additions and say this is what we want for Barbados? I have not seen a statement or read a paper on the Jamaican constitution to know whether it suits me. The Jamaica constitution might not suit me through and through. There is an Executive Council here and if you want to retain it you should say so.

In passing I should like to show how magnanimous I am. I am one of those people who caused the Premier to be one of the members of the Executive Council. There was a time when Sir John Chandler was a member and I objected. In those days when there was no Cabinet system, the Leader of the Government should not have been in an inferior position to an ordinary member on the Executive Council. Nobody in the British Government is closer to the Queen than the Prime Minister. The Lord Chancellor comes from a recommendation by the Prime Minister to the Queen, but there is no question of the Prime Minister not being a member of the Privy Council. Some people do not realise that if people are pushed in front of them they should not make a fuss. I said I did not agree with that at the time and now you find that the Premier is a member of the Executive Council, because I felt that he as Leader of the Government should be in such a position. I say that so that hon. members can understand that I am a full believer in self-Government.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in self-Government we are going to pass through a period like that which occurred after the Spanish group broke up in the twenty-one Republic. They were left without any traditions, and therefore

it depends on the people at the time who take over; and if you have some rapacious people who have no regard for any sort of constitutional decency but would go to the lowest level to deal with any opponents and begin to use threats and names against them as enemies, that is the danger that self-Government would bring. It means that you would have no one to cry to - not that I am looking for anyone to cry to. What we have to be careful about is that in self-Government there is no one to appeal to, like in Cuba with Fidel Castro and Batista, Peron in Argentina and Jimenez in Venezuela. There is this gradual pattern that is growing, and undoubtedly you can see semblances of it in Trinidad; there have been semblances of it in Jamaica; and in Barbados I have seen the beginning of some of these semblances that if the group which is in power had the power, from what I have seen of their National Executive, and they could put a Policeman in your house or get one to go there, they would do that for any contrary act which you did.

4.15 p.m.

You get instances now where there is such viciousness of the party system that they control the people in their Party to the effect that if these people would say that they do not agree, they dare not say that they do not agree with them. It has reached the stage where it is a matter of life and death. That, I feel, Mr. Speaker, is the challenge to people in this democracy. You will see that it is not only a question for the Leaders in Parliament but it is also a matter for the people. Members of Parliament should make people become aware that they should participate in the affairs of the running of the country not only at election time but constantly and continuously, so that they can act as real arbiters when the occasion arises as to what is good and not good in their own interest. If the people are not prepared to do that, they are not prepared to accept the challenge offered them by the granting to them of Adult Suffrage.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the terms of this Resolution by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which insist in the body of the Resolution that an all-party committee be set up to make recommendations for extension of the Barbados Constitution, I would at the outset say that to expect one Party or the majority Party in this Chamber to be the only competent Party to decide on the further extension of the Constitution would be entirely wrong, inequitable, unfair and entirely out of keeping with the recognised practice in other places and colonies in so far as constitutional advancement is concerned. It is elementary. When we look at the work done in recent years by the former Premier and the various steps which were taken towards constitutional advancement, we will recall that on each occasion that an advance in the Constitution was made, the then Premier saw to it that all Parties were consulted, and more especially the Leaders of the Parties had interviews with the Governor on all constitutional matters before any decision was reached; therefore, it is elementary and I am startled to think that this present Government having that experience would even attempt to amend the Constitution without having consultations first with all Parties in this House. Because of that experience, I can see that this Government would be willing to listen and to agree to the amendments as moved by my hon. colleague because to expect them to do otherwise would be entirely wrong and out of proportion. Even though the majority Party represents a greater number of seats in this House, yet they do not represent the wishes of all the people of the island; so they have to admit that if they amend the Constitution without previous consultations with all Parties and all representatives in the House, whether with the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados National Party, and in this case each independent member, the Constitution would not be representative of the wishes of the people of Barbados as a whole. Therefore, I can hardly expect the Labour Government which is running the country to do something which is entirely undemocratic and which has never been done in the past.

Mr. Speaker, in a debate like this one can speak at length, but I shall not attempt to tire my colleagues. I shall make certain points which I believe have not yet been made and I shall do so as briefly as I can.

Now, Barbadians have always prided themselves on their advanced Constitution. In other words, Barbados has always enjoyed a certain measure of self-government. There were three colonies - the Bahamas, Bermuda and Barbados - which from time immemorial enjoyed a certain measure of self-government; but the self-government enjoyed by Barbados in particular was enjoyed on a limited franchise until in 1951 when we had adult suffrage. Before that we had a reduced franchise from £50 prior to 1946 to \$80 a month and along with that women were granted the right of franchise. That was so until 1951 when we had Adult Suffrage. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter explained, we were many years behind Jamaica and Trinidad in the granting of Adult Suffrage; yet the former Premier would come in here time and time again and say how very advanced was the Barbados Constitution. When it came to all, Barbados was merely given what the other colonies had been given already and it was not a question of acquiring anything special for Barbados. For that matter, Barbados was always trailing behind in constitutional matters because when we heard of constitutional advancement and of Barbados being first and foremost, yet right here in the Caribbean area, you had Jamaica having been granted adult suffrage in 1944, Trinidad around 1950, British Guiana around 1950 and Barbados did not acquire it until 1951. In the outside world, Ghana and places like that were almost on the verge of being granted independence. That is letting the cat out of the bag. Barbados was not in the forefront; Barbados was always trailing in the rear. As I have said, Barbados always enjoyed a certain amount of self-government, but it was on a limited franchise, with the planters and merchants dominating the Assembly. That continued until 1951 when we acquired Adult Suffrage. Of course, we had several changes before that but the great change occurred in 1951 when we had Adult Suffrage with the advanced Constitution which we always enjoyed, but only on a limited franchise. Since 1951, conditions have changed and we have more workers' representatives in this Chamber than heretofore.

4.25 p.m.

What I am saying is that the Constitution of this island is based on the Executive Committee Act of 1891 and the conventions which we have had in 1954 - I mean the various Despatches and Replies which took place between the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1954 when the Ministerial System was introduced, and again in 1958 when the Cabinet System was introduced. No matter how much we talk about conventions, the Act which governs this country is the Executive Committee Act, 1891; although there is all this talk about conventions and the patterning of ourselves on the English system of Parliament and so on, yet it would seem to me that the very word "Conventions" is not thoroughly understood by all hon. members. The word "Conventions" means the constitutional or democratic custom as practised by Parliament and Government in the running of the country. Therefore the conventions are not written in the true sense of the word, but they are handed down through generations. If it is a question of patterning ourselves on the English system, we have to study constitutional history and go back to the constitutional history of England over the past 300 years. In order to avoid the constitutional crisis we had recently, it would be better to have a written Constitution and let it be set out in a new Executive Committee Act which would be clear and unequivocal and in language which would be understood by all and sundry.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock, the House will revert to the consideration of Government Business.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1959-60, No. 1

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee of Supply before the suspension of the sitting, we were dealing with a Resolution for \$776,000. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when the sitting of the House was suspended I was on the point of explaining that in some matters it seems as if the attitude of the Government or that of the Premier is like that of some of those hon. members on my left, and I made reference to the hon. senior member for St. George, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for the City, and they in turn got up and defended themselves. In so far as the payment of low wages is concerned, I said that for centuries employers in Barbados had the workers in their hands to pay low wages and the wages have remained as they are, based on the lowest standard. The workers had no redress until such time as the Trade Union came into power. The Government is not like a business; the Government draws its revenue from the taxpayers so that the taxpayers would have to ask: "Is this a fair and living wage which the Government is paying?" I cannot see how members of the Government could pretend that they are representatives of the working-class people who in large numbers have put them there, and they are underwriting in this year of grace, 1959, the same standards as were underwritten by these same employers many years ago. In relation to what money can mean today, when we find what you are still paying a man, and you are increasing his wages from \$10.80 to \$12.78, I ask any man or woman to tell me by what stretch of the imagination can any proper man live on anything approximating decency on \$12.78 a week. It is no wonder that this island is ridden by immorality; it is no wonder that you get this type of thing going on because men are forced to work for wages on which they cannot live. A man should not be doing what men are doing; you are asking a man to provide himself with sustenance on a wage of \$12.78 a week! What bed and what furniture do you think a man can buy with that money? A man who is getting \$13.20 a week will now be given \$15.00; do you think a man is entitled to this treatment? The economic system which we have in Barbados means that he must die on that; do you think that a man is not entitled to food and clothing and somewhere to sleep? Do you think that he is not entitled to have some sort of saving by means of which he can go to a doctor? And do you think that he should never marry? Do you think that what you are paying a man can allow him to make a woman his wife? Can he do that on these wages? We have this type of living because a man cannot appreciate what family life means; the cantonniers and people like that form the bulk of the people about whom you are thinking, and do you not think that it is time that the Government should get to grips with the problem and denounce this idea of paying \$15.00 to the lowest paid worker in our ranks? You have the male labourer and the female labourer and whatever you choose to call them, and when you say that you intended to give a cost of living allowance to the lowest paid people, you come down with a Resolution for \$776,000 and you embrace all and sundry; you embrace everybody who is working by the month and you are giving them \$9.00 a month more.

4.35 p.m.

To some, Mr. Chairman, this is going to be ridiculous. Some are going to regard it as adding insult to injury in that it is so small. To others it will mean something. I thought there was going to be a bold policy; and it is my considered opinion that if you were going to review wages in the Public Service where you have a pattern which is as wide as that dealing with somebody who is getting \$2,000 down to somebody who is getting 24¢ an hour and pretending that you are creating a salary scheme to set that structure, you are fooling yourselves, because the type of increase that is commensurate with a salary of £2,000 could never be the same sort of increase

which you would begin to give a man working for 30¢ or 40¢ an hour. He himself would not ask for it, and the need to provide a man at the bottom with an increase at a particular time might not be the same need for which you would review a salary at £2,000. No man who is in the £2,000 or £1500 bracket, Mr. Chairman, would expect his salary to be reviewed every two years.

Here you are giving a man who is working for 31¢ an hour and is not on an incremental scale an extra 4 1/2¢, and these men include cantonniers, gardeners, road menders, lorry loaders, fumigating hands, ordinary seamen, boatmen, caretaker of the Garrison Savannah, senior attendants, workshop cleaners. They do not go on an incremental scale, and that is all they will work for as long as they do that job. They are not apprentices; they are able-bodied men and you can go and see a crowd of men whom I am talking about. Do you regard that as something in which you can say that it is not a pensionable emolument but merely a cost of living? Is it not a further insult to group him with a man of £1,500 whom you are telling that this \$108 is not pensionable?

I have already said in this House and will repeat that Government must begin to look at salaries in their true prospective. There is no point in looking at the salary of the cantonnier and at the same time you want to look at that of the Engineer at the Waterworks, as one member said, because when you are dealing with these salaries you cannot ask the cantonnier to do the work of the Engineer at the Waterworks. The circumstances which will require you to increase the Waterworks Engineer's salary are not the same circumstances to cause you to increase that of the cantonnier. As Socialists let us look at this: it does not matter whether you are black, blue or a prince, you should eat decent food.

I was looking for my own manifesto during my election in 1956. I said then that the minimum wage for any person should have been \$15 a week, and if I said that it should have been \$15 a week then, I would not be saying less than \$18 a week now because I believe, Mr. Chairman, that \$3 a day for six days is nothing princely for a man to buy food with in these days. Let us examine our own lives and ask ourselves, if we had to live on \$18 a week, how far would we be removed from what we are enjoying now and see what a man working for \$18 enjoys, and then we could ask ourselves if God intended that there should be this big disparity in getting the necessities of life. Let us picture ourselves with \$18 to carry home! I am sure that the members in here who have wives and know how to treat them would never begin to give them anything like that when the week comes. I am very strong, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to giving people money on which to live.

The employers are not many in this House but the two members here should take a lesson from what I say, and I am saying it in good faith: to increase the purchasing power of the poor working men in Barbados is to increase the prosperity of Barbados; and whenever the Government primes the pump to increase the purchasing power of the man at the bottom it increases the purchasing power of the community as a whole because they can buy more food and more clothes. I was reading a book some days ago and when I looked at the comparison - and I do not mean that the comparison should be on a parallel level - and the type of wages existing in Barbados today and see that they are those which existed in the United States in 1825, more than a century ago, we should examine the real wages and see what they mean. You should ask yourself what is a reasonable amount of money which a man should get as a minimum anywhere for any job and then start from there to build it up. A reasonable wage is based on buying food, paying rent, buying clothes and looking decent, because if you talk about raising the standard of living of the community, you can only raise it by the purchasing power which it possesses.

The lowest rate is 24¢ an hour and the next rate is 30¢; you are adding 4 1/2¢ to these low rates and saying it is

only a cost of living amount and it is not pensionable. What is the use of telling a man getting \$13.64 a week that you do not intend to make the other 4 1/2¢ pensionable now that it is only a cost of living? That should be added to his basic salary; but if you intended to do that to somebody higher up, it would be all right. Are you going to treat a man who is working for 24¢ an hour now the same way you treat a man who is getting £2,000? Are you going to look at a man who is working for £600 a month in the same light as you look at one who is receiving \$14 or \$15 a week? Mr. Chairman, that could not be so; you cannot be serious. You have to review this. You cannot say this is what the Auditor General must do. If you do not review this for the next two or three years, it means that if any of them should die, go out of the service or anything happens to them, their pensionable emoluments would be less 4 1/2 cents which you are allowing them. That is niggardly treatment. Why create these problems apart from the mental torture it would mean to people?

I think the time has come, Mr. Chairman, when the Government should get down to this question and get an expert or a group of people from the University College of the West Indies who are capable of working out what could be regarded as a minimum wage for any man to eat food on, and let us get rid of this nonsense. In the United States there is a Law that nobody can employ anyone in any part of the country for less than \$1 per hour. The Trade Unions are asking to make it \$1.25, so that in no Government Department in the United States, no matter what the person is doing - a charwoman cleaning toilets - that person could not carry home less than \$40 a week.

4.45 p.m.

The Government here says that their minimum is one shilling per hour. Do you believe that is reasonable and that it really connotes what a man can eat? Why I am so worried about this is because I go around and watch these people and see what they eat. If you are to see what they eat, then you would be convinced that I am not wrong. Look at the poor diet of a man working for \$13.20 a week. Some of these people in the Government are now working on the street near the Trade Union Headquarters and they come and buy a punch. Some of them do not know what it is to get a good square meal three times per week. Some are seeing hell literally. To buy a pair of pumps, some of them have to save money for three or four weeks. Some of them do not have one good dress suit, like this which I am wearing, to their credit. They cannot own it because the capital cost of a tweed suit is beyond their reach. Some of them are the most embarrassed people when they have to go to their own parents' funeral. Let us raise the standard of living of them! We have the opportunity of so doing. If we did not have it before, let us do it now. Let us say that so much can give a man who is doing the lowest job a decent standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, I will say quite frankly that, in such times as this, a man working for \$20 a week is working for a reasonable amount; but what I can say is that these low wages which are perpetuated here are a pattern of life which exists in these colonial territories in which slavery was the background. The workers when they were emancipated from slavery worked for subsistence wages; and up to this day we are still perpetuating a system that savours of subsistence wages. You find in our salaries structure that this is below what can keep body and soul together. I know that we have a legacy of slavery, but are we bound to carry on giving a man 24 cents an hour? Why can't we pay a man something which we know he can live on?

Sir, I do not intend to insult anyone but I have to be factual. Many a man who works for this low wage is tempted to steal. A man who is working for \$13.20 a week must look around to see what he can put his hands on to make up his salary. The vices and evils which are going on, I believe, are more rampant today than they ever were and the reason why they are growing and becoming such a fetish is because a man has not enough money in his hand.

I am satisfied in my mind that we cannot continue as we are, and the economy of the island and the balances

which we have in the Treasury are such that we can pay a lot more to these people. We can be more generous to these people whom we know are living at subsistence level. I am not pleading a case for anybody who is getting a lot of money, but when we pay a little more to these people in the bottom brackets it would be an inducement to some of those other employers too to pay a little more. If you pay a decent minimum wage, it is from that that you will get a better wage level for the community as a whole. It is better to have more people working for a reasonably good wage than to have a few working for a good wage and the majority living on a wage below subsistence level. What do you want a man to do? Do you want him to wash his feet and go to sleep hungry? I see more barefooted people in recent months than I have seen for all my life. If you take a look, you will see the number of people who are walking barefooted on the streets of Bridgetown. I am not talking of the people in the country who walk barefooted because that is a natural thing to them. A good pair of shoes in Bridgetown costs more than what some of these people get as a week's pay. A good pair of shoes costs between \$15 and \$24 and these people do not get that. The pairs which you get for less cause you to be always buying them. When you buy the cheap stuff, that keeps you in the store all the time. When you buy the cheapest shirt, as soon as you put it in the water the colour is gone. The man who buys the cheapest shirt always gets two colours, one for the day he first wears it and another colour after that. You also get more sickness by paying these low wages. When people do not get proper food to eat, they cannot throw off diseases of the body. Such people cannot put up any resistance against illness. I know men who are getting \$15 a week who are drinking punch and Ju-C and are eating sweet bread and pone. That cannot build them up against the ravages of diseases. I hope you will realise that if you spent a little more on these people you will save a lot of money in your social services. Spend a little more on these people and keep them outside of the Hospital. They have told me some fantastic figure which it takes to keep a person in the Hospital for one day. I hope hon. members will see that you cannot get any advancement in your community if you are still perpetuating low wages.

Sir, I feel that I have discharged my responsibility when I say that this low salary structure, geared as it is, is not in the best interest of the people concerned. It has been drawn to my attention that even the Whitley Council has not agreed to this but I wish that that body will get a little stronger. I will say this to people in the Public Service. This is an age of power and strength. If you are weak you are going to always suffer in this age. You must make yourself strong to fight everybody - Government, your employers, your brothers and sisters and everybody. If the people who work in the Public Service should ever bind themselves together to make themselves a strong group of working-class people, the days of this one-cent an hour increment and things like that would be over and would be days of memory; but as long as they remain a fragmented group the Government will always suffer them.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I have discharged my duty to these people and I say that to give them a Cost of Living Allowance at this stage, based on what you are giving the whole service, is grossly unfair. You actually deprive them of other amounts of which they are so deserving.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the hon. member who has just sat down; I agree that this matter should be postponed for further consideration. My reason for saying that is that this increase of 4 1/2 cents per hour is not enough for the lower brackets of employees. If we consider the cantonniers, the scavengers and these poor people who have to work for eight hours in the sun barefooted on the hot tarred road and without any consideration, they are receiving \$13.20 per week. In the way in which the matter has appealed to me, it seems to me that these people are making bricks out of straw and they cannot cope with the situation; they are hungry and tired and absolutely naked. I am not criticising the Government; I am only asking the Government to consider that whereas they have brought down this Resolution, there should be a greater increase offered in the lower brackets. The big

man can save one half of his salary but the poor man cannot get enough to carry to the shop. On many a day the poor man is working but he is also crying. We all remember that one of old told another: "When you get before the Master, remember me". That was an early indication of when you hear hon. members telling the people: "We will remember you". If we are going to remember the people on this low basis, then we had better not remember them at all. I see that some hon. members are laughing, but you must remember the poor man who has his wife; and when you see some people going out with their wives to the hotels eating and drinking, there are others who are destitute and the children cannot go to school because of hunger.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of living has risen to 30% and the cost of materials is 40%, so that these poor people can never reach that figure. I am asking the Government to consider the people who are in the lower brackets. The bigger man can wait and you should not give him any money to be put down. In time to come we have to ask the poor people to support us and how are we going to them to ask them to support us in time to come? We must remember them now when we are eating beef, ham and eggs. We are wearing good suits and they are wearing dungaree and khaki and they cannot afford to eat but salt fish. We are here to remember the poor; the position is hard with these people. You have the Government in your hands and you can pass a Resolution so as to supply the needs of the poor people; as to those who have not got, we are here to see what we will do for them today. How do you feel in granting this increase of four and a half cents per hour? I do not think that any hon. member on the Government side today would refuse to agree to a postponement of this Resolution; I do not think that we can pass this Resolution to give these people a four and a half cents an hour increase. In that case, I am sure that you will not be able to go to the homes of these people.

My chief reason for speaking on this Resolution is to ask the Government to consider the position of the poor cantoniers, the scavengers and people like that who are trying to make the way clean for us when we pass. The tourists have to use these roads and so they depend upon these people. I do not think that those of us who have servants would be so narrow as to think that if they give the poor man a fair wage, they would have to increase the wages of their servants; if a man is poor, he is poor and therefore he should be given a proper wage. Mr. Chairman, I think that we should agree to the postponement of this Resolution and let the Government bring it back down on a proper basis.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, this is a cost of living allowance which the Government has brought down for the Civil Service; this is something quite different from a salary revision. We had a salary revision in 1956 when every one's salary was increased, from the Governor down to the last cantonnier, but since then the cost of living has risen. The Premier did not tell us today how much the cost of living had risen in the interval and it would have been interesting indeed to us to know what is the present cost of living index today as against what it was then. From that index we would be able to get an idea of the increased cost of basic necessities.

The Government have found themselves unable to do more than what they have done. They tell us that they are apprehensive over further intrusion into the Treasury for fear of running into a deficit. In other words, they are pressing that more than \$776,000 cannot be allocated for this purpose. The Civil Servants had put up a scheme whereby it would cost the Government \$1,400,000—double the amount for which the Government have come down to this House, and the reason why the Government have had to give this amount is the reason of economy. If the Government, at this stage, feel that they are unable to set aside a greater sum than this \$776,000 and that is primarily an amount for the purpose of meeting the cost of living, I agree with those hon. members who have stated that it is the workers in the lower categories who need to be considered more so than the others.

5.05 p.m.

To attach these people to the entire Civil Service is a means of watering down what they will eventually get. It is true that if such a thing was done the Civil Servants in the upper brackets would feel that they had been discriminated against, but this is a temporary relief because it is just a matter of time when the Government will have to come down or bring someone into Barbados, another Commissioner, for a salary revision. Trinidad is doing that now; they have actually set aside a sum of \$7 million and they are setting up a Commission to go into a salary revision. We know only too well that no matter how our finances stay, we cannot lag far behind Trinidad in having the same thing done for our Civil Service. Our salary revisions have always followed Trinidad and British Guiana; and if they are setting it up now it is only a matter of next year when we will have to do the same thing; so if Government find themselves unable at this present stage to do more than this \$776,000, they could have earmarked it for the very low category as an *ad hoc* contribution to the cost of living.

You may say that the cost of living has gone up for all. That is true; but in the absence of some definite policy whereby Civil Servants' salaries are fixed to rise or fall with the cost of living, these things will recur. Whether we like it or not, we are in the Caribbean and we are going to have comparisons in this region. The rise and fall of five points in the cost of living will necessitate a readjustment in the salaries, and I wonder if when the next Commissioner is appointed here he would not recommend something like that.

I am in favour on this occasion of letting the Civil Servants know that their salaries will be adjusted by a salaries revision, but that on this occasion they cannot partake in this sum of money. If they happen to fall into the category of £200 and down, all well and good; but we should be fixing the salaries of those of £200 and then you would find that the sum of money you have allocated would increase the very low category which is in great need of adjustment because of the cost of living. I am not ignoring that the cost of living has gone up for all, but those in the upper brackets are more able to take care of themselves than the ones in the lower brackets, and for that reason if Government can see their way to come back with the Resolution along these lines, I will vote for the postponement.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that of hon. members in this House - and I know that we all have an interest in this matter - I can be said to be more noisy about it than most others, not because I know more about it than anybody else or because I have been told more about it or because I have been annoyed more about it, if annoyance it was, than any hon. member, but because it so happened by pure chance to fall to my lot within the last year or so to remind the Government from time to time of their obligations towards their own employees. In this respect, while I might have spoken more and appeared to be more concerned than other hon. members on this side of the House, I should like to say here and now that, so far as I know, all of us on this side of the House were equally disturbed about the way Government was responding to the appeals of the Civil Service for consideration, and all of us, I know, felt the same way and were equally anxious that something should be done about it as quickly as possible.

For fear that Government should run away with the idea that what it has proposed to do meets with the unqualified approval of everybody on this side of the House, I would like to say that it does not meet with mine, and I am sure that when the views of all hon. members on this side are heard, we shall all of us be discovered to have had very great reservations with respect to these proposals.

What we have been asking for and have always contended for was this: that the level of salaries among the lowest paid Government employees was not as high as it should be, and therefore when we ask for an increase in wages, we are not to be taken not to understand the difference between an increase in wages and a cost of living

allowance. It was never in our mind to ask for a cost of living allowance for several reasons, not the least of which are these: in the first place, a cost of living allowance solves no problem except a very short term immediate problem. It is not an increase in salary because if it were it would count towards a public employee's pension. It is no more than a recognition on the part of his employer that he deserves something, but that his employer is not prepared to do more for him than he has to at a given moment.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the reason why we would have rejected and disliked the idea of a cost of living bonus especially at this time is just this: when salaries were revised three years ago, the then Salaries Commissioner recommended the taking away of the cost of living bonus. Actually it was a consolidation of the then cost of living bonus into the basic salary, but everybody knows that from then on, there would be no more cost of living bonus. If the cost of living bonus had been agreed on then, what is being given now would have been given then and the man who now looks forward to \$2 a week more or \$9 a month more would have had it since 1956. You are therefore, not doing anything for him now when you give him what you refused to give three years ago or what you were advised not to give; so he can thank you for nothing now. If you should have given him three years ago and you are now giving it, and the cost of living is such that even what you are giving now cannot help a man, then you have been robbing him for three years and you are making him believe that by giving him a cost of living bonus now you are making up for the harm which you have done, when the opposite is the truth.

5.15 p.m.

There is a third reason as to why the cost of living bonus, however generous the scale may be, has to be rejected. Civil Servants, Public employees at any rate, are workers like any other people; and according to their training, their experience, their length of service, their adaptability - because of all of this, they are paid at a certain level of salary. If they are organised in any way through their Association, that body decides what in the interest of the public service it is best to pay them. It is the man's basic wage or his basic salary which is important and anything other than that is sheer robbery; because if you admit that things are so bad that you have to give him a cost of living, you are also admitting that his level of salary is below what it should be. From a practical point of view, all you are doing now is to make sure that he is again robbed when the next salary revision takes place because as the next General Election draws near and the Government decides to review and revise the salaries of its public officers and servants, the Salaries Commissioner will again have past history as a guide; that is to say, he would take into consideration the cost of living allowances which they are now getting and consolidate that into the basic structure of their wages or salaries and then give them a little more than that; so you can see that we will be repeating in four years' time the same dreary arguments which we are going through now.

Now, there is a side of this question which is peculiarly used by Government in beating down arguments about increases in salaries and wages in the Public Service. I have never known since I have been interested in public affairs of a time when this Government did not say on the occasion when more money had to be found for Civil Servants that it did not have the money. It has always been the misfortune of the Civil Servants and public employees generally to make demands when Government does not have the money and ignore the times when it has. It may help, when Government has the money, to tell the Civil Servants that this is just the time when they should ask for money. I have noted with monotonous regularity, whenever the time comes for Civil Servants to get a little more, that it is always inopportune for them and that they have always put the Government in an embarrassing position of having to refuse their just demands on grounds of financial stringency. But if the truth were to be told,

there never is a time when Government has at its disposal as much as it would like to have. As a matter of fact, that has never been the experience in this or any other problem. You can expect that the claims on Government's income, just as it is upon a person's income, are so great that there is always something which has got to be left out; but it would be a bad system of priority which dictates that of the many conflicting claims on the Government's purse, the one which must be ignored is the claim which Government servants make on their employers. That is a contention which we on this side of the House can never admit; so we tell Government that, much as you may be justified in saying that many are your commitments on public money which must be met, we say that your system of priorities can be revised and changed so as to include a more generous response to the requests of your own employees for higher wages.

Now, there is a mentality unfortunately in public life which always feels that a public employee is more responsible than, and a different kind of person from, any other kind of worker; and I am sorry to see that even in the Government Party there have been voiced from time to time on public platforms sentiments that cause you not to have a generous view of this matter. We on this side of the House, particularly my colleagues and myself, have been frequently accused of wanting to make political capital out of the grievances of Civil Servants and of trying to embarrass the Government unnecessarily in agitating on these matters; but if you go to St. Andrew now, there will be people there who will tell you that one of the representatives of that parish in this House - and I am not referring to the most recent addition to this House; I am referring to the senior member - said that she could not understand why cantoniers and people like that are always asking for more money because she has seen them on a Monday morning with their trousers well creased, and when she sees them again on the Friday afternoon after that she still sees them with their trousers well creased. If she is correctly reported, and this particular reference of hers is well spread currently in her own constituency, she is displaying an attitude towards these men which is not only mistaken but is puzzling. Before you can criticise public servants as to whether they do their work or not, you at least owe it to them and to yourself to find out all you can as to the nature of the work which they do. It would be a credit to cantoniers if they can still keep a crease in their trousers after a week's work and their cleanliness is on the upgrade. I think the hon. member should be proud to see manifested among her constituents such a welcome display of virtue; but on the contrary, to throw cold water on their aspirations by wondering if they do work when they still retain a crease in their trousers is not only to betray the trust in them but it also displays woeful ignorance of the facts of the case. She is not alone in her misconceptions. There are other people who feel the same way to and who are wondering how certain increases to Government employees can be justified. It is true that when you pass in your cars and see them so idle it gives the impression that they are getting the public's money for nothing.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain facts which have got to be taken into account. If you tell a man who is a cantonnier that he must weed or clean, or whatever it is, 200 feet of roadside in a day, and he can get that done in half a day and get the rest of the time to himself, then I do not see what you have to quarrel about. If you feel that not enough work is being done, then you should apportion a greater task and pay more money for doing it. It may be that hon. members feel that we complain about the apparent lack of work which has been found with certain categories of employees; it may be that they are not aware of the fact that in some cases the portion of work allotted to be done in a particular time has already been done and the Department concerned has not yet come to grips with what is to be done with the unexpended time. We have to be very wary about criticising these people until we know what the position is with them.

There is one other reason why we on this side of the House must fight shy of a cost of living allowance unless better argument can be brought forward. It is this; these employees, like the rest of us, are people who have to live on a certain amount of credit and the people whom they owe will be patient with them so long as they hear that these public employees are to receive an increase in pay. The man whom you owe may not always know the facts of the case and he may well think that you are going to be very generously treated, whereas, in truth and in fact, you are not so very generously treated. As soon as this Resolution is passed, a large number of people are going to be run down by people whom they owe because the latter people will be under a terrible misapprehension that all the Civil Servants are now sitting on a tub of money and they had better get paid before the money all goes. That will be a wrong impression because when you give a man an extra \$2 a week and about six or seven weeks' back money, you are not doing him a lot and you may be putting him in more trouble than that in which he is now. All of that has to be taken into account. That is not a reason for withholding a cost of living allowance or for paying it; it is a matter which arises out of the proposals which are before us now.

Then there is the political side of the matter. There has always been a tendency in this House to look upon the electorate as people who are only fit enough to be bribed at Election time and, consequently, while we, on this side of the House, and the people of this country generally might feel that now is the accepted time for increasing the salaries of public employees, particularly those in the lower categories, that point of view does not find favour with the Government. They look upon the matter in this light, that if there is going to be a General Election, it is best for us to have that Election taking place in circumstances which are most favourable to the Party in power. And what they ask themselves is this; are these circumstances most favourable to us? From their point of view, it is best to increase the Old Age Pensions in Election year or to increase the salaries of public servants in Election Year and do things like that which attract large numbers of voters just at the time when the polls are about to be opened. The Opposition or the public as a whole should not be concerned with what the Government does or what it says but we should rather look objectively to what has been done. We all know that there is going to be a salaries revision within a year and a half or two years from now and the best argument with them on that side is that they are not having it now. You are throwing a sop to the Civil Servants with this cost of living allowance; why do you put off something which is obviously right? Why shun from doing it now so as to do it at a time when the situation is bound to be worse?

Last year when I gave notice of my motion asking the Government to bring down legislation the purpose of which would be to provide for an increase in the salaries of public employees, the Minister of Trade, the Deputy Premier, who is now the stoutest defender of the Government and who is doing the work which naturally falls or should fall to the Head of the Government, was quick to tell me that I was three months too late. "Why", he asked, "did you not say these things in June?" As if it is the business of the Opposition to be in front of the Government in doing what is right. It is a curious political theory which he enunciates; but if the Government knew that members of the Opposition should ask for increases for these people three months before they actually did so, why has it taken the Government from June last year until May this year only to give these people a cost of living allowance? More than that, Mr. Chairman, nobody on this side of the House could be accused of suborning Civil Servants to hear what their attitude towards this matter is; it came over Rediffusion that the Civil Servants, when they met last week, were in a very bitter and angry mood because not only what was offered to them was inadequate but because they also felt that they had not finished discussing the matter. 5.35 p.m.

The customary procedures have not all been used or used sufficiently; therefore Government has jumped the gun in giving them less than was necessary or just. Everybody

knows that, and because of the bitterness existing then and the critical mood which the Civil Servants were in, last Tuesday there was a postponement, and I for one had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the postponement meant that Government was at long last aware of the bitter discontent of its employees and had postponed doing the Resolutions because they wanted to be a bit more generous even with a cost of living allowance. I little thought that they had only withdrawn, as it were, from the battle in order to let the atmosphere cool down and bring it back again this week. Look at the supreme irony and the almost lefthanded humour of the situation. They tell us that every person who is an employee of Government is to have this \$9 a month except the Governor and the Ministers.

Now I can well understand why the Governor is not to have it. He is lucky that they did not take away what little he does have. He does not know how fortunate he is, because the mood they are in with him, he is lucky that they have let him escape so lightly only to take away \$9 from him; the mood they are in they would not leave him with a shirt on his back if they had the power to do it. But it is more ironical to hear them say that the Ministers are not to have it. Why are they not to have it? Do you mean that it would be a little too much on the travelling allowance or on the entertainment allowance or on the salaries? I do not see really why they should be so hard on themselves. Why cut their noses to spite the entire Civil Service? Every workman is worthy of his hire and the Ministers do more than the entire Civil Service put together, because that is the new theory we are hearing. Give yourself the cost of living because you need it and times are as hard with you as anybody else or perhaps more so.

The idea, Mr. Chairman, that a man who works for \$1,000 or \$900 a month is to be insulted with an extra \$9 in precisely the same degree as a man who is working for \$90 is a travesty to the democratic principle. In other words, we are now hearing from this Government that although everybody is equal, some are 'equaler' than others, and because they are 'equaler' than others, they must receive the same treatment and the same cost of living—according to the theory and practice as we have now seen. It appears as hard upon the man who is at the top of the scale, the Heads of Departments, as it does upon the man who is at the bottom.

Now I have not had an opportunity, and I do not suppose any hon. member had, to go into the figures as carefully as I should, and therefore I do not know the difference it would have been in dollars and cents between giving this cost of living allowance to everybody as is now done, and giving increases in salaries which we asked for to the lowest paid employees. I want to make it clear both for the record and for the public at large that what the Democratic Labour Party was interested in was not an omnibus cost of living for everybody, but substantial increases in the salaries of the lowest paid. If Government now says that it can only spend \$800,000 or \$770,000, we are not prepared now to contest that figure; we only say that instead of paying out the cost of living allowance all over the place, you should have concentrated that large sum of money where it was most needed, and that would be among the lowest paid employees of Government; because, make no mistake about it, I will tell you why no good can come of what is being done. All the Permanent Secretaries, Heads of Departments, Deputy Heads, Assistant Secretaries and the professional technical and administrative sections of Government are going to receive substantial increases when salaries are revised, for it is among these people that you get \$100, \$160 and \$200 a month increases when you revise salaries; so the man who knows he is going to get \$200 increase on his salary in two years' time with possibly a year's back pay can well afford to forego \$9 a month now, because \$9 a month from now to the next three years cannot be as much as even the increase in salary will be in two years' time, even without back-pay. That is why, Mr. Chairman, it was not necessary for Government to spread the cost of living allowance over the whole Service to make the Chief Secretary or the Director

of Highways believe that Government is as solicitous to him as it is to the watchman at Highways and Transport. That is not our idea at all: and when the Minister on that occasion said to me in rebutting my contention that Government had to look after all its employees, I was under the impression that he meant all the lowest paid. I could not imagine that it would be in the mind of that Government to take \$9 from the taxpayers' money and give it to people who are working for \$700, \$800 or \$1,000 a month. That is an extravagant waste of money and a sum of money for which these people have not asked, which can mean nothing at all to them, but which, used differently, might make all the difference between keeping one's head above water and having it pushed under, to a lot of people far below them in the scheme of things.

I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has moved for postponement. In that respect, he is milder than some of us. I myself had wanted to prevail upon him to move a total rejection because I could not see that we are doing the Civil Servants any good to pretend to them that we as representatives of the people accepted these proposals which can mean no good in the end, and which will have to be undone at a future date. If the members of the House of Assembly were angry enough and could show their displeasure so as to make that Government take these proposals back, study them over and bring something which is more in keeping with the requests of the people concerned, I think a good job may be done. After all, how could it affect those Civil Servants who have been waiting a year and a half now to get some adjustment in their salaries if they had to wait another four or five weeks in order to get something really worthwhile? I sincerely hope that they are not so short-sighted as to believe that you should take whatever little is given now for fear that Government might withdraw the offer altogether. In certain circumstances it is better to take nothing at all than to take what is less than you should obviously have.

The man who is going to receive \$15 a week as a salary plus cost of living is worse off than he would have been if we had got Government to agree with our suggestion in 1956, because when the proposals which Mr. God-sall had recommended were brought to this House particularly in respect to the lowest paid employees, we asked them then to take them back and bring down proposals which would give a man a basic wage of \$15 a week. Well, he is going to get \$15 now, but how is he going to get it? He is going to get \$13 one way and \$2.08 cost of living allowance; so what we were trying to get in 1956, he is now going to get, when the cost of living has gone up ever so much more since 1956. So the increase which he gets now, since it belongs to 1956, cannot possibly affect what he is experiencing now in 1959, and that is why in six months from now the grumbling will start all over again.
5.45 p.m.

There is another sinister thing which will happen and which is always happening in this island. Mr. Chairman, the people of this island never believed the Democratic Labour Party when we told them certain basic facts. We have told them how whenever an election is held and members of your Party are successful, there is always immediately after that a phenomenal rise in the cost of living, the reasons for which, we know, we cannot go into here. Equally so, after this money has been passed by this House, the next few days and, perhaps, not longer than four weeks, those who will have to buy over shop counters will hear of increases in foodstuffs and other things the people buy from time to time because the merchants in town will hear that a quarter million dollars has been paid out of the Public Treasury to poor people; therefore they will take every opportunity to get as much as that quarter million dollars in their hands as they can. How can a man who has to sell get money from you except by an increase in prices? So, in more ways than one, the very people whom we are trying to help are going to be worse off than before. This is not a problem which has an easy solution but it is pathetic to see how time after time when public employees get a little money, within a short period of time they are grumbling again.

The Minister over there appears to be saying that Government cannot help that. (Hon. M. E. COX: I have not said that.) I did not say that he said that but if he said that, that would be a sensible remark. If you are putting money in the people's pockets, however small it is, you owe a second duty to them, that is, to see that they do not pay more than they need pay for what they have to buy, or to see that the little money you give them is not taken away from them through increased prices of foodstuffs. As I have said, it is a complicated matter but it always happens. Whenever there is an increase of wages or whenever there is a favourable election to members of that Party which represents the Government, the cost of things sky-rockets. A succeeding Government may know how to tackle that problem as it is not tackled now; but it is some - thing to which public attention has been paid.

Mr. Chairman, I close on this note. We of the Democratic Labour Party are asking and voting for postponement, not because we agree in principle with the idea of a cost of living bonus but because we have always asked for an increase in basic salaries. That is what we want: but there seems to be no prospect of forcing our point of view, which is the best one in this House. We therefore as a Party have to make do with something which we know to be very inadequate. We ask for postponement not because we think it is good and that Government only needs to brush it up and come with something better; we ask for postponement because we feel that a big injustice is being done to Government servants. We want a change of policy with respect to their salaries and wages. The cost of living allowance means nothing and does not meet the requirements of the time and it will only put the very people to whom it is given in worse plight when salaries come to be revised.

Then too let me say a word to the Civil Servants. No member of this House of Assembly ought to have to stand here and argue a case for better treatment of public employees and I know we are doing wrong to them basically when we do that. I have heard members of the Government boast that they are the largest employers of labour in this island and it is true, apart from the people in the sugar industry. In a sense they are larger than the people in the sugar industry because whereas they can boast of giving almost full-time employment, the sugar industry is part-time; therefore, so far as full-time is concerned, the Government is the largest. If they have 10,000 of varying degrees of people whom they employ, that is a large enough body of people to make their wants felt and to insist on proper standards of wages and salaries for themselves and they should not have to rely on others to argue their case for them, because no matter how much interest we may put in this or other aspects of their affairs, we have not the experience of how the people who actually are in the trouble will feel. They form a large enough body of workers that they can band themselves together to work and fight their case without reference to any other help which they may get, and it is largely the fault of the Civil Servants themselves that these things happen to them. They seem to think that because there are quite a lot of workers, most of them are placed in a different category from all who work for the same employer. Nothing can be further from the truth.

I am told - I do not know how true it is - that they are about to put up a request to Government that they should be recognised as having trade union status. That would be the best thing for them to do because the whole position between them and the problem of their wages and conditions of work would be brought under a proper footing and examined: but until that is done, there is bound to be confusion and disappointment. This ought to be a lesson to them, no matter if they be Permanent Secretary or Cantonnier - because as they are all workers, they are basically in no different position than other workers. They have rights which have to be respected. They owe duties to their employers as other people, and they ought to insist that relations between them and their employer be put on a footing of mutual goodwill and one which will be respected on both sides.

If a Government servant does not believe this, it is a matter for him: but Government can be as big an exploiter of wages as anybody else. Indeed, Government can be because they have the majesty of the law to back them up where a private employer has not that backing. 5.55 p.m.

The people who are employed by the Government have got to look after their own interests as vigorously as all other categories of employees.

Mr. Chairman, a cost of living allowance for these employees is not satisfactory to members on this side of the House; it is customary for the Government to feel that the Opposition has only a duty to talk and the Government has its numbers to carry a measure through. Well, they can use their numbers to carry through this most unpalatable measure, but I venture to prophesy that they will be doing the public employees the greatest disservice if they force through their motion as against the motion of the Opposition which I intend to support.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, a dissatisfied Civil Service is like a purse with a hole. Dissatisfaction leads to a drop in the morale, a drop in the morale leads to a drop in the production, and a drop in the production leads to more money being pulled out of the pockets of the taxpayers. It is regrettable that this Government throughout the past few years and even up to now has been unable to produce any overall satisfactory scheme for the salaries and wages of Civil Servants. The thought or thoughts which gave birth to this travesty are certainly in need of a good doctor; to suggest that an over all picture should be taken of a service such as this, and that this amount is equivalent to an over-all 4 1/2 cents an hour to be granted to everybody, is beyond the powers of conception of anyone sitting down and really thinking out what he is doing. When it is realised that the amount which those in the higher brackets will receive is almost, as one hon. member has put it, an insult to them - and not only that, the people in the lower brackets are receiving the same thing. They do not get any incremental basis but those who are paid in the higher brackets get it. Where can we, for one moment, agree with the Government on this matter? Let us not fool ourselves that in these days there are not a number of persons at the top, in the middle and at the bottom who are in need of increased pay; do not let us for one minute think that the increased cost of living affects only one class of person. If we want a satisfactory Civil Service in this island as in any other walk of life and if we want good men in certain posts, we will have to pay them and pay them in relation to what is paid in other parts of the world. Therefore, do not let anyone get the impression that I am agreeing with not paying those who warrant an increase.

Mr. Chairman, what is the whole trouble is this; this Government is incapable - absolutely and utterly incapable of handling this problem; this Government has not got the ability to handle this problem. It has not got an Adviser at its back and call to handle these matters. If my advice in 1957 had been taken and they had imported into this island a consultant, as has been done in other civilised countries, a consultant who knows something about how to pay a man for what he is doing, the Civil Servants would have been in a better position today. Certainly, I will be asking questions of one Department in particular; do not let anyone believe that there is not dissatisfaction bordering on hatred in one Department and I will be taking up the matter with the facts in this House as soon as I am ready to do so. Do not let us fool ourselves that our Civil Service is what it should be. If this type of stupidity is continued - and I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down; apart from the fact that they need a doctor badly, they must also be blassed by some reason, the reason being that they are holding off for sometime or for the time being, until the General Elections are a few months off and then they will tell the employees to vote for them. This is really playing politics - the one thing in which I do not believe. There are a lot of people in this island who are playing politics and politics should not be their future. If we, in this House, are going to play politics and in the mean time

the island is suffering, the overall picture in the end will be that the good people will either come to realise that we are getting in this island no more than a vast totalitarian state or that when the sops are thrown out to them they will be standing on their own feet; it may be that they will be accepting the sops and acting differently. Let us not forget that this is merely a cost of living allowance and with that I entirely disagree. It makes me feel more than ever that this is nothing more than a sop. 6.05 p.m.

Cost of living in these days? I never heard anything about cost of living until the War started. I know there is a cold War on now but I never knew that it had got hot and that we are in need of a cost of living in these days. Facts are facts. We are not going backwards; we are going forward and any increase is an increase on the basic wage. The days of cost of living are over and will only come back in case of necessity in such a time as War. This is an effort to fool certain members of this House, but it will not fool all.

Again, Sir, in an effort by the Hon. Premier to substantiate this travesty, he has quoted the cost of various products such as rice, rum, flour and so forth; that, Sir, is of little use to this debate and I will repeat now what I have said a number of times in this House: the foundation of national wealth and income is based on the propensity to produce and not the propensity to spend. If the hon. member who introduced this had come in here and told us that in Trinidad it costs \$10,000 for a mile of road and in Barbados it costs \$15,000, \$10,000 or \$8,000, that would give us something on which to debate. If he had told us that the Civil Service *per capita* in Trinidad costs \$X and in Barbados it costs \$Y, they have a Statistical Department and we could get that information on which to base our debate; but we have not been told anything about the production of the Civil Service at all, and when I hear laughter over there when I talk about the propensity to spend, I will say that you can spend in more ways than one. You can pay one man twice what another man is getting and get three times as much work from one; and there are a lot of posts - I am not going into personalities - that need investigation in this island for the amount of work that they do, and I am not talking about cantoniers; I am talking about seniors in Departments. If we had someone to see that in spite of the fact that I am recommending that this is much too little for the people in the lower brackets, with an overall picture it may take less than what we are proposing here now to produce more.

It is remarkable when you look around today at some of these posts to see how many Austin cars they can buy and what houses they can provide. (Hon. M. E. COX: Why Austins?) Mr. Chairman, I hope to sell the hon. member one some day. I have, Sir, the propensity to produce; the more I sell, the more I produce and the more I can employ, and that, Sir, is the basis of the whole argument. This needs ability which we have not got in the Government. I go further to say that we need somebody from outside with ability who has a completely unblassed outlook to settle our Civil Service.

It is very regrettable, Mr. Chairman, that the Civil Servants on whom the taxpayers of this island depend should be dissatisfied. It is very regrettable that the Hon. Premier has got up this afternoon and said that the official side and the other side could not get together to make a decision. It does not augur well for the future of the island. If you do not, as I recommended in 1957, get someone down here with a full knowledge of financing and work-studies as quickly as possible, your whole Civil Service is going to be a seething mass of dissatisfied people. When that time comes, Sir, the taxpayers again as in a number of instances which I hope to substantiate in this very House shortly, will suffer. But surely the Government must accept the blame for not taking the bull by the horns.

It is all well and good to make comparisons with the United States, but which other country in the world produces as much per capita as the United States of America?

So when the hon. senior member for St. Peter talks about their wages, what argument is he basing it on? We cannot just come here and say give everybody \$40 a week or whatever the case may be

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the comparison I drew about the United States is that the wages they are now paying here now are the wages that were paid in the United States in 1825. That is all I said; I was not comparing that with Barbados in any other way.

Mr. DOWDING: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that whether it is 1825 or 1959 the whole thing is based on production *per capita*. I do not care what year it is or what nation it is, the whole economy of an island or country must be based on one thing and one thing alone, and no comparison whatever can be made between the production *per capita* of Barbados and the production *per capita* of the United States. I wholeheartedly agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that it is necessary and obligatory for this Government to increase the purchasing power of the people in this island and that consequently, as he said, would increase the propensity of the whole island. But it cannot be done unless thought is given to the production side of the matter. Let us not forget that and let us take again the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, - I may say here that I like to listen to him except when he becomes a little bit personal and argumentative - that somebody from a University should be brought in to get at this problem. In 1957 I suggested something similar, and I am suggesting it again to this Government now. This Government has not produced a satisfactory answer to the Civil Service wage and salary problem. It is wrong for the Civil Service to be dissatisfied and this Government must accept the blame.
6.15 p.m.

If on the other hand this Government is willing to accept the recommendations of members of the Opposition, that is, to get someone here at once to investigate, I feel certain that the matter can be dealt with at an early stage and that the Civil Servants on which we are so dependent can be saved from what looks to me like a very, very serious time ahead.

Now, Sir, I cannot as I have said in the beginning, agree with any talk of cost of living in these days and that is a fact, along with the fact that this is an overall picture regardless of whether you are casual, unestablished, incremental or otherwise. It has to me no sound basis for my support. I intend to beseech the Government to reconsider this matter; therefore, I intend to support the motion for the postponement. I feel that it is inadvisable and that it could be a much better picture; it should be a picture which should last for years and years ahead. This, Sir, is a sop which will not last overnight. It has no beginning and it will have no end; so I am hoping that from the arguments put forward by members on this side of the House, the Government will fully realise that the Opposition is honest in its attempt to criticise the effort made as not befitting of the occasion and I hope the Government will take this matter back and return after further consideration with a solid overall plan which will satisfy every Civil Servant of this island from now onwards.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the speeches of members of the Opposition and, of course, the old story is repeated. It is the duty of the Opposition, as members of the Opposition have said in this House on many occasions, to criticise. They never said 'to make constructive criticism'; they always say that it is their duty to criticise and they have gone as far as to say not only to criticise but to embarrass the Government.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I have never gone as far as to say to embarrass the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have no intention to correct it; I never accused the hon. member of saying that. I said that it was a statement of fact which was said on more than one occasion in this House 'not only to criticise but to embarrass the Government.'

We were well aware of the fact that whatever we brought here would be criticised and that the Opposition would say we should do more and could do more; so we started off with that. Speaking for myself, I doubt if any hon. member, even my vilest opponents, would say that I have not fought for better wages and conditions for workers in this island, including Government employees, and if I am challenged on that statement, I believe the hon. senior member for St. Peter would bear me out. On one occasion even when that member was opposed to a strong consideration on behalf of the Government employees in the lower level, I think if he thinks for a moment he will remember what happened at that time.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not know of that occasion. That is an absolute lie.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, Mr. Chairman, what are we faced with today? I listened to the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, and no doubt throughout that speech you can see what can be regarded as sheer hypocrisy. Some time last year, the hon. member brought a Resolution to this House. I have a copy of it in my hands which I intend reading. This is what the Resolution says:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly is of the opinion that the level of wages at present paid to artisans and labourers employed by the Department of Public Works, Highways and Transport, and the Waterworks is not high enough to meet the rising cost of living."

"The House accordingly request the Government to introduce a new wage rate for these workers which will provide a weekly wage of not less than \$18 as a minimum."

I got up when this matter was under debate and I drew the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member had selected three Department of Government only and had completely forgotten all the gardeners, the cooks at the Hospital, the washers and all of the other people in the other Departments. He had only selected these three Departments. I said then and was convinced, and am more than convinced now that the hon. member was only trying to catch votes by the cheap way because he had a few of those people in a Union of which he was supposed to be the Secretary. What of all those other employees of the Government? What about those people who are working on the Deep Water Harbour and of all those people working in the employ of the Housing Board?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do you mean the Deep Water Harbour too?

Hon. M. E. COX: What is wrong with that?

Mr. TUDOR: If there were anybody I left out, it is the duty of the Government to include them.

Hon. M. E. COX: I agree. That is exactly what we have done and what we are doing now. Sir, that only shows if they had the opportunity to run the Government that they will run it in that partial manner. They will only look out for a handful of the workers and leave out the larger number.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Premier dealt at length with the Resolution which is before the House. I would like to say at the outset, unlike a statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy about the Civil Servants having asked a long time ago for this increase, that this increase which we have brought here now did not originate from the Civil Servants. Mr. Chairman, the Civil Servants asked for an increase in January of this year. Last year, when I was replying to the hon. member on this particular Address, I made it clear then that the Government had under consideration since October the question of an increase for these people. The Civil Servants only asked for an increase in January this year and that was the first time.
6.25 p.m.

We, as a Labour Government, no doubt depend to a large extent on the man in the street for support. We, who have

pledged to fight, who have fought for many years, are still fighting and will always have to fight against the combination as you see it over there - we were thinking of these persons before and long before the official representation was made by their own organisation. Now, Sir, I have listened to both the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and no doubt it does appear to me from what they have said today, that they are beginning to change. It appears to me as if they are beginning to realise the fact that the payment of \$10.00, \$11.00 and \$12.00 a week and wages like that, cannot provide the barest necessities of life today. If what they have said is their feeling, well, let them put it into practice and not merely talk it. It is only recently that I had to set up a Wages Council for porters and such people. The Union was trying to get a wage of \$15 a week for them and the employers stuck out for \$12.00 a week and they had to compromise on \$13.20 a week. The Government is giving \$15.72 to the lowest paid person and yet those hon. members over there are willing to have this Resolution postponed to give these employees - how much? They have not said, but they are opposed to this amount of money which we intend to be spread over other people. If you want to try and convince people that you like the poor man so much, well then, you should stop hoarding up this money and give it to the people now, and show by a tangible and practical effort that you really like the people. People are being chased away overnight and hon. members on that side are talking a lot of nonsense today saying that the Government is not paying proper wages when we are providing for the payment of 25% of these wages as pension. When it comes to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, all along that member was a member of the Whitley Council when he was a member of this Government, and Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was always used as a machine for the securing of better wages for the betterment of people and his advice was always taken.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, my advice was not always taken. When I asked for more money for people, they agreed with Sir Archibald Cupe. Do you want me to show you the Memorandum which I have here? I have the Memorandum and the Minority Report signed "F. L. Walcott". The other members of the Executive Committee did not agree with my Minority Report, so what nonsense is the hon. member talking? That is a grossly misleading statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: I happened to be a member of that Committee. I was there on the very day on which the hon. member was there and I attended very many more meetings than he attended. The hon. member was put on the Council because of his Trade Union experience and also because of the position he held and which he still holds in the Barbados Workers' Union. In all matters pertaining to Labour, and in all matters pertaining to the increase of wages and conditions of work, the hon. member's advice was sought and he was the person who advised the Executive Committee as to what we should do and what we should not do. The hon. member used to come in here and back up everything which the Government brought down to this House of Assembly. Even in relation to the Dos Santos Report you will see where the hon. member supported the Government strongly on this three cents and four cents an hour increase, the fifteen per cent bonus on whatever the amount was. He did that because he was a member of the Government and he knew that it was on his advice that the Government was working. But the hon. member comes in here today and says: "Look at this poor barefooted man in the street; this is a Socialist Government and it comes down with this increase of 4 1/2 cents an hour for this man", when it was on his advice that the people were ever given a four cents an hour increase, the highest they were ever given. Now they are getting a 4 1/2 cents increase, just a year and a half since the revision of salaries. That is the position. I know the set-up today; it is to attack, slander, lie and do anything against the Government and if that is not sufficient, to try to shoot us out of office. Their attitude is: "We want to get in; therefore we must get them out."

What does the hon. senior member for St. Peter tell us today? He says that these people should get no less than \$18.00 per week. Well, I will give him a secret now; as soon as this Resolution is passed, he will go over to his office and he will pay his Messenger, porter or handyman 72 cents a week more.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I do not employ anybody. The Trade Union employs people and the Trade Union's minimum salary, as the hon. member has said, is more than what the Government has given now for the last two or three years. We are not waiting until this Resolution has been passed to do anything; we are not waiting on this at all. (ASIDES) You will never treat your servants as we treat ours because you do not even treat your wife well.

Hon. M. E. COX: You see, Sir, he cannot help being nasty.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot be anything but nasty. You were born nasty.

Hon. M. E. COX: If I were to tell him something now,

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot tell me anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You cannot tell him anything.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know that you will defend him now, but you and he had it on occasions and accused each other.

Mr. WALCOTT: You accused Garner too of stealing money down at Fogarty's.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter please take his seat?

Hon. M. E. COX: What I am saying, Sir, is that as soon as you bring the truth to the surface, it is bound to hurt.

Mr. WALCOTT: What truth is that? How can he make a futuristic statement that as soon as we pass this I am going over somewhere to do something? What can there be truthful in that statement for something that is to come? Is he not a blaring fool?

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept all that. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the Union of which he is in charge and of which he is boss.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Which gripes you and which you would like to boss from the outside and cannot do!

Hon. M. E. COX: The Union is paying \$15 a week to a similar workman and all I am saying is that when we have finished now and he wants to follow the House, he will go back and give that handyman who is used and abused 72 cents a week more.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, when the hon. member says that I am going to do something as a result of what he has said, I said prior to that that the minimum wage which I regarded for a man should have been \$15 a week for doing any sort of ordinary job. The man he is speaking about now is a man doing a job like that and getting \$15 a week, and I would ask him to compare that with a man getting \$12 a week or \$10.80 whom he is now increasing by \$2.08 which brings it to less than \$15 a week. You have people getting 24 cents an hour, but there is nobody in the union getting 24 cents an hour; and may I tell him that a man who gets \$15 a week gets three weeks' bonus at the end of the year and gets extra money for any extra service he performs?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, if you look at the rates paid you will see that no man employed by the Government gets as little as \$12 a week which he is talking about.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you have a scale here and if he says that a man does not get that, I say he is lying. If you look at the scale of female labourers you will see there are cleaners at Public Works Department, caretakers at Public Works Department, attendants at Civil Aviation and Scrubbers. What is the difference between a woman scrubbing a floor and a man doing it for which you are paying a different wage? I said that the minimum wage for a man should be

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a point of order. I said a male labourer, but the hon. member was so anxious to catch the hook

Mr. WALCOTT: You can hook loafers; I do not loaf.

Hon. M. E. COX: There is no man that gets what he just said. That salary or wage applies to women. I will say here and now that unfortunately there are many women who have to work in stores in Swan Street and elsewhere who up to now are not getting as much as \$12 a week.

Mr. WALCOTT: Why not bring a law saying what the minimum should be?

Hon. M. E. COX: Up to now they are still getting \$7 and \$8 a week. I have mentioned already and will mention again that in 1956 when Mr. Godsall came here to go into the wages and salaries of Government employees, he got in touch with private firms as well as the Trade Unionists. He consulted the Barbados Workers' Union and upon the proposals made by various people including the Union, he arrived at his decision to recommend what he did, and I think it was a penny an hour for the people in the lower brackets.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it is true that only an hon. member who has a perverted mind can continually lie although the statement

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not refer to the member as lying.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, only a person with a perverted mind will continually say something that has been categorically denied when he knows it is not true. That statement about the Union was not only denied by me, and may be he could ask the Speaker now because it is alleged that that was done when I was out of the island, and therefore the Speaker is supposed to answer what was done. The Union cannot make recommendations to Government on behalf of workers in the Public Service as to what an increase should be.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I should like to tell the hon. member that the document which the Trade Union submitted is with the Chief Secretary of Barbados, Mr. Barton. We have seen that document and I have said already and I am going to say again that there is a substantial number of people that believe what I say to be statements of fact.

Mr. WALCOTT: Loafers and touts!

Hon. M. E. COX: They are respectable people and I would say again that we have given more to the workers than the Union recommended.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, again I repeat.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what are you rising?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Union could not make recommendations, and only a foul mind.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot use those phrases.

Mr. WALCOTT: Only a foul mind, Mr. Chairman, can say that a Union can make recommendations to the

Government on behalf of Government Servants. Why not ask the Union now? The Trade Union can only represent its members. I happened to be away when that statement was made but he is getting up here and saying that the Union made recommendations.

Hon. M. E. COX: When the hon. member was speaking I never interrupted him. We are in Committee now and he has the right to get up and reply when I am finished.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to get up any time he makes a statement that is incorrect.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Peter please take his seat?

Mr. WALCOTT: Listen, Mr. Chairman, we were going on here very well. I do not know if you are under the impression that someone else is here on sufferance. I rose on a point of order, to say that the statement which the hon. member was making was not true. This is about the sixth time he has made that statement in this House, not on the basis of dragging in the Union but on the basis of including me in the debate to show that I agreed that workers should get one penny an hour more. Can you imagine my agreeing to give a penny an hour for a man and then coming here and quarrelling with somebody for giving him 4 cents? Do you think I am a foul-minded, perverted, wicked liar?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said on one occasion that it was never done. He said that the Union never sent in this memorandum and on another occasion he said that he was out of the island.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that no memorandum was ever sent. We could only send a memorandum on the workers we represent.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I think that I have made Government's position clear on that particular point and I do not intend to continue because the hon. member is there to break all the Rules of the House and to interrupt as regularly as he can in order to break the trend of my speech. However, Sir, I still contend that the increases which we brought to this House were more than what were submitted by the Union to Mr. Godsall.
6.45 p.m.

Now, hon. members talked about postponing this Resolution and let Government go back and think up this and study that and all sorts of thing. I know too well that all that means nothing but that they are doing it so that they can make a big splash and behave in the manner in which they are accustomed to behave and which is more or less becoming a fairly popular pastime with a certain element in this community; where that is concerned they want to thrive on that and perhaps they may win. I will only say this. This is what happened in 1949 when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was still a member of this Government and this is what he said in connection with wages paid on that occasion:-

"Mr. Speaker, those honourable members who have not received their copies of this Order and who have spoken in favour of its postponement may be excused but those who received their copies and have spoken in favour of the postponement of the Order are merely playing to the gallery. If the senior member for St. Philip had read the Order he could not have made the accusation or the insinuation which he made, that is, that this Order seeks to deal with the people at the top and leaves out the people at the bottom."

Now, I have quoted that and I am going to quote it at length because that is the very argument which has been used from the time this debate started. That is the very argument which has been used not only by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, not only by the hon. senior member for St. Peter but.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Hon. Minister what time is it that I said that because I have not said one single word in this debate as yet.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I apologise to the hon. member, I mean the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Anyhow, this is what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said. I am not getting at the hon. senior member for St. Philip but I am quoting the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and at the time he was a member of this Government, and, no doubt, he used to cross swords with the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation. Dwelling on the past cannot help us in the future. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to let us leave the past and do something for the future.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I know that people like the hon. member hate us to refer to the past. I say no more on that. I was reading from a speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I read on:-

"That is not true; that statement is incorrect; it is a misstatement. Are you going to describe a scrubber at the General Hospital, a member of the Fire Brigade, a Policeman, a Postman as people at the top? Are you going to describe them as people at the top who are in receipt of salaries and wages that do not need to be adjusted? Well, they are all included in this Order and I challenge any honourable member of this House to say that that is not true. The senior member for St. Joseph made the position crystal clear; but on the other hand you hear the twisted argument, the illogical argument, that if we had brought the people at the bottom first they would be inclined to deal with this afterwards. Even from the substance of their argument, Sir, if we had brought the people at the bottom first, they would not have known what the people at the top are saying. This is only a matter of procedure. We have other Orders coming before the House shortly. Honourable members will remember that I was one of those who said that I was not prepared to give one red cent more to an officer who was in receipt of a salary of £1,000 and over, but I want to make hon. members understand that I am a Trade Unionist. The Whitley Council is a Trade Union and any honourable member who knows anything about Whitley Councils, will know that in their structure they are the representatives of the Trade Unions and their members."

Now, I pause at this stage to mention that this matter is one which was thoroughly threshed out and discussed by the Whitley Council with the Government of this island and while it is true that they did ask for 15%, 7 1/2%, and 5%, and we were not able to grant their requests, yet I am going to quote percentages to show that the man at the bottom is getting more than 15% by this Resolution. He is getting 18.75% increase which is more than what the Whitley Council had decided upon. They asked for 15%.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter went on to say: "Now what has this Government done in this matter? This Government met the Whitley Council of the Civil Service Association and asked their opinion about the whole matter. This Government said that the Unestablished Staff shall be paid 4 cents instead of 2 cents an hour more and that is what is contained in the Order dealing with that type of government employees. A member of this same House even had the guts to tell the people that this Government was not going to bring down any measure to give them back pay from the 1st April, 1948, and I would like to know what that member has to say now. I want to say that some of us are glaringly dishonest." (He was referring to his friends over there at the time.) "If ever the Civil Servants had a case at any time, it is right now. The members of the House are at liberty to do what they like and it is left to the Civil Servants to do what they feel they should do with their labour if the agreement which has been reached between the representatives of their Association and the Government is not carried out by the Government. Any such Agreement which is broken leaves the side which

has kept it to do what they feel they should do with their labour and I would support the Civil Servants to the hilt if the salaries and wages that have been agreed upon are not paid to them. There are some people who are not interested in labour at all;" (Those hon. members around him are the hon. members to whom he was referring). "There are others who like to ride on the band wagon....." (Those are the same hon. members to whom he was referring.) "I stand in this House as a person who has been dealing in Trade Union matters for the past five years, despite the opposition of many people who would like to see the structure of Trade Unionism broken, and I feel that it is my duty to honour any Trade Union organisation in any part of the world."

That is what the hon. member said when he was on this side of this House in reference to remarks made by several members on that side of the House in 1949 when dealing with the salaries and wages which were recommended by the Commissioner, Mr. Adams, at that time. In so far as this Party is concerned, that principle still holds good. We have not changed that principle. We are not a political chameleon which is subjected to changes of its colour with the shade of the trees so as to hide itself. We never will be. We lay down a principle and we intend to pursue that principle to the bitter end.

However, Sir, what is the position now? I mentioned just now some of the increases and again I want to repeat that the Hon. Premier who is responsible for the finances of this country pointed out and no doubt, hon. members will recall that when the Estimates were before the House, we budgeted for a surplus of a half million dollars. By this increase, that surplus is going to turn into a deficit as soon as this Resolution and the other Resolutions dealing with pensioners getting a cost of living are passed. It will turn itself into a deficit of \$800.
6.55 p.m.

The Hon. Premier went into this matter very carefully and it was put up to us that this was about the best we could do at this time. Again, I repeat, perhaps if we had done what used to be done in the old days, that is to come into this House and increase the wages of people in the higher brackets, giving a large cost of living allowance to people who could probably do without it - if that were the case then hon. members would have had something to oppose. But what is happening today is that each and every employee is getting a flat amount of \$108 per annum; that is what is happening in this set up.

In replying to what has also been said, that is to say, that we start from the top and give the people at top the most and those at the bottom the least, hon. members will see that the female labourer who now gets 24 cents an hour will get an 18.75% increase. The male labourer and people like that who are now getting 30 cents an hour will get a 15% increase. The cantonnier, the gardener, the road mender and so on - all of these persons who are getting 31 cents an hour are going to get an increase of 14.51% per hour.

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

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

This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

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

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

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

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were last in Committee of Supply, the House was debating a Resolution for \$776,000. The Hon. Minister of Trade was speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: When the sitting was suspended I was dealing with the statements of the hon. senior member for St. George; I am sorry that the hon. member is not now in his place. The hon. member attacked the Government and said that the Government was incompetent to deal with questions such as the one which is now before us. Mr. Chairman, knowing the hon. member as I do, perhaps I can say that at times he uses extravagant language which perhaps may be more applicable to himself than to the members of the Government. The hon. member said that if we had taken his advice in 1957 and brought down someone who could deal with finance and work study, we would not have been in the position in which we are now today. I am sure that this is not the first time that this Government has to deal with the salaries and wages and conditions of service of its employees. If I remember correctly, my first experience in this House was in 1945, and in that year a Committee was set up to deal with the salaries and wages of employees and Mr. Wilkinson was Chairman of that Committee. Cantoniers and people like that who were getting 10/- a week were recommended for an increase of 1/- a week more. That was before we were in charge of the Government. In that year we also dealt with the salaries of Teachers; in 1946 we brought down Superintendent Calver to deal with the salaries of Policemen and in 1948 we had Mr. Adams who also dealt with salaries.

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned these cases in order to show that this is not the first occasion on which the Government has had to deal with salaries. It is true that in fixing wages and salaries or increases thereto, you will never be able to satisfy everybody.
7.50 p.m.

We have just recently tried to correct what was considered as anomalies in Secondary Teachers' salaries, and I understand as a result of trying to correct them that we have created some anomalies now in the elementary teachers' salaries; so it will go along like that all the time. Whatever you do, you will never be able to satisfy everybody; but I think I can say with some measure of assurance that from the time we started to revise salaries, recommendations which we have made and which we have put into practice have met with general approval and satisfaction. Again I repeat that that is due to the fact that the Whitley Council which represents the Civil Servants was in on all these questions and made certain recommendations; and while it is true that we cannot at any time agree with all the recommendations that were put up, yet, as in this case, after they realised the financial position of the island, I understand that agreement was reached in a fairly friendly manner.

I mentioned just now that the Civil Service put up 15%, 7% and 3% to us, and if we had accepted that it would have meant less for those in the lower brackets. As I pointed out just now, it would have meant in the lower brackets 3 3/4 cents instead of 4 1/2 cents. As I said just now too, a female labourer who gets 24 cents an hour is going to get an 18.75% increase and the male labourer at 30 cents is going to get a 15% increase. There was a lot of talk, Mr. Chairman, that this was 4 1/2 cents an hour all round.

What I think is worrying some of the Civil Servants, Sir, is that some sort of resistance has been whipped up among the people in the lower bracket, and the fact that on this occasion, unlike former revisions or increases or cost of living allowance and so on, to use a hackneyed apothegm "little Judah, big Judah gets the same". The man at the bottom gets \$108 increase and the one at the top gets \$108 increase; but the difference is that while the man at the bottom gets an 18.75% increase on his wages by way of cost of living, the man at the top who gets

\$700 a month tapers off to 1.25% increase. So as regards the statement made by some hon. members that we were relieving the top at the expense of the bottom and that we looked into the top first, perhaps the Hon. Premier would not mind my saying that our original plan was not really to give a cost of living allowance to everybody either. We were convinced, Sir, that the man at the bottom was finding it very difficult to make ends meet and we decided ever since in October, as I mentioned on the floor of this House already, to come down with an increase or cost of living for the man at the bottom, and I think our original idea was to stop at \$150 a month. (Mr. TUDOR: That is what we asked for.) You asked for increases in three Departments. I have the Resolution here and you cannot get out of it. Again I repeat, our original idea was to give an increase up to \$150 a month because as I said, we felt that those persons who are at the bottom were finding it very difficult indeed to make ends meet. The Resolution was already approved for the ones at the bottom, but we were faced with the Civil Service Association who, as soon as they got on to what we were doing, asked in January this year that they be also considered. I just say that in order to refute any statements made by the Opposition that we were looking after those at the top first and leaving out the bottom. The reverse, Mr. Chairman, is true.

Now, Sir, I must repeat again before I sit down that I am not prepared to speak at any length unless I am provoked at a later stage, because we can speak many times in Committee if we want to; but frankly speaking, I think that the Opposition is surprised to see that we have brought down 4 1/2 cents an hour for the unestablished people; they are surprised to see that we have brought as much as 4 1/2 cents, because they know that all along whenever recommendations are made - from Adams to Dos Santos and now with Godsall - a penny an hour is recommended after consulting the Trade Unions and employers in this island. On each occasion, we have had to increase on those recommendations, and as I said, I believe the Opposition is surprised to see that we are giving the man at the bottom 4 1/2 cents increase for the first time unlike other times when they got 3 cents or 4 cents. What perhaps surprises them too is that they were not able to make out a strong case or any case at all against this Government on this occasion.

Now, Sir, one of the arguments used by some of the members of the Opposition is that they did not mind our increasing by 4 1/2 cents an hour, but it should be on the basic wage. That is what I understood the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to say. They say that they do not mind if we have this amount to spend because we know best how much we are able to spend, but it should be basic and not by way of cost of living. That is where the hon. member differs from us, not in quantum but in method.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think I must correct the hon. member. I said that no member of this House had probably had the time to go into the figures, but if that was all they could spend, it should have been an increase in wages, but I could not say that I agreed with them that that is all they should spend.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that at all. I said that the member said that we would know better as to how much we could spend and he was not quarrelling with the quantum or the amount we were going to spend, but what he wanted was a basic wage instead of a cost of living allowance. Am I not right?
8.00 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: He is not quite right. The point I made Mr. Chairman, was that since the figures were not available to every member of this Committee and were only known to them and they told us that it was in the vicinity of \$800,000, we have to take it as that. But if that was what they have to spend, we would like to see an increase in wages amongst the lowest paid employees.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is well aware that this is our intention. As I was saying, the last budget is for a surplus of \$1/2 million:

but when these Resolutions are passed, they will cause the surplus to turn into a deficit of \$800; so the hon. member ought to know the amount we can afford to spend.

Now, Sir as regards the point made about this being a cost of living, I would like any hon. member to tell me if he has known of any time when a cost of living was really taken off a man's salary after it was put on. However, if for example, anyone retired before the cost of living was consolidated, provision is made here now in this Resolution to give an increased pension, that is to say, for the individual to get as high as \$4.50 more. That is contained in a subsequent Resolution which is on the Table of the House. You increased the pension up to \$4.50; so, Sir, in that case the point made about making it basic instead of cost of living need not to be taken too seriously at this stage from the point of view of pensions.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. George is not in his seat. No doubt, by innuendo it was shown in no uncertain manner that while on one side of his mouth he is saying: "Increase the wages of these people," on the other side, he is making out a case against the workers because he is saying that they are not producing. I cannot accept the remarks as genuine because he is saying that these people are not producing and if he said that, surely he cannot at the same time say to pay them an increase. He actually said that as regards the question which obtains in the United Kingdom and no doubt there are other hon. members who sometimes say that. However, Sir, when you meet a Conservative such as the hon. member and he is advocating that these people must work and nobody objects to that, of course; we feel that people should work and give a good day's work - I am saying here and now that it is all well for the hon. member who is not in his place and other hon. members who think like him to see a man standing up sometimes and decide that that man is idling and is not producing; but that poor man may be one who works in the street, in the roads and in the fields and by so doing he has to withstand the rigours of the weather. When it rains he gets it. He has no house in which to shelter when he goes out to work; therefore, the rain wets him and the sun dries him; the tar under his feet burns them and no doubt all of that saps him of his energy; therefore, how can you expect him to produce in the same manner as if he were living in a cold climate? Too often I see Conservatives saying these people would no work when these same Conservatives if they do work at all, work under the most favourable conditions.

Mr. GODDARD: I think those words refer to someone on this side. It was said that someone on the other side was looking at the crease which was there from Monday mornings until Fridays in the trousers of cantoniers. The Hon. Minister who is speaking now is the only member who has accused the busmen for taking money and not producing. I have never heard any other hon. member saying that - surely, not a Conservative.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a point of order.

Mr. GODDARD: So, if he said that a Conservative said so, I am saying that is not so.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, how has he got the busmen into this? It is not an analogy to what we are discussing. Of course, he has to seize the opportunity to punch at me but I am not afraid to answer anything. What is the point of the hon. member getting up now and trying to throw cold water on what I was saying when his colleagues said that these workers are not producing. What is the meaning of that?

Mr. GODDARD: If the hon. member on his feet heard that, I did not hear it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, the hon. member may have been sleeping, but that is what the hon. senior member for St. George said in answer to what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said.

Again, I repeat, the hon. member said that these people are not producing as much as they should and that is tantamount to saying that you cannot have better wages without better and more production. Yet, in the same breath he wants to fool somebody that he is willing to give more than we are giving here as increases to these workers. It is all right to fool gullible people and those who depend on pith and things like that.

8.10 p.m.

If that were so, if the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. George had all of this sympathy and they were so sympathetic towards these poor hardworking people, I am quite sure that the trade unionist sitting next to the senior member for St. George would not have so much trouble. (Mr. WALCOTT: And still you voted against the Trade Union Bill) (Laughter). Porters are getting between \$9 and \$10 a week from the people over there and these employees are still going to the country during the night and coming back in the morning. And now you hear those Conservatives crying out for these hard-working people and saying: "Give them more, the Government is not giving them enough". When you hear all of that, ask them what examples they are setting. Some time ago when this same question was under debate, I took time off to get some of the figures as to the wages paid by some of these printeries (A MEMBER: Like the *Beacon*?) in Bridgetown, and it was surprising to learn that some of these printeries are still paying technicians \$5.00 a week.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I think we have grown accustomed to the misleading and lying statements of the hon. member who has just sat down.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You can object all over the world. There is no printery in Bridgetown which is paying as wages the figures which he has quoted. The hon. member knows that he is lying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is saying that the printeries are paying technicians.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw the statement that the Hon. Minister is lying.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that the statement is lying. There is no Printery which is paying technicians any \$5.00 a week.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot refer to another hon. member in that way.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know that he was bound over for 18 months for calling people liars and he bluntly refused to withdraw the statement. When I was speaking just now, I was not referring to the hon. member, but he got up and attacked me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I got up to refute the statement that there is any printery which pays technicians \$5 a week; and further more, do not let the hon. member tell me anything about my being bound over for 18 months. What was said about him in the Law Courts could not be said about me; you do not support your wife. I am not going to have the hon. member telling lies on any occasion at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: According to the Rules of this House, the hon. member cannot refer to another member as being a liar; the hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that there is no printery which pays technicians \$5.00 a week.

Hon. M. E. COX: All right, Mr. Chairman, I am not worried about statements which are made. That mentality must reap up things from the gutter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You were born in the gutter.

Hon. M. E. COX: The statement I am making is a statement of fact and I know that they do not like to hear facts. As I have already said, I was not referring to the hon. member; I have not got his figures but the cap fitted him and therefore he drew the string.

Mr. CRAWFORD rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister was not referring to you.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am interested in a printery and the hon. member cannot say that technicians are paid \$5 a week. Go to any of the Printeries in Bridgetown - the *Advocate*, *Letchworth*, the *Recorder* or any of them - and you will not find that technicians are paid any \$5 a week.

Hon. M. E. COX: That same hon. member came into this House and accused the Government of not doing this and of not doing that. I repeat, just find out what they are paying and it will shock you to see the low, meagre wages which are paid by some of them who keep a lot of noise in criticising the Government from time to time. If they feel that the Government is behind the times, let them come in here and say: "I am paying so and so; why can't the Government pay the same thing?" Mr. Chairman, none of them is paying what the Government is paying, and the Government is paying these salaries and wages plus pension which is regarded as 25% of one's salary. The Government is subsidising rice and other things for people; the Government is subsidising housing, education and all of these things. As I have already mentioned, hon. members will come in here whenever we bring down anything to this House and make it appear that if they were on this side, they would do so much better; they would do this, that and the other. I repeat that you can check up and you will see what are the wages which they are paying and they are paying them without any security whatsoever. People can be knocked off like a hoe handle, according to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, without any compensation, without any pension rights or anything of that sort. When you compare that treatment as against the Government's treatment to people you will realise that the Government has made a genuine effort for the working classes whom the Government employs and for whom the Government is trying its best in the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to see the turn which this debate has taken. I know that whatever we, on this side, do will be wrong especially in these most turbulent and troublesome days. Whatever we do, the other side will say that we are wrong in doing it; the other side feel that they have at least some of the people with them and at this stage I regret to say that some of the workers for whom we fought most and considered most in these matters, are being led astray into thinking that the remarks made by members on the other side are genuine and sincere and that they are more willing to give than we are.
8.20 p.m.

More often than not you will find that people are willing to give when they have not got; but when they get, the picture changes.

The hon. junior member for St. Andrew, no doubt is new and perhaps will remain new until the end of the Session. The hon. member, I think, said that he was supporting the postponement of this Resolution. This is not the first time that it was proposed by the other side to postpone similar Resolutions, (Mr. CORBIN: This one especially.) but, Sir, I think that one of the things that is responsible for the delay and even the low wage which people receive today is the fact that in addition to the wealthy they have always had people to fight their battles and to keep down the very under-privileged in the guise of assisting the poor. Whether or not he has contributed to it is a matter for him and something which I am not prepared to say at this stage, but I think the member should appreciate the fact that these workers are anxiously awaiting the increases which are proposed in this Resolution

and postponing this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, will not make any difference except that you would be delaying the passing of this Resolution and depriving the recipients out of their rightful due for a longer time than is necessary.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this matter was under discussion now for approximately six months. Since October we have been going into this matter; the Whitley Council have dealt with it, the Civil Service Association has dealt with it, and I think the Premier told this Committee that only on Friday morning he and the official side of the Whitley Council had a long discussion with the Civil Service Association on this question. From our angle it would appear, and rightly so, that this matter is being made a political football. I cannot follow the arguments of some of the members who said that the \$9 which it is proposed to give to persons in the upper bracket is of no use and will not be appreciated by those who are entitled to draw that amount, because only last week I think I am correct in saying that we made increases to officers in the Police Force, and although it can be said that these officers were drawing a handsome salary, yet some of the members on the opposite side said that the increase was not sufficient. Today they are saying that we should not give these other Government Servants this \$9 but should take it and divide it between those in the lower bracket. Even if you did that, it would not result in any tangible increase for those who would benefit as a result.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on all night and quote speeches made from time to time especially by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was a very stout and strong defender of the policy of this Government. How the hon. member can change, as it were, just overnight...

Mr. WALCOTT: A chameleon lizard like you.....

It being 8.30 p.m. o'clock, Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, under Rule 5 of the Standing Orders, "at 8.30 p.m., hereinafter referred to in these Orders as 'the moment of interruption', the Speaker shall interrupt the business under discussion. If the House is in Committee at that time the Chairman shall interrupt the business and shall leave the Chair forthwith to report progress to the House and ask its leave to sit again."

That is the relevant part of the Rule, but for future guidance I would like some interpretation of that, because I took it that at the moment of interruption if the House is in Committee the Chairman would have to ask for leave to sit again and then Your Honour would come in and report.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has not said in so many words, but when he stood he actually reported progress to me.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I sought the feeling of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I regret to say that he does not find it possible to agree to our meeting tomorrow. I must say that while I regret to take this action, yet at the same time, Thursday is not really suitable to us. We do not want to stifle any debate because we have nothing to hide and stand on our feet. We believe in a thing and stick to it. There would be no stifling of debate if we asked members to meet tomorrow, and I would be willing to agree to 2 o'clock. We want everybody to say his piece and then no doubt, it being a public issue, let the public decide.
8.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday the 20th May at 2 o'clock p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to read Standing Order No. 5, paragraph 5:

"Any business which when called during the time of unopposed business is objected to by a Member shall not

be proceeded with, but shall stand over until the next meeting of the House in the place in which it shall be fixed upon the fixing of the Order Paper."

The Order Paper has not been fixed and yet the Minister has not asked if there is any hon. member who wish to proceed with any business which may not be objected to during Unopposed Business of the House and that seems to me to be highly irregular. It is quite in order for the Minister to tell Your Honour of any negotiations taking place as to whether we shall meet on Thursday or on an earlier day but he should not fetter discussion of the House to deal with Unopposed Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is any desire on the part of any hon. member to proceed with any Unopposed Business, I will not allow the motion for the postponement to rule that out. Before that motion is put, I will ask if there is any Unopposed Business to be dealt with. Is there any? (After a pause) There is none.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not want to interfere with what Your Honour has said, but this is Government's time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not technically.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, 20th May, at 2 p.m.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move an amendment of the date to Thursday, 21st May at 2 p.m. I feel, Sir, that it is only fair and reasonable if it is intended to meet two days in succession other than when we are discussing the Budget, when we expect that we will have to do so, that we should be forewarned - and not the day before but the week before - because there are those of us who have our business to attend and who will have to make the necessary and suitable arrangements so as to be able to get away.

This notice is unreasonably short. If the Hon. Minister said Thursday or Friday - and that is what we told him and he said as much when he returned to his seat and addressed you - then that would be more reasonable. That is what we feel is the earliest possible date that is convenient and suitable. Of course, if his colleagues are persuading him to meet tomorrow, and if Thursday does not suit them just to make sure that only Government Business is done, that is the sort of thing you can expect from them. I repeat, it would not be reasonable to ask us to come tomorrow without giving us the opportunity to make arrangements as regards our private business. Yesterday was a Bank-holiday and we met today and are now asked to meet tomorrow and that is two days in succession. It is unprecedented when it comes to this season of the year - the Whitsun recess - to meet twice a week and there does not seem to be any justification for it. It is a matter for the Government if it chooses to use some rule in order to override the feelings of the Opposition in order that the debate on the matter with which we were dealing should not be resumed with the Opposition taking part.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker. I rise to second the motion. I agree entirely with the hon. Leader of the Opposition and in the absence of any procedure in which it is previously agreed that we meet on a Tuesday and Wednesday, it is very unusual and inconvenient to come on a Tuesday and then you adjourn until the following day without any prior notice. That is not an honourable thing to do. 8.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, you would expect that there would have been the minimum amount of decency and courtesy shown us, in view of the fact that we normally adjourn from week to week. Nobody would expect that you would give a person who is living in an ordinary rented house a day's notice to give up possession of that house; you would not go and tell that person that you want possession of the house tomorrow. Hon. members come here with the expectation that the House will meet next Tuesday and we

arrange our business to suit; but now you say that you will meet tomorrow when at least a day's grace should be given to hon. members so that they can arrange tomorrow anything which they have to do on the following day. Because you are a member of this Chamber it does not mean that you do not have anything else to do; furthermore, the only inconvenience which a meeting on Thursday could mean to the Government is that the Government as a Cabinet meets on Thursday, and even at that they can fix the Cabinet meetings to suit themselves, because they are members of this Chamber. The Cabinet can meet on Thursday morning and still meet here at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

What do you find? Members of the Government are asking the House to meet tomorrow instead of giving us a day's grace. Well, Sir, that is just another example of what I said as to why you have to be afraid of self-government because even the ordinary courtesy to which a person is entitled, he is not being given - a reasonable notice of what you are going to do. Even that you are depriving a man of. We are not meeting from day to day ... (ASIDES) Sit down what!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not get out of control of himself even if he is provoked by another hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that if we were meeting from day to day the question would not arise. If we are meeting from today and ending on Friday we would not expect to be meeting again on Saturday, unless we were given notice beforehand. I am saying that moving the adjournment until tomorrow without any previous notice being given to hon. members, is not the common courtesy which we would expect to receive. I agree that we should meet on Thursday. The hon. member knows that it is not a question of people waiting for this Resolution to be passed in order to get this money; it is not as if it is Christmas time and people have been waiting for this Resolution to be passed for the past six months. This is purely a matter of debating something which is on the Order Paper and, moreover, it is not a matter of any particular urgency as between passing this Resolution tomorrow and passing it on Thursday. I say that we have to get the normal courtesy to which we are entitled.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the clarity with which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has put his amendment would afford anybody the reason for voting for the amendment. As a matter of fact, I too would like to add my quota to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: If hon. members speak on this matter until 9 p.m. of the clock, if they talk out time, then the House will have to be adjourned until next Tuesday.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that Sir; that is exactly what I am going to do. If the hon. member has not got that decency which he should have, then I will speak until 9 o'clock. That is plain, simple English. Did you not think Mr. Speaker, that I realised what you have just said when I got up to speak? I am saying that there are lots of ways of dealing with a dog; you can hang him by his neck and you can hang him by other parts too. I would like to contribute to this debate and I am supporting the amendment of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, because the Hon. Leader of the House has made such wild and reckless accusations against those who are not in the Socialist movement that it is going to be a part of my job to come in here and clarify the situation. As I have said, I am making my quota to this debate and it may be that I have to take a different line from that taken by others. Tomorrow is a busy day for us and, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, those of us who are not professional politicians, must plan our business from day to day. (PAUSE). It would be rather difficult, Mr. Speaker, when I see that you are speaking with the Clerk, to continue my remarks and I was waiting until Your Honour had finished.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can hear the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I was saying, Sir, those of us who have to plan our business and who cannot live on

politics alone, must plan our business to suit. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has rightly said that those of us who know that we must come here on Tuesdays, always plan our business to suit; those of us who are engaged in other spheres must plan our meetings to suit. I do not see the urgency of this matter; if the Hon. Leader of the House can make out a case for the urgency of this matter, I am sure that all of us would vote for coming here tomorrow in order to do this business. But what difference does it make now? As a matter of fact it makes very little difference if we vote for this Resolution today or if we came tomorrow and voted for it as against if we voted for it on Thursday. Apparently, the Hon. Premier was leaning towards this side of the House for the adjournment until Thursday and I will say that it is good to take a little advice from a child. It may be that if our advice had been taken we might not have been in this position now. We observed from this side that the Hon. Premier was leaning towards an adjournment until Thursday.

8.50 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. The Premier never had that in mind.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is the profession of the Leader of the House because he says that the Premier never had it in mind. He did not even say that the Premier never said it, and it is really amusing to see what hon. members who are not new like the hon. junior member for St. Andrew would get up and raise as a point of order. The Leader of the House is sitting beside the Premier and gets up and says that the Premier did not have it in mind. Can you imagine that the Leader of the House not only wants to speak for the Premier but wants to think for him? What next! What are we coming to?

Anyway, Sir, as far as I am concerned, there is no reason in the world why we have to rush this tomorrow. As a matter of fact, in consultation with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew a few days ago, he reminded me that it was during the St. Andrew bye-election that the Government made this promise; therefore it is nearly six months ago that they made a promise that this would be done, and if we delay it until next Tuesday there could be no harm; time is a great healer.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has stubbornly refused today to acquiesce to the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that this Resolution should be postponed and that they should go back and give it further consideration. They do not have to postpone it for good or indefinitely, but they could postpone it for a reasonable time so that they could summon all their efforts, ability and thinking powers.

The Hon. Leader of the House has actually launched his attack on Conservative members, but opportunity will be given to those of us to differentiate between Conservatives or Socialists and Conservatives. I am one of the hon. members of this House who would like to have that opportunity and I cannot be here tomorrow.

I should just like to say that as Speaker of the House you have made it quite clear that you are not Speaker of a Party or Speaker of the Government, but Speaker of the whole House, and I am sure that you would never lend yourself to any suggestion by the Government to summon the House for tomorrow after we have refused to pass it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is already known.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am so happy that you have again lived up to my expectations because I sensed in the atmosphere that there was an attempt to rape you. (A VOICE: Rape?) That is exactly what I said and I hope hon. members who are worried will keep worried. If the hon. member wants me to use a milder word, I would say "seduce". Some of my friends on the other side are getting a good kick out of this, but I am absolutely certain now that Your Honour has given us the undertaking that you would not lend yourself at all to any such thing, because, I repeat, you have made it quite clear that you are Speaker of this House and not of the Government or of any Party, whatever might be your special leaning. We all agree that when there is something of urgency or importance Your Honour must exercise that right and discretion in summoning any such meeting, but as I said, time is a great healer and as I look into the faces of some hon. members who are using drum-sticks over there, I know that they will go back after hearing my argument - because the arguments which were heard today from the Trade Unionists and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition are different from the arguments which I am going to use.

The Leader of the House was at pains in his criticism to stress that charity begins at home. I would like to remind him that while charity begins at home, it never always ends at home.

The hon. member is getting a lot of fun out of this, but I am getting this adjournment because I want to be on the floor of this House, and then they are not going to get the same fun, because the personalities which I have heard more especially from the Government side today, I hope they will be given time to think them over, and although I do not think that any opportunity will be made to interfere as is customary.....

(A VOICE: Shame!) It may be a shame for some people who have not got shame. People over there who talk about shame have not begun to know what is shame. If they want to know what is shame, let them bring this back before next Tuesday, because they are not going to get you to summon a meeting before. Let them go back and think of what they should give. This is no increase; this is an allowance and I feel that this matter should be fully debated, and when I intimated that the idea of coming tomorrow is to stifle debate, I still maintain that it is to stifle debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 9 p.m. o'clock, this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday next, 26th May, at 12 noon.
9.00 p.m.