

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th 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*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER; Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE (*Minister of Education*) and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings held on 12th and 19th May, 1959, respectively have been printed and circulated among hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*AFTER A PAUSE*). There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

GOVERNOR TO RECEIVE REPLY TO HIS SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Honourable the Chief Secretary:-

Sir,

I am directed to refer to your letter of the 19th May, 1959, and to inform you that His Excellency the Governor will receive the Reply from the Honourable the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor's Speech on the occasion of the opening of the Legislature on the 3rd February, 1959, on Tuesday 2nd June, 1959, at 3.15 o'clock p.m.

This letter has been signed by Mr. A. F. C. Matthews on behalf of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1959."

Resolution to place the sum of \$48,022 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. 5, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the terms upon which the Housing Authority may borrow a sum not exceeding \$1,800,000, for the purpose of financing loans for housing as provided under the Public Officers' Housing Loans Fund Rules 1958.

A Bill to repeal the Public Trustee, Provost Marshal and Official Assignee (Amalgamation) Act, 1937, to make other provision for the performance of the duties and exercise of the powers attaching to the offices of Provost Marshal, Sergeant at Arms and Official Assignee and to provide for the performance of the duties and exercise of the powers attaching to the office of Public Trustee by the Crown Solicitor.

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

Mr. STRAUGHN entered the House and took his seat.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to repeal the Public Trustee, Provost Marshal and Official Assignee (Amalgamation) Act, 1937, to make other provision for the performance of the duties and exercise of the powers attaching to the offices of Provost Marshal, Sergeant-at-Arms and Official Assignee and to provide for the performance of the duties and the exercise of the powers attaching to the office of Public Trustee by the Crown Solicitor, was read a first time.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the word "junior" be deleted in order to substitute the word "senior", so that the hon. senior member for St. James who is happily now in his place may act as Chairman of Committees until the Hon. Chairman of Committees arrives. I do that particularly because I feel that if the hon. senior member for St. James, who is so well known to be a gentleman of such perfect equanimity and so unruffled in the Chair, with so judicial a temperament, is available and his services can be placed at the disposal of the House, then we should not fail to take advantage of his presence on this occasion.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I would have made that motion myself had it not been for the fact that the hon. senior member for St. James is not feeling the best way today, and after consulting him he prefers not to be in the Chair today. That is why I proposed the hon. junior member for St. James. Surely the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will agree with me now.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

The question that the hon. Junior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone the first Resolution which was under discussion during the last sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the House that there has been some irregularity. I was of the opinion that the House had to resume Committee, but no motion was made and I left the Chair.

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.

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.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in asking leave to postpone the first three Resolutions, and to take the Resolution for \$24,545, I should like this Committee to understand that there is absolutely no attempt to delay the discussion on the Resolution which was under discussion on the last occasion. As far as we can see, these Resolutions are going to take some time before they are passed, and there is a Resolution here which is very urgent. As you will appreciate, this Resolution is for equipment for the Printery and we would like to get this passed quickly. We believe that the House in Committee will agree perhaps in five minutes' time to the passing of this Resolution, and therefore I am asking that this be taken first, and as

soon as that is finished, we will revert to the other Resolution for \$776,000.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not opposing this Resolution, but I am not agreeing to it for the reason given by the Hon. Leader of the House. He must be clear with his facts. By what he has said he is likely to give the impression that if we do not pass this Resolution now something serious is going to take place. That is not true. This is a revote. The machinery is already in the island and in the Printery because I was at the Printery yesterday and saw some of this machinery; so it is not a question that you are in need of something to be put into operation. This is a revote of money which you have already voted, and in view of the fact that the machinery was not here on the 31st March, the money lapsed and you are now revoting it. There is no particular urgency more than that this is a revote, as happens whenever a situation arises; so therefore it is not a matter that the machinery is waiting and you cannot get it; rather, it is a revote to pay for it.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1959-60 No. 4

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this Resolution for \$24,545, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, this is a revote. I was told by the Minister concerned that it was urgent, but I do not know the urgency of it. It is a revote and as the Addendum sets out and as repeated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, this money having lapsed at the 31st March, it is necessary to come before this Committee for a revote of that amount.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if an hon. member from that side could tell us if there is any more equipment on order for the Government Printery, or if this equipment will complete their requirements so far as their orders are concerned and in so far as they are advised. I wonder if with the arrival of this equipment they will now be in a position to go full steam ahead and do all the work, at least, as well as, if not better than it was done previously by the private contractor, whether more equipment is on order or is to be ordered, or whether this will complete the sum total of all that has been ordered and regarded as necessary to have our Government Printery fully equipped.

For instance, there are some Court forms which I understand are not available. I do not know if they have been made available in the past few weeks, but Solicitors told me that they have been unable to do certain business because Court Forms were not available and they were told that the Government Printery could not handle the job.
12.35 p.m.

Likewise, there are other things which either the Government Printery does not have the equipment to do them with or the equipment is insufficient to enable them to be done within a reasonable time.

I know there is great shortage of summonses in the Courts and these summonses were on order before the Supreme Court of Judicature Act came into operation in August last year. Some of the old summonses are still in use because the Courts have no new ones to use. I would just like to know from the Hon. Minister in charge of the Printery what state this new equipment would bring us up to when these things come into operation; in other words, I want an Interim Report as to the working of the Government Printery.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is a coincidence. Yesterday, I had the opportunity of visiting the Government Printing Office and so far as the general equipment is concerned, the office seems to be able to cope with the work which it has at present in hand. I do not know what the future would be because it depends on the volume of work and the amount of space that there is available.

What I do say of what I have noticed at the Printing Office is that there is a building there which - I do not know what it formerly was built for, but I understand it was used by the Ministry of Education at first and now I see that it is in use by the Town and Country Planning Officer. From what I saw at the Government Printing Office in the building for storage and equipment, it does seem that the present building with the other types of machines which they have on order and the types which they have now are of sufficient bulk to cause them to utilise the whole building if they want all that equipment and material properly stored.

But there is a question to which the Government must give serious consideration. Only this morning, I was negotiating with the Advocate Company over the question of the laying off of six people. This question of the printing industry has to be examined. Since the Government has undertaken to do its own printing, it means that the Government is subsidising printing for itself, that is to say, the Government does not pay duty on any of the equipment which it uses, it does not pay duty on any of the paper which it utilises; therefore, the Government is subsidising printing for its own purpose which formed part of a substantial amount of commercial printing in the past. By so doing, you have disrupted the employment force in the Island and you have no Unemployment Insurance Scheme; therefore, it means that every worker who is laid off is a potential destitute person and that leads to what the Government does not like people to depend on, and that is alms.

I have a single case which I can give you as an example. A man of sixteen years' service with that firm and who has six or seven children proved redundant on account of the company's inability to retain him as a result of loss of trade. That is somebody's business and what is everybody's business seems to be nobody's business. You cannot look lightly on an industry with a trade and skill such as printing and think when a man like that is displaced, he can find alternative employment by turning up at somebody's door the next morning. Apart from that serious problem, the figure of Barbados unemployment is a colossal one. It is approximately 25% of the employment force and that is a colossal percentage for any part of the world. When one-quarter of the working people of a country is permanently unemployed, it is a serious case for the next person to be employed because he has no opportunity of getting a new job.

I am satisfied in my mind that the time has come when the Government must take a complete re-appraisal of the printing industry and see what can be done in order to give whatever assistance there is possible so that the employment which is at present being done in printing can be maintained and that we do not have more people placed at the door.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think he will remember that on the first introduction of this Resolution I explained in detail to the Committee what hope the new machines would achieve. I set out the various causes for the delays in work. The Hon. Member has just complained of court forms being unobtainable and I would say as regards that, in many cases it is not the fault of the printery. In this case, the people sent to the Printing Office some form which was badly worded and the Government Printer had to change it and draw it to the attention of the person in charge. Very often, it is not the fault of the Printery. As I was saying, when I introduced this Resolution on the last occasion, I explained to the Committee the hope that this

new machinery would allow the Printery to do its work properly and fulfil all the orders which it has at present in hand and, as far as the debates of the Legislature is concerned, to do them in quick time. I would not tell the hon. member that everything is 100% perfect because it is not so in any part of the world and the hon. member must bear in mind that the Departments are growing every day. Everyday this House meets, it passes some Resolution and in the course of every year we bring into effect some new Department.

I would like to make this quite clear, because anyone who listened to the last hon. member who spoke - the hon. senior member for St. Peter - will believe that the Government is contributing to the unemployment in the printing trade. He did not say that in so many words but that may be inferred by the tenor of his remarks. Let me tell the hon. member, as he ought to know, that for years and years this House has been asking for a Government Printing Office and the chief architect was the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. We have established this printery not to lead to unemployment in the printing trade but in order to get through with the work of the Government at less cost and more expeditiously than when it was done by the contractors, the Advocate Company. I will say that Government Printing is now costing us 25% less than when it was done by a contractor and that means a lot to us when Government is called upon to pay higher wages and all that sort of thing. It was not a spontaneous act of the Government in getting a Printing Office; it was the Legislature pressing the Government to establish a Printery in order to save cost and in order to get out the work more expeditiously. That is what we have done.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to the question of six printers being laid off. Let me tell him that some of these printers have been employed at the Government Printing Office. We are very much concerned about the employment situation in this island. You get factories closing down and that leads to unemployment. You get the Deep Water Harbour which will soon be coming into operation and that would mean a displacement of workers.

12.45 p.m.

It is a general situation; it is not applicable to printing alone. Obviously, we are concerned with workers, especially skilled workers, who may be displaced. We want to see something done; actually the recommendation by Professor Beasley was a good one. A Printery like the Advocate would be against much competition from other Printeries who underpay their workers. There is no Wages Board or minimum wage set up and we know that many of these people are being underpaid. It may be a case of redundancy at the Advocate, but the mere establishment of the Government Printery did not cause that redundancy at the Advocate. We want to do something to ease the situation, but it is not an easy matter; this is something which is occurring throughout the world. We have the rationalisation of factories, we have new equipment and so on; however, I will bear in mind what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said; I am not quite sure of what he is aiming at in so far as the workers are concerned, but, I repeat, I will bear in mind what the hon. member has said. Any suggestion coming from the hon. member or from the Barbados Workers' Union will receive attention and be carried out if possible.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if what I said was not clearly put to the Hon. Minister, I will repeat it. I did not say that the Government should not have a Printing Office; the idea is that the Government has a Printing Office and is subsidising its own printing in that the Government does not pay any duty on any of its machinery, its paper, its imports or anything like that; therefore it is subsidising its own printing as compared with printing done by commercial firms who have to pay duty on these items. I said that, as a result of that; I would not use the word "merely", but as a result of that, and it does not matter whether it comes from the Legislature or from the Celestial. When I say as a result of that, it means that

relative to the Company which had the contract for printing and which was geared to contracting something in the vicinity of \$100,000 per annum, it must of necessity mean something to the employment force. The hon. member must know that where you have a business in any part of the world losing income of approximating \$100,000, that must of necessity have some effect on its employment organisation. I said that as a result of that, and I would go further and say this; where you have any new industry capitalising in this present day, it is likely to spend more money than an old industry and employ less people, and you have this classic example of the Government Printing Office. I am not suggesting that the Government Printing Office must take over every person who is unemployed from the *Advocate*, but as an economic factor, if the Printing Office is established on "X" thousand pounds, a new Printing Office in 1958 would employ less people than if that same "X" thousand pounds had been capitalised in a business in 1930. That is so, because the type of machinery and the cost of machinery which you use today would require less persons per unit cost than you would use before.

The *Advocate* would capitalise at a figure in the vicinity at which the Government Printing Office is capitalised, but the number of people to run your Printing Office in modern times will be something like one-quarter of the number they need at the *Advocate*. The fact remains, however, that there are human beings who are working. I am asking for a re-appraisal of our printing industry in order that as a result of this new Printery you do not find more people becoming redundant, but you can give assistance in quarters which are likely to get some of these people employed. That is the point I made and I think it is as clear as a pikestaff. It does not take any Solomon to understand that. It is not merely six people; I mentioned that number because I had negotiations this morning. You have an exodus of workers from the *Advocate* and fortunately some of them have been able to find avenues overseas; but the fact remains that the employment situation is not what it was. It is a fact that some of these people have been absorbed in the Government Printing Office, but the number which were laid off at the *Advocate* could not be absorbed because there was a different type of machinery and a different type of organisation. This is not a matter which will settle itself; it is a matter which we, as human beings, have to settle.

Mr. BRANCKER: The Hon. Minister spoke about being 100% perfect, but I am sure that no other member of this Chamber thought that I was speaking about 100% perfection. What I was enquiring about is whether this present equipment will constitute the full set of equipment of which the Government is in need, or whether more equipment would be forthcoming. I want to know if what is being asked for now will bring us up-to-date with adequate provision or whether more will be forth coming. I have always been more than enthusiastic about the Government having its own Printery; it is not good enough for a Government to have to depend upon a private contractor to do its printing and we were one of the only places in the West Indies which did not have a Government Printery. I wanted to make sure that private enterprise is not in a position to say that the Government Printery did not have the best equipment or the correct equipment as the case may be; I want to make sure that as far as lies in our power, we have first-class equipment and all of the equipment which is necessary for the type of work which has to be executed today and that we have the best available people to man that equipment.

It was expected that as and when the Government Printery was set up, the employees comprising men and women at the *Advocate*, or almost all of them, if not all, lock, stock and barrel, would have been transferred to the Government Printery. That does not seem to have been the case. I am not in a position to say whether some of them could not have been fitted in or whether some would have been redundant. If, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter points out, there is one of such persons who had given 16 years' service at the *Advocate* and who has seven children and no room has been

found for him, that is a most deplorable thing. The private Printery could not have kept on a man for sixteen years to be a member of its staff if he were not efficient. It is much to be deplored and regretted that no employment has been found for that man because the Government has taken in hand the work which the private contractor used to do.

There is one other point which the Hon. Minister has mentioned and it is that it costs 25% less now that the Government is doing this work than when it was done by the private contractor. I venture to say that in process of time he will find that it will cost still less just as in the case of the buses he will find that the service, if it is run properly, will be cheaper than it has been.
12.55 p.m.

In any business, Mr. Chairman, you must employ people, irrespective of colour, religion or political bias, who are the best for the job. Square pegs in round holes will condemn any business. That is the trouble with the Transport Board and in respect of their office. But to return to this particular Resolution, I must say that I am not surprised that Government realise that they are saving 25% now, and if they had heeded my advice earlier after the first Address was passed by Government headed by the former Premier of Barbados, they would realise how much Government would have saved over these past years when they delayed putting into effect a Resolution that Government establish a Printery and do its own printing.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this matter, but after listening to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I must join this debate.

First of all, let me say that at the time this Resolution was originally introduced, as far as my memory serves me, the Hon. Minister did say that this equipment was all that was needed for the time being. I made a particular point in that debate and stressed the fact that I hoped that it was not going to be like the Transport Board where every year we would be voting more and more money for equipment and other expenses.

Now, when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggests that the Government should run all things in this island, frankly, I think it is time that the taxpayers of this island were represented. I should like to ask the Hon. Minister when he says that they are saving 25% what exactly does he mean. How does he acquire the figures to give him that percentage, how much duty are they losing in the meantime, is it really an overall saving of 25%, or are the matters of income which they have lost from duty etc., taken into account? I should like to know if the overhead of the building is fully charged to it, whether the depreciation of the building is charged and a million and one other things which a businessman would ask. Is this really purely and simply a fact that it is costing so much to produce without taking into consideration the factors of overhead, depreciation, insurance, loss of duty and all the other things? I think that should be made clear to enlighten the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the trouble sometimes with some hon. members is that they are misled by others without going into the facts themselves. The hon. senior member for St. Peter started off by saying that he is clear as a pikestaff, but I must say he is as thin as vapour, because no duty is paid on any machinery or paper coming into this island either for Government or for private enterprise, and the hon. member should know that. He should remember that one of the recommendations in another enquiry in Trinidad, I think by Professor Beasley, was to the effect that they should follow Barbados in so far as the Printing Industry was concerned and allow things to come in duty-free. All that time we were allowing these things in duty free. But suppose we were allowing them duty free for Government and not for these other people, what would that be? What argument is that? We are not competing against them; we are doing our own business, and not in the field with private enterprise. We are not

going out and asking for work; so I do not see his argument. He may as well ask us to consider the lighters and the companies who are losing through having a Deep Water Harbour. It is the old story of displacement through rationalisation of machinery or more mechanisation and things of that sort. What can we do about it?

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has talked about somebody who had worked at the *Advocate* for sixteen years with so many children. I understand the Union is trying to negotiate for a pension for him after all these years. I was authoritatively told last night that after all these years he was fired without a pension. The hon. member is saying that the Government should have employed him. Well, Sir, I have nothing to do with employment and the hon. member should know that. It is often heard that this Government staffs its offices with people who are opposed to us, and that is said by people especially in our own ranks. Would we employ people who are opposed to us? We do not say that this or that person should be employed. Since I have been Minister of Communications, let me assure this House and the hon. member that I have instituted a system of taking people on their merits, but I have nothing to do with appointments or dismissals or anything of the sort. I do not get into any rows. Something was brought to my notice the other day in which the hon. senior member for the City was involved. I am told that he went up there and built a big row and made threats that somebody should be fired. I said I was absolutely nothing to do with it; it was a matter for the Board. We play no politics up there; so far as the policy and day to day running of the Department is concerned, that comes under my Ministry, so I want to make it quite clear to the Leader of the Opposition that the case of Government putting friends in jobs or filling posts at the Printery is absolutely untrue, unfair and inaccurate and is just a low means of propaganda against this Government. We have been accused by our own supporters that our enemies get jobs before our friends. At one time I understand that half of the people were going over to the other side; how then can he accuse us of putting our friends there?

To get back to the subject, I do not know what the hon. senior member for St. Peter is driving at. I do not see how we can prevent these things from happening. If he is arguing that we should take over people who were displaced from the *Advocate*, that is a different matter. I do not know if the man applied; I do not know who applied and who did or did not get a job. If a man was working for 16 years, it is obvious that he must be in a senior position. We may not have needed a senior man; we may have advertised for a man lower down. If he were at the *Advocate* for 16 years, he would be in a position of foreman, and I do not know that we need a foreman or supervisor; so to come along loosely and say that a man was working for 16 years and was displaced and Government did nothing about it is just stupid.
1.05 p.m.

In reply to the hon. senior member for St. George, I can only tell him that I have all the figures and that the charges include 25% for overhead and depreciation. It also includes maintenance and all of those things. There is no duty paid on any machinery entering into the island for Government or private business. If he reads the Customs Tariff Act for 1921, the year after I was born, he will see that this was happening since then. I would just like him to check up on that so that he can make sure that I am not pushing anything down his throat.

Mr. BRANCKER: In reply to the Hon. Minister, I do not have any time to waste on him but it would be interesting and nice to the public to learn that persons in the employ of the Transport Board, that is to say, in the office were not dismissed as a result of chits, messages or calls sent on behalf of him. It will be nice on behalf of the entire public to hear of this.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I thought the last time that I spoke on this matter would have been the last. It is pathetic that a Minister of the Crown does not seem to understand a simple point. He accuses me of saying something which has mixed up the whole debate. He ac-

cused me of asking the Government to take in its employ at the Printing Office a man who has been working for sixteen years at the *Advocate*.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, it was not the hon. member who asked that question; it was the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was talking of these displaced workers and what the Government was going to do about the matter and that is the point on which I was talking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that is the point which I made clear and he should be able to understand it. If you are given a contract of \$100,000 in Barbados, the organisation of the industry or of the trade to which you gave that contract would have to be geared to deal with that income of \$100,000; therefore, if you withdrew that \$100,000 of income from that concern, it must affect that organisation. It is as simple as if you were keeping 100 pigs, and to keep those pigs you would have to construct 100 stalls for them; therefore, if you lost eighty of those pigs you do not need all those stalls.

It does not matter whether the Government has capitalised on a Printing Office; it does not matter whether it comes from the Legislature or from the Government; the fact is that Government has capitalised on a Printing Office and its present capital value would not employ the same number of people that the same capitalisation would have done 20 years ago. That is a simple economic fact. As a result of the Government establishing its own printery, the last contractor of Government Printing now finds himself in a position that he cannot any longer employ the number of people he employed when he had the volume of Government's work. The amount of Government work is not small. Tell me something as big as \$100,000 which you can get from one source on a contractual basis. When you have a situation like this and when you have a situation in which the Government subsidises its own printing as against what a commercial firm has to do, the situation must be different; therefore, it needs a complete re-appraisal in Barbados of this matter.

Professor Beasley wrote a report on the Economic Survey of this island which we all criticised in this House. Let the Hon. Minister read that report and see the recommendations which Professor Beasley made. Of course, I do not agree with many of the things he wrote. Do not worry to say that I am asking you to employ a man who was employed at the *Advocate* for sixteen years. I was not suggesting that the man who was working for sixteen years at the *Advocate* happened to be working there on Government contracts. It is not a question of employing this man. I said it was a matter of coincidence that this morning I was negotiating with the *Advocate* Company on the basis of redundancy on the fact that men have been laid off by that company.

The printer who has been laid off from the *Advocate* has more than six children. What I want to tell hon. members is that he was one of six laid off last week but those are not all the persons who have left the *Advocate*. Some of these people have left and found employment in the United Kingdom but I drew that one example to show that there was a man with sixteen years' service and with a family of six or seven children who had been laid off. What I also drew to the attention of the Committee is this. We had no unemployment insurance scheme and a man with six or seven children having been put out of employment would be forced to accept what members of the Government despise, and that is alms. A man who was forced out of employment through redundancy with six or seven children could not get sufficient out of that to keep him; so he must wend his way to some parochial institution and look for alms. I said that that is a situation in which he should not be placed; therefore, situations like that call for complete re-appraisal. Who is going to do that?

I also said that where you have in a community an unemployment figure which represents 25% of your total working population, that is something which you must

take note of. I am a man who has to be concerned with these things; I am not concerned with looking at constitutions of other places or power for myself; I am concerned with the fact that if I go to sleep with something in my stomach, I feel the other person ought to go to sleep that way too.

Every man who loses a job in Barbados is a man without hope, a man who is looking for a dole and help, and no self-respecting man likes to have charity given him. That is the re-appraisal which I called for. If the Hon. Minister is not prepared to understand that we are living in an age which calls for a brutal economic assessment, I am not responsible for it. I say that the Government has done something and the fact that the Government was asked to do it is not the question. The Government has done something and I have asked what remedy the Government intends to do about the situation. The Hon. Minister has said that the Deep Water Harbour will soon be responsible for causing a lot of unemployment. I say that any alert statesman must be prepared, whenever he goes and touches anything which will affect something in another place and which will produce an adverse effect in another place to have a project to put in hand. Do not leave it to chance and say that God will out of His own wisdom make everything right.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I had no idea on speaking on this matter at all, but I heard the Hon. Minister of Communications who has ability for distorting facts in general, mention something about my going to the Transport Board throwing my hands about and saying that this person and that person should be fired. While the hon. member is distorting the facts in general, he should have responsibility in here; he must live up to his responsibility as a Minister. As I said, I had no idea of entering this debate, but my name having been mentioned, I want to say this; I do not speak by throwing my hands about because I do not belong to the Ministers' Band. I spoke to a bus driver whom I observed was under the influence of alcohol at an excursion and who was carrying some sixty children; I asked him to sit in my car and I told him that no doctor could tell them that he did not have a headache. He insisted in driving the bus with these children and eventually he was found by a doctor to be so drunk that he did not know what he was doing. He was charged and convicted and the people in charge of the Transport Board dismissed him. I discovered that this man was a man who had a family and I saw that he had never had a conviction in his life. I therefore went to the Transport Board and said that this man had not abused anybody but he was under the influence of alcohol and that could have happened to any of us. I went to ask for a chance for that man.

If they distort the facts in their newspaper - the hon. member said that I went up there throwing about my hands and said that somebody should be fired. What I did was to tell the man that he should not drive the bus and the man is now praising me for trying to prevent him from driving the bus. I believe that the people at the Transport Board have re-hired this man.

I had another occasion to go to the Transport Board because of the misconduct of a driver who, I thought, was very stupid in his attitude; he was very abusive. As a matter of fact, I told the manager that this man should be displaced, and since then I have heard that he was suspended. If it hurts the Minister that the man was displaced - and it might well hurt him - I happened to be involved in this matter. I have heard all sorts of things and for what reason have I got to make a noise? I want to say this; I want the hon. Minister to realise his responsibility at least when he comes in here. It is all right when he is on a public platform; but when he comes in here he should have some responsibility.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has said that no duty is paid either on the paper or on the machinery for this Government Printery. For that I am grateful; but as to this statement that the printing is costing

25% less at the present moment than what it used to cost when it was done by the *Advocate*, the Minister said that he had figures as to that. He also mentioned that there were charges made relative to overhead and depreciation. I wonder if the Hon. Minister would circulate this House with those figures in order that hon. members can definitely find out for themselves whether the proper charges are being made for that Department. I wonder if the Minister's salary is apportioned in any way to that Department or if there is depreciation; I am wondering if it is depreciation on the machinery or if the matter has to do with any charges which are made, capital charges, rental charges, cost of land, etc. All of these charges would go to make a correct balance sheet which one could say one could apply to local conditions.

I am not using the *Advocate* as any example of the best market to be obtained. I would like to know what has been obtaining in other parts of the island and not merely at the *Advocate*. If those facts and figures, which it is very difficult sometimes for this House to obtain, are not obtained, then we cannot really argue on this 25% reduction. It might be a broad statement made but in actual fact it might boil down to no difference at all. I would like the Hon. Minister's statement to be backed up by facts and figures circulated to this House.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member and the Committee will be supplied with all these facts and figures concerning the Printery. I do not remember if we laid the Report at the time of the last Estimates, but we are getting the figures for the second year and I will produce them to the satisfaction of the hon. member.

I just want to say one thing with regard to the charge which has been made by the hon. senior member for the City as to irresponsibility. I do not know whence he got this idea about irresponsibility. If I were irresponsible when a man came to me with every right on his side, I could have interfered with greater effect (*ASIDES*) I am not referring to any man being drunk; if an employee is responsible for driving people on a bus, he should see to it that he should not indulge freely in the drinking of alcohol which is supplied at an excursion (Mr. MOTTLEY: To what are you referring?) I am referring to another incident. The hon. member has accused me of irresponsibility; if we were so irresponsible as to make politics out of anything, we could have made a lot of politics out of that incident. I said that it was a matter for the Union and I had nothing to do with it. The hon. member knows that. I repeat, I am not referring to any incident of rum drinking like that; there is no excuse for a man who does a thing like that. I said that I had nothing to do with the matter and that it was a matter for the Union.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why does the hon. member not come out and say exactly what he wants to say? He said that a man came to him with all the right on his side, but the hon. member forgets that there is a law Court. However I may feel about the hon. member, let me say this now: If it comes to anything about the hon. member's family, let him say that I have shown him disrespect. What does he mean by saying that the man had every right on his side? Is the suggestion being made that I can bring political pressure on people with every right on their side, at the Transport Board? The hon. member is accusing his own Department for doing something right. Let the hon. member unveil what he wants to unveil; if he feels that there is political pressure at the Transport Board controlled by the Government of this country, I am not interested in that. If something affects me or one of my children and I have to make a complaint I will do that; but I will say; let the hon. member come out and say to what he is referring.

1.25 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like to put the record straight. I happen to be the only Trade Union representative in this House, and I want to say that in this apparent triangle I played no part at all.

Mr. COREIN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the grant for the Printing Office, I believe that the money which the Government has asked for is necessary. Often in reading my papers I have seen a lot of low types, and if the appropriate Minister has asked for the proper equipment, Government should have it by all means, and I think that this money should be voted without any kind of argument whatever.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in agreeing with the terms of this Resolution, as we all know this is purely a revote of money which lapsed; but I should like to say that despite the quantity of machinery or equipment which we may purchase, all of which would be strictly necessary, yet in my view, what the Government Printery needs most are efficient and experienced printers. They need a few men of the necessary ability, knowledge and experience to handle the job up there, and until the Government equips that Department not only with modern equipment and machinery but with two or three competent printers with the necessary experience and ability, it is no point and you will always have a slipshod job being done.

I think the time is still ripe when Government has to look around and see that they employ not necessarily men who have some education, but men who have the necessary skill and experience in printing. Until that is done the Printing Department will always be in a state whereby full satisfaction and efficiency will never be provided. Now that we are revoting this \$24,545, I am hoping that the Minister will look into the personnel and deal with them, because until that is done no matter what machinery you get and how expensive it might be, until you get men to run the machines with the necessary experience and ability, the job will not be done properly.

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

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON RESOLUTION re COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to revert to the Resolution for \$776,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to revert to the Resolution for \$776,000, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on the adjournment of the House on the last occasion when this Resolution was under discussion, I was beginning to compare the rates which are paid by the Government with the rates paid to similar categories by private enterprise. Perhaps I should say at this stage that I have heard it said by some people who perhaps do not know better - the hon. senior member for St. George, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. Peter - that the Opposition wants to pay these people more wages, but I am opposed to it. As I said on the last occasion when I was speaking on this question, there are some people who are willing to give when they do not have, but as soon as they get it, all this giving is over. What are the members going to give? They are not responsible for the Government; they can only be responsible for their own private affairs, and I am going to show you in a few minutes from now what exists in private enterprise, the wages paid and the conditions under which these people exist, and prove to this Committee in no uncertain manner that the wages paid by them are far less than the wages paid by Government, although at the same time those persons who work with them have not got any measure of security whatever and no pension rights apart from the two weeks' holiday with pay which this Government provided and which was passed in 1951.

I should perhaps go a little further and say this: I remember well when we were discussing the Five Year Plan, that the Opposition realised that we were prepared

to raise income tax, company tax and things of that sort. They kicked up against the Government and went out in the highways and hedges and called in the halt, the lame, the blind, the deaf and the dumb, those who could not understand and those who could understand, people who never knew that the House of Assembly existed in Barbados, to hear what was happening because they did not understand issues involved; but that did not detract one moment from this Government; that did not prevent this Government from putting through its Five Year Plan and I am sure that many people in this country today are more than proud to see what we have done in that Five Year Plan, so much so that we are taking another Five Year Plan and will take another. When we put through the last Five Year Plan, they were dumb on it. As soon as you get up and say you are going to tax them to provide money to pay better wages, for a hospital and schooling, they get up and oppose us, and they get people who do not know any better and who are not prepared to work hard or work at all for money to go around kicking up a lot of opposition against us. We thrive on opposition. This today is small potatoes as compared with what used to happen in days gone by.

In 1938-39 I used to go in the middle of the night with the Prime Minister of the West Indies hiding in the bottom of my car, when the people wanted to shoot him and burn down his house, to the length and breadth of this island to keep our meetings, and to convince the people of our sincerity, and a lot of people gave us their support and had confidence in us. We did all that against the opposition in those days. We have nothing in these days as compared with what we had then, and if I was not afraid in those days, are you telling me that I will be afraid now? I want to say that where fear is concerned, I have none of that in me. I will face anything because I know I face it with uprightness, straightforwardness and honesty.

Mr. Chairman, I will read for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Peter a statement which he made in the House of Assembly regarding me some years ago in support of what I have just said.

1.35 p.m.

Now, Sir, I will preface my remarks by saying that people do not realise what is the case, and what is more or less regarded as heart burning is that those persons for whom you are trying to do something are vast and, as I mentioned on the last occasion, the first time that we are really giving the man at the bottom more than the one at the top is on this occasion. Whenever there was any cost of living allowance to be given, the men at the top got the lion's share. Today we are increasing it by 4 1/2 cents an hour which will give the people at the bottom an 18.75% increase. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are giving a fixed increase.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will have his chance to speak. I heard him say that we were giving the people who were \$600 a month the same percentage. That is not correct.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of correction. Are you allowing the Hon. Minister to say that? I believe I am an intelligent man and can work out percentages. If you say you are giving a fixed increase, I say you are giving the man at the top the same amount of money as the man at the bottom and that is so because you are giving the man at the top \$108.00 per year. That is not a percentage increase; therefore, you are giving the man at the bottom the same as you are giving the man at the top. Because the two figures, that is to say, the figure at which the man at the top is working for and that which the man at the bottom is working for are not the same, different percentages must be the answer.

Hon. M. E. COX: I appreciate all of that. I know that as soon as you make a speech nowadays, the practice is that members on the other side will jump up every now and then and the hon. member who has just spoken is no exception. What I say is this. In this Resolution which we

have brought down, the percentage varies. For example, if the man at the top was getting the same percentage as the man at the bottom, he would be bound to get more than \$108 per annum. But there is a ceiling; therefore, the man at the top from the percentage point of view is getting far less than the man at the bottom.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. George in his speech said that we must get down somebody here who knows something about work cost and these different things. We must get down somebody to look into these salaries and wages and all that sort of thing. When we come to the House of Assembly from time to time to ask for money to bring somebody here to investigate and to go into salaries and to make recommendations you get members saying: "why can't you get somebody here to do it, you are wasting the public's money." This is the first time we have gone to the extent of granting an increase of 4 1/2 cents an hour. When the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a member of this Government and the now Prime Minister of the West Indies was the Leader of this House at that time, you got an increase of three cents per hour. The last increase which was given in 1946 was four cents per hour. Today, it is 4 1/2 cents and we arrived at that increase so that these persons at the bottom, the lowest paid people, should not get less than \$15 per week.

No doubt, there is a lot of opposition against the Government and for more reasons than one. The Opposition feels primarily that in the absence of Sir Grantley Adams who was Premier and Leader of this House the opportunity avails itself that they can run horse and buggy through this Party. They fail to realise, as I have made it clear to them on more than one occasion - and I would say it again - that it will not happen despite the fact that they are a few gullible people who are willing to follow every abuse and slander and lie and attack on the Government. I know that in a very short time from now the very people will be seeing the other way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he was addressing this Committee on this question said that it was an insult to the workers employed to offer them this increase. He went further too, and said, that this should only be given to those persons at the bottom.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If he wants to quote me, he must quote me correctly. I said that in so far as this increase is concerned this should not be mixed up with a man drawing \$600 or \$800 a month because when you look at a man who is getting 24 cents an hour and you give him an increase of 4 1/2 cents an hour, what is that when compared with the man who is getting \$800 a month and you give him the same \$9 a month. Another thing, the Hon. Minister cannot quote me correctly in his speech because there is no Hansard published on speeches in here.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am going to quote him when he occupied a responsible position in 1952 and we were dealing with the Turner Report on salaries. That debate took place on the 17th June, 1952. As a matter of fact, I can quote him from the time he was a member of the Government and even before that. I can quote him to show that he was one of the persons who used to formulate the policy and defend the policy of the Government all along.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you mean to say that all of you were nitwits?

Hon. M. E. COX: I said one of the persons. This is what he said:-
1.45 p.m.

"When the Adams Report came down to the House increases were made to the salaries of the clerical and administrative staffs. An increase was made to the subordinate staff because we felt that the 15 per cent that was given to them brought their wages well below the basic wages of agricultural workers and we said that Government should not be paying basically lower wages than the

wages paid to agricultural workers. But when we came to officers who could be transferred from this colony to Trinidad or elsewhere, we must of necessity be forced to compare the salaries paid there with the salaries paid in our own area. We could not look at Africa. How could we look at salaries other than those which came within our immediate concern? Is any honourable member really suggesting that because you will have some differentiation in the structure that now exists, therefore it should be otherwise than what is now proposed? That in itself shows that the whole thing is out of gear. I would ask the hon. senior member for St. Thomas if he would agree to increase the salaries of those officers in the technical branches of the Service tonight while those in the administrative branches should have to wait.

I would agree with hon. members of the House who hold that this was not a similar matter to what is done in Parliament because the Government had not taken their employees into their confidence before they attempted to do something. I am a member of the Whitley Council representing the Government, but I make no apologies. I am no employer. I am basically a trade unionist. I work day in and day out fighting for more wages and better conditions of service in this island right and left. My associates in the Party can tell you that I would fight against injustice in any form or in any place because I have no sympathy with dishonesty of any kind in any quarter. If there ever was any person around me who was dishonest, he could be my dearest brother, I would remove him.

What has brought me to this statement is a remark which was made by the hon. member for St. John in reference to the Whitley Council. I do not know if hon. members are aware of the composition of the Whitley Council that represents the workers in the Civil Service, and I would back down if you cannot ask the Government to recognise that body as a bargaining body on behalf of workers. I have to admit that Parliament is always supreme, but although Parliament is supreme, Parliament must remember that if they give Government the authority to put up an organisation like the Civil Service Association out of which grew the Whitley Council - and the procedure of the Whitley Council is even more rigid than any other organisation in Barbados - when an agreement is reached by the Whitley Council it is binding on the Government, but Parliament can rescind it."

The hon. member referred to the various people who comprised the Whitley Council and then a little further on he went on to say this:-

"Mr. Speaker, the reason why I am saying that is this: I represent the workers in a trade union, and anybody outside that union is entitled to enjoy his own opinion about the union; but when outsiders say that we are not accredited leaders, that we are self constituted leaders and that we went forward to represent the workers on our own initiative, that is an entirely different question. Can anyone accuse the Government of not doing anything when we carried the Report to the people themselves and allowed them to express their views? You go to the Civil Service Association, and then you are told the Civil Service Association has not got sufficient representative men, but the members of the House are. No one can ever fool me with that. I do not belong to that school of thought.

The members of this House sat down here and debated the question of salaries from top to bottom. It was referred to the Civil Service Association, and there is no member in this House who has ever dared attempt to sponsor a resolution in or out of the House stating that the Civil Service Association does not represent the members of the Service. That being so, dare the Government refuse to put it to the Whitley Council and hear their views? And members of the Whitley Council decided that the terms of reference should have been widened. If that had not been done would not the Government have been deserving of severe criticism? What more could we ask the Government to do?"

Mr. WALCOTT: And if the Council rejected.....

Hon. M. E. COX: They have made rejections from the time I was a member of the Whitley Council; he was a member of it and it was not for the Governor to say how much we could spend. I agree that they have made objections; the hon. member and I have had to sit down on reports made by

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. To whom is the hon. member referring? It is about the third time he has said that members on this side are always interrupting. Now, the hon. member says "he" I would like the hon. member to address his remarks to the particular hon. member concerned.

Hon. M. E. COX: You are not yet hot; you will be very much hotter later on. To continue what I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Peter in that debate referred to the difficulty in getting a Government Analyst, and then he went on:

"But the hon. senior member for St. Thomas," the Minister of Communications and Works.....

Mr. WALCOTT: So he was criticising the salaries.

Hon. M. E. COX: And you were defending them. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hon. member will learn to behave himself. He goes on:-

"But the hon. senior member for St. Thomas seems to have forgotten what he well knows, that human beings are not dummies. He knows that if you interfere with the man at the top, those at the bottom would soon be found highly articulate."

In his apology now he is admitting that he dealt only with one side. He was pointing out at the time that it was impossible to deal with one side and not the other. He went on to say this:-

"He knows that that is the ever-present problem with us. How can we then begin to say that the Government Officers are different human beings because the word "different" seems to have reference to them? I was very sorry to hear the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. John because he made one unfortunate statement which I feel no responsible man in this House should make. He began to insinuate threats. He said 'all right, wait and see; if you are going on with this policy you will soon get things like those in 1937'."

Unfortunately now the hon. member finds himself in that irresponsible group and he goes further on occasions and he went further on this occasion, than Mr. Alder went on that occasion.
1.55 p.m.

I will continue to quote the hon. member.

"Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not like to misquote hon. members. Here on earth we have to face the inevitable sometimes. I do not know that the workers or the people or the populace are my God. I do not look at the populace to see if I am right or wrong. There is no point in the hon. member talking about these things that happened in 1937 because I would ask him this. What has this Government done that is outstanding for the working classes?"

In other words, he is saying that so much good was being done since the 1937 disturbances that there was absolutely no reason for the people to find themselves resorting to what they had to resort to under the rule of the Conservatives aided by the satellites who sit with them today. He goes on:

"You realise that the Government must have an efficient Civil Service. Every working-class man cannot do the work of the Director of Agriculture."

At that time the member who had spoken compared the increases which were given to the Director of Agriculture with the rates which were given at the time to the

unskilled man; so the member made it quite clear, and he went further and said:

"I do not like to hear that you have reduced your administrative duties to a position of inferiority."

By that you will appreciate from the innuendo that the hon. member was asking how the increase for the Director of Agriculture could be compared with what was being given to the unskilled man. In other words, they were poles apart and therefore you had to concentrate on the man at top so that he could drive the life, blood and sweat out of the man at the bottom. Now, Sir, he said further:

"Not every man who has had....."

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, as to the innuendo which he now uses and now he is sitting down and smiling, when a man can be so

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, do you think I can sit down here and let him smile and grin behind the idea that I said then that somebody wanted to give something to the man at top to drive the life, blood and sweat out of the man at the bottom? He is so dishonest that he is reading my speech and putting his own words into it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would not ask him to withdraw that. (In reply to an aside by Mr. DOWDING.) You are not going to tell me how to conduct my debate. You get up and talk a lot of nonsense in here from time to time and you are now talking foolishness. Do you think that because you have a loud voice.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

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

On resumption

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was formed.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Private Members' Business was called.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when the House was discussing Private Members' Business, we were dealing with the Resolution moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the proposed change in the Constitution and various consultations which should take place prior to the delegation's leaving for the Colonial Office, and I happened to have been speaking at the time. I was actually recapitulating to the House the constitutional position or at least giving some idea of the various constitutional advances which we have made.

I referred, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the three colonies, the Bahamas, Bermuda and Barbados, have enjoyed a certain measure of self-Government for many years, but in the case of Barbados and presumably the others, we did so with a limited franchise, which means in effect that the power remained vested in the hands of the merchants and planters of that day or the monied class or capitalists, as they are popularly known. In Barbados we had a £50 franchise up to 1946 when it was reduced to £20 - in other words \$8 a month - and women were granted

suffrage. It was not until 1951 that Barbados was given Adult Suffrage and we voted under Adult Suffrage for the first time in 1951.

Now I would just like to clear up a misconception. It is not that the constitution of Jamaica and Trinidad is more advanced than ours; I was just referring to the time when Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana had been granted Adult Suffrage before Barbados, because it was not until 1951 that Barbados was granted Adult Suffrage and voted under it whereas in the case of the other colonies, Jamaica acquired theirs, I think, in 1944, Trinidad in 1950 and British Guiana around 1950. It is not that the Constitution in Trinidad today is more advanced than ours, but the Jamaica Constitution is more advanced than ours, and unless we move along it means that Trinidad in time may be more advanced than we are. The point therefore is, Sir, that we do not enjoy that full measure of self-Government as many of us believe, and the next move should be to secure a further advancement in the Constitution.

Now I will deal with the Executive Committee Act. Our Constitution is based mainly on the Executive Committee Act, the Letters Patent and the various conventions which have come into force only recently since the introduction of Ministerial Government. The Executive Committee Act of 1891 is the governing Act of this country; and no matter how we turn and twist it, yet it is fundamentally the governing Act of this country in that it is the only written, unequivocal Act to govern and control the administration and the Executive of this island.

2.35 p.m.

Then we have apart from the Executive Committee Act of 1891 which is still on the Statute Book and which controls the Government of this island despite what may be said, the Letters Patent of 1914, which were amended on the 22nd February, 1937, and again further amended on the 26th August, 1943. They were amended twice within recent times. Along with that you have the numerous conventions which have been only introduced since Ministerial System of Government. Now, the conventions are not written in any way; they are the result of despatches between His Excellency the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and these series of despatches started from 1953 prior to the introduction of Ministerial Government.

I would like to explain these conventions. Mr. Speaker, it is very important in a debate of this nature to make it clear once and for all what are conventions. Conventions are Parliamentary customs and usages as practised in the United Kingdom which control Ministers and Ministerial Government. In the first place, we had certain conventions which were introduced in 1954 when Ministerial System of Government was first established. The Hon. Premier was made a member of the Executive Council, as I was reminded by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was responsible to some extent for having that done from what I have gathered. The Hon. Premier is now a member of the Executive Council and the four Ministers in my time were members of the Executive Committee. They formed a Council of Ministers who enjoyed collective responsibility. Well, that is the first point. Under the Conventions, Ministers are collectively responsible not only for the good running of the Government, but in the case of misdemeanour or mismanagement by any one Minister, the whole gathering is responsible for that, and on a vote of "No Confidence" passed in this Chamber, they must all resign. If the Government at any time happens to lose the confidence of the electorate and the Government is defeated in this House, the convention is that the Government must resign. That is not written in any Executive Committee Act or in any despatch, but it is one of the first conventions to which we all must adhere. I am not suggesting any resignation. It has nothing to do with what is going on in this House today or at any time.

In the conventions of 1954 when Ministerial System was first introduced, there was the convention that Ministers should not be engaged in any form of private business whereby that private business and the Government business would conflict. It was agreed however - and this is not taking

tales out of school - that in the case of professional men they should be granted certain latitude, but that latitude only extended to the giving of advice in their professional capacity; that is to say, if you were a barrister or solicitor, there was nothing to prevent you from advising in your branch of study in a consultative way, but you could not undertake a job by virtue of the fact that your job as a Minister was a whole-time job. So far as carrying on business was concerned, you were debarred altogether.

I will not elaborate upon that; but what is very astounding is that this convention, which is the second convention, appears as though it is observed in the breach and not in the performance. That is how it seems to me. Anyhow, that is a matter for the powers-to-be in the Cabinet and such persons. Now, under that convention, it is unnecessary to state that Cabinet Ministers cannot secure employment or any other job elsewhere, whether he is being paid or whether he is doing the job gratuitously. However, it is very surprising that these conventions are not being observed. You cannot find that in the Executive Committee Act or any Local Government Act; therefore, it is not against the law; but it is against the conventions, which is worse yet.

There are certain conventions which are based on the English conventions, one of which is that a Minister should not sit as a member of any Board, not only Boards under his particular portfolio but also semi-Governmental Boards. Normally, the Minister nominates or approves of members of the particular Board under his portfolio. In my case, I was forced to resign from membership of the Governing Body of the Foundation Schools - a Board dearest to my heart - not to mention from membership of the Peasants' Loan Bank and the Fancy Molasses Marketing and Control Board and other Boards under my portfolio then. As to the question of Ministers being granted the right to sit on Boards, I hope that theory has been exploded once and for all because it is a breach of the conventions. As I have said, you will not find it written in any law.

There is a further convention in Barbados at least that the Financial Secretary should attend meetings of the Executive Committee. Now, I am speaking of the Executive Committee and not the Cabinet. As we all know, since we have the advanced Constitution, the Financial Secretary, the Attorney General and the Chief Secretary can only attend meetings of the Cabinet when requested to do so. It is one of the conventions of this island since the appointment of the Financial Secretary that the Financial Secretary should sit as a member of the Executive Committee though he has not the right to vote.

2.45 p.m.

I hope that there is no confusion in any one's mind that the Executive Committee and the Cabinet are one and the same; there are two separate and distinct entities for my purpose now. Another convention is that the Financial Secretary has the right to attend meetings of the Executive Committee, which is still operative. The Financial Secretary has the right to sit in but not to vote. Since the advancement of the Constitution he only attends meetings on request. There is another convention since the introduction of the Ministerial System and of the Cabinet System, that is, that full meetings of the Executive Committee will not be summoned for the discussion of matters normally dealt with by the Cabinet unless there was in the opinion of the Governor good and sufficient reason for that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that an hon. member is talking with a person in the gallery and that is against the Rules of the House - the hon. junior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. TALMA: I was referring to the 5th convention since the introduction of the Cabinet System and it is that full meetings of the Executive Committee will not be summoned for the discussion of matters normally dealt with by the Cabinet unless there was in the opinion of the Governor good and sufficient reason. That gives some idea of what conventions mean. You will find some pointers to them in the Despatches and the others are English Parliamentary conventions adopted by the local Parliament. Then we had

a further advance in the Constitution - we had the Cabinet System; and because the Cabinet system exists, it does not mean that the Executive Committee has ceased to function. I am hoping to speak once and for all, and at least hon. members will understand the conventions of the Constitution and how we are being governed. Under this Cabinet System the Hon. Premier substitutes for the Governor as Chairman of the Cabinet, but the Chairman of the Executive Committee still remains substantially the Governor of this colony who has the right, in case of any matter which is being considered and which he thinks requires the consideration of the full Executive Committee, to summon the whole Committee. The Governor still has that power. Normally, all legislative matters are the concern of the Premier and the Cabinet, and the whole Executive Committee need not be summoned.

While we are at this point, I shall refer to the despatch which took place between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor, which is dated 31st July, 1957. In fact, it is really dated 27th May, 1957. It is a copy of the Constitution which was given to us. I want to make it quite clear how the Cabinet, as it is, functions today. I am reading Clauses 6, 7 and 8 of the Governor's Despatch and the reference is S.260/SI Vol/v/42 and the number of the despatch is Barbados No. 304. Clause 6 reads as follows:-

"I propose to establish the Cabinet by using the legal machinery contained in section 28A of the Interpretation Act, 1949, as amended by the Interpretation (Amendment) Act, 1954. This provision enables the Governor-in-Executive Committee to delegate his authority or the authority of the Executive Committee to exercise his or its statutory powers or perform his or its duties, except to hear appeals or make subsidiary legislation....."

In other words, the Cabinet has power delegated to it to carry out the duties and functions of the whole Executive except to hear appeals or make subsidiary legislation. The Clause goes on:-

"Under this provision it is therefore competent for the Governor-in-Executive to authorise the Ministers to exercise collectively the powers and to perform the duties imposed on the Executive Committee under and by virtue of Section 2 of the Executive Committee Act, 1891. These powers and functions are -

- (a) the transaction of the public financial business;
- (b) considering ways and means;
- (c) advising the Governor on any measures which the Executive may deem it expedient to bring before the Legislature;

That is to say, that in respect of the legislation which is being brought down, they will advise on all measures which the Executive Committee may deem expedient to bring before the Legislature.

The Clause goes on:

- "(d) the conduct of public works; and
- (e) the control and management of public institutions.

The Governor-in-Executive Committee would continue to deal with those matters which under Section 28A of the Interpretation Act may not be delegated, with matters of an executive nature such as appointments to boards etc., and with matters for which the Chief Secretary is responsible to the Governor."

We have had all this noise about the appointment of Aldermen the other day. What is meant is the appointments to superior Boards, not those under Ministerial Portfolios. What is meant is the appointments to the Legislative Council or the appointment of Justices of the Peace and in this case, for the first time, the appointment of Aldermen because with the Government having an interest or being an interested party in the Elections, they could not be reasonably expected to appoint the Aldermen. 2.55 p.m.

In this particular case they have for the first time to deal with the appointment of Aldermen, but in future Aldermen will be elected. I will not deal with that any longer because that point has been cleared and a ruling given by the Colonial Office and the English Parliament, and I suppose everybody should be satisfied that the Governor did not act wrongfully in performing his duties as constitutional Monarch of Barbados. I will just go through that again.

"The Governor-in-Executive Committee would continue to deal with those matters which under Section 28A of the Interpretation Act may not be delegated, with matters of an executive nature such as appointments to boards etc., and with matters for which the Chief Secretary is responsible to the Governor."

Clause 7 reads as follows:-

"In this way the changes will be effected largely by convention, which is in keeping with the pattern followed hitherto of introducing changes by this process rather than by legal enactment. The effect of the proposals will be that Executive Committee will be enabled to function both through the full body, which includes Executive Council, and through a Cabinet of Ministers."

Clause 8 reads as follows:-

"The Governor would preside over the full Executive Committee, but would not attend the Cabinet. The Premier would preside over meetings of the Cabinet; the Chief Secretary, the Attorney General, the Financial Secretary would attend meetings of the Cabinet on request. It would be open to the Governor, acting in his discretion, to summon meetings of the full Executive Committee at any time for the discussion of any matter."

The Governor can still summon a meeting of the whole Executive on any matter at any time he thinks fit; so when they talk about being absolute masters, of what are they masters? It would be a good thing, Sir, if the next advance of the Constitution would bring us in line with what ostensibly we hold ourselves to the public as possessing. Let us try and get as far as Sir Grantley Adams, the Prime Minister of the West Indies, who knows all this about constitutional advancement and forgets the economic side very often, believes we have got. Let us achieve that goal which we have not yet achieved. I will continue reading.

"It would of course be a convention that full meetings would not be summoned for the discussion of matters normally dealt with by the Cabinet unless there was in the opinion of the Governor good and sufficient reason. It would also be open to the Premier to request a meeting of the full Executive Committee at any time for the discussion of any matter. Arising from this it will be necessary for Cabinet papers to be circulated to members of the full Executive Committee as at present to enable them to advise the Governor when called upon."

In other words, the full Executive is still in being and is still receiving all its papers and it is left to the discretion of the Governor, at any time if he thinks fit, or the Premier to summon a full meeting of the Executive Committee, so that all Executive Committee members are still circulated with copies of their papers as heretofore. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have proved conclusively that what I am saying now is nothing I have discovered recently, but what I have always maintained and was aware of - that the Governor acted within his rights when he actually appointed the Aldermen; but to fool people and to confuse various types of Boards and say that the Cabinet has complete authority to appoint all Boards is not correct, because the Cabinet does not appoint Legislative Council members and certain other people like Commissioners of Probate, Justices of the Peace and people like those. They could not appoint Aldermen for the first time because the Government Party was an interested Party in the election and it would have been, if not against the convention, immoral, to say the least; and to contend that Government could nominate whom they wanted is preposterous.

I would not worry to tire hon. members further, but I think I have proved that the Governor has the appropriate authority to appoint people to superior Boards. He is the representative of the Queen and is still the person to appoint members to superior Boards like the Legislative Council, Justices of the Peace, Commissioners of Probate, and Aldermen for the first time because they had to be nominated, but that will not happen in future. Those are conventions and the conventions are based on certain despatches between His Excellency the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I think I have read three of the effective Clauses and can leave it at that.

I have covered the question of Aldermen mainly because a certain amount of confusion existed even in the minds of one or two of the Ministers as to what are conventions and where you find them and things of that sort. My impression is that one or two of the Ministers seem to think that conventions are written somewhere. Conventions are Parliamentary usages and customs as in the democratic system of Government obtaining in English Parliaments. I hope that in future this confusion which existed in the minds of certain Ministers and thousands of minds of the public will no longer continue, if I am reported at all.

You will realise, Mr. Speaker, that owing to the confusion - or apparent confusion - which existed here recently when the question of Aldermen came up, in the best interest of all Barbadians and more especially of the ones who are politically minded, it would be as well if a new Executive Committee Act were drafted and enacted in clear and unequivocal language which can easily be understood by all and sundry, so that there will be no misapprehension, misunderstanding or misconception as has arisen in the past in the interpretation of the Act. It would be a good thing if, as a result of the Hon. Premier's visit to the United Kingdom and the various consultations which he and his delegation will have, they adopted a system not as much on convention, but on changing and having amended the Executive Committee Act, and embody in the Act all the new advancements in the Constitution and the new system which has been granted and which he has been fortunate to secure. 3.05 p.m.

Now, I endorse the terms of this Resolution as moved by my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, but I feel that the Resolution does not go far enough and I am desirous with Your Honour's leave and with the permission of my hon. colleague of moving an amendment to his Resolution. The amendment which I propose moving is one whereby the people of Barbados would feel more satisfied in that all view-points would be represented not only here in Barbados but in the United Kingdom, because I think it is their wish that the Committee of all parties should not only sit prior to the visit to the United Kingdom but on the delegation. I would say that at least the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should be included in the delegation. One would even go as far as to say that the Leader of each Opposition group should be included. However, I am interested in the Leader of our Opposition. I feel that as he is the Official Leader of the Opposition, he should be one of the officials who should attend the Colonial Office. What is more, he is a trained lawyer and one of the oldest sitting members of this Assembly. I feel that with his qualifications as a lawyer trained in constitutional law and with his experience in this Assembly for between twenty and twenty-two years, he would be a fitting member of that delegation. Without giving any further reasons - as a matter of fact, I do not think any more is necessary - I am going to move the amendment to the Resolution: At the end of the paragraph "Be it resolved" put a semi-colon instead of a full stop and add the following:-

"and that in any such delegation the Official Leader of the Opposition shall be a member."

Mr. SPEAKER: Why Official Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. TALMA: Well, the Leader of the Opposition. There are many splinter Opposition groups, but I happen to

belong to the main Opposition group, the one which has been acknowledged and which is ready to take over at any time.

Mr. Speaker, one can readily see the reason for this amendment. I am not in any mood to discredit anyone or to be insulting. But it is plainly in evidence that the Government Party, sound as it may be and with the big political brains it may have, yet cannot boast of having a legally trained man in their midst although they may have the Attorney General and somebody else to guide them; but from the Opposition's point of view, we want to have a lawyer who has the sentiments and the viewpoints of the people of Barbados and who understands their sentiments; we do not want any imported official, or one who has not been elected to this Chamber, and therefore, one who does not represent the wishes of the people of this Island. We are fortunate in having a lawyer as Leader of the Opposition who has been in this Chamber for 22 years and who has been fighting for the rights of the people for over 25 years, one who has fought in what can be called the black days when one happened to be ignored; and because of that, I am recommending that the Leader of the Opposition should be included in this delegation. I may say in passing that I too am one of those who fought in the black days. From the numerous reasons which I have given, it would be undemocratic if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition fails to be included in that delegation.

The question of expense does not arise at all because taking an additional member would entail probably about another \$2,000. When one considers the vast sums of money which have been thrown down the drain whether in this department or another, and this expenditure of \$2,000 or thereabouts for the purpose of including the Leader of the Opposition who has been in here for 22 years and who is a Leader of a Party which is as much Labour as the present Government, if not more, and which represents the wishes of the people on the Labour ticket more than the Government Party - I see no reason for excluding him on grounds of expense.

3.15. p.m.

The money was spent for the first time in the right direction. I may not be fortunate in being one of the members of the Committee which is going out and I am saying what I have to say in the hope that some little note might be taken of it. In any advance which we may seek or which the Government may seek from the Colonial Office, let it be borne in mind that we, in Barbados, are anxious to break away from the old Colonial system; we want to pattern ourselves more on the lines of Puerto Rico. We know that Puerto Rico is an American colony; I happen to know something about it and I feel that we should pattern ourselves along the lines of Puerto Rico and we will be further ahead than Trinidad, Jamaica, British Guiana or any of the other colonies. Puerto Rico was an American colony but it is now really in the American Commonwealth. The Puerto Ricans elect their own Governor and they appoint their Attorney General who goes into office during such tenure as his Government remains in office. Those are some of the constitutional advancements for which we will look. When we are proceeding to secure constitutional advancement, we must also aim at progressing and advancing both economically and industrially. In Puerto Rico it is not only a question of constitutional advancement but it is a question of industrial, economical and any other aspect of progress with the result that Puerto Rico is now a wealthy country in which there is little or no unemployment, and the standard of living is as high as it is in the United States of America.

We are hoping that this delegation which will go to England will comprise men of the necessary experience and ability and knowledge of constitutional law whereby a good case will be made out for this island, so that Sir Grantley Adams will realise that although he did consult us before he went on his missions, he seldom took anybody along with him to these constitutional talks and then he would act as if he had achieved something wonderful. He has not achieved anything wonderful because Barbados is not ahead of Ghana, Nigeria or Jamaica; and if we are not careful Trinidad will get ahead of us. Whereas a sel-

fish policy was adopted in the past and the great Sir Grantley alone went to the Colonial Office to seek this advancement and used that as a kudos at Election time, on this occasion we are hoping that the Hon. Premier will see the wisdom of having a truly representative delegation accompanying him and bolstering him up in putting the case for Barbados for all time and not for this Government alone. Some people seem to think that this Government will be in office for another fifty years. We do not want to adopt a rather niggardly policy; this is a question of getting the best constitution for Barbados from now on and therefore let this be the best delegation, the most virile, experienced and active people who can think and express their thoughts in proper language and in accordance with the Queen's English. Unless we do that, it may be that the delegation which goes to England to secure this advancement of the Constitution may not be as fruitful as we are hoping it to be.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I am going to move that the Resolution be amended. I think I have done so already, but in order to bring the matter home to my colleague, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who has just come into the House, and to make the matter clear to the House as a whole, I will state that the amendment is to the effect that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should be included in this delegation. I am suggesting to the Clerk that a semicolon be inserted after the word "Constitution" occurring at the end of the Resolution, and that the following words be added: "and that on any such delegation the Leader of the Opposition shall be a member." Although where numbers are concerned, we may be outvoted, I am hoping that the Hon. Leader of the House, the Minister of Trade, will see the wisdom of this amendment and agree with something which is feasible and sound and which will be beneficial not only to us, but to future Barbadians. I am asking leave that this amendment be inserted in the Resolution and with the permission of my colleague the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking for two things.

Mr. TALMA: I am asking leave.....

Mr. BRANCKER: I will accept that amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to make an amendment to the motion which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member.

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

Mr. TALMA: I thank you, Sir. I am hoping that hon. members will see the wisdom of this amendment which I now move, that on any such delegation the Hon. Leader of the Opposition shall be a member. There is hardly any point in saying why the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should be a member of this delegation. I repeat: I hope that hon. members will see the wisdom of this amendment and not take advantage of the weight of numbers. This amendment is timely and it is fair and equitable; it is a question of an important delegation which seeks to amend the Constitution. In any important delegation dealing with the amendment of the Constitution, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, at least, should be a member. In Trinidad and in other places, you will find that in a case where a Conference in London dealing with the Constitution is taking place, members of the Opposition in the Legislative Council have been invited to attend if they want to do so. 3.25 p.m.

I am not suggesting that you should have all the members of the Opposition, but definitely the Leader of the Opposition should be a member of the delegation.

With those few words, Sir, I am hoping that the Leader of the House, the Premier, and the Government Party as a whole would at least see the wisdom of such an amendment and would not use sheer weight of numbers, on this occasion at least, to destroy what on the face of it appears to be a good amendment in the best interest of Barbados and the future of Barbadians.

Mr. STRAUGHN rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the amendment?

Mr. STRAUGHN: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. junior member for St. Lucy approve of the amendment?

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I did not get the chance to speak after the hon. senior member for St. Philip had spoken last Tuesday, but it so happened that at the time when he had finished his speech I was in consultation with the Clerk and another member rose to speak before I got the chance. Since then two members have spoken, the hon. senior member for Christ Church who has just sat down and the hon. senior member for St. Peter. However, my remarks will be based on some of the arguments which were put forward by the hon. senior member for St. Philip because I personally feel that the arguments put forward by this hon. member were better arguments against the passing of the Resolution moved by his colleague than in favour of it.

I think it would be correct, however, before I proceed with the main body of my speech, Sir, to refer to some of the closing remarks which have just been made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. Time and again, even though I know that during the course of this debate you have in your good wisdom reminded members that this is not necessarily a debate on - to use a phrase used by the hon. senior member for St. Philip - the Aldermanic issue, reference was made to it and sometimes members seemed to be speaking on it as if it were the substantive Resolution.

I noted however, that the hon. member who has just sat down, the hon. senior member for Christ Church, did say that the issue now has been completely settled and we have heard officially from the Colonial Office and the English Parliament their ruling on it. I think I am quoting him correctly. I do not know if this House is really aware that we have had any ruling by the English Parliament on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is not aware.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I agree with you, Sir, because as far as my knowledge or information serves me, all that we know has happened is that a member of Parliament in Britain did ask a question of the Colonial Secretary with reference to the leaving of our present Governor from Barbados, and the question was whether he could say if the leaving of the present Governor of Barbados was in any way affected by the situation of the appointment of Aldermen to the Bridgetown City Council. All we know is that the Colonial Secretary replied saying that the Governor is leaving at the end of the normal term of office and that his leave is in no way affected by the appointment of Aldermen to the Bridgetown City Council.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is either labouring under a delusion or suffering a slight lapse of memory. What distinctly he referred to as being made in Parliament was tantamount to a statement by the British Government delivered by a Minister of the British Government - by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies Mr. Julian Amery - and he went further than the hon. member says he went. The Minister said that he was quite satisfied that the action of the Governor in the matter under reference by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was justified, that is, the action by the Governor on this Aldermanic issue was, in the opinion of the British Cabinet, completely justified. They supported it.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Well, I certainly was not finished, Mr. Speaker, because plain commonsense would tell anybody that if there are three Parties involved in any discussion or any dispute whatever, and only two Parties

happened to have been in consultation with each other, no one can say that the issue has been completely settled. If it happened - and I am just using this as a passing reference because I do not think it is the substantive Resolution - that His Excellency the Governor was in consultation with the Colonial Office and the Colonial Office has given the appearance, at any rate as we can see it now, that they have supported His Excellency in his action, if there are three Parties involved there is no evidence to the fact that the Government as such, meaning the Premier, was in consultation with the Colonial Office on the particular matter, and a final decision could only be reached on a situation like this if it so happened that all three Parties were in consultation with each other. If the Premier does choose when he goes to see the Colonial Secretary on the matter of constitutional advancement to raise the question there, that would be the only time when the Colonial Office would be getting a complete picture of the situation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I hope the hon. member will make the position quite clear. He must understand what he is saying. He himself has just said that there was this statement in Parliament supporting the Governor's action on this matter. To whom is the Government going to refer this matter further, to the Shah of Persia? We do not understand what he is saying at all.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: It is just as well that he does not understand because, as I have said, that matter they were labouring on that day so much was not part of the substantial Resolution and evidently, if there are three parties concerned in a dispute, you must expect that all three Parties must have a say in it. It was not so in this case.

I also noticed that reference was made to the Constitution of Barbados as compared with the Constitution of Jamaica and what not, and members who spoke from the other side have been apparently riding a very strong, happy horse saying that there is no evidence and the former Premier was entirely wrong when he kept saying that the constitution of Barbados was more advanced than other Colonial constitutions and that it was not right to say that it was more advanced than that of Jamaica. That is an anomalous statement because everybody, certainly everybody in this House and I believe a lot of people all over the West Indies, knows that only a few months ago the Jamaica Constitution was advanced and, as a matter of fact, it was only since the inception of the Federal Parliament; therefore if the statement made by the former Premier before he went to the Federal Parliament was that the constitution of Barbados was more advanced than that of Jamaica and if in the last few months the constitution of Jamaica was further advanced, that shows that the statement made sometime previously was not an erroneous statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the hon. member so often. I rise on a point of order. Why should he venture in such days of echelons?

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point is this. All we did was to quote the Hon. Premier. He said that he had observed recently that the Jamaica Constitution was more advanced than the Barbados Constitution and he had drawn it to the attention of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I did not say that the Constitution of Jamaica was more advanced than that of Barbados. I certainly did not say that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I took part in this debate and the Hon. Premier said that he was going to the Colonial Office to have discussions on constitutional changes and at least to put Barbados in the same position that Jamaica is. Whatever conclusion you like to draw from that, you can.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Premier said on this floor of this House

that the constitution of Jamaica was now in advance of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no further argument on that.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Sir, with regard to the general claims that we did have the most advanced constitution, hon. members were taking that former reference by the former Premier and saying that it was an erroneous statement because the Jamaica constitution was more recently advanced; but that, I think, is an erroneous argument and I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter can see that too.

I will just spend a little time in dispensing of a statement which I do not think brought any particular burden to bear on the Resolution which we have before us. I noticed that the hon. senior member for Christ Church spoke at length and spent his time talking about the Constitution which we have, and spent just a little time talking about the Resolution before us. I will like to make some mention of the Resolution before us because that is what we are faced with today. The Resolution advocates that an all-Parties Committee be appointed to go into this matter of constitutional advancement before oral discussions are commenced with the Colonial Office. I am glad to see the hon. senior member for St. Lucy in his place. One must spend a little time, at least on one of the remarks he made in respect of this Resolution which was moved by his colleague. I wonder if the hon. senior member for St. Lucy would deny this? If he does I will stop but he repeated it more than once. He said that we need an all-party representation at all times on this delegation and we need to have an all-party discussion on this situation.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, referring to some remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy as regards an all-party delegation, he pointed out that if the Hon. Premier goes to the Colonial Office at this time alone, the Colonial Office might well question what mandate he did have to come on this question on constitutional advancement and that if he goes alone it could not be said that he represented an all-party delegation.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know, of course, that ignorance is responsible for fully nine-tenths of the hon. member's oratorical output but at the same time I must correct him. I never said that the Colonial Office would ask what mandate the Hon. Premier would have for coming alone. What I did say and what was challenged by the Hon. Leader of the House was this: I said that the Colonial Office might well ask the Hon. Premier if he can entrust him with more power if he did not have the mandate of the people.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that the Government Printery would soon be able to get the debates in order. He did say that and I can remind him of a little more. He also said that if the delegation goes from Kenya or Cyprus or Uganda where a particular disturbance was taking place, the Colonial Office would say that they can see the reason for the delegation coming because there was a disturbance taking place in those countries; but where we are more peaceful, the Colonial Office might well ask how comes it that we are coming at this time for this particular kind of constitutional advancement. If he denies having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all we can do is to wait until these debates are printed. I sincerely hope that the printing of these debates will take place as quickly as possible so that hon. members might be able to read what they did say in the heat of discussion, and what they might not have said if they were not in that state. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy did say that we were more peaceful and, therefore, we might well be asked how comes it that we are coming at this time for this particular kind of constitutional type of advancement. However, I would like to see that we get the *verbatim* speech of what the hon. member said when the debates are issued.
3.45 p.m.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the most interesting

contribution to this debate on the passing of this Resolution for an "all-parties" Committee came from the hon. senior member for St. Philip. He, like the hon. senior member for Christ Church, read from the Governor's letter to the Colonial Office on the 27th May, 1957, when we had the institution of Cabinet Government, and they used paragraphs from that letter in support of this Resolution for an "all-parties" Committee. Somehow or another, one of the paragraphs which they quoted is paragraph 12.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member must differentiate between what I was at pains to point out and what he is pleased to refer to as an "all-parties" Committee. At no time did I, personally, make any reference to any "all-parties" Committee; that is the gist of the Resolution. What I, personally, said was that there should be previous consultation and agreement between the various Parties comprising Parliament, and the part of the despatch which I quoted said that there had been previous consultation and agreement between the Leaders of all parties prior to the granting of the advancement of the Constitution on the date to which he has referred. An "all-parties" Committee is a different thing from previous consultation and agreement.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is amusing to see how people, after they have made statements, try to defend themselves in such a futile manner. I will read in passing one of the paragraphs which the hon. member read and even alluded to just now. This is what His Excellency the Governor is saying:

"These proposals were framed in consultation with the Premier and have been agreed to in 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."

I could continue reading more of the paragraph which is what His Excellency the Governor is saying that he has done. He says: "These proposals were framed in consultation with the Premier and have been agreed to in Executive Committee and I have also discussed them separately with my Executive Council" ----- and so on. They have read that as a part of their argument in support of this "all-parties" Committee Resolution and they have read the part in which His Excellency the Governor is saying what he has done; who knows if before the Premier goes, the Governor will not be following the same precedent and custom which has been followed right through? That is where you get these proposals in consultation with the Premier; they are discussed in Executive Committee and you have the Governor discussing them with some members of the Legislative Council and with certain Parliamentary Leaders. You cannot use that as an argument for an "all-parties" Committee; I rather think that it is an argument against an "all parties" Committee. The Governor has said that he has discussed the proposals with these people and there is no evidence that he has refused to discuss them with the members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member must not take these things out of their context. My quoting paragraph 12 of the despatch under reference was in extenuation of my criticism that the first intimation to this Parliament and to the public, the first intimation which we had of these forthcoming Constitutional talks, was the statement of the Federal Premier that he had informed the Colonial Office to the effect that the Barbados Premier was going to London and then the subsequent statement by the Barbados Premier that he was invited by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, not to discuss the Aldermanic issue, but to discuss the further constitutional advancement because the Jamaica Constitution was further advanced than ours. Whether or not the Governor intends at any stage to have discussions with an "all-parties" Committee or not, the fact remains that we have no right to get any intimation of this proposed change in the Constitution in such a back-handed manner. In other words, both this Parliament and the public have been in-

sulted by not having any previous intimation in any direct manner as to these constitutional talks, which is an entirely different thing.

Mr. STRAUGHN: That was a long point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had to explain it for you.

Mr. STRAUGHN: When you have to spend all of that time in explaining a point of order, it might have been a point of disorder. Here again I wonder what is the source of the hon. member's information, that the first intimation we got of this constitutional visit by the Premier is that the Federal Premier said that the present Premier was invited to the Colonial Office. I was not aware that the Federal Premier had to make that statement; I was under the impression that the Colonial Office itself had said that the Premier was invited there.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. If the hon. member does not know what he is saying, well, let him sit down. He is saying that he thinks something, but I am telling him what the position is. The first intimation we had of the visit of the Premier to the Colonial Office was this statement by the Federal Premier and the subsequent statement made by the Barbados Premier. That is a positive fact, not what he thinks; there was no previous statement made in connection with this matter by anybody else.

Mr. STRAUGHN: The hon. member is referring to some newspaper quotation and apparently such newspaper statements are official statements in his opinion. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all that the hon. member is saying now is yet no argument in favour of this "all-parties" Committee; and now I think we have got to the crux of the hon. member's remarks, I cannot imagine how somebody could be really making remarks feeling that they are in support of a particular Resolution when he is saying what a back-hand slap, to use his own words, it is to himself and to his own Party. I quote from the hon. senior member for St. Philip: "We are against the Premier carrying on with his Constitutional visit, which apparently he intends to do, because if you give them more power they will abuse it even more than they are doing now."

3.55 p.m.
I must say that the hon. senior member for Christ Church was a little more understanding. I think he is correct in saying you are not giving any particular section of Parliament any power. Some people who are in power at the time may abuse it, but it is not that you are giving them as a particular group, because the Government as such.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, what is the hon. member trying to do, to split a hair? If you grant an advance in the Constitution now, to whom are you giving more power, Chiang-Kai-Shek? If you are giving an advance in the Constitution, you are giving the present Government more power, and this is what I said; I said that the Opposition agrees with further advancement in the Constitution but not until after the intervention of a general election.

Mr. STRAUGHN: He made a second statement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I do not know why he has to be so fearful.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member must understand that I am merely remaining here to prevent his childish mind from making too many mistakes about what I said; but I have no objection to what he can say or says.

Mr. STRAUGHN: How can he prevent somebody else's mind from making mistakes? He is not even qualified as a teacher. He made a second statement and I said that he does not need to be so fearful. If he cannot see the people of this country returning this present Government to another lease of power, it is all in their favour to get constitutional advancement because when they do come into power they will have an advanced constitution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of explanation, this is really tiring. In my time I have heard bad speeches in this

House, but nothing worse. The point that I made with reference to the fact that I cannot see the country returning them is merely a further extenuation of my claim that you should not have an amendment to the Constitution before a general election. In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot give them more power because they are going to abuse it; but we are quite confident in saying that if you are going to amend the Constitution and give us more power, you should give the nation after a general election because we cannot see them getting back into power; people have more sense.

Mr. STRAUGHN: If you are going to give the nation more power so that whoever gets into power will be able to use it better, I do not see why he should be so fearful if they are going to get the chance to use that power. However, evidently there was a latent fear being exhibited by the hon. member.

Now, Sir, I think that we must now turn our attention to this particular Resolution as we have it before us and see what real arguments and justification they have to offer in saying that they should be represented on any delegation that might be going up now. Constantly during the debate they kept referring to this "Aldermanic issue," as they call it. They considered that it was a good argument to use. (Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER knocked the gavel.) (Mr. TUDOR: They do not want to hear you.) I hope you want to hear me when I am finished. They considered it was a relevant point in their argument even though the Speaker kept reminding them that it was an absolutely unnecessary point for the debate, but here, who is now asking to be represented on the same delegation? Those same people who have been using this argument that the Government was wrong and was trying to misuse its power in the appointment of Aldermen. Ask them if any time during this Aldermanic issue or the constitutional crisis as people may call it, any official public statement ever came from any of them - the official Opposition! You call that political absurdity. This is what you call jackal and racoon courage, because after they feel the matter has been closed they now come in the House of Assembly and say: "Please put me on any delegation you have on constitutional advancement."

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. TUDOR rose. Mr. TUDOR gave way.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never in all my life listened to more absurdity. What the devil are we to do with pulling their chestnuts out of the fire? We are not coming to their rescue. On the floor of this House during this debate we quoted from the despatch to prove in whose hands the power lay to appoint Aldermen.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As far as the Aldermen issue is concerned, you know I am not going to entertain that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member said that this part of the official Opposition Party did not interfere with the Aldermanic dispute.

Mr. STRAUGHN: That is entirely wrong.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If he does not understand the English language, he said we did not intervene, did not make any statement, and I said that during this debate on the floor of this House this Party quoted from the despatch under which the transfer of control of the Executive in certain matters was passed from the Executive to the Cabinet, and we quoted to show that according to the despatch they only had power in legislative matters. If the hon. member does not understand what he is saying, let him sit down or do not come in here at all.

4.05 p.m.

Do not say that we have not made our position clear. I myself, three Tuesdays ago, told the public that in our considered opinion that appeared to conflict and to be contrary to legislative matters. Do you want any further statement than that? Our opinion is backed by some of the best constitutional lawyers in Trinidad and Jamaica. In our opinion, the Governor was fully within his rights not to take the Premier's advice except on legislative matters.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Evidently, there is a sound case but the question still remains if they are a Party that expects to be considered by the general public, if I may put it that way.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have been made the official Opposition Party by the people. You cannot want any more recognition than that. Apparently, because we are the official Opposition Party, we must get into every dirty row of theirs. We are not in that.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I wish the hon. member could be as calm as I am.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot be calm with nonsense.

Mr. STRAUGHN: A fool generally knows when anybody else is a fool. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Philip is saying - he can deny it - that the opinion of the Official Opposition was silent on that occasion. Even the other Party made its position clear and they did so openly. Even members who were Independents at some time or the other gave their opinion on it. Here is this courageous Opposition saying: "We had better not say anything of what we think it is."

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is no confidant of ours. The position is that we refuse to get into their dirty business; it was no concern of ours. We were not a party to the dispute.

Mr. STRAUGHN: When it was a constitutional issue, when other people said that it was a constitutional issue, do you mean to say that it was their dirty business? They considered it was their business. If you believe it was dirty business while the other people said that it is not dirty business, let me ask you this: what are you going on now; is this clean business? What are you saying now is: "let us go on this clean business." That is complete racoon courage. I see that they cannot stand it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I do not think we ought to sit here and allow our Party to be accused by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Our Party is the Official Opposition and we can only know that there was a constitutional crisis when the Government comes into the one place - the Legislature - and announces that there is a constitutional crisis going on. The Legislature was not told that there was a constitutional crisis on. How do you want the Opposition Party to take notice then? Until the Hon. Premier told us that there was a constitutional crisis on and brought it to the notice of the Assembly, you cannot take notice of it. All that we can take it as otherwise is that it was a private quarrel between them and the Governor.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, this is the only opportunity which we have had in dealing with this matter in this House since the appointment of Aldermen, because this matter affects the Constitution and this is the first opportunity since then that we have had of dealing with it. This Resolution has been going on for the past few weeks and has been dealt with by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and the hon. senior member for St. Philip. I have only spoken on it today. What is more, I have made it clear in my constituency.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What the Government must understand is this.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. What is the hon. member speaking on? Is he still speaking on a point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is his second point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am replying to the statement that this Party did not express any opinion on the issue. We

considered it was beneath our notice. It was so patently obvious we would not get mixed up into it. We knew the Governor and the Colonial Office would soon put them in their places and they both did so.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point of order is that in the considered opinion of this Party, what they termed as a constitutional crisis was not a constitutional crisis; it was merely an attempt by a misguided Party to rape the Constitution for a specific purpose for themselves.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Now, we see where they were. They were in complete agreement with the Barbados National Party.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member must not put words in my mouth. If he does not know the effect of what I am stating, let me put him straight. We are in agreement with the stand taken by the Governor, not with one party or another. Our stand is based on Royal Instructions.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is a question of a matter of privilege of this House. Without trying to presume on what I believe should be your powers on a particular situation in the Chair, it is my humble opinion and I am willing to submit that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is misusing what privilege you have given him to speak on a point of order. I consider a privilege of this House is being misused and I think in the name of the hon. member I can protest against it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If any member rises on a point of order, it is the Speaker's duty to hear the point of order. When the hon. senior member for St. Philip rose and said that he was speaking on a point of order, I had to hear it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, as you are aware, we operate on parliamentary rules. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is fully acquainted with the stiff totalitarian rules which operate that Party's business but in Parliament we have certain rules by which we are guided. The hon. member has said that because we supported the Governor in his action.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: On a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not made my point of order yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me hear the hon. member's point of order. (*ASIDES*) Both hon. members must take their seats. The hon. junior member for the City has risen on a point of order; just let me hear his point of order.

Mr. MILLER: It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not that I am infringing on your rights, but with the explanation relative to a point of order, you have given hon. members the opportunity to speak

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for Philip was speaking on a point of order; let me hear the hon. member's point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My point of order is this: the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that this Party in supporting the Governor's stand on the issue relative to the appointment of Aldermen, is in effect supporting the Mottley Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In so far as I am concerned, that is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am objecting to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is the first time that I have heard anything about the Mottley Party.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I heard the hon. member say so. (A MEMBER: He said the Conservative Party.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must take his seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let the hon member repeat what he said.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the Ministers has asked me to disregard the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To disregard me?

Mr. STRAUGHN: I can quite easily understand, and they are probably sorry that the visitors' gallery is so full today. (*Laughter*)

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am only rising to say that the hon. member cannot make any reference to the gallery during the course of his speech in the House.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I completely agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I was making reference to the members over there, the Official Opposition; I was saying that they are probably sorry that the gallery is so full. The hon. member says that he wants to know if I feel something. I speak in my blissful ignorance (*Cheers*) in answer to their exalted wisdom.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member carry on with the debate; let us keep to the debate.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I am glad that Your Honour is appealing to me because I see that you cannot appeal to the hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member may not know much about the Rules of this House, but let me tell him this; all of us on this side have already spoken and therefore the only other method we have of contradicting him is to rise on a point of order whenever he misquotes us.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I am not misquoting anybody; I am putting arguments against theirs. They are saying that the Democratic Labour Party is not worthy of any representation on any constitutional issue.

Mr. TUDOR: They on that side are not worthy of it.

Mr. STRAUGHN: When I have that on the regular political platform I will meet their twisted minds on this issue.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask that those words "twisted minds" be immediately withdrawn. However ignorant an hon. member may be, he cannot use those remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is objecting to those remarks.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I withdraw those remarks and I substitute for them the words "serpentine behaviour".

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I am asking that those remarks be withdrawn. We take them as being most offensive and unparliamentary.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I think that serpentine behaviour is a very apt description of the behaviour of people if they are mixed up in certain things. If they are so clever, I do not know whether I should withdraw remarks which commend them on their political cleverness.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I object to his use of the words "serpentine behaviour"; they cannot mean clever and indeed they do not mean clever. We take those remarks to be offensive and we are insisting that they be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As far as the use of the words "certain time" behaviour is concerned, I do not think that they are unparliamentary remarks. I do not see that there is anything unparliamentary in them.

Mr. TUDOR: The hon. member did not say "certain time" behaviour; he said "serpentine" behaviour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought the hon. member had said "certain time" behaviour.

Mr. TUDOR: No, Your Honour, he said "serpentine" behaviour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate your attempt to put the best construction, as you are bound to do, on what the hon. member has said; but Your Honour would not have heard what the hon. member said because of the noise which was taking place on the other side. We, on this side, distinctly heard the hon. member say "serpentine" behaviour which he interprets to mean clever. We do not take those words to mean clever; we consider them as being offensive and we insist on their being withdrawn.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has taken objection to that word.

Mr. STRAUGHN: I imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would easily be withdrawn and I wonder if they would object to the term "political meanderings"?

Mr. TUDOR: Has the hon. member withdrawn?

Mr. STRAUGHN: Sure. It is so much easier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to listen to everything that someone has to say and then you could be easily influenced one way or another, whether the arguments are good or bad; but when hon. members keep jumping up like jack-in-the-box, as some hon. member said, they can never get the particular point at issue.

Concluding my remarks, - and I mean this to be a strong conclusion- they as the official Opposition and as a political Party are unworthy of asking for representation on any constitutional delegation, and it is a pity that that has to be said in a Chamber, but if they have not shown themselves worthy enough to take on responsibility when responsibility should be taken. . . .

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member said that the Opposition has not shown that it is worthy to take on responsibility. It is easy for the hon. member to say that; but if he wants to give an appearance of responsibility, he should be able to buttress his comments with facts. It is not good enough merely to say that the Opposition has not shown itself responsible; let him give chapter and verse in substantiation of his comment. His remarks can only carry weight if in support of that contention, he can say they have not done so and so, they have done so and so and recite chapter and verse and point after point. What he is saying is mere wind and does not mean anything.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Has he finished with his point of order?

Mr. CRAWFORD: For now, until you make another foolish statement.

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

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

COMMITTEE RESUMES CONSIDERATION ON COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, when the suspension was taken, I was dealing with a speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was the then junior member for St. Peter, and that was on the 17th June, 1952. I just want to quote again. I will repeat for the benefit of this Committee what the member said on the salary revision when Dos Santos was made Commissioner to revise the salaries, and this point is in connection with his argument today that consideration should be given to the people at the bottom. In other words, he said that the money we have to spend should be spent on the people at the bottom and that people getting \$600 or \$800 a month should not be considered because the amount which was being given to them was so small. This is what the hon. member said at the time, and I am quoting, Sir, from the debates of this House of the 19th May, 1953 at page 68. This is what he said:-

"I will challenge the hon. senior member for St. John by saying he did not know what he was talking about when he made such reference on the representation of the Whitley Council which decided on this matter. I may say that the technique of running an organisation such as the Civil Service Association will differ from the running of a Trade Union. I have my own opinion on the working of a Civil Service Association, but I believe one of the tenets of the Barbados Civil Service Association is that you have a service which is tied from the top to the bottom; that is, if you have to give an increase to a certain group in the Service - say to a cantonnier and people in that group - you will have to give an increase to everybody in the Service."

That is what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said in 1953 when we were dealing with the salary increases recommended by Sir Errol Dos Santos, the Commissioner appointed for that purpose, and I quote that to show how inconsistent he is in so far as his policy regarding wages and conditions of service are concerned. He was a Trade Unionist and said that we must take the time from the Whitley Council, as that was the bargaining body. He was a member of it and therefore we must accept what they say as a matter of principle and policy. Now on this occasion he comes back and makes a complete somersault saying that if we only have so much to spend we should spend it on one group and forget the others. Frankly speaking, Sir, I know very well, if we had adopted that attitude, what the very member would have said. If we came here and said that the Whitley Council wanted something for everybody but we objected to it and have come down with this amount for those in the lower bracket, he would have said in no uncertain manner that we have ignored the Whitley Council. In other words, however the situation swings, it is on his side.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will continue to read what I was reading before the suspension. This is the debate on the Turner Report in 1952. This is what he said:-

"You will agree that the Adams Report forms the basis of unification for the future. I would agree with the hon. member if he had said there is no difficulty at all existing in the Service. Why should there be any difficulty when we have so liberally fixed these matters for the Heads? A certain Department is spending over a million dollars; are we going to allow that Department to fall into the hands of a layman? He might have the best intentions but he simply cannot manage it, and when you place a qualified man at the top you need an assistant who will deputise for him sometimes. I maintain that the British people from the point of view of their education and historical background still have something to offer us. They are more liberal than the people whom they educate. Many of these who have gone to them for education have returned here and criticised them."

Then he goes on and I will soon get to the most important part of this debate; but I have read that so that you can get a good graph of what he conveyed by this speech on that occasion.

4.35 p.m.

He said last year that the Civil Servants wanted a further cost of living allowance and we came to the House and asked for \$50,000 for that purpose. "Can any hon. member say we are not doing our best?" That is what the hon. member said on the last occasion. He said that we were doing our best when we brought a Resolution for \$50,000 giving a 15% increase or a cost of living allowance to persons right through the Civil Service. Today we come down with a Resolution for \$776,000 and to give 18.75% to the people in the lowest range and what is he saying now? He is saying that it is an insult and they should throw it back in our faces.

This is what he said then: "Can any hon. member say that we are not doing our best? I do not think any such charge could be made against us. We have stood up on many occasions for principles despite what the hon. member says, and thus it is that the people will have confidence in us." He was speaking then about his newly found, strange bedfellows now. Those were the people whom he was hitting at at the time. I remember well that whenever the hon. senior member for the City got up and accused the Government for being dishonest, his favourite phrase was "Have a little introspection."

I go on with what he said then: "And when I speak about confidence I mean confidence in one whom you can really trust. It has always been a pleasure of mine to be associated with men in whom I could have implicit confidence and *vice versa*". That is what he was telling members on this side. He was speaking of members of the Labour Party with whom he was associated at the time. He said it was always a pleasure of his to be associated with men in whom he could have implicit confidence and *vice versa*. That is what he said then when dealing with salaries which were similar to what we are dealing with today.

He went on: "I am associated with men in the Legislature because I have confidence in their political philosophy, and it is because I have confidence in their political philosophy that I remain in the Party. We can differ at times but I still have implicit confidence in them because we are working towards one common purpose and there is absolutely no reason why any member of this House should feel that any member of this Government would do something that he would not have done had he been in that hon. member's position." (Mr. WALCOTT: You are only fillbustering.) When you get face to face with what you used to say when you found yourself in a responsible position, you say that. When he was over on this side he was a member of this Party and, as I have said, his influence meant a lot. He was very disappointed when the former Premier did not make him Minister of Trade because he was self-satisfied that he was to be the logical successor to Sir Grantley Adams.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member is suffering from innate jealousy I cannot help. He is one of those ruthless people who would destroy the truth for a debating point. He said that I got on platforms and said that I was the logical successor to the Leader of the Labour Party. To put it at its lowest, do you think a man would be so egotistic as to get up on a public platform and make a statement like that? Only a fool would do something like that, one with a black mentality.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am accustomed to abuse and it just rolls off, as water off a duck's back. Did I say that?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, less than two minutes ago, he repeated that statement. When you get a man who has the effrontery to get up and say he did not say what he just said he is capable of doing anything. I would not say short of murder.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that I heard the hon. member say that on many occasions.

Mr. WALCOTT: He said he heard me say publicly. I am not afraid; it is not the first untruth I have heard him say about me. When I get up to reply I will give him in chronological order. He should be associated with Ananias.

Hon. M. E. COX: He has told the present Prime Minister of the West Indies from the same place the same thing. Again, I say, when you come face to face with statements you make on more responsible and sober occasions, that is the sort of thing you get. I know how he feels now. This is what he said.

Mr. WALCOTT: He should be associated with Ananias.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask the hon. senior member for St Peter to be calm and dignified. If you insist in preventing the Hon. Minister from speaking, I will have to name you.

Hon. M. E. COX: He cannot help being rude. This is what he said: "I am associated with men in the Legislature because I have confidence in their political philosophy that I remain in the Party. We can differ at times, but I still have implicit confidence in them because we are working towards one common purpose, and there is absolutely no reason why any member of this House should feel that any member of this Government would do something that he would not have done had he been in that honourable member's position."

He goes on:

"I hope the honourable senior member for St Thomas will see the necessity for these increased salaries that have been proposed here and the very good reasons that have been advanced in support of them."

Again he repeated:

"It was not my intention to have spoken so long on this matter, but I have felt that in fairness to myself as a member of the Whitley Council and as a trade unionist it was incumbent upon me that I should make a full exposition of the whole matter for the benefit of the general public. If we had done anything less it would have been unscientific; it would have given the Government more headaches and in the end it would not have solved the problem."

Sir, I am going to ask him one question. What has the Government done since he left it in January 1954 to cause him to lose that implicit confidence which he said he had in the Government? What wrong has the Government done since then which has caused him to get up and spearhead attacks on the Government whenever we have anything like this before us? That is the challenge which I throw out to him.

I happened to be in on all of these Ministerial questions. I appealed to the former Premier then to make him a Minister because I knew he wanted to be a Minister, not because of the fantastic statement that a Minister gets \$800 a month. No Minister gets \$800 a month. A Minister gets \$720 a month and \$200 of it goes to the Income Tax Department. If we had taken his advice, we would have come down with the Bill for \$50 for chauffeur allowance and travelling and because I said that \$50 would be sufficient for travelling allowance, he said that I was not accustomed to anything and that is why I said that. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. A man who will destroy the truth does that in order to suit himself. Now he is talking about an Executive matter (Hon. M. E. COX: Not necessarily.) He can only talk about the Ministerial position in relation to an Executive matter. I want to show that he is a relentless destroyer of the truth; I have never had any discussion with him in relation to anything which we should bring down to this House in relation to salaries. We have had discussions as to what the Ministers should be given as travelling allowance.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member has the right to reply when I have finished. It is not fair (Mr. WALCOTT: It is not fair for you to lie on another hon. member).

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

Mr. WALCOTT: You have threatened to name me, Mr. Chairman, but you cannot do that; no Chairman has any right to do that. No Chairman has any right to threaten or challenge any hon. member.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am going to read this for the benefit of the hon. member; he can look at the debates in 1954. On the 26th July, 1954, this is what he said:

"I accept the hon. Minister's answer because I have worked with him on the Executive for five years. During that time I have found him to be a man who would stand up for the truth. But I will say that although I have never found him to be a man who would indulge in lying, it may be that he has so much love for an individual, although he would not lie he would prefer to be what is known as 'neutral'."

Look in the debates of the House on the 26th July, 1954. That is the hon. member who has just got up and slandered me. He said that he had worked with me for five years on the Executive Committee, but he comes to this House of Assembly every now and again and what does he do? - He lies, slanders and does whatever else he likes to do. I accept that because I know that there are certain shortcomings with which one has to put up at times. I want to say that if you lack something when you are a child you will never get it when you are old. Let us examine the wages which are paid to people in private enterprise. As I have already mentioned, you hear a lot of noise kept by the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for Christ Church and I do not know if sometimes they do not really hang their heads in shame for the misleading statements....

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. Will the hon. member quote any misleading statement and the noise which I have made? My voice may be loud but I make points in debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: If they appear to be shedding the imaginary crocodile tears, do they care for one moment or consider the people who work for them and who have produced the wealth which gave them money so that they could buy estates and invest money in South Africa and other places which have no use for us? Have they ever considered these people in relation to the hundreds and thousands of dollars which they make in return to the Vestry every year? Today every voter has the opportunity and the privilege of going and seeing the returns which they make yearly. What do these people pay their employees? I want this matter clearly understood; I was not born in this House of Assembly; I came to this House as a poor man elected by the hard-pressed, down-trodden people. They now have the power in their hands at any time to say whom they want and whom they do not want to represent them; but as long as I have the opportunity to sit here, as long as God gives me health and strength, when any one of you, the people over there, tries to bring back these people into slavery, I will defend them.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, will you ask the hon. member to say whom he is referring to as "you"? The Hon. Minister should mention the name of the hon. member to whom he is referring and the constituency which he represents. Whom does he mean by "you"?

Hon. M. E. COX: I mean the Conservatives of this House aided and supported by the satellite Party called the D.L.P. Let us deal with some rates now. The present rates obtaining in the Government Service are as follows:- Female workers, 24 cents per hour; 44 to 48 hour working week. Private rates; 18 cents - 23 cents; you have not attempted to reach the Government yet but you will criti-

cise the Government although you are not doing as well as the Government. You cannot....

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. member to say to which hon. member he is referring. When he says "you" he means you, Mr. Chairman, in the same manner as "you" means the Speaker.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. George; the Hon. Minister has explained that he means the Conservative Party.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, do you know any Conservative Party in this House? You must stick to the debate and correct the hon. member. When he refers to "you", he is really referring to the mouthpiece of this Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to tell the hon. member who is supposed to be a Parliamentarian of some years' standing, if he does not know it, that when an hon. member says "you", he is referring to the Chair. May I offer an apology, Sir, for not saying "Mr. Chairman" instead of saying "you"? I am apologising to you, Sir, not to the hon. member.

4.55 p.m.

Now, Sir, the lowest paid category in Government gets 24 cents per hour while in private enterprise it is 18 cents and a few in the top bracket gets 23 cents. The employers have it in their hands to do more; they do not have to come on the floor of the House, keep noise and waste our time. They can increase if they want to, and I know that they can, because I have seen returns to the Vestry and they make hundreds of thousands of dollars every year.

The lowest paid male employees in Government get 30 cents an hour and with private enterprise get 25 cents, which is still 5 cents below ours; cantonniers and lorry loaders get 31 cents with Government while private enterprise pays 30 cents; gardeners in the Government Service are being paid 31 cents an hour and privately 20 cents. Government porters get a minimum of 31 cents an hour and private enterprise pays 17 cents. The lowest paid lorry drivers with Government get 36 cents an hour, private enterprise pays 22 cents an hour. The lowest paid painters in Government receive 30 cents an hour, private enterprise pays 31 cents an hour. The lowest paid mechanics in Government get 40 cents an hour, private enterprise pays 30 cents an hour. Carpenters in Government receive 40 cents an hour, private enterprise pays 34 cents an hour. Masons in Government get 40 cents an hour, private enterprise pays 34 cents an hour. Plumbers in Government receive 40 cents an hour, private enterprise pays 34 cents an hour. Watchmen, district foremen get \$17.28 a week and the highest \$25.92 with Government, private enterprise pays 60 cents an hour.

Now, Sir, let us look at the category of shop assistants in Bridgetown - a very burning question. How in the name of Heaven these ladies are able to walk the street so well-dressed and getting \$7 and \$8 a week, only God in heaven knows! As I mentioned last week, we had to set up a Wages Council for these clerks and shop assistants, and the Union tried to get \$15 a week for them, but the employers stood at \$12 and they had a compromise at \$13.50 which is still less than what cantonniers get. These are the wages in Broad Street; the lowest \$12 a week, the highest \$25 a week for males, and for females the lowest \$10 and the highest \$15 a week. In Swan Street, the lowest a male receives is \$9 and the highest \$15 a week, the lowest a female gets is \$7 and the highest \$14 a week. That does not start to get near what Government pays to Clerks; besides, there is no pension. The only thing these people can get is two weeks' holiday with pay which this Government had to fight for hours in this House of Assembly for against big business, and do not forget that when it went to the Other Place they threw it out; they said it would come in God's good time. Those are the people hiding between them, masquerading and misleading people, no doubt with the hope, as you always hear, of taking over the Government.

In Roebuck Street, a counter-assistant gets \$10 and \$18 a week as males, and females \$8 and the highest \$14. I need not even mention that at these various stores these men on bicycles have to go through rain, wind and water pushing tons of goods all up to Navy Gardens, Top Rock, Maxwell, Jackson and St. James without having anything which automatically carries them along, and they only get \$8 and \$10 a week.

Now, Sir, there are oven men getting 39 cents an hour, table hands 31 cents an hour, van drivers 24 cents an hour. If you take a comparison with a van driver who gets 34 cents and the highest 33 cents, you will see that in the Government car and lorry drivers Grade B get 31¢ by 1 to 35¢ an hour and Grade A 36 cents to 42 cents an hour. I just want you to follow the trend of the argument. Now you have counter clerks in private enterprise in Bridgetown and the cost of living is rising all the time and they get \$7 and the highest \$15 a week; cashiers at some places - a disgraceful shame - get \$8 a week; labellers 9 cents an hour, bottlers \$3.75 a week and the highest \$5.65.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on *ad infinitum* calling out these various rates which are being paid. At places like the Cinema a man gets 29 cents an hour, cashiers \$4 a week and the highest \$10 a week, caretakers 17 cents an hour and the highest 33 cents, ticket collectors \$14 a week, cleaners 14 cents an hour and the highest 16 cents. Butlers get \$12 and the highest \$17 a week; bell boys \$7 and the highest \$13 a week; bartenders \$15 and the highest \$24 a week; cooks \$22 and the highest \$25 a week; waiters \$12 and the highest \$17 a week; storekeepers \$15 a week; gardeners \$8 and the highest \$12.50 a week.

5.05 p.m.

I have some others here. I would not worry to call the name of the particular firm but the people there are only getting 19 cents an hour. Then you come to people like fitters who are getting as little as 27 cents per hour in a particular undertaking here. The women get between 15 cents and 30 cents an hour and some boys get 17 cents an hour.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have some more rates here in various undertakings which are just as low as those which I have mentioned already. Laundries, for example, are only paying 15 cents an hour to the people who work there. Our gardener gets 31 cents an hour. You get them paying out as low as 17 cents per hour in a particular undertaking.

Now, you come to the printing trade. I mentioned here the other night while I was speaking on this question that there are technicians who get as low as 17 cents per hour. The hon. senior member for St. Philip got up and squarely attacked me on that point, but I am accustomed to that. He has done it on many occasions but it has not changed one hair on my head. Abuse is no substitute for argument. Let them abuse while we do something concrete. As I was saying, Sir, when it comes to printers, binders and pressmen, in the C class, they get 16 cents an hour, the highest gets 33 cents per hour. When we add this increase of 4 1/2 cents per hour to the cantonment he will be getting 35 1/2 cents per hour; therefore, you can see that he will be getting more than technicians at these printeries. You get guillotine operators working for 26 cents per hour, bookbinders (women) get between 15 cents and the highest 31 cents per hour; collectors 31 cents per hour.

I said then, and I will go further and say now, that I was not sorry that the hon. member attacked me because since then I have got further information which I can tell this Committee. Now, there are men who are working at these printeries who get as low as \$2.50 a week and some who are getting that are doing as long as ten years' service. A man at a particular plant is getting \$6 a week. These are the wages which I am saying should be not paid and although I have not seen the actual payment to these people, I can bring chapter to prove.

Now, you get the telephone people who are paid 31 cents per hour and you get the people at the Electric Company who until quite recently were getting as low as 25 cents per hour. Only a couple of weeks ago, the Bar-

bados Workers' Union has effected successful negotiations for an increase for these workers. I know what they asked for as an increase, but this is what I also know too, that the 25 cents per hour man was able to get as far as 30 cents per hour. The Union has not yet been able to get a figure for these workers over and above the Government figure for the same type of workers. This means that people at that company who used to draw \$11.70 per week, by the increase they have got will draw \$13.75 a week. That same type of man in the Government will be drawing \$15.72 per week when this increase is effected and along with that is entitled to pension and gratuity. At these other places, these poor unfortunate people have to work and when it comes to the evening of their days, they get no pension. They work for so little that they are not able to put by anything for those days and sooner or later they find themselves going into town cap in hand and worshipping people, begging them for a little pittance to keep body and soul together. At one of these same undertakings - the Electric Company - the workers got a general increase of three cents per hour but they increased the man who was getting 25 cents per hour to 30 cents per hour. Even with that increase, he is still behind the times.

Now, there is another undertaking which pays 23 cents to 25 1/4 cents per hour. The Office Messenger gets 23 cents per hour but there are some workers at this same undertaking who get as low as 16 cents per hour. Our Office Messenger goes from 31 cents to 35 cents an hour. These undertakings have not begun to get near to Government yet in so far as paying their workers. I must repeat at every stage, this. How can anyone believe that they are genuine and sincerely interested in increasing the wages of the people who work in the Government who do similar work to people whom they employ when their employees are lagging so far behind those of the Government? These people in private industries do not need anybody to prod them into giving an increase; they can go home now and decide to give their workers more.

I am glad that the people are here because I think it is going to serve a useful purpose. I am glad the Democratic Labour Party are opponents to this Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I understand members of one Party invited the people to come to the House today. I do not know if he thinks it is our Party.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I wish more people would come to the House and listen, because the newspapers give such a distorted and twisted version of matters which go on in here. If we get this House packed to capacity every week, I am sure that somebody would be sorry. I understand that it was the Lower Green Meeting last week which caused them to come here. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter said that we invited them, which means that you invited them. He substantiated what I always say, that is, that the two of them together - the Conservatives and the D.L.P. - form what can be imagined as a coalition which works hand in hand against the Government.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I know it is useless denying all of these things as soon as they are said because you will have nothing else to do; but it is strange that our Party should be accused by him. It is also strange that he should be accusing members of the other Party of not paying their own people when his Party has the power to make them do it, and the fact that they would not do it makes them more closely associated with that other Party.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, that is not a point of order. 5.15 p.m.

The hon. member is only interrupting me; we are in Committee and he can speak when I am finished. What is the good of having a Trade Union? The Government does not want to assume the functions of the Trade Union; there is no dictatorship in this country. We were drawing up the terms of reference for the purpose of enquiring into the sugar industry and what did the hon. senior member for St. Peter say? "Hands off, we do not want you to interfere with any wages here; we have to get together with the employers and discuss wages." It is not for the Government

to do that; we come in where the Union fails. The Union failed sometime in 1958 to reach agreement as to the reaping of canes and the Government had to come in and settle the matter; again the Union failed to get better wages for the shop assistants, and so on, and the Government had to set up Wages Councils for the purpose of meeting the deficiency where the Union was concerned. We do not come in until the Union has failed. I am quoting these figures in order to show you that you cannot take seriously the statements which are made by the people in the industry, people who come to you and tell you things just for cheap political propaganda, cheap praise and things of that sort. Some of my people were silly enough to say: "Oh! Mr. So and So really wanted to give us more, but the Minister of Trade opposed it."

What have they got to give? They do not give of their own pockets. I read sometime ago where one man said to another: "I always feel for the poor" and the other fellow asked: "Do you really feel for the poor? Do you feel in the right place? Do you feel in your pocket?" That is where you feel for the poor. Mr. Chairman, they are willing to give away what they have not got, but what they have got they are not giving the poor. I also found lots of figures dealing with increases for lightermen, men at the Barbados Foundry and men all around. I regret that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is not in his seat and I sincerely hope he will come into the Committee before I am finished. During the crop last year the Agricultural workers got an *ad hoc* bonus of 7%; this year the field workers got for the crop year the same amount, not an increase on the 7% which they had last year. What they got is the basic salary and the *ad hoc* bonus consolidated. The factory worker who got 7% last year or the man who worked for as much as \$600 this year, gets a 4% and that gives him \$24.00, but if he goes over by one or two dollars he gets less in proportion than what he got last year. I listened to a meeting which was held in Hillaby on the night before the voting for the Bye-election took place, and I heard the hon. senior member for St. Philip say that he and his Party were not prepared to allow one cane to be cut until they were satisfied that the price paid for canes this year was good and reasonable and that they had a substantial and reasonable increase.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order.....

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is becoming a nuisance; why is he interrupting me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Anyhow, he is speaking on a point of order.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I want to say that my colleague did not, and could not have said that our Party was prepared to prevent the reaping of the sugar crop this year for whatever purpose, because my colleague and our Party have no influence or power (ASIDES)...

Hon. M. E. COX: He is a successful failure.

Mr. TUDOR: He cannot make me sit down; I am replying to his slanders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. TUDOR: No, I am not, because I have not yet made my point. What my colleague said was that so far as our opinion and ideas went on the matter, we would advise all workers in the Sugar industry not to begin the crop until satisfactory arrangements were made for them. That is very different from saying that we were not allowing the canes to be reaped. We know that he is fond of distorting speeches and then accusing himself of not being a chameleon lizard.

Hon. M. E. COX: Nobody told me what I said; we had a meeting just a few yards away. I said that the hon. senior member for St. Philip made those remarks, not the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew was hanging around too. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Philip say that it was his Party which

caused this big strike and it was his Party which made the workers get a 7% increase. He went further and said that he was not prepared to allow the peasants to send one cane to the factory until they got a substantial increase on the year's price. That is what I heard.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. My colleague is not here and I could not allow such a wicked and untruthful statement to go unchallenged.
5.25 p.m.

He did not say that he would not allow the peasants to send their canes to the factories; that would have been nonsensical on the face of it. Equally he said that he was not advising them to do it before they heard about the sugar price.

Hon. M. E. COX: You will get near the truth one of these days.

Mr. TUDOR: You cannot get to it at all.

Hon. M. E. COX: People know better than that. We used to listen to you and read a lot of what you used to say. What I said just now, Mr. Chairman, is Gospel truth, and I know that many people who were present can bear me out. All I am saying is that his Party did not make any noise and therefore we have to conclude that they were satisfied with the rates of wages that were paid for this crop. That is the conclusion I have drawn because they said they were going to make all that noise and not allow one cane to be cut or allow the peasants to send their canes to the factories until they knew it was a substantial increase. I was saying that the Union also carried on negotiations with stevedores, steamship warehouse porters and tally clerks. What was the position? The member can correct me if I make a mistake; there was a three cent an hour increase; there was also a 5% increase for lightermen. Again I repeat the Government is paying an 18.75% increase to the man at the bottom.

Now, Sir, we go further and get to the Foundries. There was a 4 cent an hour increase for one section, 3 cents an hour increase for another and a penny increase for another, and this is how it works; the man at the bottom who is getting 36 cents an hour will get a penny, the man a little higher up will get three cents and the man at the top will get 4 cents. We run this country and we will run it until the people say they do not want us to run it.

Now let us take the field workers with whom the hon. senior member for St. George is intimately connected. I have here some averages for pay. During the month of January, the average wage of an A class man is \$9.40 a week, in February it is \$15, March \$17, April \$11, May \$14, June \$15, July \$10, August \$11, September \$11.18, October \$10.64, November \$10.27 and December \$10.07. There is no security of office and no pension, and I think they get the holiday with pay. Now, Sir, for women, it is \$7.20, \$11, \$12, \$8, \$10, \$11, \$7, \$7, \$6, \$6, \$6.7, \$9, and it goes right through like that. Those are the average wages which are being paid to these people, and if you look at some of the districts, you can see the disparity between these wages. Between January and June they pay as low as \$12.98 a week. It is true that it is geared on the number of days, which roughly is 3.98 per week.

Now I do not want to speak at any greater length. I know that I will have to reply at a later stage to some of the attacks that will be made upon me, and as I said earlier, I am not afraid. I know that in so far as these recommendations are concerned, the Opposition is surprised to see what the Government has brought down because they did not expect us to bring so much, because the most we have ever brought to the House is a 4 cents increase. I remember when I came to this House in 1944 that cantonmiers were getting 10/- per week and the Conservatives who sat on the Committee recommended 1/- more per week. I only say this to remind hon. members, including the hon. senior member for St. Peter, that there is not a single member of this House who has ever fought more valiantly and assiduously for increased wages and better conditions for the workers in the Government in particular as I have, and I

say that without fear of contradiction. (Mr. WALCOTT: I fought against them!) We fought together. I remember in 1946 when the Estimates were put before this House, I went through them carefully and discovered that the Government at the time - the Conservative Government - was spending more on forage for one police horse than it was paying to a postman and it is in the records of the House for anybody to read. I understand that that had Sir Grattan Bushe very upset because it was published by accident in the paper that a police horse was getting more than a postman with a family.
5.35 p.m.

I pointed out that they were spending more for forage on a police horse than what a postman was getting. That was done by the Conservative Government of that day. I aired that on the floor of the House. I am sure that nobody can accuse me of not trying my best for the poor people from whom I have sprung. I challenge anybody to say that I have ever opposed anything for the increase of wages for poor people; rather than oppose anything, I initiated things. We have been attacked for what we consider to be the best in the interest of the poor people. As I have said here last week, the Opposition said that it is their duty to oppose and to embarrass the Government, and that is what they are doing. They are only opposing and embarrassing the Government; they are not doing anything constructive. If you had brought down anything giving these people \$1 an hour, the Opposition would say: "Oh no, make it \$1.50".

Mr. Chairman, it is my duty as one of the members, and one of the foundation members of this Party, the Party which has brought the working-class people out of the mire and dirt of oppression, to remind this Committee that this is the Party which has brought the people to the position where they can claim self-respect from their employers; this is the Party which has put them in the position in industry where employers can no longer regard these employees as mere cogs in the machine of industry and this is the Party which has put them in the position where they have the right to sit down around a table and barter with their employers for better wages and better conditions of work. We have done that and we have done it in the days when there was no pay for us, when there was no money paid to members of the House; and, no doubt, we were just as starving as the people whom we represented. Today, what do you find? Because it has so happened that we are able to draw a little money from the Treasury to make sure of our meals and to put us in the position where we cannot be bought, you find this jealousy, grudge, maliciousness and nastiness whenever the time comes that we are doing anything to help these people. You find them doing everything degrading; you find them vilifying us, abusing us and lying on us and for what? They are only doing it to get into office. Let me tell you here and now, you can get in without that. Sir, that is being done morning, noon and night because they are hungry to get in office. Some of these members have already stated that they will do it at any price. They say that the price of democracy is too dear and, therefore, it is time that you should revert to the trenches and fire in the trenches. They are saying "the people are still with you, no matter how we lie on you and all that we slander you."

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I would like the Hon. Minister to explain what he means when he says "they". I have never lied on any member. I want this debate kept on a proper level. "They" can mean me. I have not said so and I will not have the Hon. Minister to slander me like that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I was not referring to the hon. member; I was referring to the opponents of our Party. I am very glad to hear that he has not done it. "Thank God, I am not like other men!" I am glad to hear it. Perhaps, I should go as far as to say that I wish some of the others would take a leaf out of his book. Today, you will find all of that happening in Ghana and all of those places which are fighting to throw off the yoke of imperialism and the yoke of oppression. You find some of the same people conspiring to kill the people in Government and doing every sort of thing against them. Quite recently, the Leaders of the

Opposition Party in Ghana attempted to assassinate the man who went to prison for them and who was elected while he was in prison. (A VOICE: That has nothing to do with this debate.) The hon. member cannot tell me what to say. Sir, I am saying that the poor man went to prison for the cause of freeing himself and the people from the yoke of slavery under British Imperialism and he was elected while in prison. An honest, faithful and sincere man, he succeeded in freeing those people; but yet you find people like himself organising and conspiring among themselves against him. In this place, they are trying to do a similar thing as is being done in Ghana and other parts of the world, where people are trying to free the subjects. Just to get into office, we are subjected to the vilest and nastiest lies and slander from time to time - I will almost say day in and day out. Sometimes I hear things which by no stretch of the imagination would I dream I would be accused of, and all because no man can buy me out. Indeed, if I die for starvation I challenge any of them to do that! My father used to walk with his head in the air and never knew what was on the ground; I walk in like manner because I do not pamper to the whim and fancies of people.

Sir, I can hold my head high up; they cannot refer to me as any stooge. This is something which I feel very strongly about and I am sure the Hon. Premier would not mind my saying it. I am the person who suggested to him sometime ago that these people in the lower brackets of the service were working hard and were suffering, and I thought that the time had come when we should do something for them. The idea came from me. I am not boasting now of it. Now that we are doing our best to help these poor people, you get these malicious people getting between them and trying to distort the facts, trying to twist things in order that they should get into power. When they get into power, what are they going to do? Would they pay more wages? Sir, we have the devil's own job when we bring Resolutions or Bill in here for income tax. They get up and fight against income tax and say that the Company's tax is too high. I have seen some of their returns and they are very handsome indeed. I will say that I have not seen them lately. These people are strongly opposed to paying good wages because they want to make sure that their unborn generations are able to come on the scene and to continue to exploit the underprivileged of this country and all the other countries.

5.45 p.m.

That is a set and fixed policy among themselves and I would be an enemy to this cause of the people for whom I have done everything I could possibly do in order to raise the standard of living in this country - I would be an enemy if I sat quietly and allowed anything like intimidation or threats to prevent me from speaking fearlessly for the people from whom I have sprung. I never expected that this debate would have taken such a turn; I know the reason, or one of the reasons, why it has taken such a turn, but I will not mention it at this stage. It does not help the workers when they lose confidence in an organisation which has been working for them for all of these years and hang on to a few people who want to get rich overnight and who feel that I should not draw the salary which I am drawing. If you were to take my salary and divide it up among a lot of people, they could not get one cent each. We try to establish something on a sound foundation for a few generations to come; that is what we have been doing and what we shall continue to do whether inside or outside of this House. Do not let anybody fool himself; if I were not a member of this House I would not be the type of man whom they could buy over; I am not for sale. If I am even disappointed, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, in not having been made a Minister, I would stick behind this old flag. It is a selfish attitude that if you do not make me the top man or the boss I will destroy everything; you cannot get anywhere with that mentality.

I appealed to the Premier at the time because I saw that a lot of trouble was coming and I told the Premier: "For God's sake do not leave out Mr. So and So because you will have no end of trouble." I saw that, but the Premier at the time, poor fellow, could not see it. You have now an imaginary split between the Labour Party and the Barbados Workers' Union who have been working hand in hand for years in

order to achieve what we have achieved today. What you find now is that people are hanging on to the Conservatives and the Conservatives know that they dare not come out as they used to do; but they are taking one and putting him against the other.

I have already pointed out that we have budgeted, as you will see from the Estimates, for a surplus of \$574,981 and when this Resolution and other Resolutions come before this House and are passed during the financial year, we will have a deficit of \$800,000. We have already provided for income tax relief in this present year; you also have to remember that we have the Deep Water Harbour under construction, we have a Secondary Modern School under construction, we have the Hospital under construction; and whenever all of these projects are finished, we have to look for staff and the staff is not of a Capital nature but of a recurrent nature. All of these things are things which we have planned to do and which we are doing. I know that the Opposition will oppose, yet I thought that there would have been some measure of soberness; but perhaps I was hoping against hope when we came to discuss this question.

Before I sit down, I would like to appeal to those who will benefit from this Resolution; I would like them to realise that in the present circumstances, the Government has done what it considers it could do within the limit of the financial resources of the island. I appeal to them not to be used as tools and pawns in any political game for the Opposition. The Civil Service Association discussed this matter and went into it very carefully; the Government also went into the matter very carefully and decided that we could not do anything more in the present circumstances. It is quite easy for one to say: "You have a few thousand dollars put down." If we had followed the Opposition saying that we have levied so much taxation and if we had not put by something, when we had the hurricane in 1955 we would have been in a terrible position. As far as Jamaica is concerned, it took them three years before they could make a start with rehabilitation, but we were in a very good position within a year of the hurricane.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few figures (Mr. DOWDING: More figures again?) And I have very many more too; I am only giving one half of the figures I have this afternoon. These figures are from Trinidad, figures which we were able to get recently. You will find that Trinidad has a revenue of approximately \$190 million. It has oil, industries and everything, but we have not got such things. Very soon from now I feel that we will have three fairly substantial industries established in this island. We are establishing a brewery and recently we have had someone coming in to engage in the building of pleasure yachts; and there is yet another scheme which we hope to put into being pretty soon. We know that we can only pay increased wages when we have increased production. I want to say that this island is not getting any bigger; it is getting smaller. The greater number of people who are born every year, the more the revenue has to be divided among them. I have some rates here from Trinidad; I regret that I have not got the figures as to the people in the lower categories like the unskilled people, people who are cantoniers and people of that type; but, Sir, the Foreman of Works and Hydraulics in Trinidad gets something like \$5.36 a day and if he passes an efficiency bar he goes as high as \$7.28 a day.

5.55 p.m.

Now if you compare that with what our Overseer gets, or if you look at the Junior Road Overseer, you will see that he gets a maximum of \$4.12 a day, and the least our Overseer gets is \$2,016 per year and our Grade 1 gets \$2,880 which is far above what is being paid in Trinidad.

I regret, Sir, that I have not got the lower rates, but I have been made to understand that in Trinidad an unskilled man still gets below \$3 a day; I understand it is around \$2.88. In British Guiana up to the end of November, 1958, an unskilled man got \$2.52 per day, a skilled man got from \$3.94 to \$4.98 and a semi-skilled man got \$3.63 to \$4.59 per day. When you compare these wages with what we pay here, you will see that they compare very favourably and ours in some respects are higher; therefore it

could not be said, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, that this can be regarded as something which should be thrown back, or rather something which is an insult to people.

Mr. Chairman, I regret due to unforeseen circumstances that I will be absent for a short time. I say that because I do not want the Opposition to feel that after I have spoken I have left without waiting to hear what they have to say, although I can anticipate what they have to say; but I feel in the circumstances, as I mentioned earlier, that we have done our very best. We could not ignore the claims of those at the top because this is not strictly speaking a revision of salary; it is a cost of living allowance, and the argument must and can be used that if the cost of living has risen for those at the bottom, equally so it has risen for those at the top and in the middle. The only difference is where we should stop.

Again, I repeat, I feel this Government has done its best under the circumstances, and I hope that members will not turn their direction to the Gallery but will be statesmanlike, because this has never happened before. We have had criticism but not the sort of virulent criticism that emanated from the mouths and bellies of the Opposition. I hope, Sir, that with those remarks, members will see that the Government has made a genuine effort to assist its servants and those at the bottom in particular.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member seems to have been afraid to reach the end of his long recital, and now that he has finished his recital he has informed us that he is going to a Cocktail Party. (Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that at all.) I, too, would have liked to have gone to a funeral because an old friend of mine has passed to the Great Beyond, but I considered that he was dead already and I could not stop him from dying, and therefore I remained here because it is good for me to be here.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's long recital was mainly on me because he read passages of my speech. He said he is an honest and an upright man; he walks with his head upright, but I cannot say how Ananias walked. I know, Mr. Chairman, that you are going to get ready to knock the gavel. I have heard the most slanderous statements made by the Hon. Minister today, and in the end he turned around and said that other people had made slanderous statements of him, and in his long statements and nasty remarks he broke all the Parliamentary Rules with pleasure. I believe he is going to get back from the Cocktail Party and find me here; so I only want to attune your mind for the sort of thing to which you have to look forward. This debate will go on.

Now the hon. member gave a recital and the only thing he did not give a recital on was my birth. By innuendo he mentioned that people like me cannot be otherwise. Well I do not have to make any apology for how I was born, because I love how I was born, I love myself and I love my parents. Some of us have a better relationship than others and some of us have a better way of living than others. Some of us are not fortunate to have the right union and we therefore get these temporary aberrations.

I should like to say that he has associated me with the Opposition and the Conservatives, but it is very convenient for the hon. member to say that when it suits him, and that I spearhead the attack of the Conservatives. He says that because he is echoing the statement he made on a public platform where it could not be denied; and when he refers to this villainous Opposition and that I go around with them, and when he says that they are satellites and I am associated with them, I am going to deal with him piece by piece.

6.05 p.m.

I am glad the Hon. Premier is in his place to let you see what kind of man I am. He is echoing Sir Grantley's statement. Sir Grantley was astonished over the respect which I gave him but received the shock of his life when I stood up to him like a man and refused to be pushed around by him. The Hon. Minister said that I was a grievous man

because I was not made a Minister, and because I failed to be a lackey and got on my feet and told Sir Grantley what I thought of him. I am not a loafer; therefore, I would not find myself on the Government bench. I would have been there, but I never intended to be a lackey for anyone; I intend to work for my living until I die.

Now, in 1953, before Ministerial Government came into being, it would surprise you to know that the same hon. member came to me to persuade me to accept a Ministry and I told the same hon. member that when you accept a Ministry you give up your whole means of earning a livelihood, because if the people ever put you out of the House, where stand you? Do you know what his reply was to me? He said: "You need not be afraid of that; the people will always support you." The Hon. Premier came to my House in 1953, before Ministerial system came into operation and asked me to accept a Ministry. Far from that, I told him that I was going to resign from the Party because I did not like the methods of Sir Grantley Adams. My wife was sitting in the same room and the Hon. Premier told me that it was not the best thing to do. How can you say that a man who, a month prior to the Ministerial system coming into operation, wanted to resign voluntarily because he did not understand what the then Premier was doing is a man who was aggrieved because he wanted to be a Minister and was not made one? Because one wants to twist you around and to turn you into a little boy and because you would not be turned around and you stand up to them like a man, they are shocked; and because they are not prepared for the shock, they do these things.

I have listened to all the meanderings of members of the Government. They thought that the break between Sir Grantley and myself was something for them to get on a platform and put to the people in St. Peter against me, but they found out that the people of St. Peter rallied around me despite that type of slander which they wanted to use. The Hon. Minister talks of being a Party man. I have always worked for my living. He also talks of when he entered politics. I challenge him, comparing my age with his, to say that he entered politics before me. See if he can compare with my early beginning in the cause in which I believe. I have been a Socialist from the time I entered political life, and have remained so; and this mention which he tries to bring about of my association with the Conservatives and people of the ruling class, as he has done when speaking at meetings at Porey Spring and places like that, are things which he knows are not true and things which he is not in a position to defend. He starts off with that sort of speech to make people believe that anything he says in relation to the debate goes back to 1954. I was not a Minister then. What members of the Government do not understand is that I am a man, if money mattered to me, who would be a loafer. They can see that in the teeth of subversive actions even in the Trade Union, it has not caused me to falter because I do not believe in the philosophy that you must bow to wrong in order to succeed.

The Hon. Minister talks about a seat in here. A seat in here is only a medium whereby I can do something for people in a different way from what I can do elsewhere. Some people do not regard a seat in here as a medium; they regard it as an honour and it epitomises all the grandeur of all their existence. I am not like them to look at those things. I think I have a few years before me. He also says that I am hanging on to the side of the Conservatives. I would say that the Hon. Minister is a ruthless and relentless distortionist; he has absolutely no respect for the truth. He would say anything against an opponent if in so doing he feels he is making a debating point. He is so relentless in that, that you can see only a man with a morbid, perverted and perverse mentality persisting in that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Trade is not in his place. I am not going to defend the Hon. Minister in his absence but I rise in defence of parliamentary institutions and parliamentary debating standards. The words used by the hon. member have been ruled unparliamentary by the Speaker. Members on this side on many occasions have been forced to withdraw them. We have been forced to withdraw such words as "perverted

mentality," "no respecter for the truth." I do not think that it is fair that the hon. member should be allowed to use those words in a debate of this sort and the hon. member can do better than that, I am sure.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am surprised at the Hon. Minister for Communications. He sat through this debate and heard the Hon. Minister of Trade speak for close on three hours. What the Hon. Minister has not called me during his speech is a gentleman.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I rise on a point of order. I have not sat through this debate. If I had heard my colleague saying any such thing, I would say that you had every right to say that my colleague is wrong and that he should withdraw such remarks. As I have said, I have heard a member to say "untruth" and the Speaker said that that was unparliamentary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would withdraw any unparliamentary statement but what I said is this. Hon. members on that side heard the Hon. Minister of Trade talking about lies, nastiness, maliciousness, slanders and all the invectives you can think of - the worst things you can say about a man. The Hon. Minister dragged up all that sort of thing. He went to the extent of calling an hon. member a perjurer. As the Hon. Minister of Communications has said, his colleague is not here; so I will accept his advice and will use parliamentary language. I say that any man who persists in saying something which he knows is not true, we can only say that a man like that possesses a morbid mentality. I do not think the Speaker has ruled 'morbid mentality' out of order. That means a sick mind. A healthy mind would not give effect to that. Such a man is suffering from morbidity. I say that, because in this debate I do not think I have to defend myself in Barbados or in the West Indies or internationally, because people in all those parts know that I stand up at all times for the betterment of the standard of living for all people. I stand up for the betterment of living for all people, and in particular the working-class people and people in the lower income groups.

6.15 p.m.

By innuendo the hon. member suggested that in 1956 when we were dealing with salaries - and I remember that debate. There was the Salaries Commissioner, Mr. Godsall, and even before the Godsall Report was published, the Government brought down a Resolution, and out of the Godsall Report they picked out that Resolution for the increase of the salary of the Chief Justice of this island. There was a long debate on that Resolution. Then in 1956 I stood here from my seat - I believe it is the same seat which I am now occupying - and I said that I considered \$15.00 a week the minimum wage for any unskilled man at that time. The Elections took place in 1956; I printed the things which I supported and sent to all the Electorate and I told them what I stood for - a minimum wage of \$15 a week, greater security for people who work, more industrialisation - there were ten specific points which I mentioned and sent to the Electorate of St. Peter. In the teeth of opposition to me by the Labour Party I was re-elected a member of this Chamber. Can you say to me now that the people have not given me the right to say that I regard this wage of \$15 a week as a minimum wage? Now the Hon. Minister is accusing me of hanging on to the Conservatives on the basis of making the position embarrassing to the Government.

Let us look at this question - and this is why I said the hon. member's mind is sick. The hon. member mentioned something in the debate in 1956, and in this debate he has repeated it. The hon. member refers to a letter from the Union, and when he speaks about the Union he speaks of it as if I am opposed to the back-pay and he was saying that instead of giving the people four cents an hour I recommended a penny an hour. I do not have to defend that. It was explained to him by the Speaker because I was out of the island at the time; and out of the discussion which they had, it was drawn to my attention that Mr. Godsall had sent some rates of pay to the Union asking the Union if those rates were the rates of pay in existence. The Union must have answered in the affirmative; but the Union as a Union could not make any recommendation on behalf of

Government employees, because we are not the accredited representatives of Government servants. Therefore, we could not send to the Government and tell the Government what we wanted for these people. It would be unscientific for us to say that the Trade Union did these things because we could not represent these people. I take the blame for things which the Union does and with which I do not agree. With a membership of 16,000 or 17,000 people, you could not possibly expect that everything you want done could be done; that could not work because we are in a democracy. But the members opposite want to remove me from this seat; I want to say that my seat in the Labour Party is more worry to them than their seats in the Government are to me. They would prefer to see the hon. senior member for St. George in this seat rather than see me in it although they talk about the Conservatives.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. It may save a lot of rancour if I just let the hon. member know that it is a fact - I believe that the hon. member was out of the island - that when we were discussing these wages, we enquired in so far as the Key Scale workers were concerned from whom they were taking advice. A letter was shown us from the Union making recommendations. We felt that the amount was not enough, and we went higher than that. Since the debate last Tuesday we have been told that the Union had put up these recommendations and I believe that these wages would have been consolidated; instead of an increase on the basic rates the amount would have been consolidated on top of that. That is the explanation, but that was not told us at the time; that is what we were told after the debate last Tuesday. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Why did he not correct it today?) It is a fact that we felt the wage was a bit low, but the consolidation was not explained to us at the time.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the hon. member for that information; but the reason why I said what I have said is that the Hon. Minister repeated that argument some three or four times; he repeated it on the last occasion and again today. I was the most surprised man when I heard the Hon. Minister make that statement in the House, and he was making it not as a challenge to the Union, but as a challenge to me, that I had made this recommendation in the Union and now I am getting on the floor of this House saying that it was not the recommendation which the Union had made. What the Hon. Minister has now said was stated. I asked: "What authority do you have to make recommendations on behalf of people whom you do not represent? You have never had any discussions with these people and how can you make a recommendation to the Government for them?" 6.25 p.m.

Their reply was that they were not asked to make a recommendation, but this query was asked and they were more or less putting something which they considered they would have asked private employers, because at that time, Mr. Chairman, the Union itself had been asking private employers for a minimum wage of \$15 a week wherever we began to negotiate; so it would be ludicrous to ask Government for less than what we were asking of private employers. Now I say that because the Hon. Minister of Trade attempted throughout this debate to show that I was a man who was inconsistent with my former views. He read the debates, but they did not prove anything. What I believe is worrying the hon. member is that we had a debate here, and the other members unwittingly, not realising that the Government had sent down a Bill in 1949 to provide for peaceful picketing on the same basis as the one which I brought here, felt that I was trying to pull a fast one on them, and the hon. member made one of the most reactionary speeches that any Minister could make, and then to his great surprise I read back the 1949 debate in which he held an entirely opposite view and in which he also made an attack on the hon. senior member for the City; so the hon. member would be on the defensive in that it was a Trade Union Bill in which you had a precedent, and not a matter of opinion as to whether you believed in this sort of thing.

But what do you find? On that occasion the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the Minister of Trade, was making a speech supporting the views of the Conservatives

10 years ago on a Trade Union matter, and yet he is saying that he did all these things for the workers. He wants to get even with me because I read back his debate of 1949, and he is worrying his mind to find a debate in which he can get even. I remember on that occasion that he told one of the clerks that he had all these facts and that he would paint me, but his painting was like whitewash. When I got up he was subdued and the members of the Labour Party voted against a Bill in which the Labour Party had a settled policy and in which they believed before 1948. I can understand that he is trying to get even.

His other worry, Mr. Chairman, is that he made another statement when in this debate he said that he was at Hillaby and heard the hon. senior member for St. Philip speaking about this present crop; but you will remember that in another debate he said that I, as a Trade Unionist, got on a public platform and said that, had it not for the hon. member for St. John, the workers last year would not have got any money. That is why I say that a man is possessed with a sick mentality if he can say these things. He knows that they are not true, but he is repeating them because he feels that they would have some effect on the audience. When he made that statement about me, he was trying his best to discredit me and he was going to do it by any means. When he used the statement on the Ministerial basis, he thought it was good, and right through this debate you will find that it is not a question of these wages but more a question of associating me with people who have no intention of paying better wages.

Let us take an analysis of what he said. He read out the wages of the people at the *Advocate*; he is now today asking us to look at the wages which the *Advocate* is paying, but in 1956 when I was in the vanguard of one of the biggest strikes in Barbados in which I was going against the *Advocate* for higher wages for workers, you would be surprised to know that on an election platform in Queen's Park, just before the eve of the Federal Elections, one of the biggest slanderous statements to which I could not reply was made against me to the effect that had it not been for them, the workers at the *Advocate* would have been starving. At that time he was using something against me on a political platform because the workers went on strike, but now he is asking us to compare the wages at the *Advocate* with what Government is paying.

If you do not understand Trade Unionism, it is not my business to lecture to you; but if you cannot get an employer to agree around a table, the last and most potent weapon which you possess is the idea of withdrawing your labour, because if a man can do with the withdrawal of labour, he can do without your time. It would be a monkey Union if it is afraid to go on strike on the question of low wages. Today he is saying that the wages are low, but in 1956 he said that it was done for political purposes and not on the question of wages. When he wants an audience, he goes down in the Market to his lackeys because he has a market mentality; but I am a man who does not like to look for people to lap up what I say; I like to deal with people who are my equals and otherwise in order to get equality in an intellectual discussion. When he went to his lackeys, he said that it was done for political purposes; but today he is saying that the wages at the *Advocate* are low and in 1956 when we were in the vanguard his attitude was to thwart the efforts of the Union. The attitude then was that whatever could be done to discredit Frank Walcott would be done so that he would fall in the eyes of the workers. The whole thing is based on this seat which I hold in the House of Assembly; you would not believe it; and he said that he is not for sale. Do you know, if a poor man like me who has been in Parliament for 15 years was for sale, how much land I could have got already in the sugar industry? If I were for sale, look how many underhand methods there are! The hon. member on a public platform said that he is not for sale, but I challenge any of them to tell me.....

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order, I would like the hon. member to say to whom he is referring when he refers to "them", because he may be referring to hon. members around this table.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member wants me to be specific, I would say people like the hon. member for St. George. He is a sugar industrialist and I am opposed to him. I believe I said some memorable words of him in 1951, because I said that he would not get back in here even if it was to bring a message, and at that time, he did not get back in. That was the time when the hon. junior member for St. John was in the vanguard. You would believe that when the Hon. Minister was in the vanguard fighting for somebody that I was somewhere in the backyard. You would not believe that in 1944 the same hon. member was running a campaign that the workers wanted me to run, because they felt I was a poor, and up-and-coming young man; but I did not give my support for an old waistcoat. He had nothing to offer but I took two weeks from my job to campaign for them and it was not done on a basis of being paid, because the Party had no money, but were calling for people. The present Premier said that he did not know me. Ask the present Premier if he did not tell my wife when he was Churchwarden of the parish of St. Michael that he had heard some of the Conservatives talking about me because I had been to the Chamber of Commerce and put a case before them, but he did not know who the person was and he inquired of Mr. Hugh Springer.

6.35 p.m.

Now, this is the same man who said that I wanted to be some Conservative. As the Hon. Premier said, in those days I was in a 'two by four' store, but I had enough principle and integrity as not to sell myself to the people who had a 'ten by eight' store. I supported the Barbados Labour Party and fought for the members of it through thick and thin. I was one of their foremost platform speakers, and now you are going to tell me that I am hanging on to the Conservatives. If I did not hang on to the Conservatives when I was an unknown quantity, tell me why, at this stage of my life when I should be making a profession for my child, I would attempt to do something so that my child would say that I started in politics one way and now I am doing something else now. I do not think I have too long to live because I have mashed up the heart too long. I am not the sober type of man. It is no point your telling me that I am a man who is hanging on to people as a means of keeping other people down.

The Hon. Minister talked about other things. I do not borrow anybody's money; I can walk through the whole of Barbados now. I do not have any overdraft at the bank. The only business I do with the bank is on behalf of the Barbados Workers' Union. We will borrow money as we have done to put up a building; but when we do that, I go overseas and borrow it. They say that a man like me could not be in this impecunious circumstance and still in politics; but when it comes to that, I am an honest man and I do not have to tell people in Barbados about that.

When the Hon. Minister made an analysis of wages, I was wondering whom he was really dealing with because he is so glib in these things. He is superficial. He thinks, if a Permanent Secretary makes a statement to him, that all is right. He told me on one occasion that if I had been to a secondary school, they could not hold me with a basket. He possesses the mentality that you can only know something if you have been to a secondary school. He is a man who suffers from the mentality that if a man from a University tells him, "I am gone", he would believe that is right. I do not belong to that school. I feel that, no matter what is the ability of the other man, so long as he is dealing with something of which I have knowledge, I can deal with it too. Of course, if you talk of technical things I will not be able to deal with them in that way. I am not a doctor; but if I go to a doctor and I tell him that my foot is hurting me and he tells me that it is my head I will disagree with him. He could not tell me that, but I could not tell the doctor what medicine to prescribe for my foot.

Again, Sir, the Hon. Minister gets confused about wages and percentages. Imagine a third standard boy who would not be able to do this sum. "If you gave an increase of \$2 to two people, one of them getting \$10 a week and the other getting \$100 a week, what is the percentage you gave to each?" They are bound to be different percentages. There

is absolutely no necessity to say: "Do you know that the percentage which we give to those in the lower bracket is higher than that which we gave to people in the higher bracket?" That is quite obvious. If you are giving a fixed increase to everybody, the man at the bottom who is only getting \$10 a week must get a higher percentage than the man who is getting \$100. That is a simple thing. You do not use percentage as a criterion for determining the wage. You have decided on a fixed increase for everybody. The man who gets paid by the week is getting \$2.08 more per week. The man who is working by the month is being given an increase of \$108 per annum. What is the difference between \$2.08 a week and \$108 per annum? There is no difference. You cannot calculate exactly the pay of the man who works by the day because you do not know how many days he may work in a week, but 4 1/2 cents per hour would give him something like 36 cents a day in case he is working an eight-hour day. On the basis of a 44-hour week, he would get \$2.08. On a basis of 45-hour week, he would get \$2.13. If you multiply \$2.08 by 52, the total comes to the same as what you are giving to the monthly paid workers, and that is why I say that the question of percentage does not arise. When I go forward and ask for an increase for workers, I say I want an increase of 5 cents an hour. The employer would go and look at his books and say that that increase of 5 cents would mean so much percentage added to the wages which he has to pay out.

Now, this is what the Governor said at the opening of the Session; this is not what I say. "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."

The Governor said that you were looking into the cost of living for the lower paid employees of the Government. I will begin to analyse what I said on the last occasion. You are saying that you are satisfied that people in the lower brackets are hard hit and you are going to deal with them. I said here - and I would repeat - that I considered that your method of giving a cost of living allowance is not a fair basis of arriving at the matter, because if you are dealing with a cost of living and you have arrived at a cost of living to be given to these people, what you are saying is that the man's present standards are okay, and you are only making up to keep him at the same place he was three years ago. I brought the example that if the man could only afford to have one pair of shoes, what you are doing is that he may retain the same one pair of shoes. This is not an increase to advance the standard of living; it is only an increase to deal with the question of cost of living.

6.45 p.m.

Now the hon. member read - and you would have thought that he was doing me something - from the debates in 1952, and he said that at that time I was supporting the Government in a Resolution that came down from the Turner Report. Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member should not have mentioned the Turner Report because, as he said then, the hon. Minister of Communications was not a member of the Government or of the Executive Committee, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was not a member of the Executive Committee either. The Premier was one of the members who sat on the Committee in connection with the Turner Report as a member of the Executive Committee. There was a lot of bitterness in the Party about the Turner Report; and when the Hon. Minister talked about the 1952 debate, that is the last which he should have mentioned. That Resolution was passed on the strength of the Conservatives; if the Conservatives had not voted for the Resolution, it would not have been passed. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew walked out of the House and did not remain to vote because she was vitally opposed to it. I want to show you how the Hon. Minister can distort the debates. He said that I initiated something; I do not expose Executive secrets, but there were certain people for whom the Premier did not agree there should be increases, and there was a division of opinion. There was a certain section in respect of which the Premier said that he was not in favour of giving any increases and he gave his reasons why. The Hon. Minister said that I said things

in Executive Committee which guided them, but he knows what the position was very well. If you talk about a man being jealous of another man, the Hon. Minister was more jealous of me than I could ever be of him, because when the present Premier and the former Premier were out of the island he asked that the Clerk call out his name so that he could introduce Papers and act as Leader of the House. On one occasion the Premier had to go to the Dominican Republic, and on another occasion there was the question of a visit to San Francisco in connection with Farm labour. The Premier said that I knew more of these matters than he so that he thought that I was the best person to go. Since I have been a member of the Executive Committee have I ever asked anybody to push me in certain positions? On one occasion there was a move in the Party to make the Premier the Vice-President of the Party and we had a caucus on that; the hon. member refused to accept the nomination but he wanted a vote on it. The Premier said: "Don't worry with that." Well, the Premier is a man who, if he sees that a fight is coming down, will say: "Don't worry with it" (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Because I do not like fighting for foolishness.) I was never a man who was worried about any position; I went into the Labour Party to work. I was not like the snappers nowadays who are looking for position. The Party did not have a motor car at the time and I used my bicycle; nobody gave me any travelling allowance. The Minister of Communications was opposed to the travelling allowance which was suggested. He felt that a travelling allowance of the amount which was mentioned was too high. We had a Party caucus down Culpepper deciding what the Ministers' salaries should be.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I hate my name being bandied about.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that when we were discussing the question of travelling allowance for Ministers you were opposed to the amount.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In which direction?

Mr. WALCOTT: You said that the amount was too high. I said that in the other Parties a more favourable travelling allowance was given, and I made a suggestion that Ministers should be treated in the same manner as Civil Servants would be treated in so far as loans towards cars to be paid back was concerned. Hon members did not agree with that. I ask, Why should I say something which I know was not the truth? In those days, in connection with Ministers the Party was discussing something in the vicinity of £1,000 a year. After Mr. Turner went to Jamaica and came back, the Premier can tell you that I asked him; "How could we come down to the House nibbling? You either have Ministers being paid or not." The hon. senior member for St. John said that you want your Ministry run on a proper basis. When Mr. Turner came back from Jamaica, there was a suggestion made of £1,500 a year. Sir Grantley Adams said things which were of the sort that people would believe. I had no discussion with the Premier and when I came back from Sweden he asked me to go and see Dr. Cummins; the Premier could not face me. I repeat; I had no discussion with the Premier; this is only to show you how you can have these things distorted.

I will repeat what I said. I am a Trade Unionist; and if the Government recognises the Civil Service Association, then you have to respect their views. If you look at the debates you will see that I said more than what the Hon. Minister repeated today. I said that the Government was pursuing a wrong policy in its wage structure for Government employees, because you are taking a man who is working by the hour, and the people who work for fixed wages and relating them to the other people in the community and putting them on a structure based on a man who is starting as a junior clerk and ending up as a senior clerk; but they are on a different basis of recruitment.

6.55 p.m.

You have the service so tied to that basis that as soon as you touch one, you must of necessity touch the others, and that is why you have this danger. If you increase the salary of a doctor at the Hospital, a Veterinary Surgeon or a Specialist Officer, the man at the bottom feels that

if the Government can give a man at the top \$100 a month more, it can also give him more because you have a structure in which all these people are tied. On one occasion I was trying to organise Government Servants here as in Trinidad, because in Trinidad the Union negotiates for the Civil Service. If you have a man digging up the road, you cannot give him the same conditions that exist in the Service, but you can leave the matter to be negotiated on its merits. There is no point in telling a man that because you are going to change the Chief Justice's salary you have of necessity to change his, because there may be different reasons to change his salary and not that of the Chief Justice.

When he read the debates of 1952 to show what I said then, Mr. Chairman, I will say again what I said in 1952, and it is that if the Civil Service has a Whitley Council, there is nothing wrong in meeting it. He talks about being inconsistent, but members of the Whitley Council told me that when this Resolution came down to the House they were not even treated with the courtesy of being told that the Government did not agree with them. If you go to an employer and he cannot meet your demands, he tells you that he cannot agree; but the Government did not tell them that, and they were surprised people to know that the Resolution had come down without being told by Government whether or not they agreed.

Now when you have a situation like that, Mr. Chairman, - and the hon. member read debates of long ago to show what I said then - I would repeat again today that if the Civil Service possesses a Whitley Council, you should meet them.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

On Resumption

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was formed.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was making the point on the suspension that the Hon. Minister of Trade in his long recital made out that I was supposed to be the arch-enemy of the Government spearheading the debate, and aligned me with those rapacious employers who try to keep the workers' wages down, but I drew the Committee's attention to the situation at the Advocate. He mentioned that the Advocate today is not paying wages like the Government, and in 1956 when there was a strike at the Advocate and a Commission was set up and no recommendation was made, he said that when the Union failed the Government did something. He forgets that the Arbitration Act has nothing to do with the Labour Party. The Arbitration Act is one which the Union passed long before the Labour Government was in power and it is modelled on Colonial Office Legislation which you will find in Timbucktoo, Basutoland, Switzerland, the Windward and Leeward Islands, Somaliland and anywhere in the British Empire. It is not due to the imagination of the Labour Government that you now have this legislation on the Statute Book, but it is something by which you can settle a labour dispute and even in cases where there is no dispute you can refer matters to Government.

At the Advocate the workers went on strike for more wages, but what was the situation? They were laughing at

us as if we were asking for something for ourselves. Now the hon. member spoke about the Foundry. He does not understand the rates at the Foundry. In the first year at the Foundry an improver gets 36 cents an hour and in the next year automatically goes to 42 cents an hour. The next year he passes a test and goes to 63 cents an hour; so the hon. member does not know anything about negotiations. When we began to negotiate, the situation was that in view of the fact that the man at the bottom was getting a penny increase to make his amount 38 cents an hour, it was all right because he only remained at that figure for a year, and therefore he automatically moved from 38 cents to 45 cents in the next year without negotiations with the Union, and so it went on to the top.

The hon. member said that we got 3 cents increase for waterfront workers and in some cases we got 5 cents; but he did not say that a stevedore gets \$6.16 a day, a tally clerk gets \$7 a day and a winchman gets more; so there is no point in comparing the increase which you are going to give to a man who is getting \$6 a day with that of a man who is getting 30 cents an hour.

7.50 p.m.

Quite obviously, if we go and increase the stevedores' wages by percentages, then the employers would come and say what are you going to do with the colony. I do not want to have a recital of the wages which we negotiated in 1946. Professor Shephard made a recommendation for 46 cents a ton. Today, after negotiations, wages are \$1.25 per ton which is nearly three times as much. The Government set up a Commission last year and the Commission made a recommendation for 1958 only; therefore, we had to negotiate for 1959. The Government did its best in 1959 to decry the Union in its efforts to get more money from people like the hon. senior member for St. George. Do you realise that the Hon. Minister of Labour was a valiant defender of those same employers on the last occasion? And the reason why that was so was because he was fighting against the hon. junior member for St. John getting a seat in the House of Assembly and, therefore, he praised the employers to the sky. He said we were trying to put this country in bankruptcy and were trying to destroy the economy of the country.

I am not responsible for his mathematics. He is comparing a Resolution in 1953 for \$50,000 with a Resolution in 1959 for \$776,000. He does not realise that in 1953 this country's expenditure was \$11 million while today it is \$21 million; therefore, when you get an expenditure which is something almost twice as much as what it was, then your expenditure today has no relation to what you expended in 1952. In short, you did not have the number of employees then that you have today; therefore, it means that if you multiply the same figure by the greater number the answer would be different. Today, if you give this same increase to the workers in 1952, do you think the figure would be more than \$50,000?

Mr. Chairman, some of us do injury to the educational system which you have in this island. I think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was in here when the Government budgeted for a surplus of \$577,000. Here is a classic example of the Government's fiscal policy. They bring in a Resolution for \$776,000 to pay these workers and they say that they have budgeted for a surplus of \$500,000; therefore, by this, that surplus has turned into a deficit. I say this: look, you budgeted for a surplus of \$555,000 last year and it turned out to be a surplus of 2 1/2 million.

The Hon. Minister talks about a hurricane. You cannot budget for a hurricane, a tidal wave or that sort of thing. If you begin to budget for anything like that, nobody would eat food. Those are disasters in which some people must come to your assistance. If every country had to budget for a disaster like that, you will have to tell people tomorrow you are going to die; therefore, budget for death. It is just like saying you have to get turn-outs for everybody; therefore, we must have sufficient money in the bank to bury everybody at one time.

I would like to say that the Government is a different employer from any other employer in the world. The Government of any country is a different employer altogether from any employer in that sector. Nobody else employs Civil Servants or Postmen. The type of employees which come under the Government is what you call a special employee. I have nothing against the Clerks in Bridgetown, but you will find that when Government makes such increases in its wages to its employees it acts as a fulcrum to other employers. They take it as an example; therefore the Government must always be the model employer. It cannot lag behind private investors. Then again, the Government gets its money from taxation. Why is it that Government servants get pensions? The idea of giving pensions to public servants is because of the maxim that if you are working for the public, you are entitled to the best conditions of service which the country can offer; but when you are working for a private firm or a private employer, you are working for him and him alone. Therefore, you try to evolve systems in a private sector to bear some relation to the Government sector. You require from one who works in the Government a General Certificate. You require a General Certificate from a boy before you give him \$80 a month; therefore, the boy who does not acquire the General Certificate, quite obviously, when he goes to work with a private employer, you will offer him less. If you are seeking for people with qualifications, therefore, the man who is not seeking for people with qualifications will pay a little less than you, and the people without qualifications will accept a position where they do not have to fight against the fellow with qualifications.

The Government has no policy. The Government has not set any example to make people say that the Government is paying high wages. The Government of Barbados in 1959 is patting itself on the back for paying out \$15 a week to people in the lower income bracket. When you divide \$15 by seven, you will have an idea of what amount of money that is. I am not talking any stupid talk. See what is the price for a pound of pork! See how much meat he can eat out of that. Salt fish which we regard as the lowest diet, see what is the price of that per pound. I do not know what are the prices of goods because I do not go in any shop to buy any, but I understand that salt fish is 54 cents per pound. Imagine, salt fish being sold at even 40 cents a pound. Would you say that the ordinary fish and float is the sort of diet you should eat all the time? That is the sort of diet which a man at the bottom is eating now. You cannot tell me that you are justified in paying a man something which you regard as the minimum standard of life. Let us use our imaginations and ask ourselves this simple question. If we had \$15 to live on and to support a wife, let us see where we would begin. I am sure the Hon. Premier would not know where to start. I am not asking Ministers to draw \$15 a week; I am only asking the Ministers how they regard the living standard of people who are living on \$15 a week. Do you believe that a man should look for a wife? Do you mean to say that a wife is a luxury? I do not believe that God meant that you should have a wife only when you work for a certain amount of money. Here in Barbados you have a lot of people who are working for less than \$15 a week. Do you expect a man can support a family out of that?

8.00 p.m.

How do you expect a man to support that kind of family? By all means the employers are paying low wages but you should not satisfy yourself by telling the hon. senior member for St. George that because when I deal with him I do not get any support from the people on the other side. The Union does not fail because we will go on strike if we do not get more money, but the Government feels that we should not go on strike; they want to prove that Frank Walcott is wrong. In 1956 when we asked for a 25% increase they laughed at us, but it turned out that we got an increase of 12 1/2%. The same Minister of Trade was persistent on a platform and the Minister of Agriculture was asking the people to work. When it comes to wages, no hon. member on this side of the House has been in the vanguard fighting for wages more so than I have been doing for the last fifteen years. I have just come from the Taxi-cab Company;

there we have people for whom we want a minimum wage of \$20.00 a week. We have men at the Shell Oil Company getting \$30.00 a week for driving the petroleum lorries; and we do not regard that wage as the maximum either. We have an agreement running for two years, not for three years.

Here I am asking: why are you giving a cost of living allowance to a man who is getting 30 cents an hour, and you give him 30 cents an hour as a basic wage and 4 1/2 cents as a cost of living allowance? This man gets 30 cents an hour and when he goes on vacation, the cost of living allowance goes by the board. Why are you giving a cantonier the same thing which you regard an officer like the Chief Justice should get? We intend to give a cost of living in the lower brackets and the reason why we are doing that is because the cost of living in so far as the lower brackets are concerned, hits them more so than those in the higher brackets. I say that as to the question of dealing with people in the higher brackets, those people can wait for a general revision when you are revising the salaries. I do not deal with wages within such a wide structure. If the hon. Minister knew what he was talking about, he would realise that in the private sector he can deal with as high a rank as the Governor. The structure which you can lay down for one is not the same which you can lay down for the other. The Hon. Minister has read out what I said in 1952 and you were having a complete salary revision at that time; you cannot have a complete salary revision for the whole Service and say that you are only dealing with cantonniers; you would have to have a complete salary revision.

Now when it comes to the question of giving a cost of living allowance and the Government was dealing with the people in the lower brackets, I took them at their word. This is my view; the Chief Justice and the people in the higher brackets could wait until you have a salaries revision because I am saying that before the ink is dry on this amount of money, the people at the top are going to come to you and press you for a salary revision; the type of officer who is at the top is not going to accept this \$9 a month as anything equating to a salary increase. If you were revising the salaries of the Ministers, do you think that any Minister would accept a revision of salary amounting to a \$9 a month increase? Are you making fun? You are giving a man \$700 or \$800 or \$12,000 and you give him a cost of living allowance of \$9 a month! Is it like a car number 1209? (Laughter.) I say that if you cannot revise these salaries by at least \$200 a month, then you should not worry; you cannot revise these salaries on the basis of any \$9 a month. They have to wait on such parities until they absorb all the things at the bottom. The wife of a poor man goes at the shop twice a day, but the man who has the money, his wife buys as much by way of groceries as will last for a week. He has a refrigerator; the poor people buy their tea every morning and they go to the shop every day and they cook every day; and if they are short of money there is no cooking either: You will understand that the man who has the money gives his wife money so that she can buy items by the week. When you come to the people in the higher brackets, I am saying that this \$776,000 which you are now providing might have provided greater satisfaction if used by a different method; I say that with due respect to the Whitley Council. If you say that you have met that Council - and I am not saying that you should reject them out of hand; what I am saying is that if you have met the Whitley Council and it was your intention to pay a cost of living to the people in the lower income groups, I would say that I regard what I have to do for them requires a cost of living allowance, I would say that a cost of living allowance will do for them now and I will review the salaries of other people at a later date. 8.10 p.m.

You see, Mr. Chairman, the service requires splitting in two. You need to put key scale people in one bracket to be negotiated for on a different basis from the man who enters the service and can rise to be a Head of Department. What I would like to point out to the Premier and his Ministers is that now that you are giving an increase of 4 1/2 cents to a man who gets 30 cents an hour, you have the opportunity now - and there is no law, neither

is there anything sacrosanct to say that you must make this a cost of living allowance. You should make that a basic wage and not a cost of living allowance, because if a man goes on holiday he is not going to get that cost of living, and if he dies it would be taken out. There is no war on; so you should not talk about a cost of living. This should be regarded as an increase in salary because you are satisfied that a man cannot live on the wages he gets and therefore you should not deprive him of an increase in wages. Even the Holiday with Pay Act says that you can only pay a man on his basic wages; so what are you going to do when these fellows go on holiday? Are you going to pay them 30 cents or are you going to include the 4 1/2 cents?

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, the Minister concerned has left and I think I have discharged my obligation. He said that people made slanderous statements against him, but he made many about me. He said that I made the statement publicly that I was to be the successor of Sir Grantley Adams. I believe he is my Siamese twin so that wherever I turn he is behind me, because he can get up and say something I never thought of. He said that I was a member of the Electors Association when he was fighting for the people and sat down and smiled. I do not know how you feel, Mr. Chairman, but when you read the Old Testament and see the things that used to happen to people like Ananias and Sapphira, you wonder if they should not happen now. If you could only get some of the Old Testament happenings taking place today, you would be able to know because he can more be associated with that category.

The other point which I want to make concerns the Sugar Industry. Why make any point about the Sugar Industry when they brought a man to help? They brought a man here by the name of Mr. McKenzie with whom I will deal, because if the Union goes by Mr. McKenzie we would freeze wages forever. He said on the one hand that the cane growers were getting enough money and the employers themselves could not pay out more; but I will deal with that debate when I come to it.

On this matter of cost of living allowance, I have said already that I do not see that the Government can be justified now in giving any cantonnier or any of these people in the key scale a cost of living allowance because anything you give to these people should be regarded as a basic wage.

Finally, on the question of the minimum of \$15 a week which I made in 1956, I am still of the opinion that that \$15 in 1956 did not bear the same relation as it bears in 1959, and that is why I favour \$18 a week now which is nothing extraordinary to any poor man. I would say to the Premier that one of the best things you can do in this community is to prime the pump for higher wages, because I can tell you that the sugar industry is going to come in for a gradual diminution of labour. I know that there are a few factories which are going to close down - the Belle, Sandy Lane, Gibbons, Guinea and a few others - and therefore you should not think that the gradual diminution of factories is going to increase wages; and until you prime the pump for those who remain to get decent wages, it is going to be very difficult for those who work.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words. I am not replying to any remarks that might have been made in connection with this debate except that I want to correct the hon. member who has just sat down when he referred to the occasion when I saw him at his house. I do not get into any acrimonious debates, but I want to make this correction. The hon. member said that I saw him in connection with coaxing him to accept a Ministry.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, let me repeat what I said. I said that I saw you in 1953 when you came to my home and my wife was present, and I told you that I had no desire to continue, because I had a clash with the then Premier and I was going to resign from the Executive Com-

mitee and you were persuading me that it was not the best thing to do.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am sorry; that is all right.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that we have listened for some time to speeches, but today we have had a harangue from the Government side on this Resolution. It is unfortunate that the Minister is not in his place, I mean the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour.

During the entire harangue, I was told that in my absence nothing was said pointedly about me as a member, but I suppose I can safely say that the innuendos made in respect of Conservatives and persons who do not hold Socialist views, or at least persons who are not members of the Government, were that they are enemies of the people, and therefore I am to be included among those people. Well, I never worry about what the hon. member says; I only worry about what happens with the Ballot boxes; therefore I am not going to get into the row which was actually taking place, because we have listened for the past few weeks to what actually transpired with the hon. senior member for St. Peter who was in Government, before the hon. member was a Minister, and when there was a scramble for Ministries. We have listened to when they had meetings at Bathsheba, at Culpepper and when salaries were being fixed, and I wonder myself if I could with any conscience say that I would like to be a Socialist. 8.00 p.m.

I really could not; therefore, I am going to deal with the Resolution. We have not much time tonight now to deal with it because we have only ten minutes more and I cannot finish my speech in ten minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in simple words, I am going to condemn the Government for this. Here is a Resolution as to what they consider is a cost of living bonus. Let me ask them, is any war on? What is the idea of granting a cost of living bonus? I cannot understand why it should be a cost of living bonus. I speak as a Conservative; I have never apologised for it. I can masquerade as a Socialist; but I have no intention of doing it, and the time is not far distant when some people will see the difference of those people who are really masquerading.

This is a cost of living bonus of \$9 per month for everybody in the Government Service. Now, it is either right or wrong and public opinion must judge it. The Government of Barbados, and more especially the Hon. Leader of this House, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, feels that he cannot be removed and that he is there for life, until death. Nobody can remove him. Let him enjoy that opinion.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have never heard the Hon. Minister to say that. He never said that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: My hon. friend is really losing time. He is really not listening to what I said. Did I say he said that? Are you beginning to think for him? We have different political views but I have always found you to be a sensible man. I said that the Hon. Leader of this House has the feeling; I did not say he said so.

Now, this Resolution has to be like this despite even those backbenchers who have been fighting against it, even despite some of the Ministers who have been fighting him and saying that it is wrong, and despite the fact that there is a disagreement among the members of the Government that \$9 per month for the Chief Justice of Barbados down to the gardener is not the right thing.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I want to categorically deny that there has been any difference amongst members of the Cabinet or even backbenchers as regards this cost of living allowance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the Hon. Premier now saying that no members of that Party disagreed with the action of the Government that \$9 for the Chief Justice and \$9 for his gardener is the correct thing? Is the Hon. Premier saying that I am telling an absolute untruth and that there is absolute agreement between members of the Government Party on this question of \$9 per month for cost of living for the Chief Justice down to the gardener? I have not said anything of the Cabinet because it seems to me that the tail is wagging the dog.

The speech of the Hon. Minister of Trade reminds me of the story of chaining a monkey within easy reach of a piano so that he can use his paws to play it and after a while he can play the Doxology on it. Apparently, some people think that to come in here and recite what somebody said years ago or what has happened years ago justifies their position for doing something. I am not going to deal with the Hon. Minister's idea of the percentages because that is his idea of it; but what I am going to deal with is this. It is clear that the four or five gentlemen responsible for formulating not the policy but for putting these figures up to the Cabinet (and let the Hon. Premier deny this) could not have had the interest and the general welfare of the Civil Servants or the island at heart. Unlike the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I am saying that not in Barbados alone, but all over the world the standard of wages is set by the Government in power. Whatever wages the Government of Barbados might set, people employing people usually ask the question; "what is the Government paying?"

The comparison which the Hon. Minister of Trade have been making about what the Conservatives have done, what the hon. senior member for St. George has done and what the hon. junior member for Christ Church is doing is so stupid. He has not made any reference to me but I am going to include myself. We are three Conservative members in this House, as opposed to what I would call the left wing Socialists in the Opposition, and may I say the right wing Socialists of the Government. This is not the sort of comparison you should make. What I am saying is: is this the policy of the Government? Did the Cabinet sit down and agree to this? These are questions which you must answer and with which you must face the public of Barbados despite how very snug and how very safe and settled you all feel in your seats, and that you cannot be removed and despite the fact that that is the feeling being given to you by the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour.

Mr. Chairman, who on earth can argue that \$9 a month for the Chief Justice down to the gardener is the correct thing?

It now being 8.30 o'clock, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to Mr. SPEAKER, who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

8.30 p.m.

THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, in fixing the Order Paper, Order No. 2 becomes Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you do that, I am going to ask if there is any Unopposed Business. *(A pause)*

There being no Unopposed Business, the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any desire for a change in the Order Paper under Private Members' Business?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, there is no proposed change in respect of the Order Paper, but may I say that we hope that certain arrangements in respect of the admission of people to this gallery as has happened today where there were cases of discrimination which came to my knowledge, I hope, will not recur next Tuesday. The Police allowed certain people of Caucasian appear-

ance to pass, having previously refused admission to other people on the ground that there was no room to people of African complexion. I hope that that will not happen next Tuesday.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the Police

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow any debate on that matter.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I do not think it is fair to the Police

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a matter for any debate.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The people of Caucasian appearance did not come in here.

Mr. TUDOR: The Hon. Minister was not there and therefore he does not know the facts.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I thought it was Your Honour's ruling that there should not be any debate on this matter. (A MEMBER: You want to debate it.) Surely the Police are worthy of a defence.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 2nd June, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 2nd June, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.40 p.m.