
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd May, 1961.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. StA. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

Messrs CORBIN, BRYAN, BRANCKER and GODDARD entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings which were held on the 18th and 25th February, 1961 respectively, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, those Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended the 28th February, 1961, this year.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Local Government (Pensions) Regulations, 1961.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the Quarter ended 31st December, 1960.

Barbados Statistical Service - Quarterly Digest of Statistics, No. 17 - March, 1961.

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators. February, 1961.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Governments of Barbados, and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the Provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 31st December, 1960, in respect of schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Customs Duties (Materials for the Manufacture of Livestock Feeds) Order, 1961.

The Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) Regulations, 1961.

Report of the Public Utilities Board for the year 1960.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay a statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to the 31st March, 1961.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay a Statement from the Barbados General Agricultural Society regarding the appropriation of the Legislative Grant for the year, 1960.

PETITIONS

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists praying the House to pass a Bill to amend the Leeward Islands Conference of Seventh Day Adventists (Incorporation) Act whereby the Conference shall be known as "The East Caribbean Conference of Seventh Day Adventists." The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

I also beg to present a Petition from the Pharmaceutical Society of Barbados praying the House to pass a Bill incorporating the Society under the name of "The Barbados Pharmaceutical Society", granting to the Society all powers and authorities necessary to enable the Society to carry out the purposes for which it has been created and established.

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.
12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$9,200 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1961-62 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1961-62 No. I, which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

367

not responsible for the non-circulation of any document of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is right. I am responsible for that.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is only a matter of courtesy. The hon. member does not understand the meaning of an apology. He thinks that because he is not responsible for the sending out of the Order Paper he can propose to have something done for which he is taking the responsibility. The hon. member has to make an apology to hon. members, which would be an appeal to them to the effect that the reasons being such and such for dealing with this matter, we should consider it. But bombast does not deal with any matter. If the hon. member really wanted this matter to be dealt with as the first Order of the Day - I might say it has happened that Order Papers had not been sent out and the Government made an apology to hon. members for not having their Order Papers. An appeal was made to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that that Chapter has been closed. I do not think that the hon. member should proceed with it.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier has mentioned to me that it was his intention to have this matter done in view of other matters, and he was appealing to me in order to see if I would be prepared to withdraw my objection. That is why I was going to appeal to Your Honour that if you would permit the withdrawal of my objection based on what the Premier has said - because the Premier was more amenable and courteous in this matter than the hon. member who has said something about benefits, as if I am looking for sick benefits. The hon. member's manner will not get him anywhere. This matter is purely a matter for Your Honour. I have raised my objection on a matter of principle. It is not a matter of pinpricking anybody. I would be quite prepared to withdraw my objection to the matter, but the matter is one for Your Honour to deal with. 12.55 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to the hon. member who has just sat down that the amendment to this Bill is rather urgent. First of all, as you know, most of us will be leaving the island at the end of the week; but, beside that, the City Council will be facilitated by the passing of this amendment. I do appeal to the hon. member to withdraw his objection and let us proceed with the passing of this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think, Sir, that the matter does not entirely end there. Speaking for the Opposition, we regard this amendment as an undue interference by the Other Place.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this stage. Is the hon. member objecting?

Mr. CRAWFORD: We are only giving you early notice that we intend to consider the matter on the ground that it is unconstitutional.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this stage. There is no objection at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Do you mean to dealing with it? How can you deal with a matter which you cannot deal with, constitutionally speaking? The point is this, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage I can only deal with the objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We are objecting not because we refuse to consider the suggestion made by the Premier, but because we regard the entire amendment as unconstitutional.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member objecting to the amendment being taken now?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I must make it perfectly clear. We appreciate the reasons for immediately

dealing with the matter as suggested by the Premier, but we regard the amendment as such a violation of fundamental constitutional principle that we must have a copy of it to see that our objection is based on appropriate grounds.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member insists on having a copy, he is now opposing the suggestion of taking it now. Since there is a single objection, it may not be taken now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If I may be permitted at this stage....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is another objector. The hon. senior member for St. Peter withdrew his objection, but the hon. senior member for St. Philip has now made another objection.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want at this stage to make my position abundantly clear in case the members of the Government feel it matters to me whether it is dealt with. I am suggesting that in view of the fact that they have to go away, it is not a question of dealing with it now, but dealing with it today. In other words, the amendment will only take five minutes to be circulated amongst hon. members of the House, and I am suggesting to Your Honour that instead of hon. members taking objection to dealing with it today, objection be taken to dealing with it as the first Order of the Day, so that with Your Honour's permission, it can be dealt with later today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The objection so far as dealing with it is for taking it as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The objection is that it be not taken as the first Order of the Day, but be taken later on. Since we have been speaking, the matter is so small that it could have been circulated to hon. members. As to the constitutional propriety of it, that is a different matter altogether. I do not agree with the hon. member who suggested that constitutional propriety should be brought in; there are two separate and distinct questions altogether; but I suggest to hon. members of the Opposition that it can be dealt with later today.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter for the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the members of the Government adopt the reasonable attitude of the Premier and not try to emulate the bombastic attitude of ex-members of this House without having the necessary qualification and brains of the ex-members of this House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Since objection has been made, such leave will not be granted to take the Order as the first Order of the Day.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACT, 1891.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to resume Committee on a Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On the last occasion when this Bill was being considered, the House was in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I leave the Chair, I just want to make these remarks to hon. members of this House. During the discussion which has just ended, an hon. member on the Government side of the House made use of a remark and I know it was intended for me. It was a matter which is not now under consideration by this House. That remark I know was intended to bring nothing but insult to the Chair; it was an aside which contained words like these: "I am nothing to do with it, because somebody is afraid of an election." That is a most uncalled-for remark. That hon. member I would have so named. It seems to me as though an hon. member does not understand what is meant by "naming"; I will now tell him. Any hon. member of the House of Assembly may be named; there is no Rule or Standing Order of the House which says that back-benchers can be named only. There is no such Rule in any Parliament I have ever heard of - naming hon. members who are disorderly especially to the Chair. When the time comes, the Rules may be revised which exclude certain

members of this House, but that time has not yet come. I hope the time will soon come when the occupier of the Chair will not hear and receive insulting remarks made to him as has been the case made to him this day. By naming an hon. member, the hon member's name is called; in other words, he is not the hon. member for Saint Anything; he is now Mr. Brown. That simple procedure is naming an hon. member; that and nothing else.

The House will now resume Committee.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, there are certain money Resolutions which the Leader of the House, if he were in his place, would have asked permission to deal with first. One is the Resolution for \$9,200 which was circulated; that is urgent, Sir, because this is money which the Government is seeking permission to obtain from the Legislature in order to get a Salaries Commissioner, and that is why we asked that it be circulated and be passed through all its stages today. The Hon. Minister of Education also has one which is urgent; so in order that these Resolutions be dealt with, I am going to move that Committee of Supply be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

1.05 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the two money Resolutions - one for \$9,200 and the other for \$1,925.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1961-62, NO. 1

SALARIES REVISION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, as I indicated earlier, this amount of \$9,200 is sought to pay the salary and other expenses of a Salaries Commissioner. I think the House is very well informed about this matter. Hon. members know that early in the year the Government did make a decision to consider the increasing of salaries of Civil Servants.

We had a little difficulty in obtaining this person. At first, the Civil Service Association felt that this matter should be dealt with by members of the Civil Service Association and representatives of the Government; but for one or two reasons the Government did not agree with that suggestion, the principal reason being that the senior Civil Servants who should take part in an exercise of this sort did not have the time. At that time, we were considering the Estimates and then we had to prepare to go to Trinidad to the Inter-Governmental Conference. After that, we were taken up with producing the next Five-Year Plan.

That was one reason why the Government was unable to accede to the request of the Civil Servants. We then tried to get a gentleman from Jamaica who is an experienced man but he was not available; he could not come. We then asked the Federal Government, the Government of Jamaica and the Government of Trinidad whether they could help us with a suitable person and after many weeks had passed, they replied that unfortunately they could not help us. We then had to turn to the United Kingdom and the Colonial Office recommended a Mr. Jacobs, who I understand, is a know-

ledgeable man. I understand that he was the Financial Secretary of Sierra Leone and within recent times he conducted a salaries revision in Trinidad. This gentleman has agreed to come and this is a breakdown of the money which we are requesting on his behalf:-

(i) Fee to the Salaries Commissioner	
\$960 per month for 3 1/2 months	\$3,360
(ii) Hotel accommodation	
\$16 per day for 105 days	1,680
(iii) Subsistence allowance	
\$7.20 per day for 105 days	756
(iv) Official car	525
(v) Passage expenses.	1,300
(vi) Contingencies	1,579
	<u>\$9,200</u>

With regard to his coming to the island and the likelihood of the date, we were unable to pin him down to the date until we had this money passed but his date is soon after the 15th June. After this money is passed we will make a strong effort to get him to come as early as possible.

His terms of reference are as follows:-

"To examine the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees and to make recommendations having regard to -

- (i) the economy of the Island;
- (ii) the need to recruit and retain suitably qualified administrative, professional and technical officers;
- (iii) the need to maintain an efficient and contented public service;
- (iv) any other relevant considerations."

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, we on this side of the Table possibly are more anxious than the Government to review the remuneration of all public officers and Government's employees with a view to giving substantial increases where necessary. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, you will recall from the very first year of this legislative session, my Party has been endeavouring to have a salaries revision especially of the Unestablished Staff of the Government Service.

But really, Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the hon. Introducer of this Resolution cannot bear any scrutiny. We agree with the submission of the Civil Service Association that this is a matter which could have been attended to on a local level without resorting to bringing anyone from outside. It is an absolute waste of public money to bring a Salaries Commissioner here for the proposed period of 105 days to conduct this investigation. Whenever he comes, Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen is that the Minister of Finance on behalf of the Government will present to him the financial position of the country and will tell him what proportion of the increase our resources can sustain and he is going to prepare his report along the lines of that information.

1.15 p.m.

It is either laziness, indifference or passing the buck on the part of the Government to bring down a Salaries Commissioner at this stage and for this reason. It is an absolute waste of time and money. The Civil Servants are not going to get one cent more than this country feels it can afford, by bringing down this Commissioner. As a matter of fact, before this Commissioner starts to do one single

stroke of work, they will tell him what the country can afford to do; therefore, under those circumstances, to bring down a Salaries Commissioner from the United Kingdom - especially from that country - to do this work is merely to establish a smokescreen behind which the Government can hide if this man comes to any decisions which are bound to become unpopular. That is all they are doing. They will say: "It is not our fault that So and So was recommended. It is the Salaries Commissioner."

The Civil Service Association is perfectly right. You have a Financial Secretary. Every single piece of information with regard to the finances of the country will have to be submitted to the Salaries Commissioner by the Financial Secretary. There is absolutely nothing that the Salaries Commission could know that the Financial Secretary would not know. You have a Financial Secretary and you have a Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance is there to formulate the financial policy of the Government based on the financial position of the colony as given to him by the Financial Secretary. If you have a Financial Secretary and a Minister of Finance, what is the Salaries Commissioner to do that the two of them could not do? And this talk about the chief Civil Servant who is responsible being too busy is sheer balderdash. Supposed he was ill or dead or something like that? The Premier has said that this particular individual would not have the time to devote to a review of the Salaries of public employees because of the preparation of the Estimates and so on, but is he the only Civil Servant which we have? What is the Financial Secretary or the Minister of Finance doing? Are they throwing all the work of the Government on this one particular Civil Servant? Did he prepare all the ground work for the inter-governmental Conference and all the work for the Five Year Plan? The Premier must be thinking that he is talking to children. Instead of coming out boldly and stating what the financial position of the country is and what the country can afford to pay to Civil Servants, they are further weakening the colony's financial position by undertaking the expense of \$9,200 in bringing down this Salaries Commissioner to undertake this salaries revision; they are bringing in an outsider to do that. They are paying him a fee of \$960 per month for three and a half months, which comes to \$3,360; the hotel accommodation at \$16 a day for 105 days amounts to \$1,680; then there is a subsistence allowance of \$7.20 per day for 105 days which amounts to \$756; then there is the provision of an official car estimated at \$525; passage expenses amount to \$1,300 and contingencies amount to \$1,579. That makes a total expenditure of \$9,200.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that in so far as we are concerned, we regard a revision of the salaries of the public employees especially those in the lower brackets, as a matter of primary importance, and as a matter which should have been dealt with long before Election year. We do not regard this matter as any Election sop to the electorate. This is no last-minute bribe to try to swing the votes of the Electors in a particular direction feeling that the electors are so dim-witted as not to understand a bribe from a real attempt to increase salaries when that should be done. From the first year of the Session there was an attempt made in this Chamber to review the salaries of the Unestablished Staff at the Department of Highways and Transport, the Public Works Department and what not - people who were in need at that time of an immediate increase of salary. They are, of course, more in need of an increase in salary now, but nothing was done in 1958, 1959 or 1960; presumably we will be told that the colony's finances could not afford such an increase; but now the Salaries Commissioner will come down and tell them what they can afford to do, whether they can afford to do it or not! For a country or territory which is on the verge of independence and of running its own affairs, it seems to me that to appeal for outside help on a simple straight-forward matter of this sort is a demonstration to some extent of our incapacity to run our own affairs. Do you mean to say that there is not sufficient talent inside and outside Government circles which could be appointed to investigate and report on this matter? To put the matter more simply, are they telling us that whatever this Salaries Commissioner recommends they will implement? Do we have to bring down an independent Salaries Commissioner for this purpose?

1.25 p.m.

In the final analysis the decisions taken will be theirs. If he recommends salary scales that are in their opinion too high or too low, they are going to review them. In so far as they are concerned, his Report will not be the law of the Medes and Persians; it is to be subjected to their final consideration, scrutiny and decision; so if they are going to do it finally, why not do it at the beginning, and save money and not waste time? It is the height of ignorance to bring a man here who must spend 105 days, over three months, going into a matter which a local Committee with proper Governmental assistance could finalise in two weeks. It could not take more than two weeks; and if it is going to take more than two weeks for a local Committee informed by the Cabinet and the Financial Secretary's Department to decide on this matter, well then the entire Cabinet should be abolished and the Financial Secretary's Office should be abolished because they are completely useless.

These Commissioners, Mr. Chairman, especially appointed in the manner in which this is going to be appointed, serve merely as curtains behind which the Government can shelter and perpetuate either popular or unpopular decisions; that is all they are, and we do not mind them appointing any kind of person they like, but for God's sake not at the expense of the taxpayers of the country. If they believe that the people in this country are so naive not to be able to appreciate that this expenditure is totally unnecessary, then they are living in a fool's paradise.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when I received this notice to deal with this matter today, I was a little taken back because I thought the Government had reached agreement with the Civil Service Association on the basis of arriving at and settling the local question of salary. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has said something that I think members should pay a lot of attention to. The basis of this Resolution is to get a man to come here, and the Premier said the gentleman is a man by the name of Mr. Jacobs. The terms of reference are "to examine the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees and to make recommendations having regard to the economy of the island."

Who is going to advise this Commissioner on the economy of the island? Is he going to do it outside of himself? He is going to be guided by the Minister of Finance. I will say this to the Premier: let us stop this 'colonial days' practice. It was a habit of the colonial days that in view of the fact that the majority of the colonies were aided by the British Crown, whenever you were reviewing salaries and structures, somebody from the United Kingdom usually did that, because it was somebody from home doing it thereby giving a better safeguard for the Home Government. Things have changed now; the economy of Barbados is in the hands of the electorate of Barbados and the elected Ministers. The Ministers and the Premier in particular, who is Minister of Finance must be prepared to answer to the people of Barbados for its economy and not the Salaries Commissioner. The economy of Barbados is not the business of this man; it is the business of the people who run this Government.

Just as I tell the employers I am going to tell the Government. I tell the employers that they can get as many Commissions of Enquiry or as many Arbitrations as they like, but they have to sit down around a table and talk money with me; I am not going to arbitration. I tell them that they can sit down and talk it out because I am not getting up until they make arrangements as to what they are going to pay out. If they have money to pay out, they are the best persons to know; so they can sit down and bargain. It is true that the Civil Service in Barbados is a pious organisation not capable of making its weight felt, because the structure of the Civil Service Association is wrong. There are men who work on the graded system. Men like the Permanent Secretaries in the Civil Service Association and the cantonnier have the same structural organisation and you deal with salaries on that basis. I have said and I repeat that it is unscientific. The basis on which you recruit a Chief Justice is not the same basis on which you recruit a cantonnier, and the basis on which you recruit people to the graded service is not the same as for a cantonnier.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Premier and to the Government as a whole that they are in a position to tell us what is the economy of this island. Last night I read in a paper published by the Government that up to the 28th February, 1961, the Government collected \$1,000,000 more in Customs Revenue than it collected for the corresponding period in 1959-60, and it collected in income tax nearly a similar amount more than for the corresponding period, which meant that Barbados taxation gave the Government \$2 million more than it expected even in a year when it budgeted for a deficit, not a surplus. You budgeted for a deficit and in Customs alone you got more than the deficit for which you budgeted. You budgeted for \$1 1/2 million as a deficit and received from Customs alone \$1 million.

Now what is the economy of Barbados? The economy of Barbados is going to be tied in with Federation and how much money Barbados is going to be called upon to pay to the new Federation and to other things to which it is committed. All of that is part of the economy of Barbados. Who is to decide that? When these things are given to the Salaries Commissioner, a Memorandum is prepared by the Ministry of Finance, and the Salaries Commissioner bearing the economy in mind will only make a recommendation knowing that this is the economy of Barbados. All Commissioners come here and say that the economy of Barbados is only sugar, and with a one-crop economy, what can you do? You have therefore to keep things within that context and the future always looks bleak.
1.35 p.m.

I am suggesting to the Government that their spending this money to bring this Salaries Commissioner here is a matter of their shirking the responsibility of the Government itself and not having it done on the basis on which it can be dealt with impartially and soundly. I do not go to the extent of saying that the basis of negotiations should be between the Minister of Finance and members of the Civil Service Association because if negotiations between them break down, it does not leave much room for final discussion.

The Hon. Premier said in his introductory remarks that the Financial Secretary was too busy. You can never be too busy to do a job which you should do. You must take time off to tell them how much money you can spend. The Minister of Finance must say to the Salaries Commissioner: "This is the limit to which you can go." You therefore must say to the local body controlling the civil servants that this is the amount of money which we can spend in that direction, whether it is \$1 million, \$2 million or \$3 million. You must say to them that it may be desirable to have more than that but we cannot provide more under the circumstances; therefore, we make a compromise there. There must be a foundation stone. If the Government were bankrupt, then the Government would not be in a position of providing any more salary; and if that were the position, you would be bound to say, "I cannot give you any more; therefore, I must go in for retrenchment."

The basis of the argument is to what extent we can pay more money. Sir, you have a number of local men who are all quite capable of doing the job instead of sending for this Salaries Commissioner. I foresaw that the best basis of dealing with this matter and saving money was to get some knowledgeable local men to do the job, but I know that it is not so easy to get these people. I suggest that you put some of this responsibility on local people in the context that it is work to be done for Barbadians. If we are going to run this country, we should know how best to run it. I would suggest that you set up a local committee to go into this matter and you should say to that committee "have a go at this." I do not believe in this idea of your paying people just to sit on board meetings. That is just a joke. If you want money, go and look for a job; but if you are going to serve the community, you should be prepared to serve the community without recompense.

I say, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that a local committee can do this job. It is true that some years ago you set up a local committee under Sir Archibald Cuke as Chairman to undertake such a job and that commit-

tee recommended a penny an hour for some people in the Service. However, you should not look for people who do not like to pay out money; you have to look for people with a certain amount of liberality. I do not want to call names but I know that you can get an independent body of men such as ex-civil servants - and they are men of quality and of calibre - who can examine the situation. Let the Civil Service Association prepare a case and put it up.

I want to give notice that so far as I am concerned and the body to which I belong, we are not looking for membership in the Civil Service Association, but I want to say as a citizen that you cannot keep a man who is a cantonnier or a man who is driving one of the motor lorries in one of your departments or a road roller, for five years before you give such a man an increase in salary. By your method you are tying such a man on to the same structure as that of the Chief Justice and the Permanent Secretary. When a young man joins the Civil Service at 19 or 20 years, it is a fact that sometimes before he reaches the age of 35 or 40 years he has completed the administrative line of Long Grade Clerk and gone to something else. Sir, you know very well that in Barbados you are dealing with a class conscious society. There are some who think that because you bring a man in as a cantonnier, he should die a cantonnier; therefore, because of that feeling, a man who comes in as a cantonnier will for the next ten years be a cantonnier and you will find him getting the same penny an hour. By your structure, you are making people who are not structurally the same look at each other in the same way. There are people who say that you cannot increase the salary of the Chief Justice unless you increase theirs.

I have already told the Hon. Premier this. Do you realise that you wasted the Government's money when you came in here and gave the Chief Justice an increase of \$2.00 a month. That could not even buy cigarettes or matches. A man of an income of \$1,000 a month will be in such a position that when you give him \$2.00 a month more, about 60% of that will go back to the Government by way of tax. Therefore, when you do that you have a situation which is not realistic. A man in Barbados getting \$700 a month is a man who is living in peace and is not seeing hell. All that he is worrying about is that the income tax structure is such that he wants a review of that structure. But the man at the bottom of the rung cannot tell you anything of the income tax structure. He does not want any review of the income tax structure; what he wants is more income. Those are the two sets of people whom you have joined together in your structure. That is the unholy alliance which you have created and Barbados is one of the unique territories in the world which maintains a common structure for review of salaries for those in the Public Service. That is the reason why our Bill will always look astronomical. It is because you are looking at it at one time and not in different proportions.

My suggestion is that the daily paid people and people in that wage structure should be dealt with in a completely different system and they should be put on a basis on which they could have direct negotiations with the Government and the people responsible for them. Those people like the cantonniers are not different from the men cutting canes or from the broad masses of the people who are employed in the industrial sector of the community. Nobody who is employed in the industrial sector of the community is required to wait five years to get a review of salaries.

Mr. Chairman, if workers in the Trade Union had to wait five years to get their wages revised you would get a strike every year. What happens is that sometimes by your action you get private employers feeling that what the Government does is a guide to them. They say that the Government should be the model employer, and they tell you that the Government has not yet reviewed the salary structure of people in that category and, therefore, they are taking guidance from the Government.
1.45 p.m.

Let us review what has happened. In 1956 the Government reviewed salaries. The years 1957 to 1960 passed and this is now 1961. If you did not have an election in 1961

would a review of salaries take place in 1961 or 1962? It is a peculiar coincidence that a revision of salaries has taken place in the years in which Elections take place with the exception of the year 1952 when a special review of salaries was made in the case of professional people. My submission to the Government is this; I do not feel that you have come to the end. We are going to have Mr. Jacobs now and we have had Mr. Godsall, Mr. G. H. Adams and Sir Errol Dos Santos. The danger in this matter is this; you set up a commission to deal with Salaries and I am sure that you had an Anomalies Committee meeting up to last year as a result of the recommendations of Mr. Godsall. That Anomalies Committee became a permanent Committee. Up to last year you settled the salaries of the Officers at the Prison. Sometimes an independent commissioner draws a structure on paper. The Civil Service Association does not make a recommendation and say "This is what we stand by"; you agree to send down a structure and then the position of the Magistrates come up. There was a time when you could get Magistrates "all a penny", but now nobody wants to be a Magistrate. It is like the question of selling fish. The field outside is better than the one inside. The population is increasing, education is not increasing to keep pace with the population and you are getting litigation like these stand-pipe cases. Somebody is pushing a knife in somebody else or somebody was dancing with the wrong person and you have these cases. You have the problem with the Magistrates and you also have the problem with the Teachers. There are more children who are being educated outside of the Government Schools than those who are being educated within these schools.

I see that the Minister of Education is laughing, but I say that there are more children who are going to schools outside the Government schools than those who are going to Government schools. If Mr. Louis Lynch were to die suddenly the Government would find itself in a serious position. There are more children to be educated in your Secondary Schools than you have places for them. Will it be said that children will not be educated because a Headmaster died last night? I am drawing these things to the attention of the Premier so that he can see them. If you have a Civil Service Association and you admit that you have a Whitley Council, then you should be prepared to examine these things.

What I do not understand is this; the Government has a Financial Secretary and he is a man who is more capable and who would have more time to sit down as Chairman on the Government's side in an industrial matter. That is Mr. Burrowes. He is the former Labour Commissioner. You have a man who has been in Barbados long enough to understand the local situation and you will be able to have somebody along with others to make a review of the local situation. I will tell the Premier that he will not be able to satisfy anybody with any increase in salary of \$2.00 a month. I want to say that if the emoluments of the Premier had to be increased I would not agree to any increase which would be the equivalent of one of \$2 a month. Even when you are gambling you do not use that sort of increase.

The word "equality" is the word which is used, but in what context? Does it mean that it is equality to give everybody an increase of a penny? That is not equality in the context that you want to treat people on the basis which is equal to their position. The basis on which the Government is reviewing salaries is a very sound one. To give you an example, Mr. Chairman, I will say that the Barbados Workers' Union has received increases for people all over the island since salaries have been increased. We have asked for a basic wage of three dollars a day which is the equivalent of \$18.00 a week, but you find men in the Government Service who are working for 35 cents an hour. You multiply 35 by 44 or 48 hours which are the hours of a working week and you will see what you will get. What people are receiving are really pensions and not basic wages. If a man is working for that kind of basic wage which is inadequate then that man is bound to do evil things in order to exist. I say no more than that.

The term "evil" is wide but you must get to grips with reality. You cannot tell a Magistrate that you want to give

him a salary on which he can live but you do not tell that to another worker who is not asking for the same wage. All he is asking for is something with which he is able to buy food and clothes and also to give his children a reasonable education so that they can live a good life in the community. 1.55 p.m.

When I say "good" I mean in the sense that a 16' x 9' is quite comfortable for some people because they have imbibed the feeling of a low standard of life and feel that God seems to have determined that for them. This is a very Christian community and they do not kick against these things; so I do not want to feel that I am out of step with the community in which I live. If that satisfies some people and they tell you no more than to give them what is enough for the time being, I say that is not an unreasonable attitude; but I am asking the Premier to regard the Civil Service and Public Employees in a different light from how they were regarded in the past.

So far as I am concerned, there is no politics in this, because I have some strong words for some members of the Civil Service. I am a man who defends the Civil Service in that I say that local people should be appointed first wherever they are equal. I say that we should not say things about the Civil Service which are not true; as a matter of fact, we should not say them about anybody. We should be willing to defend them at all times, but I would say that the Civil Servants in Barbados or at least some of them are a bunch of lackeys, because in this island some people believe that the only way they can get on is to be a member of the Government Party and therefore disrespect other people. I know that often these Civil Servants have a knowledge that a man can rise in a Department if he lets it be known that he supports the Labour Party, and if he supports the Democratic Labour Party or the P.N.P. or your humble servant, he cannot get on. I have some so-called friends whom I have been watching for some years. When I was a member of the Executive Committee, some of them would not let me sleep on mornings, waking me up before I got out of bed. Nowadays, I watch some of them; those are political lackeys; those are the ones who are not working for the promotion of the Civil Service, because they are looking for bribes, nepotism and favours. But I do not want that to be used against them, because I regard that as a question of individual weakness.

What I would like the Premier to bear in mind is that part of the Resolution which says that there is the need to maintain an efficient and contented public service. I would ask the Premier what he regards as some of the fundamentals of an efficient and contented public service.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On resumption.

Mr. STRAUGHN: 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 obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 40 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will Government take all necessary measures to ensure, at this year's local General Elections that Barbadians

resident in U.K. and U.S.A. will have opportunity provided to cast their votes for said Elections in this Island, by setting-up requisite machinery forthwith?"

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:-

"Under the Representation of the People Act, 1957, one of the qualifications for inclusion in the Register of Electors is that a person must be ordinarily resident in the Island on the 31st of December of the year immediately preceding the year in which the Register is to be prepared, or revised, and published. The Act does not contemplate that Barbadians resident abroad should be eligible for registration as voters and it is accordingly not possible to take the measures suggested under existing legislation.

The field work in connection with the preparation of a new Register has already been completed and a great volume of clerical work is now being done with a view to publication of the Register. The Act requires that the new Register should normally become effective on 1st July, 1961.

Extensive amendments to the Act and Regulations would have to be made to provide for voting by non-resident Barbadians.

In view of all these circumstances it is not practicable at this stage to change the existing law so as to provide opportunity to Barbadians resident in the U.K. and the U.S.A. to cast their votes at this year's General Elections." 2.35 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, may I enquire supplementarily whether the Hon. Premier accepts the principle of the desirability of such provision being made whereby Barbadians resident abroad in various forms of employment should have it made possible for them, despite the difficulties in respect of the mechanics of doing it, to record their vote at the forthcoming general elections in this island, particularly in view of the considerable number of Barbadians temporarily resident abroad in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. and in view of the effect which their vote may have on the next general elections.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is a big question of policy which cannot be decided off-hand. I cannot give any assurance that they will be considered in the immediate future.

Mr. STRAUGHN: If and when at some time it might be considered feasible so to amend the Act, would the Hon. Premier state whether he would restrict such to Barbadians in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. only or would it apply to Barbadians resident abroad generally?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I cannot give any answer to that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Premier whether in replying to those questions any consideration was given at all to the Government's policy on the matter.

QUESTIONS re SEA ROPED OFF FOR GUESTS AT PARADISE BEACH

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it true that the Local Port Manager has advised the management of Paradise Beach Club, St. Michael, that the latter may "keep a 20,000 square feet area (200 ft. long by 100 ft. wide) in the sea, roped off for the club's guests?"

2. If the above is true, is it a fact that there is such a roped-off area, previously marked "keep off", but currently marked "no mooring"?

3. Have any other hoteliers or club proprietors contacted the said Port Manager re roping off other areas within the territorial waters of this Island for the accommodation of their private guests?

4. If answer to first query is "yes", did the Port Manager acquaint his Minister that he proposed to tender such advice to the Management of this club before tendering same; and did he obtain the sanction of the Cabinet or, of the Minister, to give such advice to said club Management?

5. If Government sanctions, or at least does not condemn, such roped-off area within our territorial waters, will Government cause it to be universally known, throughout this Island, that such area is available to and at the disposal of non-guests, as it is for guests of this club, and in fact as any other portion of the sea or beach (up to high water mark) around our island is at the disposal of everybody, regardless of alleged social status, colour, or race?

6. If reply to first question is (a) "no", will Government state whether there has been a roped-off area in the sea off Paradise Beach Club at any time this month, and for what period? (b) "Yes", will Government state whether Police have instructions to report or prosecute, anyone in respect of any boat whatsoever (to whomsoever belonging) being moored there?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The replies are as follows:-

1 and 2: No, Sir. The Port Manager advised the Management of Paradise Beach Club that, in view of its representations regarding the damage posed by speed boats operating in an area which was used by persons bathing in the sea, he would not order the immediate removal of the ropes laid down by the Management from the area so long as it was clearly understood that no one should be debarred from bathing in the area.

He further advised that he would refer the matter to his Ministry, but that in the meantime the signs marked "keep off" should be removed immediately in order not to give the impression that anyone was being debarred from the area and that a sign reading "no mooring" should be put up so as to prevent any vessel from mooring to the movable buoys to which the ropes were attached.

3. No; but there have been complaints from hoteliers and others to the effect that certain speed boat drivers steer their boats through areas used by persons for sea-bathing in such a manner as to constitute a danger to the lives and limbs of such persons.

4. This does not arise.

5. The Government's policy of non-discrimination irrespective of social status, colour, class or creed is already universally known.

6. (a) Yes. From 5th March, 1961 to date.

(b) No. The Police have been requested however, to assist with the problem posed by reckless speed boat drivers who break the law governing the distance at which such boats should operate from the shore.

Mr. BRANCKER: May I enquire, in view of the answer to Nos. 1 and 2 being that the Port Manager would not order the immediate removal of the ropes laid down by the Management, whether it is to be inferred from that that the removal was ordered but not immediately, or is it that the removal of those ropes is not intended to be ordered at all?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: My reply was that he would not order the immediate removal of the ropes. I do not think the words have lost their meaning. "He would not order the immediate removal of the ropes" could not in my opinion square with the hon. member's interpretation. 2.45 p.m.

It means that they will be given time in which to remove them but not to remove them or take them up at once.

Mr. BRANCKER: May I enquire whether the ropes have been removed and if they have been removed, when were they removed?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how Your Honour will interpret that, but it does seem to me to be another question; it does not follow supplementarily.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regard it as a supplementary question. The Reply states that the Port Manager advised the management of Paradise Beach Club that he would not order the immediate removal of the ropes laid down by the management so long as it was clearly understood that no one should be debarred from bathing in the area. Therefore, the question might be asked by the hon. member supplementarily. Immediate removal is one thing and removal is another.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In view of the fact that these replies were given since the month of April, I will have to get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. BRANCKER: I do not know to whom the Replies were given in April, but they were given to this Chamber only today. However, if the Minister is not up-to-date with his Replies, will the questions be allowed to remain on the Order Paper until the next meeting of this House? Is that permissible?

Mr. SPEAKER: As long as the Minister has given that assurance, I do not think it is necessary to ask that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Is the Minister aware that, in the cases of hotels other than the Paradise Beach Club, such as Eastry House and Mr. Charlie Taylor's Royal Hotel, they have, at expense to themselves and to the benefit of local labour, built swimming pools at their establishments, but this particular establishment is taking advantage of the proximity of the sea to avoid local labour in erecting a swimming pool for the benefit of its guests?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, is that a question, an allegation or a series of allegations? It is difficult to answer that.

Mr. BRANCKER: To put it more simply so that even the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would not have too much difficulty in following, does the Minister realise that, as a result of the process employed by the proprietors of the Paradise Beach Club, they have got free, gratis and for nothing a swimming pool for their club, employing no local labour, whereas other clubs have had to erect swimming pools at great expense, they have employed local labour and thereby they have benefited local workmen?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member seems to know what goes on in the precincts of these hotels more than I do. I am not aware of the effect of what he has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that question is a supplementary question; it cannot be forced.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer to paragraph 6 of this question, namely, that the Police have been requested to assist with the problem posed by the reckless speed boat drivers who break the law governing the distance at which such speed boats should operate from the shore, will the Government instruct the Commissioner of Police to have a patrol kept in this area in order to see whether it is a fact — and if it is a fact that there is still this alleged speed boat menace, will they take steps against such people as are creating a nuisance with their craft in order, as soon as possible, to obviate the alleged necessity for enclosing a portion of God's sea for the benefit of the guests of a particular luxury hotel?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: If the hon. member refers to the answers, I do not think he will expect me to go further than what has been given here. The reply is that the Police have been requested to assist with the problem posed by reckless speed-boat owners who break the law governing the distance at which such boats should operate from the shore. I myself have been to Puerto Rico and I have seen in open beaches that they have an enclosure for bathers and they put up a sign that bathers should not go beyond that area, so as to allow speed boats to operate out of that area. Nobody has suggested that in Puerto Rico that is done in order to discriminate between one person and another. Unless we have proof that that is so, unless we have proof that there is some other reason for doing this thing, I do not think it

is right for us to allege that there is some underhand reason for dealing in this way with this area, which is a small area.

2.55 p.m.

I say again that the Police have been requested to co-operate. That is all.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, further to the answer given to Question No. 5 — the answer which tells us that the Government's policy of non-discrimination irrespective of social status, colour, class or creed is already universally known — will the Government restate its policy which is alleged to be already universally known but which is not known to a single member on this side of the House, and, I am sure, to a vast number of Her Majesty's subjects resident in this Island?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: That question is not worth answering.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it is for you to rule that, and not for the Minister to get too big for his boots and attempt to reply like that in Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister is not bound to answer that question, because I too consider it not supplementary to the main question. That statement was contained in the Reply; it is one of those general statements which is connected with what the questioner had in mind.

Mr. BRANCKER: In other words, you are saying that the answer to Question No. 5 bears no relation to the Question which it purports to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had better read that statement. The Question reads as follows:-

"If Government sanctions or at least does not condemn, such roped-off area within our territorial waters, will Government cause it to be universally known throughout this island, that such area is available to and at the disposal of non-guests, as it is for guests of this Club, and in fact as any other portion of the sea or beach (up to high water mark) around our island is at the disposal of everybody, regardless of alleged social status, colour or race?"

The bottom part of Question No. 5 is general and not really pertinent to the main question. The part which reads "will Government cause it to be universally known throughout this island, that such area is available to and at the disposal of non-guests, as it is for guests of this Club, and in fact as any other portion of the sea or beach (up to high water mark) around our island is at the disposal of everybody" is merely fact and not question; that is really a sort of expansion of general remarks concerning the first part, which is fact. So when the question states these facts and the Minister replies and says that the Government's policy of non-discrimination irrespective of social status, colour, class or creed is already universally known, I think that the Minister fell into an error in making that reply. The question is if Government sanctions or at least does not condemn so-and-so, will the Government cause it to be universally known throughout the island that such area is available. In the Minister's reply, paragraph 5 does not admit that at all, but rather encourages the question which has just been asked. Whereas in my opinion the reply encourages such a question, still it is not part of the main question. I will not therefore allow the question, but the questioner cannot be blamed if he seized upon that Reply, nor do I think that the Minister can be forced to make a reply.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I was getting up to say that the hon. member in the course of his reply made some reference to the boots I wear, but I know the size of boots I have always worn. When I say that our policy and our attitude to discrimination is well known, we are not making sport. To suggest that it is not well known to people in this Island, I think, is an attempt more or less at hurling something back at our faces by the hon. member, and I therefore said it was not worth answering.

Mr. BRANCKER: Then, Mr. Speaker, I think there is an assurance from the Hon. Minister that he will supply information in the future, whether at this meeting or the next meeting, about the removal of this roped-off area. Will the Minister say how he proposes to do it, whether by laying a paper at the next meeting of this House or by what means?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: By the best means possible.

Mr. BRANCKER: Which I take it, Mr. Speaker, will be by the Hon. Minister's favourite method of laying a Statement on the Table of this House at the next meeting.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer given to Question 6 (b), would the Minister tell us at what distance from the shore are speed boats required to operate? I think it is something I would like to know.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The distance is 100 yards.

COST OF EDUCATION

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 23 was asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister state how much per child of the School population is expended annually in

(a) The Primary and Secondary Modern Schools

(b) The Grant Aided Secondary Schools.

2. Will he also give these figures for the current year and for each of the preceding year after 1956?

3. Will he also state the annual percent increase in school attendances during the same years?
3.05 p.m.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: The replies are as follows:-

1. In 1958/59, 1959/60 the cost per child was respectively in -

(a) \$56, \$56

(b) \$229, \$272

Government's share of the cost in (b) was respectively \$186, \$228. The figures above do not include expenditure on capital projects, teacher training, Housecraft Centre, administration, pensions, leave passages and other incalculables which do affect the cost in some measure. For instance, if expenditure on Capital projects and a share of the costs of administration were to be added to the 1958/59 costs for primary schools, the cost per pupil would be \$63 instead of \$56.

2. The estimated cost per child for 1960/61 is in:

(a) \$60.50

(b) \$262 of which Government's share is \$219.

It is not possible to supply figures for years preceding 1958/59 without delaying the reply to the question and I doubt whether further search through the statistical details will in any way alter the picture as indicated above.

3. Each of the years 1957/58, 1958/59 and 1959/60 showed a percentage increase on the year preceding as follows:

3.14, 2.7 and 6.3.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, does not the Hon. Minister think that the gap represented by the difference between the expenditure per child in the Primary Schools and the expenditure per child in the grant-aided Secondary Schools is too wide and it should be narrowed?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: That is a question which can be easily answered by saying that the cost of grammar

school education must of necessity be greater than Primary School education. However, I should like to see the gap narrowed.

Mr. TUDOR: But, does the Hon. Minister think, admitting the high cost of secondary education in comparison with Primary School education, of which the difference is something like four and in some cases five times as high, because of that great percentage, that enough is not done to raise the standard of primary education?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I have no hesitation in saying that I do not subscribe to the view that not enough is being done as regards primary school education. I am positively sure that with the material at our disposal we have made an extremely good job of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What steps, Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. Minister propose to take in an effort to narrow the gap?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: One of the means by which the gap can be considerably narrowed is to have smaller classes and thereby employ more teachers, and another method would be to provide more equipment in the primary and secondary modern schools.

Mr. TUDOR: Well then, Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Minister also answer this supplementary? Since he admits that the size of the classes and the shortage of teachers are likely to contribute to the smaller amount being spent on each child in the primary schools, does he think that an overwhelming case is made out for the rapid extension of these services in the primary schools and that they should be extended almost immediately?

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, that is what I wish and it would be an improvement to have these things; but it is a question of dollars and cents. At the present, the economy of the country does affect adversely the amount spent on education; and if we cannot get a greater amount of revenue, we must be satisfied to proceed at the pace which we are going.

In so far as the training of teachers is concerned, we have just increased the teaching establishment in the primary schools by 35. As soon as we can find it possible, we will perhaps increase it by another 35. But again, I say the question is one of dollars and cents. If the money can be provided, we have the answer to the problems.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time for Questions is expiring.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, can this question be held over until the next sitting of this House? If so, I would like to continue with it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know this: Why is it, in respect of Question No. 26 which was introduced by me and put on this Order Paper from the 10th January, 1961, that the Hon. Minister has found time available to answer Question No. 50 which was received on the 4th March, 1961, and has not been able to deal with mine? Is the hon. member afraid of my question? He told me on an occasion before that he would make time available to consider it, but my question is still here from the 10th January, this year.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Will the hon. member hold over just a little longer?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will also like you to hold over the replies to my question until the next meeting.
3.15 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re ENQUIRY INTO THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN BARBADOS

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the following Resolution:- Resolution relative to an inexhaustive

investigation into all phases of the sugar industry in Barbados by the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is temporarily absent, that the House will be adjourned after meeting this week; he has told me that his understanding was that after a meeting or two this week the House will be adjourned for some time again. In so far as this Order is concerned, the hon. senior member for St. Michael was speaking on the last occasion. I would prefer to have this matter debated without interruption when it is resumed; therefore if it is true that the House will be adjourned for some time after this week's sitting or sittings, I am quite prepared to wait until the House is resumed to continue this very important matter without any interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no reply. Order No. 2 is to resume debate on the following Resolution:- Resolution re Single Member Constituencies and the appointment of a Commission with respect thereto. There is no answer.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1957. On the last occasion, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I had spoken for just a few minutes on the last occasion when the suspension took place. I should say that this is one of those questions on which one does not have to speak in its favour in order to vote for it, or to speak against it in order to vote against it. We are dealing with a matter which is an arbitrary figure, the figure is 21. There is nothing which one has to get over except the age; there was no particular scientific reason for the acceptance of it and I do not know if there has been found through any social research, any scientific reason for moving from such a figure. I did not hear the speech of presentation by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who introduced the Bill, but I did hear quite a part of the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill. The hon. member mentioned that the strength by which one can make a change is that there is nothing sacrosanct about the age of 21 years. He said that it was an arbitrary age and it could be changed easily. The fact that it has been an arbitrary figure which has been adhered to all through the ages under the British law is the very reason why, unless you have a further scientific argument for change, it should remain until you can get that feeling for making the change.

This Bill calls for a change from the age of 21 years to that of 18 years. Some hon. member has asked why should we not change the age from 21 to 17 or 19 years. The biggest argument you can get for any particular figure to which you should change is to say that this is how you feel it should be. You put the figure at 18 years because it appeals to one's feelings and imagination. If we admit that there is nothing sacrosanct about the age of 21 years — that age was acknowledged as the age at which a person obtains his or her majority and at which you can act on your own. The figure 3 has some kind of significance and in Hebrew anthropology the figure 7 has some sort of significance. Somebody multiplied 3 by 7 and obtained 21.

The adult age is not a universal one. The Dutch law has 22 years for an adult; if one wanted to marry and the person was under 22 years he or she would have to get the sanction of both parents. That is another European country which has a different age at which you are considered to be an adult. I do not know how they arrived at that. I am only saying that the adult age has been an arbitrary one which has been set for convenience. I have experienced where you regard the age of an adult as 22 years; you have apprentices working alongside of you and they pay Income Tax at the age of 14 years. You have a longer age at which to become an adult and in practice you are still paying Income Tax.

I would say that there is another reason why we must not be precipitant in trying to make a change of this sort at

the moment. Research in adult education proves that really what you consider to be an adult seems to apply himself much more resolutely to educational tasks than the adolescent. In Scandinavian countries where you have major institutes for adult education, they have been able, on many occasions, to get a lot more work done by these adults and a lot more ground covered than by the teenager at the moment. There was some argument that the average youngster at the age of 18 has reached the Higher Certificate level and therefore he is capable of making his contribution by being a voter. People therefore seem to cover a certain amount of ground in a comparatively shorter time than they have been set to do this task. I am sure that there must have been some reason for that great mind of antiquity, Aristotle, to have made mention of the age at which he would expect people to study politics. Somewhere he said that old people should be allowed to indulge in politics because he believes that that is the mark of a matured mind.

3.25 p.m.

I only mentioned that, Sir, because I think some time last year, it might have been, I remember the Minister of Education was present at a function held at the Harrison College Library at which some Adult Education Expert gave a lecture to people interested in education and other adult training in this island. I happened to have been present then, and he did show from the research that was being done and by a graph which he was able to produce that in matters that appear to be more abstract and in matters of political thought, you found that it was older persons, not necessarily adolescents, but people who had attained their adulthood that were making a greater contribution and showing greater interest and potential for that kind of study, and after-school study was really something that was regarded by them in that light.

I would say, Sir, that unless we have therefore some rather sound and heavy scientific reason for making a change from twenty-one to eighteen, it would be again just arbitrary on our part to change the voting age from twenty-one to eighteen. If people come to accept things just to be a matter of practice and it has correctly become a part of your establishment and institution, you do not automatically change it just because you say there is nothing sacrosanct about it. The moment something becomes accepted, therefore, tradition gives it its own usefulness, like driving on the left side of the road. We just accept that and there is nothing sacrosanct about it. I read that it happened in Brazil where formerly there was the custom of driving on the left side of the road as in British countries, and the horses which used to drag milk carts on mornings were accustomed to walking on the left side of the road. When a law was passed and you had to drive on the right side of the road, people found the difficulty of not getting their milk because the horses were accustomed to walking on the left side of the road. It is purely a question of custom and habit, and if there is a reason for putting the age at any particular figure, there is one again for strong objection for changing it; and just as one does not have any strong reason for maintaining it, you would have no extra reason for changing it as well, because if you have no argument except the fact that it is arbitrary either one way or the other, the weight goes on the side of traditional acceptance.

If there is no other argument than what we have heard already, I would submit it is not an argument strong enough for changing the age from twenty-one to eighteen as far as representation and voting is concerned.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief because I hardly think that any individual who considers this question in the light of its importance or otherwise or who understands anything concerning the political history of the world and more particularly the Western countries would be convinced that an individual at the age of eighteen should have the right to vote. I must say, however, that there are exceptional cases, some who perhaps mature or could mature around that age, and others who may reach 90 and yet not mature.

What is the position, Mr. Speaker? First of all we should like to know whether voters at the age of twenty-one

and upwards have not been carrying out their responsibility and duty satisfactorily in this country, because if we now say that people should vote at the age of eighteen, in my humble opinion it is tantamount to saying that the decision made by persons from twenty-one upwards was not perhaps in the interest of the community, and therefore we have to seek the aid of younger persons. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not get that point.) You would not get it, but I know what is behind it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that for a long time the D.L.P. group has been advocating the reduction of the age at which people should vote, and they have been from time to time suggesting that the age should be reduced to eighteen. This is not the first time; I have heard it on several occasions as far back as 1951, maybe before, but as far as I remember in 1951 it was strongly felt among them that the age should be reduced to eighteen. In 1956 that was also said and it is largely because they felt that if they caught these people at that age, the age of inexperience in so far as this political machinery is concerned, those persons would perhaps have given them a majority. Well, the question has come to light now in so far as this Bill is concerned.

If we agree to reduce the age to eighteen, Mr. Speaker, it logically follows in our set-up that an individual at the age of eighteen should also have the right to be a member of Parliament, because in 1950 the Barbados Labour Party removed any monetary qualification for being a member of the House, and we decided that with the exception, of course, that was put in by the Other Place of the £30, any individual who reaches the age of twenty-one should automatically as of right be able to become a member of Parliament if the electorate so thought fit. If you say therefore at this stage that you are going to reduce the voting age to eighteen years, automatically the voting age and the age for being a member of the House should be eighteen. I wonder if I am correct in anticipating that if you say a person is eligible for being able to vote at this stage, he is also able to become a member of the House. We are always told that we should follow any convention, legislation and almost everything of the Mother Country and those advanced countries of the world.

3.35 p.m.

What do we find in those advanced countries? In the United Kingdom, you begin to vote at the age of 21 years and automatically, you can also become a member of Parliament at the age of 21 years. In the U.S.A., you vote at the age of 21 years, but you cannot become a member of the House of Representatives until you reach the age of 25 years, neither can you become a Senator until you reach the age of 30 years. Those are the stipulations, but yet you can vote at the age of 21 years. In Canada, the voting age is also 21 years. No doubt, throughout the West Indies the voting age is 21 years and that in my humble opinion was laid down because it is at that age when an individual is regarded as a man or woman. Below that age you are regarded as a minor. In other words, your parents are responsible to some extent for some of your activities, at least.

If we agree that the limit should be reduced, automatically, the age of minority should also be reduced to 18 years, but as I have said before, what I would like to know is the reason which permitted members to suggest or to bring this Bill to the House to reduce the voting age from 21 years to 18 years. I am in a position to say, as I have said already, that I know it is the desire of the D.L.P. to have this age reduced. (Mr. MOTTLEY: My Party wants it too.) Well, if it is the desire of your Party too, I say that those who are doubtful of people reaching the age where they can think for themselves would always say to reduce the age. From my experience, I know that despite what is being said, when an individual reaches the age of 21 years, in most cases he is in a position to weigh the pros and cons of arguments used by politicians and other people. For the most part, persons at that age are able to think and to analyse and to be able to decide intelligently. Below that age, or at the age of eighteen in some cases, they are still in school; therefore, you are asking children who are in school to decide for their parents and their elders. As I have said already, it is not that some of them are not capable of deciding, and deciding intelligently, but I think

it is asking too much of children in their adolescent age to decide who should be the representatives of the island. I repeat that with the exception of, may be, one or two States of Australia and some other country which I forget now, there are hardly more than three places that people are allowed to vote at the age of eighteen. With those exceptions it is recognised and accepted that the voting age should be from 21 years and upwards, and I cannot for the life of me see any justification whatsoever for your reducing the age from 21 years to 18 years.

I do not think that it would be in the interest of this country to have the age reduced, and I can only conclude that it is merely a question of wishful thinking by a few disappointed people who feel that if for example the age is reduced to the young and inexperienced, they will have an opportunity to get more seats in Parliament than they have today. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that ever since the franchise was lowered so that all persons who reached the age of 21 years, whether they be working or otherwise, be given the opportunity to vote, they have done a good job. I am convinced that the majority of people have done a good job. The hon. senior member for the City pushes his face up when I say so but I cannot expect that he will say that they have done a good job because he has not been put in power by them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Why have I pushed my face up? I listened to the exact words which the hon. member used, used by Dr. Hawkins when I was sitting in the gallery.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I can reply to anything the hon. member says effectively. I have never said in my speech that they were young and irresponsible. If Dr. Hawkins said anything like that and the hon. member heard it, that is a matter for him and Dr. Hawkins because the two of them shared the same Party and the same political philosophy. They represented Conservatism and the wealthy, and they had absolutely nothing to do with the representation of poor people. Before I was a member of this House I was a champion of the common man.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise again on a point of order. I have never denied what side of the fence I am on. However, I do not go around asking the wealthy for money to run an election.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not aware of that part of it. If they were so stupid as to give, I do not know. If a member of the Labour Party asked the wealthy for something to run an election, I do not know about that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You have never asked?

Hon. M. E. COX: Indeed I have never. If somebody asked and they gave, I do not know. I understand that they have already thrown up \$120,000 for this election.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. I am going to show the difference between the wealthy man who has given the Barbados Labour Party a number of motor cars. The wealthy does not pertain to any one colour, whether it be white, green or black. Do not talk any nonsense that you understand that they have already put up \$120,000 for this election. If they put it up, they put it up for you.

3.45 p.m.

If they have put it out they have put it out to your Party as a result of the big Electric Company deal, swindle, scandal....

Hon. M. E. COX: We are accustomed to that. It is obvious and logical to conclude that one is prepared to measure one by his tape. Who does not know that? If you went to a tailor he would not send you to another tailor for him to measure you; he would measure you himself. If we are accused by anybody of anything, that is the mentality of those who have been doing it for years. We invite investigation, examination and everything else; and when we invite that, we are bound to come out on the right side. I can assure you of that. A man can be in his bed sleeping tonight and any fogey can accuse him of killing a man at Bathsheba. You cannot prevent people from talking as they

like, but whenever an examination is made, there is not a scintilla in what they have said. You talk about the Electric Company deal, you talk about Banks Brewery and everything else, but whenever you boil it down it cannot bear the light of examination.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have said nothing about Banks Brewery. There was a discussion of a big deal and they were investigating it. Is that true or not?

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to get the record straight. I would categorically say that I know absolute nothing about it. I have never heard anything about it; this is the first time that I have heard anything of it. I would invite the hon. member to call names. Whenever a member gets up and accuses us of something and we appeal to that member to state the names publicly he says that it is not for him to say so-and-so; he would not say it in public. I have nothing to hide; I want the public to know everything. If you accuse anybody of stealing a motor car, then you should be able to tell people where and from whom the car was stolen. I repeat that I want the public to know everything and let it be put in the records of this House.

As far as this Item is concerned, it cannot be said, except by the Opposition Party, that the voters of this island after they have been given adult suffrage - as a matter of fact, if I remember correctly, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself got in this House before there was a free franchise. We got in here when there was still the monetary qualification. When the hon. junior member for St. Peter got in here in 1945, there was no adult suffrage. We never had adult suffrage until the 1951 Elections and the majority of voters voted intelligently; they voted to throw off the yoke which the wealthy people had thrown around their necks and their feet for all their lives. What is the position now? You would buy some votes now, but not the majority.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I introduced this Bill and it is an imputation to me when the hon. member says that I think I could buy these votes by the introduction of this Bill. When the hon. member used that term, it is not only vulgar but it is an ignorant statement to make. This Bill has absolutely nothing to do with buying votes. If that is in the hon. member's mind, I would say that I would have more people to buy, not less. Why should I increase my expense with buying votes? Why should I have to buy votes and not the hon. member?

Hon. M. E. COX: No Conservative has ever walked about and begged people to support me.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member is nothing but a vulgar vagabond to say that. The hon. member should be in Prison for saying that....

Mr. SPEAKER: (*Knocking the gavel.*) Will the hon. member listen to the Chair for once? The hon. senior member for St. Peter has made use of the expression "vulgar vagabond."

Mr. WALCOTT: He is a vulgar vagabond to say that the Conservatives went about and spent money on me. The hon. member has said things about the hon. senior member for the City which he cannot prove. The vulgar vagabond can say in the same breath that the Conservatives spent money on me. No decent man could say that. I will not stand for that sort of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I begin to speak to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I will ask all hon. members whenever they see a situation developing which will reflect on the good order and dignity of the House, to do all they can to keep that situation from developing. In this matter, I should like the attention of the hon. senior member for the City. I should like to ask hon. members of this House, whenever they see any hon. member getting into a state where he is likely to lose control of himself, to try and assist that member in getting back to the matter

which is before the House. When I began to ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter to withdraw certain remarks, he went a little further.

3.55 p.m.

I think the hon. member has had a little time to do a little cooling off. It must always be remembered that this is Parliament, and whatever is done rightly or wrongly here reflects on all of us. The things get about and abroad, and I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Peter for the good name of the House and of himself to withdraw that remark as referring to another hon. member of this House - the remark "vulgar vagabond".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour says that members should refrain and prevent members from doing these things. I want to say that I said what I did deliberately because I could not find words other than those to describe any other hon. member who would get up in cold blood and make the remarks that he did. I sat here the whole day and listened to his speech. All along he was going around the D.L.P. on this. I introduced this matter and in dealing with it he said that the matter had been introduced by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who in 1945 was elected before the adult franchise came into operation. The next statement he made was that this could only be introduced by people who could not get in because they want to buy votes. When an hon. member can accuse another member of doing something with the idea of buying votes, he must know that buying votes is a political bribe. If you buy votes at an election, you cannot come in here. I was here before adult suffrage, and when I asked him what he said, not only did he not make an apology for saying this is done as a means of bribing people, but he said that he did not walk about and get Conservatives to put money for me to run an election. What more than a vulgar vagabond would say that?

If Your Honour asks me to withdraw, I would have to do that because you ask me to do so and I do not want a reflection on you; but if you permit the hon. member to cast this reflection on me in a matter like that and sit down there grinning, the result is that he is always going to get up and say these things about people. He told the hon. member about not getting money, and he uses the most vulgar remarks in saying something about members of this House. If Your Honour asks me to withdraw, I will do so because I do not want to get into anything with the Chair, but I regret that the hon. member can talk about buying votes and about Conservatives paying for me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that this is the answer. The hon. senior member for St. Michael did make use of the remark about the buying of votes, but I would like the hon. member for St. Peter to know that although he has been the Mover of this Resolution, I am in the Chair and I can see things all around, I hear things and I am always in touch with the direct sequence of events, and I would not attempt to make the slightest whitewash of any possible guilt of the hon. member for St. Michael, not of any known guilt, if there be any. The hon. member for St. Michael made that remark not to the hon. member for St. Peter, but I think it was made while the hon. member for the City was rising on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, no, Sir. I can answer that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot be interrupted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not so, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot make me sit. This is the way I understood it. Although the hon. member made some reference to the hon. senior member for St. Peter as the Introducer of this Resolution, as I see it, I think it was when the hon. member for the City was constantly rising on points of order that he made such remarks. As a matter of fact, I am not construing anything; I am giving the sequence with which I observed things to have happened, and I do not care whether the entire House disagrees. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not what took place.) Do not interrupt me like that; this is Parliament.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is always this nasty behaviour by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must understand that when I say a thing strikes me as a thing I have observed, it is my observation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Nearly everybody knows how stink he is. He is the most scandalous liar that ever lived; his wife knows it and everybody in Barbados knows it and I have it in black-and-white.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: There being disorder in the House, I now suspend the Sitting of this House for twenty minutes. 4.05 p.m.

On resumption.

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

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Michael was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am not going to allow this thing to finish in this way. Quite often, recently, the hon. senior member for St. Michael has been getting up in this House and making these improper statements as regards hon. members and nothing has been said by Your Honour. It is becoming so fashionable that even this morning the hon. member had a clash with you. He is of the opinion that he can in no uncertain terms do as he likes. He made some vulgar and improper remarks to the effect that this Bill is the means where you can buy more votes. There is no hon. member who breaks all the Rules of the House more than that hon. member. There is no hon. member who makes more vulgar and improper remarks than that hon. member and the Speaker does not call on him to withdraw. The hon. member thinks that he can treat the Chair as he likes but he cannot do it as long as I am a member of this House.

What did the hon. member say? What he said is tantamount to his meaning that I was the member. He said that he did not mean me. He said that he could bring proof that this same gentleman told him that these Conservatives were backing me. Mr. Speaker, you may not be temperamentally a person who can deal with the hon. member, but I can deal with him. There is no withdrawing when it comes to my dealing with him. I can deal with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to say something. Hon. members sometimes make use of phrases which must be construed as generalisations. If an hon. member attempts to make an assertion from which I can say that he is referring to a single hon. member, well then, I deal with it in that light; but it is a fact that hon. members do get away with remarks which are meant to be personal but which are made under the guise of generalizations.

In my view, the hon. senior member for St. Michael was making certain generalizations. I am in the position in Parliament where I must put the best construction on what is being said by members and I intend to be ever in that position where I would put the best construction on whatever is said. By that, I mean that it is quite possible for hon. members to escape the wrath of the Chair or to come under my displeasure as long as they make use of generalizations. As I construed it, the hon. senior member for St. Michael did not say anything to the hon. senior member for St. Peter or even to the hon. senior member for the City. He used the word "they".

Mr. WALCOTT: He said that this Bill was introduced for that purpose. He went on to say that that is what you could not do before you come down with this Bill, which means that the motive behind the bringing down of this Bill was to buy votes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not have a record of the debates before me. The hon. senior member for St. Michael said that some political party known locally as the D.L.P. was quoting something. That remark was quite all right. There is nothing wrong in saying that in Parliament. If it is false, it is false; if it is true, it is true. Then the hon. member went on to generalize, as I heard him. He was interrupted by the hon. senior member for the City who more than once got on his feet, and as I remember it, I think it is then that the hon. senior member for St. Michael made use of the remark that they are bringing this to buy votes. I know the hon. member did make use of some remark which would appear to the hon. senior member for St. Peter to be personal. He made a remark to the effect that they walk around and spend the Conservatives' money. I may have taken objection to that; but even if I felt that as an individual that it was personal, in my position as Speaker I cannot attempt to construe it as such. I have no personal opinion; I have to put the best construction on all that I hear. I cannot charge the hon. senior member for St. Michael for meaning the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I may think so when I get in my office; but as long as I am in the Chair, I have to put the best construction on all that I hear.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, the House now reverts to Government Business.

On the last occasion, when the House was giving consideration to Government Business, hon. members were considering a matter in Committee of Supply.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on the adjournment, I was drawing to the attention of the Hon. Premier that we ought to be now considering the structure of the Civil Service on a different basis, and I suggested that a Committee comprised of members of the Civil Service Association would be the best means of dealing with this matter.

Now, I notice in all of these Resolutions that the same terms of reference are set out. For example, one of the terms of reference which you have set out is with regard to the need to recruit and retain suitably qualified administrative, professional and technical officers. I would ask the Hon. Premier what are the difficulties you have in recruiting staff for your administrative offices. As far as I know, you have no difficulty. If that be the case, do not put in the phrase "suitably qualified, administrative officers". Are you finding it difficult to recruit those persons? I think you are finding it a little difficult with a man like a Magistrate who can be termed a professional officer, but certainly, it is not so as regards your obtaining Assistant Secretaries. I do not know of the situation as regards Permanent Secretaries, but you do not recruit Permanent Secretaries every day. At what point of your administration are you suffering difficulty? Do not let us put in terms of reference so that whoever the Salaries Commissioner may be, he would be able by such a reference to come and play around on something when there is no real seriousness about enquiring into that particular phase of the matter.

I should say that when a matter like this is put to the House, the Government should be prepared to explain to us a little more than what was explained today by the Hon. Premier.

4.35 p.m.
If everybody says: "We agree that the salaries which are being paid in Barbados are too low", then the Commissioner must have discussions on that. When you say that salaries are too low and they should be increased, you should let us know precisely about what the Government is satisfied. If

you have a Salaries Commissioner and he has to review the remuneration of all public officers, you mean that the salaries paid are insufficient and we should have a proper insight into this matter. This amount of \$9,200 is not too much money to be spent but this money could be better spent if the Government had set up a local Committee, not of one person, but a local committee of three or more persons who would make a study of this matter. I must say that I do not believe that, with these single Commissioners, no matter how qualified they are, people are satisfied. Then you have the University College of the West Indies; you have Mr. Brathwaite who is an Economist who works at this College. With this Institution there, you should find out whether there is some suitable or capable person who would be Chairman of the Committee and have some other persons to come forward and let this matter be dealt with on that basis. The possibility of giving satisfaction to a wider section of people is easier when the matter is dealt with in this way. If you look at the lower sections of public employees to give them a little more, they will tell you how much you need. You must say what you regard as the minimum wage for any man who is working in the Public Works Department, for instance, to receive.

I do not know what answer the Premier gave to the delegation when it dealt with the matter of equal pay for equal service in the teaching profession. What should a man or a woman who is holding the same qualification be paid? I do not agree that a woman should be paid a salary which is lower than that of a man when both of them have the same qualifications in the Teaching profession. When a woman goes on to work at the Bank she gets the same pay as a man, but on another basis a woman, who spends five years in order to get the same qualification as a man, is paid about 70% of the salary of the man! I am not dealing with the Aristotle principle; because somebody says you have inequality, that is something with which I do not agree. Where there is no power to vote, the kind of representation you get is indicative of the voting power which you possess. To say in this Chamber that you believe in equal pay for equal work, do you believe that a man and a woman who are holding the same qualification should be paid the same salary? The lady Radiologist at the General Hospital gets the same salary as a man because you regard that you are paying the post and not the person. I do not know if the Premier is holding on to the Commissioner because the Financial Secretary is too busy. If he is too busy, when is he going to get time to prepare the Memorandum for the Salaries Commissioner? Are you going to give the Civil Servants whatever the Commissioner says they should have or what? Mr. Godsall in his Report recommended some salaries with which you did not agree.

In England when you discuss the salaries of Civil Servants you do not always have a Salaries Commissioner. Sometimes the Treasury have some people and they subdivide departments and set up Committees and they arrive at agreement with the various Sections which represent the Service. The matter comes back to the Treasury, the Cabinet gives the Treasury a certain amount of authority to act for them and then the matter goes to the Legislature. You come here with the Salaries Commissioner's Report and that Report is given back to the House. I do not want to sit in this House as a Salaries Commissioner or to say how much money you should pay to people. That should be given to the Trade Union of the Civil Servants. You are setting up a body to negotiate but you cannot leave out your duty. You should set up a Committee to meet your Trade Union. The Salaries Commissioner would not meet you as an employer; you want the Civil Servants to be on one side and the Government to be on the other, and you give them the idea that this is as far as we would like you to go.

I would like to ask if you have taken up this question with the Civil Servants and things have broken down, whether this matter will become like a matter of arbitration. This matter looks like a palliative and you are wasting money every five years.

4.45 p.m.

I want to put this as a final point to the Premier. I say quite sincerely that if you do not separate the unes-

tablished staff from the established staff, or certain people of a certain salary from the established staff for the purpose of negotiations, you are going to have trouble in future. As your community grows, people can see what is happening in it. There is no point in having a van driver at Highways and Transport, the Agricultural Department or the Education Department and you tell that man that he has to wait five years before you can review his salary. For an example, let us look at the back of the Estimates which have just been handed out, and the Premier has one for his own benefit; there are the rates of pay with cost of living and numbers of public employees included in the item "Unestablished Staff" appearing under various Heads. These public employees are full-time employees of Government, and are paid daily or weekly on the basis of the following scale known as a "Key Scale": Cantonier - 31 cents an hour. Also included in this list are Gardener, Road Mender, Lorry Loader, Turncock, Fumigating Hand, Ordinary Seaman, Boatman and so on. A porter gets 31 x 1 to 35 cents an hour; that means he will get 31 cents this year and it will take him five years to get thirty-five cents an hour.

The reason why I say that to the Premier, Mr. Chairman, is that it is stupid in this context. Men doing a certain category of work must come within a fixed scale and you fix that at an amount. If it is \$10, \$20, or \$30 a week, you should fix it and not keep a system that lends itself to a five year sliding scale when you compare this with a man who has a different kind of scale. You have another man who is getting \$6,720 with an increment of \$480 a year, that is \$40 a month; you have a man in the same structure getting \$2,880 with an increment of \$240 which is \$20 a month. What is the point of having a scale of salaries and a structure as wide as that in which you take a man pulling a cart or jumping on a lorry or driving a lorry and give him one cent or two cents an hour? When you give a man one cent an hour, you are giving him forty-four cents per week more. I will say this to the Premier: do you think I would waste my time to go and negotiate for forty-four cents? We do not waste any time with an employer who could not pay more than forty-four cents. I told some people at the Port the other day who were offering me something like \$15 a week that we do not talk that down there. We talk \$15 with some of the small stores in town.

On the last occasion when we discussed minimum salaries for people which is five years ago, we spoke in terms of \$3 a day. We said that the minimum which you should pay a man is \$18 a week. Can you say today after five years that the minimum should still be eighteen dollars a week? Let us analyse what you regard a man should get as a living wage, a man who is an able-bodied man, not a man who is ill. What do you regard as a minimum wage for a man doing any rough job who has to rent a house? You as a Government should say what the minimum wage should be. It should not be 35 cents an hour which is \$2.80 a day. If you multiply that even by six, that would be \$16 a week, and they work a five and a half day week. Are you suggesting today that \$16 a week is really anything? This \$16 is a rate of pay that covers a wide section of your workers, and there are very few above that group. This covers from the female labourer right through on a graded system, and a tractor driver gets fifty-six cents an hour.

I will tell you more, Mr. Chairman. These salaries are so small that when we were negotiating on the Port, some of the employers looked at them and told us that we were getting things out of line. I asked out of what line. If he gets an amount higher than another, am I getting out of line? That is the line I want to kick them out of: the low line. They said that we would upset the economy of the island. Moreover I went to the United States base and found that the Commanding Officer could tell me that they were about to pay for things at a higher rate, but when people found that the wives of the American people were paying more than the other people, all their friends got in their necks and said they were spoiling the people. Are you spoiling them by paying them more money? So there is no point in saying you are in favour of paying as much as I do. I am in favour of having a good structure, and that is why I say that you could not give the Chief Justice \$2 a month more than you gave at the time because you have to review

them every five years, and with him that is big money you are talking about. Any Salaries Commissioner who is increasing the Chief Justice's salary has to give him something that is worthwhile. Do you think that the Union can give me \$2 a month as an increase? To whom are you talking, a messenger? You increase a messenger by \$2 a month because the poor fellow says every little smile is a smile; but you cannot look at a man who is getting \$1,000 a month and give him \$2 a month as an increase.

There is also this stupidity, Mr. Chairman, about a cost of living allowance. All the Government has done is to rob some poor fellows out of the pension they should have had when they come out of the Service, because you do not pay a cost of living on pensions. What is the reason for telling a man that four cents is cost of living but not the other cent. What kind of living is the other cent? Do you realise that the Government of Barbados are the only people who talk about cost of living? No other employer can tell me about a cost of living; any wage is a basic wage of a man's pay. There is no war on and we do not expect to come down; but a cost of living connotes that you cannot adjust these things and you give them this to help. I believe that in Barbados there are more wages enquiries being conducted other than by Commissioners. The sugar industry has more people than you have, and we negotiate more wages for people than you negotiate and no Commissioner comes here. The people have money and we go and search up to see how much they have and we are not moving until they give us what we want. If you do not pay, we do not come down, or you would do it yourself.

The Civil Service cannot strike because they do not belong to the Union. I am not asking them to join the Union. Suppose the women teachers go on strike because you do not give them the money they want; they will get it because they will bring it to the attention of the public that they have a case. Striking is not anything bad. If you cannot get what you want by talking, you get it by not talking and not working. Why should you pay a woman teacher a different salary from a male teacher? If a woman teacher can teach a hard-headed boy or girl, why should she get a different salary? A woman taught me and she was one of my best teachers. I do not see anything wrong with it. I believe the Premier himself married into a teaching family and he should know. Maybe the female members of his family may be more useful to children than the male members; so he for one should know.

4.55 p.m.

It has been following even in his present production. He should know better than I. I do not see as a matter of principle that you can do so on any other basis. If the Premier because you find yourself so mixed up says that he is getting a Commissioner, it is only done to show that you are impartial.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to your reviewing the salaries of the Civil Servants; I am only concerned with the method you chose. I think the Hon. Premier would pardon me for saying this. We are holding on too much to the old colonial system on many things and this is one of them. It may not have been done intentionally. Here it is: you have them sending out from the Home Office a Salaries Commissioner to say what the people in Barbados should get as a salary. That is why you have this wide disparity in salaries. We are part of this old time product where you have in a community a salaries structure in which you give to a man \$1,000 a month and to another one you give only 35 cents an hour and you expect that that is sufficient to keep him alive. There is the idea that there must be some people in Barbados to work for the building up of the economy and to build up the income of others. You have this wide disparity in salaries and you depend on the army of the unemployed to fill these gaps.

We must create a system in this community where everybody will have to work and work towards the economy of the island; therefore, there must be a basis of giving a minimum wage to any man and the minimum must be a wage which bears relation to a man eating food and buying clothes, and not a perpetuation of a low wage to those at the bottom

to keep the superstructure up, one in which some are up there and the greater part are down there. The capitalist system is breaking down. The capitalist system is failing the world and that is why United Nations had to step in. If you believe that we must continue with the capitalist system and do not have a merger, you will find that we will be producing more poor people. Therefore, I say to the Hon. Premier: "Stop this idea of getting somebody from outside and keeping the majority of people on a low inadequate wage." There should be no service in which a man is employed in which you keep him on a wage as low as 35 cents an hour and then you find that you have a man at the top whom you are paying \$1,000 a month. You are bound to ask yourself what the one at the top is eating and what the other at the bottom is eating. If both have to eat, I say that something is wrong with that system. I humbly suggest to the Hon. Premier that our structure is one which has no bearing to any socialist concept.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I actually spoke on this matter before. It was the occasion on which I had to reply to His Excellency's Speech, and during my reply, I spoke on the proposed salaries revision. I think I might have to quote one or two paragraphs of my speech which I made then in order to clarify some of the views put forward.

I am strongly convinced that in a territory where the size of your budget has grown as tremendously as ours has grown over the past ten or fifteen years, and where the size of your administration has grown as well, you are going to find yourself with some heavy administration problems. Indeed, some of the problems which I see are not problems of policy but problems in that you are not sure as to how the administration of your policy is going to be carried out. It is in that light that I feel this salaries revision should be undertaken. Administration without a firm policy is blind and a policy without good administration is fruitless.

I would therefore like to feel in my own heart of hearts that we will not be just getting a Salaries Commissioner, and, as a result of what he may have done when he would have finished his job, you just find that you have magnified the anomalies which you had before. It is not so easy and I believe most people will say the same thing.

I regard the resolution before us as one which is essential. It is part of Government's position that they in their own wisdom should decide how best to carry out this revision. The Hon. Premier gave a lucid discussion on how they came to this conclusion. He said that the Civil Service Association felt that the matter was one which could be dealt with between members of the Association and representatives of the Government, but the Government thought otherwise and felt that they needed to get an independent Commissioner to go into the matter. They tried to get somebody from Jamaica and after they did not succeed in getting that person, they tried the Federal Government and the Jamaica and the Trinidad Governments; and after no help was forthcoming from them, they had to get a Mr. Jacobs from overseas. We only hope that Mr. Jacobs' ladder would be a good ladder on which our Civil Servants can climb when he creates it.

I would like, Sir, to submit a few points on which I think such an enquiry should be based because I seem to see that a lot of what the terms of reference lay down to the Commissioner comes close to what is really the Government's policy; therefore, if you have a clear policy set out, you can utilise the term of reference to a greater degree.

One of the terms of reference for this Commissioner is that he will have to look into the need to recruit and retain suitably qualified administrative, professional and technical officers; and to do that, he is asked to make examination of the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees. He is asked to do that: yet the item which we are discussing is salaries revision. It appears to me that we

are discussing it in the light of salaries received and that we are paying more attention to the plain revision of salaries rather than to the examination of the structure. 5.05 p.m.

I think one needs to be very clear in this review of the structure and the salaries to come down to the point as to where is this Commissioner going to place his emphasis. I would like to feel, as I said on a previous occasion, that we have some measure of job evaluation which is introduced into our Civil Service Organisation, of what is the merit of certain particular jobs which are being held, and I would hope that this Commissioner would be someone who can go into that matter in some detail. You do not want to feel that you are not giving people what is their just due. You want to give them their just due and therefore you say you want a salaries revision; but you want to be sure that it is not a revision which would be a creation or a magnifying of anomalies. You should make sure that you make your review in such a way that jobs in the Civil Service merit what they should merit as jobs. We want to maintain efficiency and a contented Public Service.

I would say that a Salaries Revision alone is certainly not the only way in which we will be able to maintain an efficient and contented Public Service. That is one of the ways in which to do that, but it is not the only way. I do hope that this Commissioner will be able to make some recommendations along that line. If you ask any Civil Servant what he desires most, he may, at a flash, say that he desires more money; but when you come to a serious examination of the problem you will find out that the Civil Servants may want something more than plain dollars and cents. They may want to feel that the job has some career in it or that there is some avenue for airing grievances. Those are not things which the Government could settle overnight; these are problems which would have been inherited and grown in enormity, but nevertheless they are problems. I would expect any Commissioner to be able to give some advice along these lines.

I would like to say under the heading "any other relevant considerations", that I wonder if this Commissioner would be able to recommend that we could handle our accounting system in a more expeditious manner. Our Departments of Government are doing a very thorough job but we need more expeditiousness by which they can carry out that thorough job. Here is a clear example of what I am saying. It has happened, I think it was last year or earlier than that, that this House passed a cost of living allowance for all elements of the Civil Service. That was a good act in principle. We had a long debate on it and the item was passed; but it is a sobering thought to recognise that whereas persons like the Chief Justice would have got their salary revision a month after it was passed in this Chamber, people like the cantonniers took about three months before they got theirs. The reason for that is not that the Government was holding it back, but because the accounting system cannot handle some of these workers as expeditiously as it is able to handle other brackets of the Civil Service. When you agree to something in principle and pass it and say that it is a good thing to do, you find that certain elements who could afford to wait longer for a cost of living allowance, - for instance, the Chief Judge could wait for any number of months for a cost of living allowance - are dealt with quickly. The accounting Department is trying to do a good job, but the system is so cumbersome that the people who cannot afford to wait long for the money have to wait long for it. That cannot be a criticism of the Government's action, because the Government's action was to give a cost of living allowance. Where you can put the bottle neck is how you can get this part of your accounting system to be more expeditiously handled. I would like to feel that the Salaries Commissioner, in making his recommendations, will be able, to some extent, to adjust himself to a problem of this magnitude.

I would like to feel that he can give some advice as to how you can handle that type of headache. The Civil Service Association were trying to feel that they could handle this problem directly with the Government. I would like therefore to be assured that any Commissioner who comes down

here will be able to do the job a lot better than any Civil Service delegation alone might be able to do it. I find it difficult, for instance, when I go into a Government Department and ask for an organisation chart of the Department, to get a straightforward answer. I may be told that we have an organisation list, but not an organisation chart. It is not the Government's fault because that state of affairs must have been going on for a long time. I would like to see that every Department has an organisation chart by which I could see the contact between the Head of the Government and the lowest employee. I would like to feel that people also know that chart, because if people know of what they happen to be a part, you will get less of these frictions and problems. I know of these problems and I would like to feel that any Salaries Commissioner will work on these terms of reference and not just come out with a creation of more anomalies.

5.15 p.m.

Sir, to show how strongly I feel on this matter, I refer to some points I had to make a few months ago on this same problem of the salaries revision. I am quoting from page 196 of the debates of this House for this Session. On that occasion mention was made of the salaries revision for Civil Servants, and I said "this is regarded in an affable light; but I am inclined to the feeling that a salaries revision in the Civil Service is needed but not by just adding to the individual's salary. I regard it as an opportunity to institute a full enquiry into the operation of the Civil Service; and I feel very strongly on that."

I am therefore just recapping, Mr. Chairman, on this particular point, that I have considered it must be more than just a question of the amount that this salaries revision is going to cost. I said further on that the Civil Service Association were saying they could do the bargaining, but if we got a Commissioner coming into the island who is not quite aware of our internal problems, then we may find ourselves in a position of creating more anomalies, and therefore as I would have said on that previous occasion, you could easily see that I would have no hesitation in repeating it now, and I say not that the \$9,000 is being wasted as was suggested by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, but rather that there must be some clearer terms of reference and a clearer direction given to this Commissioner than just telling him that you are going to examine needs and see about maintaining an efficient service, because some of these things bear very closely on what Government policy might be, and it is absolutely necessary that the Commissioner must be given a very clear direction if he is going to do a job that is going to be more than just a job of creating further anomalies. I end, Sir, as I began by repeating that I consider administration without policy as blind, and policy without administration can be fruitless.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, while agreeing generally with the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip who spoke on behalf of the Official Opposition, yet fearing that the Resolution will be passed and the sentiments of the Opposition might not be fully expressed, I am speaking at this stage with the concurrence of my colleagues. Now, Mr. Chairman, I regard the appointment of a local Commissioner, provided he is a suitably qualified person with the necessary experience and background and an impartial person, if he can be found, as being the most desirable thing; but in the absence of this impartial local person who is fully qualified and who has a line for figures, who may be a trained accountant and has had the necessary experience in financial matters - you cannot just hold on to any person because he may be a lawyer or doctor or businessman because he may have a little money - in view of the absence of finding such a suitably qualified person locally or in the West Indies if they have looked that far, and in view of the insularity and pettiness which exists in this little island as well as the prejudices and cury-favours and all sorts of things which go on, I feel that securing the services of a man who may be more inclined to be impartial than anyone found locally, who may be a Financial Secretary or something of that sort in some part of the Colonial Empire and who has had the necessary experience, training and background, would be better to deal with a salaries revision in a small island like Barbados.

I am not opposing the money which is to be spent as money being thrown down the drain or being misspent. The only amount which I would question is the amount for Contingencies of \$1,579. I will read them out line by line in order to explain my point. It reads as follows:-

"The purpose of this Resolution is to provide funds to cover the cost of the salaries revision. The estimate of \$9,200 is arrived at as follows:- (i) Fee to the Salaries Commissioner, \$960 per month for 3 1/2 months - \$3,360; (ii) Hotel accommodation \$16 per day for 105 days - \$1,680; those are in order. "(iii) Subsistence Allowance \$7.20 per day for 105 days - \$756"; that is in order because that may be regarded as being small, as it could be \$10 instead of \$7.20 per day. "(iv) Official car - \$525; (v) Passage expenses - \$1,300;" and then you come to (vi) Contingencies. After having made special provision for every possible avenue of expenditure, you tack on \$1,579 for Contingencies. That should be explained, and unless you can explain how this \$1,579 is going to be spent to the satisfaction of this Committee, this Resolution should be contested because that is a substantial sum; it is the third largest sum and it comes after adequate provision has been made for every item of expenditure - accommodation and hotel expenses, salary and everything else. For the sake of ordinary book-keeping and accountancy, I should like to know how these contingencies are made up which run into \$1,579, nearly \$1,600.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is the duty of the Premier who is Minister of Finance to explain how this \$1,579 will be spent because every conceivable item of expenditure has been taken care of and provided for already. I would like to be satisfied on that and then I would be in a position to know and say that this money is not being misspent or being handed out as a golden handshake to anyone, but is money which is being beneficially spent for the benefit of the public service of Barbados. That is my first observation, so that if a concrete, clear and logical reason is given to the manner in which and the reason for which this \$1,579 is being spent on Contingencies, speaking for myself - and I believe, certain of my colleagues - we would not be in a position to say that the money is being misspent or thrown down the drain.

5.25 p.m.

Most hon. members have spoken on the floor of the House within the last year or two on this matter and admitted that the ones who are suffering most are the ones in receipt of the weekly wage and they have expressed the view that those people should be attended to first. I see nothing in the terms of reference to the Salaries Commissioner as set out in the Addendum of this Resolution to pinpoint to him those to whom he should focus his attention. It is all right to get in here and talk, but this is the opportunity which we have to do so and I go as far as to say that he should also have a copy of the debates in this House with respect to this matter so as to assist and guide him and to let him know how the people's representatives are thinking. The Government is doing this, but the people's representatives have a right to explain the position and to see to it that copies of what we state in here would be handed to the Commissioner for this guidance so that he would understand how we are thinking, as to what his duties are and it is for that reason that I am speaking.

I see no mention made of the casual employees and the unestablished staff whom at election time most hon. members here would make a noise about. If I attempted to make an amendment to this Addendum - something which I know I cannot do - if I could do it I would probably be ruled out of order - but whether I make the amendment or not, I will say enough as to make the Salaries Commissioner realise what I have in mind.

The terms of reference read as follows:-

"To examine the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees and to make recommendations having regard to -

(i) the economy of the Island;

(ii) the need to recruit and retain suitably qualified administrative, professional and technical officers;"

The hon. senior member for St. Peter dealt at length with this question of administrative officers and I will not go over what he said. I will only say that I do not know of any difficulties in recruiting administrative officers and I do not know of any dearth of them. Permanent Secretaries are usually men with a high standard of qualifications, at least the majority of them. Assistant Secretaries are, in the main, people who have many years of service in the Government. There are a few misfits but there is no real difficulty in recruiting administrative officers. Therefore, this is put in to fool this gentleman and for him to think that he would have to tack on a substantial bit of salary to the salaries of these posts in order to keep these officers. I say that Barbados will be better served in the absence of some of these administrative officers. It is my opinion that some of them can be dispensed with.

The Objects and Reasons go on to state:

"(iii) the need to maintain an efficient and contented public service;"

The Objects and Reasons should not stop there because the main thing has been left out. There should also have been included "all those workers in receipt of wages of less than \$200 a month." If you put in that, then you will be getting down to the real work which this Commissioner is called to do. Those are the people who need attention and need assistance. If you come in here just to give the Heads of Departments more money under the guise of helping them and bringing about contentment as has been done already - not by the present Government but by previous Governments - if you come down here and adopt the policy of previous Salaries Revisions and then have your Cabinet to prune off this and that from such and such a post, it will not be any help to the people whom you say that you want to help.

Sir, I speak as one with some practical experience on this matter. I am speaking in this trend for that reason. I know that very often the best intentions may be had by the Hon. Premier and his Cabinet to help workers in the lower bracket, but you will find that everything will be so turned and twisted around that eventually those in the higher brackets would be given high increases and almost all the money available will be used in paying higher salaries to those in the highest bracket and then say, \$200,000 would be left for giving increases to those in the lower brackets. Let us assume that you can spend \$1,200,000 per year on giving this increase. Certain powers-that-be who are advising and close to the Commissioner would say to him and would see to it that \$1 million is spent on the ones in the top brackets and then you will have only the \$200,000 left to accommodate the people whom we really want to help and you then would have to give them an increase of three cents an hour.

That is the wrong way to proceed with this matter. I say, do not make that mistake again. Do not be fooled. Start with those at the bottom first. If you have \$1,200,000 let us spend \$1 million on the ones at the bottom. If you start with the ones at the top, the ones at the bottom will not get anything. You have to start with the ones in receipt of \$13.20 a week - the cantonniers, the messengers and such people. Start there and see that they can get a reasonable weekly wage, whether it is \$25 or \$30 but not less than that. Give them something which they can live on.

5.35 p.m.

You should start with them and have some sort of minimum wage, some thing that they will be able to make something of. If they get \$30 a week and not \$13, you will be able to say that something is done; but if you offer them two cents and three cents more and it works out at \$13.20 a week, nothing is done for these people and their position is worse than it was before. The cost of living has gone up; and no matter how good your intentions maybe to try and do something to remedy the hardships of the ones who are in the lower brackets, unless you are very careful you will be

led into a trap whereby all the money will be allocated to the people at the top bracket and one of the officers, the Attorney General or one of them, will say that all the money has gone. You cannot give a proper salary increase out of a little pittance. If you go about it in this manner there will be more waste of time and you will not be bringing any relief to any one; you will be merely increasing the salary of those who are already well paid and who do not experience much difficulty in getting two ends to meet.

I would be the last person to oppose the passing of this Resolution. We want to have a Commissioner, and one with experience and background and without partiality would be a better person to go into the matter. He will deal with the matter in a businesslike manner. He would have the assistance of the financial officers at his disposal and he would be able to work and produce something on which the Cabinet could work. The Cabinet could then say that everything is done in a proper manner. Mr. Chairman, I hope I have said enough so as to put the Premier on his guard. The under-privileged, the ones who are going hungry with their families from week to week, are the ones who are more deserving to be looked after.

One of the terms of reference of this Commissioner in this examination is to make recommendations having regard to the need to maintain an efficient and contented public service. If he intends to help people in the lower brackets, they would be those who are in receipt of a wage or salary which is less than \$200 a month. If you attend this category of employees first, whatever is left can be earmarked proportionately or on a *pro rata* basis. He should work from the bottom to the top or to three-quarters of the top, to the ones who are receiving a salary of \$400 a month, \$500 a month or \$600 a month and stop there. I am suggesting that the Salaries Commissioner should be given special instructions to consider those people who are working for up to \$200 a month first and not start at those who are in the category of \$1,000 a month and then say that the money has all been spent. Do not give a cantonnier an increase of a half-cent or a penny or anything like that; I hope that that mistake will not be made. In this matter I wish the Hon. Premier the best of luck and hope that he will get the co-operation of all concerned. I do not see how the Civil Service Association should sit in judgment on this matter, so to speak; I do not see how employees could set out their own salaries; I do not think that we have got that far as yet. I do not agree that the employees should sit and decide what salaries they should get. Have we got Communism here? I do not think we have got so far. Whether they are coloured Ministers or not they have to be respected as a Government. If you had other people in office, the Civil Service Association would not have the guts to suggest anything like that to them. They are employees; and if employees are going to tell their employers what salary they should get, I do not think that that should be the case.

I agree that in the absence of a suitably trained and qualified person with the necessary experience, background and impartiality, above all, well I do not say that they are no local people who are suitably qualified, but they may be in the Opposition; they may not be friends of the Government. I am saying that in the absence of a suitably qualified person of the liking and the taste and the blessing of the Labour Party, in my opinion, it is a wise thing to get somebody from overseas, as Englishman with the necessary experience who could conduct an impartial enquiry into this matter.
5.45 p.m.

After he has conducted this impartial enquiry provided he is given the necessary terms of reference and starts at the right time, I am hoping that the Cabinet and the Premier in particular would not allow themselves to be hoodwinked, fooled and turned around by making amendments to what the Commissioner has recommended as has happened already. I am hoping that due consideration will be given to certain branches of the Service, like the Magisterial and certain Legal Departments, the Registry and so on, because in the past due attention had not been paid to the Legal side; they had always been left out. The Law Courts have more or less always been ignored and left out by a person whom you would least expect would do a thing of that sort.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will have to put something right for the hon. member. I do not believe he meant what he said, but if he did, I would have to put another view to the House. The hon. member says that these Civil Servants are employees. I do not want the hon. member to go away with the idea that the Civil Service Association or any Civil Service Association should have right to tell its employer what it must get for wages. Do not let us go away with the idea that because a man is a Civil Servant he has no right to tell the Government what he expects as a salary; he has as much right to tell the Government as an employee working in another firm. I look upon the Civil Service as a Trade Union; it is true it is not legal, as I said earlier; but the Civil Service has a right to say to the Government that they want to talk wages with the Government and this is what they put up.

I want the hon. member to get away from the idea of impartiality; you can get impartiality by the Government sitting down on one side and a representative from the Trade Union sitting down on the other side; and the hon. member should know that in the United Kingdom that takes place. It is only that we still have this Colonial system. Do you think they would bring a man from Timbuctoo to Great Britain to fix salaries for the Army or Service? There are certain firms in England in which the workers are outside the established branch of the Trade Union. They have their own Trade Union. There is a Civil Service Trade Union in England; so I do not want the hon. member to make that statement because he is a man who has had association with Trade Union Movements. I am sure he could not be thinking of Communism. Call me a Communist, but I say that any employee has a right to tell his employer what he should get. If I am a Communist, let me be one and in the forefront. The hon. member said that these people are employees and you could not have them telling the Government what they should get; that is why I say I am sure the hon. member would lose votes from the Civil Service for what he said, and I am sure that he could not have meant it in the way in which he said it. As employees of the Government they have a right, even if he does not agree that they should meet the Government so close as around the Table, to say what they should get.

Mr. TALMA: For the hon. member to say that I said anything of the sort is preposterous. What I did say is that the employees could not sit and hand out salaries to themselves; they could not do the work of the Salaries Commissioner. I said I thoroughly agreed that anybody who works has a right to protest and see that he gets a square deal, but I said that the Civil Service Association should not be expected to sit as Commissioners themselves, because you cannot have employees fixing their own salaries and deciding what is to be done themselves; so the Civil Service Association cannot take the place of the Salaries Commissioner, but I am not saying they should not protest and stand up for their rights and get as much as they can by making as much protest as they can. For one to say he must get \$400, another \$800 and another \$500 is quite wrong; they cannot sit and finally decide what the Cabinet should do. After the Salaries revision has been made and everything stated, everybody then goes through it carefully and the Cabinet goes through it line by line and decide which is right and which is wrong, which should be done, which should be increased and so on; so the final power rests with the Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is an ardent and able Trade Union Leader, but he has misinterpreted what I said. I was also one of the founders of the Labour Movement and the Trade Union Movement; so I would not be expected to say a silly thing like that. What I am telling him is this: I do not agree that the Civil Service Association should do the work of the Cabinet, because the Commissioner merely makes recommendations, and the men who do the final approval are the Cabinet. In other words, the Cabinet must meet a delegation from the Civil Service Association, and when they come here as a Government, they have a right to study and approve the wages.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is all right for the hon. member to talk that here. If the hon. member tells me that because you are an employee you cannot sit in judgment on what the pay

should be, that is moonshine. Are you crazy or mad? Are you telling me that I should be on the Board of Directors in order to decide what I should get? It is people like the hon. junior member for St. James sitting over there who keep this disparity; they are not accustomed yet to workers saying what they should get. The final authority with an employee is the employer; so you cannot tell the Trade Union that it has no right to sit in judgment. You are sitting in judgment on what you are going to receive. When you tell me this old time bogus nonsense that a man has no right to sit in judgment as a worker, I will say that every man has the right to say what he is going to receive. The idea that it is Government dealing with it does not make it any different from any other employer. This idea of making Government sacrosanct and almighty is a moonshine joke, and if the Government gets that idea, there will be strikes no end. Tell me in any Port that the Government can decide that; they would have to get in the boats and bring ashore the goods as soon as they do it that way.

Mr. Chairman, every worker has the right to sit in judgment on what he should get; otherwise, who is going to do it?
5.55 p.m.

In relation to this Government and the Barbados Civil Service Association, if the Government regards the Civil Service Association as a body that is capable, the Civil Service Association has the right and ought to be there on an equal basis. You have that old time bogus idea which I hear from the Premier. That is when you are dealing with minors or slaves. Who else is going to do it for them? Do not tell us in the House of Assembly that we are going to be the negotiators. It is surprising what you hear from people. The attitude of some people like the hon. junior member for St. James is surprising. They are still part of that society which is dying out.

Mr. SEARLES; Sir, I rise on a point of order. What I say is not part and parcel of this debate. This is something to do with the Civil Servants and the Commissioner. I am nothing to do with it; therefore, I am asking the hon. member to keep me out of it.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member was only brought into the debate on the basis of the things to which he would give his approval.

Mr. SEARLES: However, I can talk after you are finished.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I said that because of the remarks made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. He said that these people cannot sit in judgment on themselves.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I rise on a point of order; I did not say that. I said that the final approval still has to be in the hands of the same people who would agree.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do not treat Civil Servants as minions. A Policeman in a Federation has got as much right to say what he wants as a Policeman as any other person. You do not talk of sitting in final judgment on wages. In the final analysis it is if the employer wants to pay and if you want to work.

As regards the idea of the Cabinet deciding, they always have to decide. I say that the Government might as well get down to a proper formal way in dealing with the Civil Service Association. When we do that, we remove from Parliament the idea of saying that you cannot sit in final judgment because they are sitting as equals with you. They are not meeting you as an Opposition but they are meeting you in negotiations; they are meeting you to discuss a matter and arrive at an agreement; and if agreement is arrived at between the two of you, therefore, that is the end. When we of the Union reach an agreement with other parties, that is the end of the agreement and nobody in here can decide it. That is why I said at the beginning that we should not have people like cantonniers tied on to your structure. Are you going to tell a cantonnier that he

cannot strike because the Chief Justice cannot strike? Let us stop that kind of thing. What has happened in 1937 can happen again. It is a question of people having more media through which to express their desires. The Civil Service Association, the Trade Union and all of those various organisations express the will of the people. I am not opposed to the hon. member, even if that was his opinion. I am not speaking for the Civil Service Association, but speaking in general terms. You must accept that if you regard the Civil Service Association as a Trade Union, that Association should be accorded all the rights that you would accord a Trade Union in its own function. Of course, I would say that the Barbados Civil Service Association is a biased, weak-bellied organisation and members of the Civil Service are such a people. Some of them would not let me sleep on mornings when they want favours. I will also say that the average middle-class man in Barbados is no freedom fighter. He only waits until the fight comes off and then joins in the dance. Civil Servants in the middle class are nothing at all; so when it comes to them, I hold no brief for them. Do not think that I am going about this matter for the Civil Servants as such. I am going about it on the thing which is more important. I want you to realise how we feel about these things. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has been a freedom fighter before me. That is why I say that I was surprised to hear the views which he expressed.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I do not care to get in any further argument but I had hoped that the hon. member would at least have listened to what I had to say. As far as the Civil Service Association is concerned, and there being a Union for Civil Servants, I am the last person to be against that. Let me say that I helped in forming the Civil Service Association, and as a matter of fact, my brother was cut down for the part he played in helping to form the Civil Service Association. He was removed from the Colonial Secretary's Office at that time and posted elsewhere. I have suffered and my family have suffered as a result. When the Salaries Commissioner would have made his recommendations, those recommendations will not go to the Civil Service Association, but they will ultimately go to the Cabinet for the Cabinet's approval. I am not saying that the Civil Service Association ought not to have representations made in every sphere and level of employment, and if the Salaries Commissioner has not made proper recommendations that they should not press for a review and to see that justice is done to them. I merely say that after the Salaries Commissioner has done his job, the competent people to whom his report will go rest with the Cabinet. Do not try to make out that I am against the Civil Service Association. As I have said, my brother has suffered as a result of the part he played in that Association and I had a hand in forming it. I have suffered twenty odd years ago for the working classes and it is for that reason, whether it is the Barbados Labour Party, the Barbados National Party, the Democratic Labour Party or whatever Party it is, I will do my best for the working class. Let me say that the people know what I have done and that is why I can run alone in Christ Church and will beat and whip anybody who runs for that parish.

6.05 p.m.

I have suffered for twenty odd years. I can say that whether it is the Barbados Labour Party, the Democratic Labour Party or whatever Party, I ran alone in Christ Church and I got a seat in this House. The people of Christ Church know me and they will send me here again.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to join in this debate, but on account of certain remarks which have been made by the members on the other side of this House, I have no other alternative but to speak. I am in favour of this Commissioner to go into this matter. Even in a legal matter, no Judge can be plaintiff and a Judge at the same time. It is right to have this Commissioner to deal with the revision of salaries and I will vote for this Resolution today. I am in favour of having certain things put right, but under no circumstances must the Government deal with the fellows who are at the top first and then deal with those who are at the bottom. Those fellows who are at the top are all right. I agreed with the Premier who brought down a Resolution to give public employees a Cost of Living Allowance of nine dollars a month. That was not an increase of sala-

ry. The man at the top bought his foodstuffs at the same price as the man at the bottom. The man at the bottom had to meet his cost of living and the Cost of Living Allowance was on a basis which was equitable.

While this Commissioner is sitting, I am asking the Government to make it a point to see that consideration is given to those who are at the bottom in the first place, and then what is left is given to those at the top. If you have to do something for the members of the Civil Service, those in the lower brackets should be given preference, and those in the higher brackets could take care of themselves. I do not believe that those who are in the top-brackets would make any row because, when you consider the position of those at the bottom, those who are in receipt of salaries of \$150 a month and downwards, primary consideration should be given to them. As I have said, those at the top can take care of themselves. The people know that this country is faced with a deficit of \$1 1/2 million and could they honestly ask this Government to increase the salaries of those at the top when they know that the deficit is there? We have a population of about 8,000 or 10,000 people who are living on the borderline of starvation in this island. They are the people who have created the wealth of this island; no Civil Servant, no matter how big or how tall he is, has created any wealth in this country and if you have a surplus, by all means you should consider the employees who are in the lower brackets. (Mr. WALCOTT: Who created the wealth?) I am not concerned with the plantation man or whoever he is; if you have given the Civil Service as a whole a Cost of Living Allowance of \$9.00 a month, it is right that these unfortunate people who get \$1.80 per week.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member get back to this Resolution which deals with the revision of salaries.

Mr. SEARLES: This is something which we have to raise in order to give these people increases in wages. They are as much members of the community as anybody else and this Government must consider the Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Old Age Pensioners are not before us. (ASIDES)

Mr. SEARLES: I am not vote catching; I can take care of myself. Whether it is the B.L.P. the D.L.P. or any P, I am sure that I can hold my own. (Laughter). I am prepared to face the Electors whenever the General Elections comes off. I can face the Election; if any hon. member of any Party is thinking that senile decay has set in where I am concerned he is wasting time. (Cheers). I agree in toto with what the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said. You cannot be a judge and a plaintiff at the same time. A judge is an independent man who will be guided by facts and figures in order to arrive at a decision.
6.15 p.m.

These things will not be decided on until we, the members of the Labour Party, meet and have to decide what policy we are going to adopt on them, and I am sure that nothing will be done which will be detrimental to anybody or any member of the Civil Service. They will get what is coming to them and we are prepared to do what is just and right towards the Civil Service.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, those of us who have been in here for some time have got accustomed at the end of every five years to dealing with a Resolution of this nature. I heard in a *sotto voce* remark that it is just a coincidence. I would like to say that once might be an accident, twice is an incident and three times a coincidence. I wonder what would happen if the life of the House was ten years. I therefore would like to begin by saying right away that I disagree with the hon. member, who having spoken on this Bill have said that we could have someone locally to deal with it.

When I received this Resolution, I was turning it over in my mind whether we should have someone locally and save this money, but when I read the terms of reference, I

felt you would either have to have a local businessman or a local retired Civil Servant; but when I looked at the terms of reference and saw that they were 'to examine the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees and to make representation having regard to the economy of the island,' naturally I could see what would happen. If you are going to get a local businessman, naturally, as Government sees it, businessmen are hard-headed people, and I say what my friends on the other side and even those who are not my friends would like to hear; that is, it does not matter what colour they are, they are Conservative people.

If you put a businessman on this Commission, whether he is a planter, merchant or whatever he happens to be, he is a Conservative as long as he thinks in terms of business. I say that even at the risk of being contradicted by the Trade Union representative. The terms of reference are to examine the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees and to make recommendations having regard to the economy of the island; the need to recruit and retain suitably qualified administrative, professional and technical officers; the need to maintain an efficient and contented public service; any other relevant considerations. I am therefore in entire agreement with the importation of this suitably qualified person whom I understand Government has looked around for and found.

Dealing with the other aspect of terms and conditions of the Civil Service, it would be stupid for anybody to argue that a Civil Servant or anybody could not put up to an Association, Government or employer what they should get as salaries. If you brought a Commissioner here and your Civil Service Association did not put up a memorandum on what they thought, it would be nonsense and should be non-existent; so when the hon. junior member for St. James says that he agrees with the hon. senior member for Christ Church that they could not be judge and jury, the Civil Service Association can only put up a memorandum which would be considered in the light of the economy of the island and the relevant circumstances by the Commissioner.

I must say in passing that while I agree with the Government in such a selection, we have had so much experience that even after these recommendations have been made, the Government is bound to review them. It is possible that you might have an over-zealous Commissioner who might after his three months in Barbados get down to the real economy of the island and might really fix things a little too high. It is therefore for us to express our views in this House, and I hope that the Commissioner when he comes to this island will be given the opportunity to see not only what the Government has said, but what the members of the Opposition have said in this House on the matter. The Addendum mentions the Civil Service, public officers and Government employees, and these go from the Chief Justice back down to the cantonnier and all those persons who are pensionable in the Government Service of this island.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman, and from my experience - and I believe it is also your experience - some of us on this side of the House have been approaching and have been pressing Government to make some kind of revision, not necessarily a general revision, in the Service, because we found that from the middle brackets down have been experiencing great difficulty with the increased cost of living. Now we find that the Government is having a general revision. I can only express my own personal view and it is this: whatever revision is made, I agree that the terms of reference must be in keeping with the economy of the island. It must be borne in mind that this country with its economy will never be able to get certain professional and technical men because we would never be able to pay the salaries offered by Trinidad and Jamaica. We have been talking about Federation over the last five or six years and with all the cutting and slashing we have had between Jamaica and Trinidad in the field of technical and other professions, whether doctors, teachers or other highly qualified men for the Service, they have been offering salaries above

Barbados, because they are in a position economically to offer such salaries, and therefore in the light of the economy of the island that must be taken into consideration first. However well qualified a man may be in Barbados, however well qualified your Chief Justice, Chief Secretary, Headmaster of the Technical Institute or of a High School may be, you cannot keep him in Barbados for your salary, because sooner or later if you are offering £50 or £60 a year and Jamaica is prepared to offer £200 a year, it is plain that you cannot keep the man nor can you offer that salary. That is why I agree with the terms of reference which mentions first and foremost the economy of the island. The economy of the island is the first thing this Commissioner must take into consideration, and in bearing that in mind I would say, although this statement would cause me not to get Civil Servants' votes, that the salaries in the upper brackets - I am speaking of those in the \$400 a month and up bracket - we cannot afford to raise because we cannot compete with Jamaica and Trinidad. As I said, I hope that the Commissioner will see exactly not only what members of the Government feel but how members of the Opposition feel in this matter.

6.25 p.m.

I feel myself that drastic revision is necessary from the middle down to the bottom. Let me say, that this is the most serious Salaries Revision which you have ever had in this House.

I am going to make a review of the general run of persons working in the Public Service. That comprises of people who are policemen and cantoniers. I have said already on the floor of the House that no unskilled worker should be working for less than \$15 a week. That feeling has been put into practice by me, not to get votes but after I got votes. Every unskilled worker should have been getting not less than \$15 per week over the past five years. I have worked it out very carefully, but there are some people who, so long as their means are satisfied, seem to forget the road which they have passed. When you are climbing up the ladder, make sure that the rungs are quite secure because you might have to come back down that ladder.

You are getting trouble in your Police Force. I saw a tremendous denial of it the other day by someone in the Press and I smiled at it. It is very well to get a denial saying that there was no complaint, but I believe that the Hon. Premier has sensed that there is some uneasiness there. You start a young man in the Police Force at a salary of \$80 a month and he must be up to a certain standard. The majority must be married and that means that a lot of them must rent a house at \$40 a month. The majority of policemen whom you select nowadays are not only men of the required height, but unlike in the past they must be persons who know something. Not only must you take the economy of the Island into consideration, but you have to take a lot of other things into consideration.

Sir, there is absolutely no need for consideration of those in the upper brackets. Your revision should be concerned with people like policemen and those persons in the Civil Service who have been working for possibly eight or ten years right down to people who are cantoniers. The Hon. Minister of Transport was pressed to pay conductors \$25 a week. Take the society which we live in. Can you imagine that a policeman would be satisfied getting \$22 a week when a conductor gets \$25 a week? Surely the responsibility of the policeman is greater to the public. I hope that the Government is taking this quite seriously.

As regards the selection of a Salaries Commissioner, I feel that it would be rather difficult to have a local man to do the job. There is some talk about not getting votes from the Civil Servants and I am going to say something now which I think the Government should consider seriously. What is wrong with those at the top? You get a man saying: "Here I am getting \$500 or \$600 a month and the slice which you take out for income tax is too big." You do create a sort of inflation in the top ranks of the Civil Service. I want to say here and now something which you should put your feet down on right away although I do not see how you can do it because there is such a bad example which you have set. I feel that the need for maintaining an efficient

Civil Service is a tremendous job but you can only get an efficient and contented Civil Service if you pay them. The only way is if you can give those in the top brackets some money also, but I feel that it is a question of the majority. You cannot have an efficient and contented Civil Service if the Civil Servant who has a family is not contented; therefore, Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the terms of reference. They read as follows:-

"To examine the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees and to make recommendations having regard to -

- (i) the economy of the Island;
- (ii) the need to recruit and retain suitably qualified administrative, professional and technical officers;
- (iii) the need to maintain an efficient and contented public service;
- (iv) any other relevant considerations."

When it comes to the administrative side of it, I personally feel that you are top heavy with administration.

6.35 p.m.

The terms of reference should also be able to tell us where we have too many people in a particular department making work for each other. I hope the Premier is listening to this. I agree that your Civil Service must be able to put up to the Commissioner a memorandum telling him what we have and what we should have, but the Government should also have the right to say to the Commissioner that he should go into the Post Office or the Government Savings Bank or the Ministry and see whether there are too many people and they are making work for themselves. If we are saying that they should be paid properly and they should be contented, then we should be able to see if you are too top heavy in the Post Office or elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deal with the one sore point which is going to give us as well as this Commissioner a very big headache. We are now asking for this sum of \$9,200 to bring this Commissioner down here to Barbados and the Government has wisely set out here what the expenses are. According to the Addendum to this Resolution, the purpose of the Resolution is to provide funds to cover the cost of the Salaries revision and the estimate of \$9,200 is arrived at as follows: (a) fee to the Salaries Commissioner, \$960 per month for three and a half months, \$3,360; (b) hotel accommodation, \$16 per day for 105 days, \$1,680; (c) Subsistence allowance, \$7.20 per day for 105 days, \$756; (d) Official car, \$525; (e) Passage expenses, \$1,300. This gentleman is coming down here from England; and then we have Contingencies, \$1,579. The Government has told us exactly what they want to spend in bringing down this Commissioner. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the most important thing in this whole matter is not education but public health. You cannot tell us about the Hospital. Mr. Chairman, do not use your gavel because I am going to talk on this matter. You took money from here out of the same people of this country to pay for the making of a Report on the conditions at the General Hospital, which is a part of the Public Service, and you have refrained from telling us one word about the Report. How are we to know that you want to get and maintain a contented and efficient public service? The Hospital Nurses, the Orderlies, the Cooks, the Washers, the Doctors, the Radiologist, all of these come under this estimate. You brought people to this country.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Hospital report is not under discussion for one thing, and secondly, I think that those who work at the Hospital are Government employees; therefore this revision covers them. The Hospital Report is not under discussion. Nowhere in this Resolution do I see anything about the Hospital Report.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sooner or later you will learn that it is our right.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City saw me keeping a watchful eye on this matter. The hon. member should know better than discuss the Hospital Report. The Premier has drawn to the hon. member's attention that these people come under this salaries revision. In so far as the General Hospital and its Report are concerned, I think there is on this Order Paper a notice which was given by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy relative to the Hospital Report. I, therefore, advise the hon. member to refrain even from attempting to discuss anything in connection with the Hospital Report as he will have ample opportunity when the Resolution of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is being dealt with. I ask the hon. member to stick to this Resolution dealing with the Salaries Commissioner.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, but one wonders when must a member be told when he is out of order and by whom.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In this instance, the Chairman will tell you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Have I discussed the Hospital Report? Why is there this long discourse from you?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Because you mentioned the Report.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not discussing the Report. The terms of reference refer to the making of recommendations having regard to the need to recruit and retain suitably qualified, administrative, professional and technical officers. Where do the professional people work? They do not work at Queen's College. I know that there is dissatisfaction at the General Hospital; there is no department in this whole island which would have more professional and technical officers than the General Hospital. The Nurses and Doctors are professional workers. I am entitled to draw an analogy and show that they are not contented. One of the terms of reference for this Commissioner is to make recommendations as to the need to maintain an efficient and contented Public Service. Everybody knows that there is discontent at the General Hospital and I would like to say that if I am out of order in saying that, I am glad to see that they are bringing down this Commissioner, Mr. Chairman, I am going to discuss the Report but not here. I promise the Government that I will discuss the Report, but this is not the proper time for doing so. We are supporting the expenditure of this sum of \$9,200 for this Commissioner to come down here to go into the general service which includes the Hospital and when they spend our money to pay advisers on the Hospital, which is a very important part of the general service of this island, they could not give the public this Report.
6.45 p.m.

I want to know if we are going to get this Report, because we have to be very careful. You brought somebody to discuss one of the most important Departments in the whole service of this country - the Hospital; you have clerical, administrative, professional and everybody at the Hospital; but you said that the Report was none of our business. You come along with this now; but suppose, for instance, this Commissioner says that he feels you are underpaying all these people, robbing them and came out with a blistering Report similar to the Hospital Report; and suppose he says that he does not know how we exist and thinks it is a crime, are you going to give us that Report? That is what I want to know, because owing to a certain condemnation in the Hospital Report it has not seen the light of day.

I am supporting this Resolution very strongly, but I hope that this Report even if it condemns the Government will reach the public. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Civil Service Association has a right to put its memorandum. I feel it is the right of Government in the light of all that happens to Reports, after they have studied it, to put to the country because no matter how far fetched the recommendations are, the Government must still be in a position to make the Report known, because we feel that this gentleman has come from Sierra Leone where there is great potentiality and a lot of wealth. In his Report, for in-

stance, the Commissioner has to state what is likely to keep an efficient and contented public service. Now you know that one of the things to keep an efficient and contented service is to come along and make sweeping recommendations to people, but the Government must still be in a position - and this is where I agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church - after the recommendations have been put up to consider them in the light of the economy of the island.

Mr. Chairman, you will never be able to pay top-flight medical officers at our Barbados Hospital what Jamaica or Trinidad can offer and possibly some of the small islands, but under the circumstances I wholeheartedly support this Resolution. I believe myself that if the Government decided on these terms of reference, they are well set out; but I would tell this officer that one of the main things to keep a contented and efficient public service at present would be to start from the middle and go down. There is no gainsaying that none of those \$600-a-month people can suffer or would have to go to the shop and trust unless they are worthless. None of them would have to go to a shop and owe the shopkeeper at the end of the month. I do not think that even those in the \$400 bracket would suffer, and, believe me, I would like to amend the terms of reference by asking you to insert "with special reference to persons below \$200 a month." None of the \$400 a month people send to the shop and trust unless they are rum drinkers and want to go to every night club on Saturday nights and spend \$100 a night. It is the cantonnier, the postman, policeman, elementary teacher in the lower bracket and the assistant teacher for whom you must make special reference, but there is a tendency in the Civil Service Association to think more of the Secretaries and \$600 a month boys.

I will tell you something that is happening, Mr. Chairman. Some people get a degree or an advanced level certificate and feel that the Government must pay for this while they have nothing to do - the Premier knows what I am saying is true - but the people doing the spade work are the ones who are finding it difficult. I make this suggestion despite what was written in the Press about the Police Force, and it is that there is still something unsatisfactory among them. Do you realise what a policeman is getting? I think it is a shame. You have been fortunate that a lot of people in this country have not walked out on you already. I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, what occurred to me when I first read the Addendum to this Resolution was the wording of the first paragraph which says "to examine the structure of the Barbados Civil Service and review the remuneration of all public officers and Government employees and to make recommendations having regard to - etc. etc." I would like to emphasise and underline the word "all", because I cannot see how anyone could have been so oblivious to certain facts as to allow their terms of reference to authorise the Salaries Commissioner to examine the structure and to review the remuneration of all public employees. By what stretch of the imagination, Mr. Chairman, could you justify even the time and energy spent on examining the remuneration of, say, the Head of the Administration, the Chief Secretary, the Permanent Secretary, the Assistant Secretary and the Postmaster General? There is no justification and no reason whatsoever even to think of including the remuneration of the higher and the highest placed public employees in such an examination as this, because it is obvious that you cannot afford to give them one cent increase; if anything, you might have to reduce them. You cannot afford, although we profoundly disagree, to give increases to old age pensioners, and yet you are contemplating, at least you are throwing out the possibility according to the phrasing of this Addendum by stating that you are going to review the remuneration of all public officers in Government employ in having increases recommended for the higher and the highest grades.
6.55 p.m.

If you have no intention of acting on these recommendations in respect of increases for the highest and highest

paid, why put it in here at all? The longer the Salaries Commissioner remains here, the more you will have to pay. If you leave out the consideration of those people, the highest paid, at least you might save a month of this Salaries Commissioner's time and it will take him two and a half instead of three and a half months and by so doing this amount will be £200 less than what you envisaged.

I repeat, unless you decide to give an adequate amount in the increase of old age pension, you cannot be justified in thinking of reviewing at all the salaries of persons in the highest categories of the Service. Of course, we are in the unfortunate position where we have somebody from the United Kingdom who will be undertaking the salaries revision. My submission is that in your giving him those wide terms of reference, you are calling upon him not only to review the remuneration of the lowest paid public employees and those in the middle, but you are also calling on him to review the remuneration of all persons in the Service; therefore, he must spend some time in considering paying the Permanent Secretaries more money and officials of that kind. There is no reason why he should do that when you are not giving any review to the pensions of old age pensioners. They should come first. In deciding on the terms of reference you should select a figure and say that you want him to give consideration to the remuneration of public officers from the bottom to those who are getting so much per month - say, £50 or \$250 a month. Certainly, there is no justification for reviewing the salaries and making recommendations for those in the top brackets when you are not giving old age pensioners anything more. There can be no justification for one moment in giving any increase to any of them in the top brackets.

I want to impress on the Salaries Commissioner that he must make a substantial increase for the people at the bottom.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

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

On resumption,

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

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

HOUSE RESUMES IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the Government would probably be well advised in determining the terms of reference of the Salaries Commissioner to fix the maximum amount, and say to him that his duty is to examine the structure of all public officers whose salaries and wages do not exceed that amount. I suggest that maximum amount should be anything between \$250 and \$300 a month. As it stands now, this official will spend time reviewing the salaries and wages of every public officer, however little moral justification there would be for reviewing that highly paid official's salary scale.

When I mentioned that figure of \$300 as the maximum, I mentioned it mainly in respect of salary to which height he should review, but I did not have in mind those persons

who hold magisterial posts. I will exclude the professional men who hold magisterial posts in this colony simply because they are inadequately paid having regard to their qualifications and the onerous duties which they at present have to perform. In the case of these public officers who are Magistrates of this island, they are to be reviewed in this light in which a fair percentage increase should be recommended owing to the fact that they are due to have their salaries completely reviewed separate and apart from this review by the Salaries Commissioner, because their salary is on too low a scale for the qualifications which they possess and the duties which they have to perform.

Sir, my general comment is that a revision of salaries of the lowest paid public officers and Government employees is urgently necessary. It is overdue. They did not have any such revision since the last general election in 1956, and with the increased cost of living and because the salaries and wages of people such as casual employees of the Public Works Department, the Waterworks Department, the Department of Highways and Transport and the Police Constables are such as to make it impossible for them to live decently or adequately on the present cost of living, therefore, adequate and substantial increases are due to persons in those classes. When such increases are given to these people there can be nothing left to give Heads of Departments, Deputy Heads and sub Heads; therefore, I think it is well to let it be known how we feel about them. Let the higher and highest paid Government Servants understand that any recommendations coming before Parliament after the Salaries Commissioner has finished his recommendations and the Cabinet has been through them for any increase for those people we intend to resist with all the power, vigour and strength at our command.
7.50 p.m.

Nothing at all for those in the higher brackets; no increase for anybody who is beyond \$250 and \$300 a month except in the case of Magistrates who are underpaid - and the country is suffering as a result of the inadequate payment of skilled, professional men or men who have had vast experience in the work which they are performing and have been performing for many years with conspicuous success. I do not know what are the other qualifications of this gentleman, whether he is a qualified economist or statistician or how much experience he has had in this work. It is a pity that in these days a West Indian was not available for this post; I wonder if it did not occur to the Government that they should seek the services of a distinguished West Indian like the Federal Speaker or somebody of his calibre. It is not a matter that when we are having difficulty with our country, when we want a Salaries Commissioner, we cannot find anybody except from the United Kingdom. When we want assistance without our salaries revision, they tell us this that and the other and that they must have an official from a country outside the Federation of the West Indies. If they cannot get a suitably qualified person in the West Indies and better cannot be done, we should then go outside the Commonwealth. I wonder if the suggestions which had been made by the high-ranking members of the Civil Service Association of the island were taken and given the serious consideration which they merit, as to the calibre of persons from which this Salaries Commissioner might be drawn. Mr. Jacobs may be a good man; but I hope that the day will soon come when, in matters of this kind, we will not have to go outside our own West Indian soil in order to get an official to do work of this nature.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1961-62, No.2 COMMONWEALTH TECHNICAL TRAINING WEEK.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$1,925 under Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - and Item 81 - Commonwealth Technical Training Week. In moving the passing of this Resolution which is for the purpose of defraying

the expenses which will be incurred by the observation of the Commonwealth Technical Training Week in Barbados, I think it is necessary for me to elaborate on what has been stated in the Addendum to this Resolution in that there is not much set out there for the guidance of hon. members. I shall begin by attempting to give a short history of the origin of what I am inclined to style a movement. This idea of the holding of a Commonwealth Technical Training Week has emanated from none other a worthy personage than His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. He has been motivated by what he saw taking place in Australia.

Although it is true to say that the proposal has come from His Royal Highness, the idea of the Commonwealth Technical Training Week was born in Australia, because it is in Australia that His Royal Highness saw a State Apprenticeship week in operation and he felt that it was something which should be emulated throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations. I think I can risk to say that we, the members of this august Chamber, share the views of His Royal Highness in so far as the value of technical training is concerned and the place which technical training should occupy in our educational system. The idea of His Royal Highness is this; he has set it out in these words: "The material prosperity of any country depends, to a very large extent, upon the general level of technical knowledge and efficiency". I make bold to say that each member of this august Chamber shares that view, and in order to show that we acquiesce in the idea, the Government of Barbados has decided to observe Commonwealth Training week and to that end a Committee has been appointed to decide on the form which this celebration should take. This Committee has reported to the Government, and here we are asking for this sum of money to be granted for the purpose of preparing for this celebration.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something more in connection with the aims and objects of holding Commonwealth Technical Training Week. The aims are to stimulate awareness of the responsibility of the community towards the young people entering employment; to stress the importance of schemes of training and apprenticeship being undertaken both for the benefit of individual firms and in the interest of the young people themselves; to give increased opportunities to young people to learn of the opportunities available for training and education and generally to emphasise the significant place which the young worker has in society.

Mr. Chairman, I make bold to say that these, in my humble opinion, are laudable aims and that we, in Barbados, are somewhat behind the times in so far as the making of the necessary provision whereby individuals could develop to the fullest what they are capable of as far as this particular sphere is concerned. In other countries, for example, the United States of America, Canada, England and Russia, technical training is a "must" and it occupies a very important place in their educational system, as a result of which students are turned out fitted to some great extent to play their part with quite a great chance of success in various fields of endeavour.

8.00 p.m.

In Barbados we have been content barely to make a man literate, but we feel that when students have reached the age of fourteen and they have a standard of literacy, there should be further training to fit them for some useful purpose in life. The feeling in the wide world today is that no educational system can be considered worth its while if it does not satisfy the needs of the country. I think that Barbados is well on the way to accept such a principle — at least, the Government is — and we can say that we are pretty well more or less committed to a policy of improving facilities for vocational training or what the Americans commonly call the study of the industrial arts.

Now I mentioned that there is a special programme drawn up and I should like to give an idea of what the programme will take the form of. This programme which has been arranged will be tailored to suit the students of the various schools; visits of parties of school children will be made to sugar factories, garages, industrial plants, and

special shows by the mobile cinema unit will be put over. Schools on Open Day will visit the Technical Institute, Housecraft Centres as well as Woodwork and Science classes at other schools. There will be broadcasts on technical training for various careers, and at centres in the several parishes there will be exhibitions representing all the crafts and the production of craft classes which have been run at the various schools.

With respect to the matter of a breakdown on these costs, I should like to give something of an idea. There will be bus trips to the tune of fifty which will cost roughly \$1,500 and there will be fares to the tune of \$75 for 150 teachers who will accompany students on these tours, the cost of film strips, posters and so on will be roughly \$200 and as far as incidentals are concerned, I am asking \$150 be provided, making a grant total of \$1,925.

I think there is hardly any need for me to say more. I take it that hon. members will concur in the effort and that the sum requested will find no difficulty in meeting with the approbation of hon. members. At the same time, if there is any information which I have failed to give and hon. members ask for it and it is available, I shall be only too glad to supply it.

I now have very much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I should like to assure the Minister first of all that the Official Opposition has no objection whatever to the expenditure of these funds for this purpose, and also by and large we approve the programme outlined both here in the Addendum to the Resolution and in the Speech of the Minister. I am asked to say by my colleagues, speaking the official point of view of our Party on this matter, that we welcome the proposal for Commonwealth Training Week, and we would like to see it established, and even more than once a year. So that if I go in my arguments a little beyond the range which the Minister has touched, it does not mean that I am critical of the proposal, but that we have certain views, Mr. Chairman, on these matters which we think it appropriate to draw to the Minister's attention.

Now while it is true, Mr. Chairman, that we agree with the idea of setting aside a special week devoted to all the problems of technical training among young people, and while such a programme is desirable, what we should like to see is a steady, persistent attack on all these problems, and an even steadier and more persistent solution of them. We would like to know, for instance, what plans Government has for a follow-through programme. We would like to know what benefits — there must be benefits — are going to be taken from the experience gained in having this particular Training Week, and whether these benefits and the experience gained from them are going to be applied, where possible and desirable, to the appropriate aspects of our educational system.

At this point, I would just like to say that this matter of technical training in our view is not only important for what it is, but also for what it can be, and that it is best seen if it takes place against a background of the whole general economic and social policy. If for instance, you isolate technical training from the remainder of the efforts which the whole community is making, you, as it were, Mr. Chairman, leave it in a vacuum; but if you could tie it in some way or other to the general picture of economic and social development within the community, well then, it has its place and that place is the first place. I have said that only to say that if there is going to be a follow through and a follow-up of these ideas, and if the spirit as well as the letter of the Duke of Edinburgh's idea are to be given their proper valuation, technical training has got to start even further back than the child; it has got to start with teacher training itself, and I should like to draw to the Minister's attention...

Mr. CHAIRMAN knocked the gavel.

Mr. Chairman, I see that I am interrupting hon. members. If as I said, the letter and spirit of the Duke of Edinburgh's suggestion are to have their full valuation, well then, we have got to take this matter even farther back than the child himself.

8.10 p.m.

When the Minister, therefore, says that part of the programme for this Commonwealth Technical Training Week is to be visits of school children to factories and industrial centres, business places and workshops, we welcome that; but I go further and say that teachers themselves ought to be made aware of the possibilities of further training for themselves by these visits being part of their own experience.

What I mean is this: It ought to be part of the teacher's training that just as how some portion of the course is devoted to what is school practice teaching, so also some portion of his own personal instruction should include during his period of training visits to factories and workshops. I think myself that if teachers are to instruct their pupils in these matters and to provoke a more positive awareness among the pupils of the aims of technical training, the teachers themselves must be brought face to face with the possibilities of this training. I think that teachers ought to be invited — not forced and persuaded — to spend some time in banks apart from drawing their salaries; they should spend some time in stores, and other Government Departments and business houses in order to see how the community earns its living and how the economic development of the community is proceeding so that they will be able to impart to the children they teach a more positive awareness of the training. They have to follow it up so that it would be a continual feature of our teaching to bring about this awareness. What goes on in other parts of the Commonwealth as regards this Commonwealth Technical Training Week should be of vital interest to the community.

This is something which I want to draw to the Minister's attention. He may not know it, but in the United Kingdom the Air Ministry and the Admiralty have both of them decided on a training scheme for Commonwealth citizens. This is what they have decided on for boys and girls between the ages of 17 years and 25 years who have reached the standard of having four, or possibly five, subjects at the Ordinary Level of the General Certificate of Education after other requirements are met. These boys and girls are to be given permission by the Admiralty and the Air Ministry to be trained in certain techniques not necessarily connected with the Air Force or the Admiralty, but bearing some connection on their future employment. In other words, these two services are prepared to extend facilities to Commonwealth countries to train young people not necessarily for the Navy or the Air Force, except they so desire to be drafted in these Services after they are trained, but they are extending these facilities to these young people in Commonwealth Countries in order to help the youths of Commonwealth countries. Some of the new Commonwealth countries, like Ghana, Ceylon and the Malaya, have taken advantage of this offer and I am surprised that no notification of this scheme has come to this Government or the Federal Government. They have said that they are willing to make these training facilities open to Commonwealth young people between the ages of 17 and 25 years provided they have satisfied the requirements at the Ordinary Level of the G.C.E. and, of course, provided that in that minimum standard they have passes in English and in Mathematics.

Now, Sir, here is the very best link up and follow through of what we are suggesting. I, therefore, suggest to the Hon. Minister of Education either acting on behalf of his own Government or perhaps in consultation with the Federal Government to seek through the appropriate channels further information on this matter and I believe that he will find my information is substantially correct and I hope they would see the significance of it. A lot of people here between the ages of 18 and 20 years leave school with these certificates and they would like to have the satisfaction of being trained in skills and crafts which they cannot acquire here; and if they are any point in emigration at all, it is that people going out should acquire skills which would be of benefit to the community when they return. I have no fear of your

finding people here who would take advantage of this facility. Both the public and the private school establishments in this Island turn out literally hundreds of people with these minimum requirements. I will like to think what emerges from this Commonwealth Technical Training Week as a positive step would be the possibility of 40, 50, 60 or even 100 of our young people of both sexes being able to take advantage of these facilities offered to them by the Admiralty and the Air Force.

Of course, there is a secondary matter which should also interest not particularly this Government but the Federal Government. One of the attributes of national sovereignty is of course that the nation aspiring to sovereignty must have a proper defence force. The Federal Government may be interested in a scheme like this because it may be a means of getting the men for our Air Force and Navy being trained. But apart from that, the acquisition of skills and techniques by these young people is something which would stand them in good stead and which would further enrich our life. Therefore, Sir, if I go a little further than the Minister, it is not because I am telling him something new or making capital out of his suggestions, but I regard these matters as of so much importance that I must draw to the Minister of Education all these facilities and so as to urge him either with the Secretary of State for the Colonies direct or with the Federal Government to see what possibilities there can be for a large number of our young people with the required educational facilities taking advantage of these training courses offered by these two branches.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Sir, before I reply to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I would like to say how highly I appreciate what he has said and suggested; but I would like him to know that I know of even more facilities which are to come our way than he knows and I hope that in the not too distant future I shall be able more or less to give him the knowledge that we are taking active steps to speed up this matter of vocational training.

8.20 p.m.

I cannot, at this moment, divulge all that I know, but I do know that the hon. member will believe me when I submit that I have a very big scheme which I shall bring down to this House very soon from now. In so far as my being critical of private schools is concerned, I am to say that anything which is taken out of its context can have a very different meaning from that which was intended. However, all that I have said about private schools is in the interest of the community and it is not at all due to any bad feelings that I have against anybody. I should like to say that we should see that we get full value for the money which we are spending. I was particular in pointing out that I shall be the first to say that private schools are serving a very useful purpose in this country, but what I am positively dissatisfied about is that certain of these schools, which pretend to be offering education at a certain level, are not doing that and I should like to see that put right. If anybody takes exception to that, your humble servant cannot help it. I have taken the trouble to get evidence and I am speaking on the evidence which I have. I have no axe to grind or any personal feelings against anybody, but in the interest of this community I would be expected to speak the truth, no matter who gets vexed. I have not got any animosity against anybody; I call a spade a spade; and when I have said what I have said, I am through. I certainly make no apology for saying that some of these private schools are not living up to the promises which they have made.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make this comment on what the hon. member has said. I appreciate that he has been speaking without any animosity against anybody; indeed the hon. member would be the last person to speak with any animosity. If there are certain private schools which do not measure up to the standards which we would like to see, that is the fault of the Government. If these schools exist at all, those which are of the poorer standard are the consequences of the Government failing to provide facilities out of the taxpayers' money. If the hon. member has been able through evidence to distinguish between those schools which are doing a good job and those which are not, the policy of the Government should be a

clear and simple one. The policy of the Government is to consider those schools which are doing a good job and help them to do a better job. By that means, the standards would be improved and the indifferent schools would have something at which to go. If the Minister can distinguish between the sheep and the goats, then he deserves to feed the sheep and let the goats amuse themselves.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

DISPLACED WORKERS ALLOWANCES (BRIDGETOWN HARBOUR) BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take as the next Order of the Day the Bill to provide for the payment of allowances to certain categories of workers displaced as the direct result of the coming into operation of the Bridgetown Harbour.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:—To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the payment of allowances to certain categories of workers displaced as the direct result of the coming into operation of the Bridgetown Harbour.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as hon. members will see, is the result of a decision taken by the Government to provide *ex gratia* payment to persons who may be displaced as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. Before I go into details of the Bill, I should like to say that there have been so many misleading statements made in relation to this question that I am prepared to deal with a bit of the background of the construction of this Deep Water Harbour. The House will remember that in 1953 a Committee was set up to consider the question of the construction of this Harbour. That Committee was comprised of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, Sir Archibald Cuke, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, Mr. F. R. Hassell, Hon. K. R. Hunte, Hon. D. Lucie-Smith, the hon. senior member for the City, Hon. E. S. Robinson, Mr. E. S. Burrows, Financial Secretary, Mr. R. W. Belt, Comptroller of Customs, Mr. Masterton-Smith, Harbour and Shipping Master and the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

8.30 p.m.

I do not remember if I mentioned the former senior member for St. Joseph who is now the Prime Minister who was also of this Committee. That Committee, Mr. Speaker, went into these questions very carefully and in paragraph 11 of the Report the Committee said this:

"The need for a Deep Water Harbour is justified by factors which characterise present methods — delays in turn-around, diverted entrepot trade, high cost of discharge, high risks of damage to goods in double handling, interruptions to work in bad weather, congestion in warehouses and in the town area. Possibilities of supplying oil fuel to vessels and facilitating tourist traffic, are also cited."

That Committee, as far as I remember, pointed out that it was absolutely essential for us to have a Deep Water Harbour constructed in Barbados, and on page 30, paragraphs 28 and 29, this is what the Committee had to say:—

"28. The question of bulk loading of sugar is still open and we are not in a position to make any proposals in detail. We recommend, however, that when the Deep Water Harbour is being constructed, some space in the Wharf area be available for lease to sugar interest to enable them to erect bulk loading facilities should they so require.

29. It is anticipated that the establishment of a Deep Water Harbour, while providing a saving in general labour costs will thereby deprive a number of port workers of their means of livelihood. Accordingly we recommend that steps be taken to ensure that, towards the end of construction, priority of employment be given to such displaced workers. We also recommend that consideration be given to the entire problem of displaced workers and their rehabilitation."

I quote that, Mr. Speaker, and this was a unanimous decision of the Committee which was representative of all sections of the community and had nothing to do with this set-up. There were two reservations made, one by the hon. senior member for St. Philip and one by the Hon. E. S. Robinson. There were only two reservations which had absolutely nothing to do with the question of displaced labour or anything of the sort. The reservation made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip reads as follows:—

"With reference to paragraph 22, it appeared unlikely during the deliberations, that the sugar interest would have agreed to the contribution of \$2.00 per ton of sugar had they been appraised of the likelihood of the suggestion for a levy of a basic port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports.

I should like to express my own reservation with regard to any future proposal to levy this cess on the sugar industry specially for contribution to the Deep Water Harbour Fund.

With reference to paragraph 23, I am in absolute agreement that the Deep Water Harbour could be financed by the levy of a port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports.

Since, however, this levy cannot be operative until the harbour has been actually constructed — that is to say, within at least five years — should there be developments in the economy of the country from which the scheme could be financed without placing this additional burden on the community, especially bearing in mind the recent increases in Customs duty, it is to be hoped that alternative methods of financing would receive serious consideration."

That had absolutely nothing to do with the persons being displaced in the Port, and the reservation made by the hon. member from the Other Place, Mr. Robinson, had nothing to do with the Port either.

It is known that the Barbados Labour Party said in its manifesto that it was prepared to construct a Deep Water Harbour. The Government felt it was essential to the economic growth and advancement of this country, and as such was prepared to have the Harbour constructed. But, Mr. Speaker, the Government was not alone in its desire or decision to construct a Deep Water Harbour, because in the manifesto which I hold in my hand which is entitled "Barbados Electors Association Manifesto of Policy, 1951" on page 5, paragraph 9 under "Capital Works", this is what they had to say about it:

"DEEP WATER HARBOUR. Unless embarked upon in the near future, the possibility of Barbados losing its importance as a Port of call for ships in spite of its position must be envisaged with the resulting loss of harbour and other receipts and possible increased cost of goods due to trans-shipment. The provision of a Deep Water Harbour will at the same time tend to reduce the cost of living and help to reduce unemployment."

That is what the Barbados Electors Association placed in its manifesto of 1951. I stated that because I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that so many misleading statements have

been made to the effect that Government built this to put people out of work. Some time ago the hon. junior member for St. John said in this House that the Government built this to be a monument to the 4,000 unemployed people.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to mention in which debate I said that the Government built this to be a monument for 4,000 displaced people. I do not want to waste time, but I remember saying that the bulk sugar store appeared to be a monumental cathedral to the 4,000 displaced sugar workers. I would like to ask the hon. member to quote from the Debate where I said they built it to be a monument. The fact that it has turned out to be a monumental cathedral is a different thing altogether.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member knows that the Rules of the House do not permit me to quote from the Debates.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, which Rule says that a member cannot quote from the Debates of the House in order to clear up a point?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member had finished what he had to say.

Hon. M. E. COX: You cannot quote from Debates of the same Session, and the hon. member said it during this Session of the House; so I was saying that the Rules prohibit a member....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, do I understand that you can misquote from a Debate in the same Session but you cannot quote from the Debate? Is that how the hon. member understands Parliamentary procedure? I would like to ask which Rule it is which says you cannot quote.

8.40 p.m.

If he is asked to point out which debate, or the part of the debate, he is perfectly entitled to do so, as far as I understand the Rules of the House. What do the Rules say as regards that point?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a Rule which says that an hon. member cannot quote from the debates of the House in the present Session.

Mr. BARROW: I still would like the hon. member to say which Rule says that he cannot do so. State the Rule.

Hon. M. E. COX: During the consideration of the Estimates 1961-62....

Mr. BARROW: What page is that?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I refer to that because as far as this Government is concerned, I am sure that it will be agreed by all intelligent people and people who are not biased and not prejudiced to us running the Government, that this Government is a Government which tries in every conceivable way to provide employment for the people of this Island. This is not an idle Government that encourages unemployment or idleness. This Government is not a Government that likes to see people walk about the streets with nothing to do and things of that sort. That can be borne out by the fact that there is no Government in the West Indies or anywhere else which has pursued an employment policy as this Government has. You cannot too often repeat it. This Government has tried in every conceivable way to find employment in almost every part of this world for Barbadians.

While I am on that, I would like to mention this. Last year, when the Minister of Communications from Germany was down here, our Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and I discussed the possibility of finding employment in Germany for some of our workers with him because we knew that at one time we were told — and that was quite recently — that there were 3,000 jobs going for the begging in Germany. We discussed that question with the Minister of Communications for Germany with a view of getting some of our workers there. I must confess that our hopes

were raised after he said that they would be willing to employ some of our workers if they would be willing to come to Germany and work under contract for approximately three years. He went as far as to say that he thought that they would pay the passage of these workers both ways. I went into the circumstances with him and tried to find out what were the wages they paid and what was the question of housing. I must confess that the wages appeared to be reasonably good. That Minister gave us the impression that as soon as he got back to Germany he would invite us to come there and discuss the matter with him. Since then, I have written two letters, but I must confess that our hopes seem to have been dashed to the ground because it appears that it was just so much balderdash when he was here. I say that to show that we were trying to get our people to emigrate to even Germany. That Minister told us that even in the Post Offices of Germany they were short of people.

I repeat, and I cannot repeat too often, that this Government is the only Government that not only lends people money but even goes as far as to train people so that they can take advantage of emigration. As hon. members know, with the London Transport we pay to have our people trained. We process them, we pay their passages and when they get to England we have the Liaison Service which takes care of them. They are met at the railway stations and we get coaches to take them to their abode. They have people to provide their meals until they catch their feet and we do everything possible to make it possible for them to remain in the country. Only recently, we have been able to get ten of our workers in St. Thomas, the Virgin Islands, a place which I visited last year; and although that is a small country, yet I met one of the chaps who returned here on the occasion of the death of his sister and he told me how well he was getting on there. He said that he was working for over \$50 (U.S.) per week.

I say that this Government would be the last to deprive people out of a livelihood or to cause unemployment; therefore, when we are told that this Government has built this Harbour to put people out of work, that is purely a political stunt used against us with a view to capturing votes.

What is the position? We have got, like any other country, to keep abreast of time. If you do not keep abreast of time, it will leave you. The construction of the Harbour is a reality now. As I have said on several occasions, it behoves all people of goodwill to put their heads together and try as far as humanly possible to assist those people who because of the construction may find it impossible to eke out a proper livelihood.

As far as this Bill is concerned, I am happy to say that there have been several discussions between the Ministry and the Workers Union on this question. I also want to say that all the proposals as are set out in this Bill have been approved by the Barbados Workers Union. I am not prepared to say that because the Union has accepted or agreed to all of these proposals, therefore, nobody should have any say in this matter because I still maintain that the Union does not represent all the workers in Barbados; therefore, if anybody wants to put forward any submissions, that individual has his right to put his point of view. But since no doubt it can be claimed that the Union represents to a large extent those persons who are working in the Port, it can be taken for granted that the decision of the Union is the decision of these people. It can also be taken that all persons displaced as a result of the coming into operation of the Port will be considered because you will see from the Bill that not only persons who may be displaced or will be displaced in the Harbour but also those persons who work in the sugar factories, including lorry drivers, lorry hands, sugar loaders and people like those. These are also included in this Bill, so that hon. members will see that as far as we are aware, we have tried to cover all categories of workers who may be displaced as a result of the coming into being of the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, the Objects and Reasons set out quite clearly the intent and purposes of this Bill:-

"The Object of this Bill is to provide for the payment of allowances to certain categories of workers at the Port

and in the sugar industry who have lost employment as a direct result of the coming into operation of the Bridgetown Harbour".

"The allowances to be paid will be met from the funds of the Displaced Workers Allowances Board established under the Act."

"The funds of this Board shall consist of -

- (a) such sums as may be provided for the purposes of the Act from time to time by the Legislature...

It is proposed that \$1 million be voted by the Legislature and the remainder of \$750,000 will be paid into the Board from the Price Stabilization Fund.
8.50 p.m.

As the "Objects and Reasons" also set out, the funds of this Board shall consist of such sums as may from time to time be paid out of the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund for the purposes of the Act in accordance with Regulations made under the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, and such other sums as may from time to time be paid to the Board. That provides that any employer or employers who are sympathetic towards these workers and who want to make a contribution to the workers may do so to this Board. I should like to say in passing that it is regrettable that the employers or the shipping and mercantile community did not make any contribution for these workers. Everybody knows that a substantial number of these workers have been employed by these people for a number of years, twenty-five years, thirty years or over. I feel that it would have come with very good grace from these employers if they had decided to make a contribution to these funds. It is not that the Government did not appeal to them to do so but they felt that the Government was constructing the Deep Water Harbour; they felt that it was an undertaking of the Government and therefore all the financial implications should be borne by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to read from a clipping which I have had in my possession since October, 21, 1960, I should like to compare the employers of Barbados with those of the West Coast in the United States of America. This clipping shows what was done in the case of similar workers; this is what the clipping says. The heading is "West Coast Longshore Deal" and it goes on to read as follows:-

"The Agreement between the Longshoreman's Union and the Waterfront employers on the West Coast carries the joint attack on the employment problems of automation into new ground - a pioneering operation that will be closely watched by labour and management in every industry,

In purely material terms the deal appears to involve a shrewd gamble by the employers that costs savings, which will come from mechanised operations and the more effective use of labour, will more than cover payments that the employers will have to make to compensate workers for losses due to automation". No compensation in this present case has been proposed by these employers for the workers employed in this exercise. The clipping goes on:-

"By all odds the most striking feature of the new agreement is the freedom it gives the employers to deploy their working forces in the most efficient way without any of the so called 'make-work' and 'feather-bedding' restrictions imposed on them by the Union. The agreement also permits the employers to instal labor-saving machinery and methods in the loading and unloading of vessels free of Union opposition.

In return for these unprecedented concessions to progress by the Union, the employers have agreed to contribute a total of \$27.5 million over a five-and-one-half-year period to an 'automation fund'. No detailed analysis of its disposition has been announced but it will be used for such

purposes as to provide additions to the Union Welfare Funds for increased benefits and payments to workers displaced by labour-saving devices and to those who retired at 65. The fund will also be a guarantee of a thirty-five hour week at minimum wages regardless of changes due to automation.

On the face of it this looks like a *quid pro quo* both humane and profitable on both sides. Both for the West Coast Longshore Industry and for greater strength to the American economic way of life, we hope the agreement works out well."

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted that clipping in order to show that there was a similar exercise, which, although it was not a Deep Water Harbour, yet it was an exercise which has no doubt thrown quite a large number of long-shoremen out of work. The employers in that country felt obligated to these workers and therefore they made a contribution to assist these displaced persons. No similar thing has been done in this case by the employers in Barbados.

As regards the actual administration of these funds or the details as to the administration of these funds, hon. members will see how it is proposed to disburse these funds. It has been agreed that the minimum qualification for eligibility for payment shall be in respect of those who were first employed before the date of the decision of the Legislature to construct the Deep Water Harbour. We had discussed the possibility of granting these payments to persons who had worked for 150 days per annum, keeping in line with our Holidays with Pay Act, but it was brought to the notice of the Government that many persons would have been deprived of the benefit of this fund since many of them had not worked for an average of more than 90 days per annum. However, on the submission of the Union it was agreed to put the figure at 90 days. A person who was employed for a few years before the construction of the Deep Water Harbour and had worked for 90 days per annum would be entitled to some of these benefits.
9.00 p.m.

The benefits will be up to a maximum of 72 weeks' pay. As you will see in the Bill, provision will be made for the Board to waive its discretion, and I have an amendment to make when we go into Committee. The Bill proposes that the Board, if the individuals who are over 60 so desire to have the sums, can use its discretion and advance lump sums to these persons. Provision is also made for approximately two-thirds of what one would earn per week to be paid by the Board.

It has also been drawn to our attention that agreement was also reached that the Board should have discretionary powers, if it so desires, to grant to persons who for some reason or other would like to have full weekly pay, *ex gratia* payments to be computed on the basis of wages granted and so on, weeks' wages not to be taken as the average wages per week. The maximum amount for which any displaced workers would be eligible will be as follows:- for every completed year of service up to five years, one week's pay; for every year completed up to the next ten years of service, two weeks' pay and for every year of service up to sixteen years and over, three weeks' pay, provided no person shall receive more than 70 weeks' wages.

Now statutory provision should be made for the Board to administer the scheme. The Board will comprise of three persons representing the workers, three persons representing the employers and the Labour Commissioner or his Deputy as Chairman. That, Mr. Speaker, is more or less the Bill as it stands, but I would like to say at this stage and I think it appropriate to mention this, that I want Government's position to be clearly understood. Now provision is made in this Bill as in other Statutory Boards for the appointment of members to the Board by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I have been reading quite a lot in newspapers quite recently and have my own experience too about the appointment of a person to fill the vacancy on the Tourist Board created by the death of the late Mr. Nightengale. I have had difficulty in getting the Union to comply with what is a very reasonable pro-

posal and policy which has been laid down by this Government for many years.

The position, Mr. Speaker, is that we have been asking all persons concerned to submit to us panels for selection to Boards. I remember in 1956 when I was then in charge of Communications, Works and Housing that I wrote the Barbados Workers' Union as is customary with all persons interested in certain matters, and asked them to submit a panel. This is a copy of the letter which was sent to the Union; this written on 10th January, 1956.

"I am directed to inform you that the Governor-in-Executive Committee is desirous of appointing a representative of the Barbados Workers' Union to be a member of the Housing Authority constituted under section 3 of the Housing Act, 1955, a copy of which is enclosed for your information.

Accordingly, I am directed to invite the Union to submit a panel of three nominees from whom a selection may be made. You will wish to know that it is not intended to appoint members of the Legislature to be members of the Authority."

It was one of the policies of the Government that we were not appointing politicians to Boards. You will remember that there were about three or four politicians including myself on the old Housing Board, and after we decided to have a Housing Authority, all politicians including myself were removed and persons who were not politicians whom we thought could contribute something to the administration and operation of the Board were appointed. The Union wrote back a letter, Sir, on the 19th January, which reads as follows:-

"The Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Communications, Works and Housing,
Public Buildings.

Sir,

With reference to your letter of 10th January, 1956, asking the Barbados Workers' Union to submit a panel of three nominees for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to appoint a nominee, I have been instructed by the Executive Council to submit the following names: Mr. Mc.Donald Blunt, Mr. E. E. Walcott, Mr. C. G. Nightengale."

On that occasion, the Union complied as it had done before with the request of the Government. I would like to say here and now that as far as the Government is concerned, it is for us to make the appointments and control the manner in which the appointments are to be made. Take the Tourist Board. This letter that was written on 28th May, 1958, and sent from my Ministry to the Chairman, the Barbados Publicity Committee, the Executive Director of the Barbados Tourist (Development) Association, the Chairman of the Barbados Hotels Association, the Secretary of the Barbados Chamber of Commerce, the Secretary of the United Taxi Owners Association, and the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union.

9.10 p.m.

This is the letter sent:-

"Sir,

"I am directed to inform you that a Bill to establish a new Tourist Board on a Statutory basis will shortly be introduced in the Legislature. The Bill provides that the Board shall consist of such number of members not being less than eight as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may from time to time appoint. As regards the proposed functions of the Board, I enclose a copy of Clause 8 of the Bill.

"It is the intention of the Minister to recommend the appointment of a Board of 10 to 12 members widely representative of all interests concerned including hotels, steamships and airlines, taxi owners, commerce, labour, travel agencies, etc.

"If the Bill referred to above is enacted, it is desired that the new Board should be established at the first possible moment.

"I should emphasise that this matter is entirely dependent upon the enactment by the Legislature of the Bill referred to in paragraph 1 above. It is neither assumed, nor to be assumed, that the Bill will in fact be enacted and this letter is written on a provisional basis."

In other words, what we wanted from every association or organisation was a panel of names of people to be submitted to us. The Workers' Union replied later like all the other organisations and agreed to the proposals and submitted the names of three people including the President of the Union. The President of the Union was already appointed to another Board, and as such, the Governor-in-Executive Committee appointed the late Mr. Nightengale to this Board.

I refer to these cases, Mr. Speaker, to show what has been done in the past and how it was complied with, and I can refer to many more cases because that is the policy of the Government for all time. For the Barbados Workers' Union or any organisation to say that it is not prepared to submit any panel of names and it is going to submit one name only, that I submit, is tantamount to saying that you are going to make the appointment; therefore, that cuts across the policy of the Government.

It is not for the Union or any organisation to make an appointment. It is for the Governor-in-Executive Committee, as is set out in the Act, to make the appointment.

I presume as has been done in the past by the Workers' Union and all these other organisations that they are not in dearth of people who can be suitable members to administer the affairs of these Boards; therefore, they can submit a panel of names of people.

Now, Sir, this is what the Union replied to us in respect of the Tourist Board and this letter is dated the 11th July, 1958. It reads as follows:-

The Permanent Secretary,
Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour,
Government Buildings,

Dear Sir,

I am directed by the Executive Council of the Barbados Workers' Union to inform you that Messrs. Mc.D. Blunt, President General; C. H. Murrell, Treasurer; C. G. Nightengale, and O. Burke, have been nominated as members of the Trade Union, one or more of whom may be selected to serve on the proposed Tourist Board.

Yours faithfully,

K. N. R. Husbands,
Acting General Secretary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Union what has gone wrong that the Union considers that this is more or less inimical to their interest that they cannot submit a panel as has been done before. We have never had any noise about this question - not the slightest noise - as far as I know. A panel was asked for on several occasions and the Union complied with our request. In the first place, we selected the President of the Union to be a member of the Housing Board. There were four names sent up on another occasion including that of the President again, and of course, you will appreciate that, the President being engaged on a Board already, it is logical to conclude that at some time or the other the Tourist Board may be meeting when the Housing Board is meeting and therefore, we said that we will not accept the President to be a member of this Board too because he is already placed on the Housing Board and because of that, we accepted one of the others and therefore, in that case, Mr. Nightengale was accepted. We have had absolutely no complaints. That policy has been operating for years now.

Again, I would like to repeat; what is wrong that the Union now finds it difficult in submitting a panel of names? There was no noise. You sent up more than one and you have to presume that all the nominees by the Union were men qualified to be members; therefore, you could select either one of them. Again, I will repeat that there is a principle involved in this. As I have pointed out to the Assistant Secretary, there is no question of our taking somebody that the Union does not want. It is purely a question for the Union to submit a panel of names. We want one person and we ask you to submit three names and we will submit one of the three.

I regret to say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has been very recalcitrant on this occasion and therefore, nobody has been appointed to fill this vacancy caused on that Board by the death of Mr. Nightengale. I understand that the late Mr. Nightengale was a very efficient member and he was a very useful member on that Board. He was very sound, as far as I was made to understand. I would like to say that as far as Government is concerned that is the policy of the Government. It cannot be argued that we have asked the Union to submit a panel of names and have not asked all the others to do likewise. To every association or organisation that is concerned with this matter, we say, submit a panel of names.

I mention that because I read in the newspaper some-time ago some article written about the Advisory Board of the Deep Water Harbour and the Barbados Workers' Union saying that it was not prepared to submit any panel of names. I have also encountered the same thing in the Union submitting a substitute in the place of Mr. Nightengale on that Board instead of submitting a panel. I thought I would mention that because it is not the policy of the Government to appoint a politician on the Board despite the fact that some of our members get in our necks for not doing so. It is not our policy to appoint even some of our members. A Board must be free and untrammelled from politics, free from political interference and free to carry out its work in the interest of the community.

Mr. Speaker, from the figures given to us by the Union, it would appear that the Union stated that the number of persons registered as workers on the Port in 1960 was 1,276. 9.20 p.m.

We concluded that approximately 900 workers may be displaced. Since then we understand that the number required for the Port is about 475. That means that at the most there will be 825 persons who may be displaced as a result of the construction of this Harbour. In addition to all this provision, the Government has decided that if there are jobs available, these displaced workers must be given priority of selection. If that is not adhered to, it is no fault of mine. I can only hope that this proposal is being adhered to because the Government has decided on that as a matter of policy. The Government has decided that these workers must rank first in any employment in this island. I do not think that the Government could have done more than what it proposes to do so as to take care of those persons who may be displaced; the Government proposes to provide for these persons by way of grants and also to provide for them the opportunities of employment wherever these opportunities are open.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I should like to repeat that, despite what may be said now by those who are prepared to prey on the unfortunate situation in which the displaced workers will find themselves, those who are prepared to propagandize against the Government because this is election year, the Government will take care of these workers. It is an easy thing to tell a man: "You would not have been out of work if the Government had not built that monster down there," as the hon. junior member for St. John has referred to it. The hon. member said that they are in the Jet age but we are in the donkey-cart age. Those are the remarks which the hon. member made during the consideration of a Resolution which I brought down to this House during the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. Today the hon. member would have people believe that the Government has done these poor workers an injustice by

the construction of a Deep Water Harbour. However, I know that throughout the world those people who have constructed the Deep Water Harbour are hailed as people of foresight in constructing one of the most modern Harbours, if not the most modern Harbour. As the Minister who spoke at the opening of the Harbour said, it is the gateway to progress.

Whenever changes are made, somebody will suffer so that many others may reap the benefit. While we may be cursed by a few people who, as a result of the construction of this Deep Water Harbour, have lost earnings, yet the island will praise this Government, as many are doing today. I am sure that since this Harbour was opened to the people for inspection, those who have visited the Harbour have referred to it as being another world. People never expected that this Harbour was such a fine job to the credit of this country. Those who come behind will reap the benefit because this Harbour is bound to bring large sums of money into this country in order to help to provide for the unemployed. The employment situation has improved over five years; there are those who go out every year. As a matter of fact, from the information which I have got from the Planning Unit, it may surprise hon. members to learn that over the last five years our employment situation has been increased by over 10,000 people. A preliminary examination of the recent census relating to the labour force suggests that employment figures, in the island have risen from 73,900 in 1955 to 84,300 in 1960. Over the same period, the number of people unemployed, all who were available for work, fell from 18,300 to 16,600. The labour force has grown from 92,200 to 100,900 persons between 1955 and 1960 (Mr. MOTTLEY: Who is the author of that report?) This is census data. As a proportion of the labour force.. (ASIDES) I know that whatever the Government has done is wrong, but the people are so wise that they keep us in that position.

As I was saying, Sir, as a proportion of the labour force, unemployment has fallen from 20% to 17% over this period. A full statement of the employment situation in the island will be made available later when the final analysis of the census has been completed. 9.30 p.m.

I quote that, Mr. Speaker, to show the improvement that has been made in recent years in this country as a result of the existence of the Barbados Labour Party and the Government of Barbados. I want to say, Sir, despite what is said from time to time, that I read, I think it was on 5th March, where the hon. senior member for the City made a statement about the construction of the Deep Water Harbour and the question of providing some assistance for persons who may be displaced.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, not me. I did not say persons who were displaced at all; I said relatives of persons who may be displaced. I made that abundantly clear as you will see from the statement.

Hon. M. E. COX: Why are you going to give the relatives of persons who may be displaced? It is because the persons are displaced and not working. Are you telling me that the relatives would receive some sort of benefit while the persons who are actually displaced would not receive any?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, he has quoted me and I am perfectly willing to answer. As far as my Party is concerned, we are absolutely prepared to do everything in our power to make the Deep Water Harbour a success; but as soon as the Deep Water Harbour work was coming to an end, we were faced immediately with the people who were displaced and the children and mothers of persons who were employed in this project, and we had to make increased provision for children and relatives. No consideration was taken of unemployed persons as such, lightermen and long-shoremen.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: From my own experience, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that newspapers are hardly ever right or

accurate. More often than not they are misleading and especially where some people are concerned, but if I may be permitted to quote, this is what was said:-

"The unemployment situation as a result of the construction of the Deep Water Harbour will reflect greatly in the municipal area, said Mr. Ernest Mottley, Bridgetown's Mayor yesterday.

It would call for additional expenditure by the City Council in the future, said the Mayor, until things were settled, because if the figure of 1,000 unemployed persons was correct, it meant that at least another 4,000 mouths who depended on these men would now have to be provided for.

The City Council's Estimates will be considered at a meeting on Thursday and it is expected that in the Estimates provision would be made for public assistance, consequent on the operation of the new port.

Said Mr. Mottley yesterday: 'Since the builders of the Deep Water Harbour, Messrs. Richard Costain and Company started to lay off people, within the last few months we have been experiencing an increase in the number unemployed and also parents for assistance.' "

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would just draw the hon. member's attention to the quotation concerning the unemployment situation since the laying off of people who were working there. In other words, for the past three or four years there have been several hundreds of people working with Costain's.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not think we are arguing the point. All I am trying to say is that I do not see how the hon. member could mean that he is prepared to give assistance to the families of these people and not the persons themselves. In other words, if you give the family something to buy food, the displaced men will eat some of the food. That is the end of it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not the end of it. The hon. member might have risen to the position of being a Minister, but I do not know that he understands the position in Bridgetown or St. Michael. Let us be brutal and face facts. We have the highest standard of illegitimacy, and there are several hundred children who come before us for public assistance. There are children of the several hundred of waterfront workers who in many ways indulge in promiscuity. You say you do not see how it can be done. I was most kind in my remarks to say that during the period that these men are laid off and until things become right in some way or other, provision must be made for these children; children are here and must be fed, and as far as the City Council is concerned, these several hundred children must be fed. The hon. member is now a Minister, but he does not seem to know that a lighterman may have children from four or five different women. These children may be getting but the workers get nothing. I just want to say, as I have said time and time again, that whatever happens, it is our bounded duty to try and make the Deep Water Harbour a success, because I do not belong to the crowd which says we should not bring in tractors or scramblers or have a Deep Water Harbour. I have always said that a Deep Water Harbour is a necessity.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not quarrelling with the hon. member. As a matter of fact, I intend complimenting the hon. member for the stand he has taken, but I do not suppose that the hon. member at the time was aware of the fact that the Government was prepared to show its worth. All I said was that he would be creating an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers if the Government is prepared to meet the expenditure of these persons and another Organisation is prepared also to meet the expenditure.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I sat here and heard very carefully what the hon. member has said. He said that workers from a certain period who are displaced would be getting nothing. Is that true or not? I agree in certain respects to what the Government says. No provision will be made for those people who worked on the cement boats that came alongside the Wharf.
9.40 p.m.

We are not dealing with these people. No provision is made for these people. We are making provision for the children of these people. Ninety-eight percent of the displaced workers as a result of the coming into operation of the Deep Water Harbour live actually in the Municipal area, and of that 98%, I say that 99% of their children live in the Municipal area. It may seem strange to the hon. member but he should know that as soon as a man is out of work, he is not going to support his illegitimate children. Those who are strong must bear the infirmities of the weak. Let me ask him this: Is that your policy?

Hon. M. E. COX: May I, at this stage, quote the Public Assistance Act, 1954, Section 33. It reads as follows:-

"All assistance given to or on account of a wife shall be considered as given to her husband."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister has quoted that as if he is living in Hong Kong! You are displacing 800 workers and of that number, you can well be sure that 780 are not married. What wife are you talking about? Look what hardships you are creating. You are going to give a few of them some money but these children have to be provided for.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I would not like to pursue this point any longer. But what I was reading also includes common law wife.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I ask again, is the hon. member from Hong Kong? How many of these people live with these women? You are a Minister now, but come down to earth and know your Barbadians. You know that the majority of these men do not live with these women. Ask your Minister of Education and he will tell you so. Are you going to starve these people's families? The hon. member ought to even realise that you do not have enough Magistrates in Court to pursue these orders, never mind sending out summonses.

Hon. M. E. COX: However, Sir, that is not the point to which I was referring more particularly. This is what I got up to quote: "This is not a party matter. I think in the interest of Barbados that all sides should co-operate." I merely wanted to compliment the hon. member for his magnanimity in making that statement because it is quite easy for persons who pretend to be responsible to be as irresponsible as ever in cases of this sort. It is quite easy for people to go about and try to incite the people in order to infuriate them and get them in a state of mind to cause trouble; therefore, I say that anybody who is in these circumstances assists in this way, I think a word of praise should be said on the person's behalf.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think there is much more that can be said at this stage on this Bill. I feel that the whole House is in sympathy with these workers who may be displaced. I believe that I can expect the wholehearted support of all hon. members on this Bill. I should like to say in closing that the Government has done its best in trying to meet the situation and we sincerely hope that this will serve as a means of relieving hardship wherever it is and that within a short period of time the workers will be rehabilitated in some undertaking or the other.

Before I sit, I shall mention this: Some people expressed the view - and I also read it in the newspaper - that the Government instead of making this sum available by way of a gift to these people should find some sort of productive undertaking so that these people can work for this money instead. That, I must confess, is quite impracticable. What are you going to do in order to bring in these people to make them work for this money? There is nothing which we can offer with which they can fit in. There is nothing which I can think of for the Government to undertake to employ them. You cannot employ them to construct houses or in the laying of water mains. You cannot employ them in the building of roads. There is nothing as far as I can see at this stage that the Government can undertake to employ them because these people are accustomed to doing a certain type of work and they have done this certain type of work for all these years; therefore, as I have said, it would

be totally impracticable to find suitable employment for these persons and to be able to absorb them.

I would like to say here and now officially that last year when we were told that the Port would be finished within some months of the time allotted, the Cabinet agreed to send me up to England to see whether we could find some employment for some of these persons who may be displaced. As I have said on several occasions, it was not practicable either, because the work was of a casual nature in Birmingham and elsewhere. We were told that the individuals would have to be living near around and just waiting for a call and then they could be only employed after the locals were employed and there was further room for employment. You can therefore see that it was impracticable. I just said that to show that the Government has for a long time been giving careful consideration to this question and has tried and made every effort to assist these workers.

With those remarks I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, we have had a long exercise by the Hon. Minister on this Bill and he has touched on matters all over the sun. He spoke about the Barbados Worker's Union and said he knows that is the principle of appointing members to Boards. Let me settle his mind. I am going to deal with Mr. Reid, the Port Manager, before I am finished. I want to tell Mr. Reid, the Premier and everybody that if you want to know if I speak for the Union, you can nominate anybody you like. We are not sending any panel of names to you. If you want to know where the leadership of the Union resides, you can do as you please and do not consult us. Pass any Bill you like, do as you please and you will see.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. During the course of my speech, I never said that the Union does not represent the people, neither have I insinuated such a thing. I said that the Union discussed this matter with us and I have said that as far as the sugar workers are concerned, I do not think the Union represented all; but as far as the Port workers are concerned the Union represented all of them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I know that whenever I cross the hon. member, I have to withdraw words. I do not want to withdraw any words now. It is not a question that the Union does not represent all. If everybody voted for members of the Government, therefore, how did I get here?
9.50 p.m.

Does the Government represent all? Everybody in Barbados voted for the members of the Government? As soon as you express certain principles in a democratic way, you have this state of affairs. We represent all the workers and if you do not want to consult us, then you can do as you like. We have a comprehensive agreement for the whole sugar industry. Who else has an agreement with the sugar workers? If the Cabinet feels like appointing the Board and you want names, well, have they seen me at the Government Headquarters asking for any favours for my appointment anywhere? The whole question is one of principle. The hon. member does not really understand this. The Minister of Communications made me waste my time. I am not an idler; the next time a telephone message comes through, I will tell them not to send any message to the Union asking us to come up there. We do not have anything to ask you; we do not ask you for any favours. There is no letter from the Union asking the Minister to do anything for us. We do not ask for money to send us anywhere. It is the membership money that runs the Union, not the Government's money; if the Government wants to have a showdown with the Union on these matters they will have it. We are not afraid of anything; I am not one of those who run to England; and when the troops come here they have to shoot me first. I will be in the forefront of any battle for the Union. You can call out every Policeman and you can go to every West Indian Court in these matters. The Port will not be opened at all if you are telling us how the Union should work. You want to

recognise that the leadership of the Union is not the leadership which you had in the past. There is no weak pillow Union which is afraid of anything. If you want to have a showdown, well you can do as you please; all I am saying is that we do not co-operate with you on this and on many other things. The power of the workers resides in the workers' hands. We know our power and we know how to use it. We are not afraid of using it when the occasion requires.

The hon. member has said a lot of things about me which are untrue. Today he said that I spend Conservative money.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I have been trying to ignore the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot ignore anybody.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Abuse is for fools, not for decent people.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member calls me a fool I will not ask him to withdraw that when he is a convulsed fool, a compound fool, not an ordinary simple fool. I will show you where he is a fool. He said that I am spending Conservative money and sometime ago he said that I am a Conservative.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member.....

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member talked around the sun today and I will talk around the moon now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was not here when the hon. member talked around the sun.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and I will speak for the Union on matters in which their name is involved. Quite a lot of things are said which are not true. The hon. member said that the Union has no right to talk to the Government when the Union has to talk about nomination to the Boards, but that is the right of the Cabinet. I want to show where the hon. member is foolish and the Cabinet is more foolish. The Act said that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should appoint people to Boards. The Union does not send and ask the Government to appoint Union members to Boards; the Union can only know if the Government wants somebody to be appointed to a Board if the Union is asked about it. It is not like going to put down your name on a panel in Broad Street; when the Government asks the Union to submit a name, the Government has already determined in its own mind whom it is going to ask to serve on these Boards.

I explained to the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing at long length that there is a difference between selection and appointment. That is to say, that if the Governor-in-Executive Committee desires an individual to serve on a Board the Government cannot appoint that individual and do not notify him of its desire. The Government cannot say to anybody that he is appointed to such-and-such a Board and do not tell him beforehand. They have to send and ask if you are prepared to serve on a Board if you are appointed by the Governor-in-Executive to that Board. When you are dealing with a Trade Union the whole organisation becomes the same thing as the individual. You ask the Organisation if it is prepared to serve on the Board and the organisation says: "Yes". What we say to the members of the Government is that when you have made that decision to ask a Body to serve on a Board you have surrendered the right of selection to that Body because you need not have asked it to serve on the Board.
10.00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you ask a man if he is prepared to serve on a Board and he says "yes", you appoint him to the Board; so why in asking an Organisation whether it is prepared to sit on a Board you want them to send a panel? Why is it that this accredited Organisation must send a panel? The reason for this really slipped out tonight, and it is that you do not want politicians on the Board. You

left His Honour the Speaker on a Board in St. Peter, but you took off another politician and put on Lincoln Rollock because he is the Minister's brother-in-law. Do you believe that a busy man like myself is looking around to serve on any "nay-nay" Board around here? Do you think at my stage in life that I am looking to serve on Boards which the Government has?

I have a contribution to make in this island and to society, and the Minister of Trade cannot prevent me from doing it unless he poisons me; and we do not drink together. Do you believe the Cabinet can appoint me to anything? My life is not in their hands. Let me give you an example of a Minister who has more commonsense. The member was appointed to the Technical Institute. His Honour the Speaker was on the Board and he left and another member was appointed. I can say — because it was not confidential — that the Minister of Education spoke to me concerning a man who was serving on the Board and out of whom they could not get the best. I explained to the Minister that the Union has a policy on technical education, apprenticeship and the like and it would be a good thing if someone from the Union could serve. I intimated that I would go on the Board, but in view of the fact that he had brought the matter to me, I would have a talk with the member, because the members of the Cabinet do not understand running an Organisation with people. When you take somebody from a Board, you do not want to make him feel that you are depriving him of something. When they were filling this post, they asked the Union and we sent a name; there was no question of putting a politician on the Board until after the 1956 election when the Prime Minister decided to carry that out. Some people are greedy and if the Minister of Trade is greedy, he can come for more too because I am ready.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you think I am on a Board because I am a politician? I am there as General Secretary of the workers' Union, one of the most powerful Organisations in the whole Caribbean. The Minister of Trade sucks his teeth in not seeing the distinction of giving this Organisation the right of selection. As an example, do you think that if the Prime Minister of Great Britain wanted to meet a member of the Government, he could ask the Premier of Barbados to send him a panel of names and let him pick out one. What blooming nonsense are you telling me about picking somebody out? Where the Act says that you can appoint somebody, we do not ask you to appoint whomever you like. Mr. Bayne was appointed to the Other Place. Mr. Bayne is a member of our Union, but he is not representing us in the Union. The President of the Union was not elected to the Other Place although for political purposes the Prime Minister said in Queen's Park that the President of the Barbados Workers' Union should be in the Legislative Council. He knows he was talking through his hat then because he knew that the man was not at the stage for that sort of thing; so the selection of Mr. Bayne was the better choice. I am not afraid of little petty people about here, because you die once. Do you think I would get on a platform and say what the Prime Minister said? The present Premier would not say that. I remember that he told somebody that he was not serving anymore on a Board because he realised that there was a lot of hocus-pocus going on.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the hon. member before he had finished, but he said a minute ago that I had approached him and asked him to serve on the Board.

Mr. WALCOTT: Oh, no! I said you approached me in connection with a member who was serving on the Board, and I told you that the Trade Union had a policy and that I would go on the Board.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I never got that understanding. What actually happened is that in my Ministry my attention was drawn to the fact that a representative from the Union on the Governing Body of the Technical Institute was not giving satisfactory service. The matter was drawn to my attention and I said to the Permanent Secretary who suggested that a change should be made that I would see the Secretary of the Union when I came to the House and let

him know that this member was not serving as we wanted him to. I did that and told him that we were writing to him asking him to send somebody else. I do not recollect ever asking him to serve nor did I know whom he would send.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, are these members of the Government stupid or what? Did I say that he asked me to serve? Man, if you are afraid of them, I am not.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: I am not afraid of them because I live at my own home. I fear one being and that is God Almighty, but I respect all men. I only wanted to make what happened abundantly clear; and for the hon. member to give the impression that I knew he was submitting himself was not correct.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are all afraid. I like to deal with men and that is why I cannot deal with cowards. The hon. member says he is not afraid. I owe no man in this world anything; so I have no particular fear for anybody. When Mr. MacMillan was here I met the Minister at the City Council and spoke to him there on the matter. That is why I say I do not have anything to do with anybody connected with the Government, 10.10 p.m.

There seems to be something vicious about their minds. I say here quite openly that he came to me and spoke to me about this matter and even before he spoke to me, other people had spoken to me. I said "Yes, we have been thinking; we have heard about that." I said that that was whispered to me and that I would see about it. If you do not want me on the Board, take my name off. I do not get money for serving on Boards. Of course, I do not want money for that; you get my contribution. I have saved you many embarrassments. This Bill could not come here today had it not been for the work I had put in before. I have a large file here of everything. Over thirteen meetings were held on this matter. Do you think I am an idler? The only place for me to go now is to prison. I have been in all sorts of palaces already — English, Swedish, Dutch.

You say that you do not want any politician to serve on Boards. When I go to the meetings of the Governing Body of the Technical Institute and serve, I am doing something for the people of this Island.

Now, Mr. Nightengale is dead. You want the Union to have one of its members to serve on that Board in place of Mr. Nightengale and you ask the Union to submit a panel of names. I would say: "Go to hell with your Boards! We do not want to serve. Do not ask us any more." If you feel that you are holding us up to ransom, keep your Boards.

Sir, I will show you the type of dishonesty which I have to put up with in my work. Do you realise that since 1957 we wrote a letter to the Ministry about these matters? Do you know, when all these meetings were finished, what the Minister said? He said: "I thank you for the statesmanship that you have employed throughout all these difficult negotiations." That is what he said to me at Government Headquarters. But to come out in the open and say so of me, oh no! he would not do it. He said in Queen's Park I, Frank Walcott, was responsible for the proposals and he called out the name of the hon. senior member for the City.

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. What did I say in Queen's Park? I called the names of the Committee. I said that the Committee functioned under the Chairmanship of the hon. member. No mention was made of the Minister who did all the spade work. I was the person who did all the spade work up to 1956 but no mention was made about me. I am not the least worried about it. I never said that he was responsible; I said that it was under his Chairmanship. What is wrong with that? The Report shows who was the Chairman.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that at this stage of my life I need to be afraid. I am nearer to the grave now than I was 45 years ago. I want the Hon. Minister to understand that I am much younger than he is.

As regards this matter of Boards, I will show you the attitude of people in these matters when you are having background discussions on these things. Let us take this matter of appointing members to the Harbour Board. They wrote and asked the Union to submit two names. In 1952 at a Conference in British Guiana of representatives throughout the West Indies when we talked about appointing people to Boards, we passed a Resolution. We said that in all future delegations for market quotas and prices for the recognised industries of the Caribbean area involving the area as a whole, or parts or individual territories thereof, the Government should as a matter of principle include in all their delegations, representatives of democratic Trade Unions. In consonance with this general principle, the Conference further recommended that Government should include representatives of the democratic Trade Unions on any Statutory Board or Commission of Enquiry established for those industries and commodities.

That is the policy which Trade Unions all over the world have established. They have established the policy that Trade Unions should have representatives on these Boards. In England, the Trade Union Congress is consulted. Sir Oliver Roberts is on these Boards. If you have employers' representatives on these Boards, why workers' representatives cannot be put on them too? But members of the Cabinet and members of the Government see Frank Walcott too much. You have to see me, because I reflect the leadership of the Barbados Workers' Union, whether you like it or not: and if you do not come to grips with that, you are not coming to grips with reality. You either come to grips with that or you are living in a fool's paradise. We have results to show you if what I say is true or not.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I have not heard the hon. member read whether it was agreed that you should not submit a panel. As far as I see, this happened in 1952 and I find that even in 1958 and 1959 the Union has been submitting a panel of names.

Mr. WALCOTT: We submitted a panel of names for those two Boards which I mentioned and since that, we have refused to submit a panel of names. We refused to submit a panel of names last year.

10.20 p.m.

The Fancy Molasses Board is dead for practical purposes. You said you were not appointing politicians on Boards. You appointed Mr. Blunt to a Board and took me off the Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I should like to ask the hon. member when did I do that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was on a little bogus Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have absolutely nothing to do with that Board. I repeat that on all occasions when I asked the Union to submit a panel, they submitted panels including the President of the Union. One ex-President was appointed to a Board.

Mr. WALCOTT: Here in this House they play that they are taking me off the Board and putting Mr. Blunt on it. Sir, do you think I would worry myself about how many tons of sugar you export? Why did you ask us to submit a name to the Housing Board and not a panel? Or why did you ask us to submit a name to the Water Board and not a panel? In each case you asked for a name. Mr. Blunt's name went up as a single name and it was not a question of any panel.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. You generally re-appoint people as long as you are satisfied with the service which they have given.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is when you appoint an individual; you send to the Union and say that Mr. Blunt's term of office has expired and you ask that he serve again. In the case of the Union, the Union is not bound to send back that man. The policy of the Union is that as long as a person gives satisfaction to the Union he is appointed by the Union. Your right is the right of saying to the various Boards whom

you want to serve. Let us analyse this question among the members of an intelligent House of Assembly, if I am permitted to say so. The Governor-in-Executive Committee asks the Clerks and His Honour the Deputy Speaker to serve on a Board. You have decided that they will serve. You are not asking all the clerks in town to serve; you ask for a name and as soon as you are dealing with a Body you surrender the right of selection. They send a name to you for appointment and the matter cannot become law until you have approved of that appointment. The attitude of the Government is that they do not want you to select the person. If you select the person.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. It is the hon. member or the Union or both of them who does or do not want it. That is the practice which has obtained for years. The hon. member says that he does not want that to continue any longer. It is not the Government who says that. Up to now, the hon. member has not told the House why he is not accepting that policy; he has not said what he has against that policy so as not to conform with it.

Mr. WALCOTT: If that is your policy, you can keep it. If your policy is that we must send names to you, then you must keep your policy. We will not be wasting any more time on that. We did not ask you to appoint us; you send and ask us about it and if we do not have the right to say: "this is the person whom we send," then you can ask whom you like, but you will not get any answer from us. You can discuss matters and tell us what you have decided and, on the other hand, we will also tell you what we have decided. When we were having discussions, the Minister told us what policy they would have and Captain Smith sent us a panel and told us how the thing would work. I will show you the attitude of the Union who is not looking for any bogus job. The days when you are looking for me to serve on a Board are over; I will get around to the Boards just now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are a lay preacher at St. Aidan's Church and therefore you have to go on the Board. These are notes of a meeting of the Deep Water Harbour panel which was held on Wednesday, 11th May, 1960. The members present were the Minister of Communications, the Financial Secretary, the Comptroller of Customs, the Acting Director of Public Works, the Resident Engineer, Deep Water Harbour, Permanent Secretary, Deep Water Harbour, Mr. S. K. Chapman, Mr. J. S. Patterson, Mr. T. O. Dowding, Hon. H. F. Alkins, M.L.C., Hon. K. R. Hunte, M.L.C., Mr. D. Blunt, Mr. F. J. Walcott, Mr. C. L. Cheeseman and Mr. S. A. Blanchette.

10.30 p.m.

I will read, Sir, notes from a Meeting on the Deep Water Harbour.

"Mr. Walcott said that he did not share the fear expressed as regards to political inference and instanced the port of New York. He pointed out that public funds would be involved and that whoever administered the Port would be subject to criticism if it were badly administered. He said that considerable difficulties would arise from time to time in the operation of the harbour and that it would be to the benefit of all if there could be an integration of the elements interested in the Port. He expressed the view that the framework proposed for the Port's administration should be fixed for a definite period of, say, three years and that it should be reviewed at the end of such a period. He said that the human element would have to be considered and that whether initiative with regard to equipment came from the Government or a private company he felt that the Union should be consulted. He favoured a structure which would provide for the Minister at the head and an Authority comprised of the collective wisdom of all the sections interested in the Port."

Do you think I am such a fool or an ass not to realise that in this the Union had strong views? We said it should be a Port Authority, but the Minister said he had been advised that it would be better to be a Department. We said O.K. and that we would not stick out, but the employers were telling the Minister that they did not want it to be that way. Now I came in on the side of the Minister and said that his policy could be adopted, though the Union was not in favour. I do not look for favours from the Government.

I am a man whom the workers put here. I said that I agreed that if you have a system like this, the authority must be vested in the Minister; so it is not a question of my looking for an opportunity to oppose the Minister.

When you talk about politicians, you cannot find anyone in Barbados now to give you more or better advice in connection with the Port than I can give so far as representation of labour is concerned. Do you think I am one of those cheap people looking around for cheap votes? If I am looking for votes, I can catch votes like a fisherman catches frays when they are in season. You have to tell somebody that you built the Deep Water Harbour, but I have to go around thousands of people. When you were my age, where were you? I entered the battle from my youth. I was not like Saul going down to Damascus. I will continue to quote.

"This collection of interest would serve as a buffer to any political pressure and the Minister would be able to remove any or all persons if it were considered desirable."

I told the Minister that if he had an Advisory Board it would act as a buffer to any political pressures you may get from outside and for people looking for yard fowl votes. I do not have to play politics with people's livelihood. The Minister would be able to remove any or all of the persons if he considered it desirable; that is to say, the Minister would have power to remove anybody from the Board if he was not doing any work.

"He said that he did not consider that in selecting representatives such representatives should be symbolic of a particular type of representation but rather that they should be people appointed on the basis of common sense, experience, etc."

Do you think that I am asking you to appoint me to a Board? I was telling you that you do not have to ask anybody, and when you come to look at my name and say that you do not want Frank Walcott, do I look like somebody asking you to put me on something? I have a wife and if I reach the stage where she does not love me anymore, I would kiss her goodnight and go through the eddoes.

I will tell the Minister that he should not set up a Board with the idea that the members have to be paid, because it only precludes people from serving. I am the Secretary of the Union; do you think you can appoint a Board down there at the Deep Water Harbour to get the kind of advice you want and look over my head because I am a politician? The workers have confidence in us at the Trade Union, and the Minister knows that. I will deal with Mr. Reid just now. I have been to Government Headquarters and discussed these aspects with the Minister.

When it comes to the principle of appointing a Board, the hon. member knows that we had a talk in Trinidad, and in Geneva one day we had a big row that involved another person. However the row meant good for the man because he is now working as Industrial Adviser to the Big Shell Oil Company and is better off than he was before. The Trinidad Government wanted to appoint people on that basis to I.L.O., but the Trinidad people objected to it. When you are appointing a man to a Board, you would not look for a man whom you do not like or one who does not like you. The Government would not put somebody on a Board to oppose its policy. Say I was on the Board; how could I oppose Government policy? Far from that, I have assisted the Government; so I want to establish, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point that the Union is not asking for representation.

When we are asked to submit a name and we do so, that is the name you told us you wanted because you told us you want us to serve. If you do not want us to serve, we cannot send a name. If you do it the way we say, we are putting the appointment in your hands, because in the first instance you say you want us to serve. We could not send some person if you did not ask us; so the appointment came from you. It is just as if Mr. MacMillan asked the Premier to send a Minister. Are you going to suffer the indignity of sending three names and letting him pick out one? I think I have

established beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Union is not telling the Government whom to appoint, but is only saying that if it wants somebody to serve, we should be able to submit a name. There may be other instances where you seek the advice of the Union as to whether Mr. So-and-So would serve. We have no objection to this, but in an organisation like the Trade Union, it creates, apart from anything else, unnecessary difficulty among the very membership.

What the hon. member does not understand is that if we submit three names and you pick out one, it leaves in the minds of the non-selected that they are not *persona grata* or not in favour or somebody does not want them. I think the Minister of Communications would admit that members believe that he had circulated six members to sit on this Board, but he has actually communicated with six Organisations.
10.40 p.m.

Now, that you have communicated with these organisations and you say that you are going to have six members as a Committee, there is no point why you should want us to submit twelve names. You can only appoint six persons. I will read this letter. It was sent on the 4th November. It reads as follows:-

Ministry of Communications, Works
and Housing,
4th November, 1960.

HARBOUR ADVISORY BOARD

Sir,

In pursuance of Government's policy and in accordance with the proposed Harbours' Act, 1960, there shall be established a Harbour Advisory Board consisting of a Chairman and six other members all of whom shall be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

In order to implement the above, I am directed by the Minister to request your association to be good enough to submit the names of two of its members who, along with the others from kindred organisations, would provide an eligible coterie from whom the Governor-in-Executive Committee would appoint the members of the Harbour Board. It would be appreciated if the above lists of names could be submitted not later than 31st December, 1960.

I am,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. WHARTON,
(for) Permanent Secretary,
Deep Water Harbour.

A letter was sent in reply to the matter by the Barbados Workers' Union. It reads as follows:-

18th November, 1960.

The Permanent Secretary,
Deep Water Harbour Board,
Minister of Communications, Works and Housing,
Government Headquarters.

Dear Sir,

I have spoken to the Minister regarding your letter 3097/79 dated 4th November, 1960 on the Harbour Advisory Board.

The Barbados Workers' Union will submit a name if one is requested to serve on the Board or two if two are required. The Union has already rejected the method of submitting names to be selected for the purpose of serving on Boards or Committees.

The matter was explained to the Minister of Communications; he understands the Union's attitude.

Yours faithfully,
General Secretary.

That was written on the 12th November, 1960. Are you going to wait until May, 1961, to say something in reply to that? That was a simple letter and it has taken you five months to digest it. Another letter was written to the Union asking to submit names and we told them "no, we are not submitting any names, our attitude remains the same." What is the point of fooling around the bush? In any organisation like the Union which has thousands of members, how would you know which is the best person to pick if we submit a lot of names? Are you going to raffle the names to find out which is the best? If I tell you that I am going to send Mr. Kenneth Harvey and Mr. Douglas Jones and you do not know who they are, how can you determine which is the better? Are you suggesting that your method is a more sensible method than when we suggest the person? You say that when we choose the person, we are doing the appointing. You appoint as soon as you ask us to submit a name. If you did not ask us, we could never send anybody's name to you. The Hon. Minister of Communications seems to understand or appreciate the point that was put to him by the Union because he can clearly see that with the Union sending up a name, it does not remove the right from the Governor-in-Executive Committee in appointing the person to the Board.

You say in a letter that the General Secretary should not serve because the General Secretary is a member of the House of Assembly. You can let the Union tell you what they feel about it. Now, let us examine this sweet talk about politicians not serving on Boards. Mr. Shepherd who is Chairman of the Labour Party is a member of the Housing Board. Do you know that Professor Laski was a Labour Party member and although he was not in the House of Commons, he yet served on Boards? Now, Mr. Hutson Williams is a member of the Labour Party and he is a member of the Public Assistance Board. Of course, Mr. Hutson Williams is a member of the Labour Party and he is a member of the Public Assistance Board. Of course, Mr. Hutson Williams was a member of the People's National Party and then he became a member of the Barbados Labour Party. He married a rich Conservative man's daughter. He is a man who has also changed his religion. Since he has come to Barbados and has found out that the Anglican Church is the most popular, he has become an Anglican. His father was a Minister in the Moravian Church. He came here and joined the Conservatives and because he found out that they were far from power, he left them and has gone over to the Labour Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that because Mr. Williams found that he was far from power, he left and went over to the Labour Party. Let me say that I found Mr. Williams too Conservative and I asked him to leave the Party.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Hutson Williams is Chairman of the Public Assistance Board. Would you continue to tell me that you do not want politicians on Boards? These things do not hold water. It is that you do not want to put people on Boards with whom you are not in favour.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I think I have read the letter which we sent out in 1956 and it was specifically stated that we did not want politicians on Boards. I am saying that the hon. member was the then General-Secretary, and I presume he still is, and he accepted that statement as a matter of principle.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not know if the hon. member is a convulsed idiot or not. You cannot tell anybody that. We agreed that no member of this House should serve on any Board where money was paid out. That is why I said, do not put money in it because it would only preclude me serving on it. Do not talk about not putting politicians on Boards because that argument does not hold water. 10.50 p.m.

On no Board where money is paid can any member of this House serve. Mr. Vaughn was a politician and he was on a Board set up by the Education Department. You have hon. members serving on Boards but apart from the legal position.....

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member spoke about the Deep Water Harbour Committee. The Minister of Communications said separately or jointly that I said something about the Deep Water Harbour. The letter which was written to me on the 19th February, 1953, reads as follows:-

"In accordance with the Executive Committee's decision on the 8th January, the Governor-in-Executive Committee has appointed you to be Chairman of the Deep Water Harbour Committee with the following terms of reference:-

To report on the action to be taken to establish a Deep Water Harbour, having regard to -

(a) the fact that it is considered essential that the undertaking be self-supporting;

(b) savings on present costs;

(c) the levy of a basic port charge not exceeding 2% on all imports and exports;

(d) the special arrangements which will have to be made to finance the scheme."

The decision to build a Deep Water Harbour was taken before the Committee was set up. This decision was not dependent on this Committee. The Committee was set up to consider what was already decided upon because the Five Year Plan informed the House that it was the Government's intention to construct a Deep Water Harbour and the Committee would be set up in due course.

As to the names of the members of the Committee the hon. member called all of them except his own, I do not know if the hon. member had forgotten to do so.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. The last thing I did was to call the name of the senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. WALCOTT: Anyhow, it was Mr. M. E. Cox.

Hon. M. E. COX: It will be that for a long time.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will be the senior member for St. Peter for a long time despite your efforts. (ASIDES). The hon. member read out portions of the Report of the Committee and he said that he would return to it. The hon. member signed the Report, Paragraph 29 of the Report dealing with "Labour Absorption" reads as follows:-

"It is anticipated that the establishment of a Deep Water Harbour, while providing a saving in general labour costs, will thereby deprive a number of port workers of their means of livelihood. Accordingly, we recommend that steps be taken to ensure that, towards the end of construction, priority of employment be given to such displaced workers. We also recommend that consideration be given to the entire problem of displaced workers and their rehabilitation."

I understand that the hon. member got up in Queen's Park and said that the Committee did not make any recommendations, that they only talked about the workers; that they did not make any recommendations in order that the workers could get money. The hon. member said that they, the Government, had to make the recommendations. But this is what the report says:

"We also recommend that consideration be given to the entire problem of displaced workers and their rehabilitation."

Only a fool or an idiot would say that that meant every aspect of a man's position. When the hon. member said to the workers that we made no recommendation for their rehabilitation.....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I do not know why the hon. member abuses me. I read paragraphs 28 and 29

of this Report in Queen's Park. I also read paragraph 11. What I read out in here tonight I read out in Queen's Park.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not know what the hon. member said because I was not here. I was in Europe or some other place. When I came back here, members of the Union informed me that this meeting was held in Queen's Park. At the last meeting the hon. member said that it was very statesmanlike on our part having regard to the negotiations which we had in these matters. Therefore, for the Union members to hear what was said in Queen's Park that the Government had to look into these matters and not Mr. Walcott, that was not correct. I will tell the Minister why I feel that work should be found for people apart from the question of remuneration. I will deal with this matter of rehabilitation first and foremost. The hon. members said that he had \$1 1/4 million put down for this purpose. That is not true; the Government put up a proposal to the Union which we rejected. This matter has been going on since 1957-58. We put forward proposals to the Government and our proposals were based on giving the workers an *ex gratia* payment based on the number of years of service and the Government put up proposals to us which we rejected. For example, we suggested for the first five years and after that up to a maximum of seven weeks' pay. The Government suggested for a period of three years, two weeks' pay; four years, three weeks'; five years, four weeks'; six years five weeks'; seven years, six weeks; and so on up to a maximum of forty years, sixty-nine weeks. We toned that down; we said that that was not good.
11.00 p.m.

The Government came back with another proposal and offered us 40 years - 89 weeks. We said "no, too low". Our proposal to the Government was that it should look at this question in its entirety, and the agreement we have now reached is an agreement after many months of negotiations.

Now, the Government cannot tell us that they had money put aside, because they did not have the information to show how many workers would be displaced. On the question of appointments, I will show you how things arose. In a letter from the Minister of 31st October, 1960, he said that the authority shall consist of the Labour Commissioner or his Deputy as Chairman, three nominees of the Barbados Workers' Union and three nominees of the Employers' Association. I do not quarrel with people when they make errors, but when the Bill came down it said that the members shall be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, though it was stated in their letter to us how the administration should be appointed.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister said that the Union had acted in a statesmanlike manner? You will note that all the money in this Bill is not to be paid out in a lump-sum. Would you regard the Trade Union as playing politics or living for money after the way it co-operated? I was surprised to see the Labour Party keep a meeting in Queen's Park on this matter, because my idea was that it should have been kept as an industrial issue and within an industrial context so that the Union could defend its position at all stages; but not only were these things done on a political plane but on the basis of discrediting the leadership of the Union.

Now I have been watching very closely for some time that it has been the calculated policy of the Minister of Labour to discredit the Leadership of the Trade Union as exemplified in me, and wherever he gets an opportunity to say that something is either done by me against the interest of the Union or would adversely affect the Union's interest, he seizes it. If it is something which would promote the Union, he would say that it was done by the Government, by Mr. McKenzie or anybody else. Whenever there is anything which has an adverse effect, my name is mentioned as General Secretary - as a chameleon lizard. These are the things you get, but my back is fairly thick. Despite all that was said about me in the past I said to the Minister that if he were paying out \$2 million in a week, apart from the temporary inflationary period and the stores holding on to the poor people and snatching the money out of their hands, people would be out of work for a long time; so therefore let

this money spread out; and I had to take this matter on my back.

This morning I met at the Labour Department the maximum number of persons who would be employed and they could not exceed 500. There are 1,295 people in the Union notwithstanding the fact that these do not include the ones coming from the factories; so you can see that it cannot be less than 1,500 people and I put it to a minimum of 1,000 people unemployed. Only those over 60 would get a lump-sum; so are you suggesting that this is the action of someone who wants to tell people that the Government should not build a Deep Water Harbour and that it is against their interest? For all the work which my colleagues and I have done, that is all we have got from the members of the Labour Party. This is what we get after meeting for weeks and after the members of the Government were so confounded. I was told to keep a meeting immediately and reply to the attacks made on me and the Union. I was not here and something you have not heard does not go down with you the same way as something you have heard. I was just back from Europe with the cold in my body, and that cold climate furnishes you and you can take things more at ease.

Mr. Speaker, I did not go into the matter until we had a dispute with the employers on this matter, and incidentally we carried out a severe fight with the employers on this matter; so when the hon. member looks at me and says that I am spending Conservative money, I would like to ask how uncharitable people can be. That is why I say the hon. member does not pay attention to the truth. Nobody in Barbados can say that I am at the behest of any employer. We reached agreement on the basis of an industrial matter, and we reached agreement with the Government in that this was something we were prepared to support.

Now apart from what we said to the Government and apart from what we said to the nation, where I cross swords with the members of the Government is in the fact that I accept the Deep Water Harbour and its development as a challenge to my intelligence and not as something to defeat me. I told the Government before the construction of the Port ended that the time had come for us to get together. The hon. member says he does not see anything we can do to find employment for these people. What are we doing? Folding our arms.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I would like to know when I made that statement.

Mr. WALCOTT: You made that statement tonight.

Hon. M. E. COX: I think I made my position clear. I said that people suggested that instead of giving these people this money we should find employment for them with the money, and I said it was impracticable. I repeat it is impracticable. (Mr. CRAWFORD: To you.) I do not want to answer him now.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Minister said he does not know what can be done in this situation. What I said is that it is a challenge to us. We cannot see it as a problem. I am not subscribing to the nonsense somebody wrote in the newspaper to the effect that the Government was responsible for bringing to an end the displacement money for coopers. Though I was not on that Committee, that is the sort of thing you appreciate and explain to the public, because the Union fought against bringing in the shipment in bulk of molasses as long as it could. I wrote the Minister and told him to let us accept this now as a challenge. I suggested to the Government that just as we have a Deep Water Harbour Committee, we should set up a National Committee and put our heads together. This is our country and therefore it is not a problem. The attitude of the Minister is a defeatist attitude when he asks what can we do. They are the leaders; and if they ask what can they do, it means their whole position is hopeless. We must endeavour at every stage to find a way and the best way is by consultation.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I am not saying that employment cannot be found for these people. What I have said, Sir, is that as far as I can see there is no un-

dertaking which the Government can go in for with this money which is available for these people to employ them instead of making grants to them.
11.10 p.m.

Again, I repeat, there is no undertaking which Government can go in for to employ these people with this money when it is available. Tell me what undertaking the Government can go in for to employ these people. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that employment cannot be found for these people. I am not saying that at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not suggesting that the money which you have for this purpose can find employment for them. I am saying that in addition to this you can find employment for them. I say let us look around and see what we can do for them. This is what we said:-

"It is anticipated that the establishment of a Deep Water Harbour, while providing a saving in general labour costs, will thereby deprive a number of port workers of their means of livelihood. Accordingly, we recommend that steps be taken to ensure that, towards the end of construction, priority of employment be given to such displaced workers. We also recommend that consideration be given to the entire problem of displaced workers and their rehabilitation."

That is what I am saying. It is not a question that you are putting men of 75 years or 65 years out of work; it is a question that people of the ages of 35 and 45 years are being put out of work and that is a problem to which we must give consideration. All that I am saying is that this is not a problem for the Government alone to deal with. Do you want any person to be more magnanimous than that? I feel that the nation should get together and that all of us should put our heads together and say that we are facing a problem in our country and reason what we are going to do for our country as regards this problem. I say that it should have been done earlier because it would have helped to take up the slack. United Nations did not arise until people sat down together and put their heads together. All I am suggesting to the Government is this: Can we not sit down and put our heads together and let me see what we can do so that the psychological effect of what you do would have such an impact on the people that there would be no looking to the question of the money which you give them and it would show that this nation is vibrating with activity and people are looking into their welfare? I told some of the industrialists that too. I do not want the Hon. Minister to confuse the situation here with the situation at West Point in the U.S.A. because the hon. member must know that there are some countries where the people are able to do things for themselves and the Government making provision for labour does not arise at all. The transformation in Barbados as a result of the Deep Water Harbour coming into operation is the greatest metamorphosis which we have taking place in this part of the world - and I will go as far as to say in any part of the world because in no part of the world has any single Port meant so much to the economy of the island and has transformed the position in the island as what this Port of ours has done. In addition to the Port itself, you also have brought along with it bulk installation. In other countries, the question of bulk installation was a gradual process, but the opening of the Deep Water Harbour Port and bulk installation has come at one time in Barbados and the bulk installation plant which we have has a capacity for loading 8,000 tons of sugar.

The Report states this as regards bulk loading of sugar:-

"The question of bulk loading of sugar is still open and we are not in a position to make any proposals in detail. We recommend, however, that when the Deep Water Harbour is being constructed, some space in the wharf area be available for lease to sugar interests to enable them to erect bulk loading facilities should they so require."

The Government has gone a step further than that. I am not criticising the Government for that. The Union agreed that the money from the Price Stabilization Fund

should be used to erect that and that the merchants pay a peppercorn rent for it. What I am submitting is that we would have to insist that the sugar exporters make an immediate contribution equivalent to the amount of money saved this year by them because of bulk shipment. A proportion of that money should be set aside so that it would start an initial fund for these people because the people in the sugar industry have got the benefit from bulk installation before the Port started to operate; and in view of the fact that they have not paid up anything to the capital cost, we say that we should get a portion of the money saved from the export of sugar by bulk. If you have 2% as a levy, 2% of \$2 million is \$40,000. I say that they must be prepared to do that and therefore, we must get around a table and drive sense in peoples' heads. Let me put it this way. In normal circumstances, the Government would not be called upon to build a bulk sugar store. That would be their business. Now, with this sort of broad co-operation on what I regard as a national economic basis, can anybody say that I am speaking as a politician? Are we doing anything to militate against the interest of country when I say that? Of course, what is dear to me is the interest of the workers. I expect to go to Puerto Rico to see the situation there because I understand that it is an arrangement between the United States Government and the Puerto Rican Government that they should get something from it. Is there anything unreasonable in my argument? I have argument to back me up that you have to make a contribution now that you have started from the beginning of 1961. The argument for that is that the people in the sugar industry have got the benefit by their beating the gun. This was not expected to happen before August. We have also asked our workers to make a contribution of 5% of their wages and, as I have said, we have asked the employers to pay 2% in addition to that towards a sick fund. I go further and say that if the Government was not afraid of the situation with the buses, we would have run the sheds too. If they can make them work for a profit, we can make them work too. These are things which you have to tell people firmly but politely so that they can understand that you are thinking. Can the Hon. Minister say that this is something which you cannot think of? Do not get this stupid idea into your heads that because this is something which comes from Frank Walcott, you should reject it. Within the whole context of this matter I have given the Government and the Union which I serve full and utmost co-operation. I wonder if the Hon. Premier was dealing with this matter instead of the Hon. Minister of Labour, what he would say.
11.20 p.m.

Do you want more co-operation than that? We went further than you. You were suggesting that the money should be given all in a lump-sum. We told you not to do that. And why did we tell you so? We have just paid out money in a lump-sum to produce workers. We helped this country; we paid out nearly half million dollars to 270 produce workers. The charges were made ex-wharf and those charges were made as if the sugar were stored in the warehouse. Do you realise that that has prevented the community from being exploded? The Trade Union had negotiations with the exporters and that saved the community. What would have been the plight of these people? Mr. Reid has had his impertinence and rudeness. He says he does not know if it is the General Secretary of the Union or if it is the Union, but if he remains here long enough he will know to whom he has to listen. If he wants to start the Port, let him get his boys to start it. This Bill will have a lot of effect on this Port. People hear the Government relying on these other people for their advice and they think that they can treat the Union in the same way, but none of them will do that with me. Some people mistake a smile for fright; they think that you are afraid. If you do not have a quarter million dollars to give these people, who here can give them? The hon. junior member for St. James? These men have not worked from the beginning of this year and not a penny is coming to them. When you provide this money, what do you want us to do? Do you want us to pay another five hundred or a thousand out and nobody knows what is the next thing that will happen? Do you realise from what we have saved the community? You see in the newspapers that a man was missing and so on. This man was not a displaced worker; the newspapers said that he was a displaced worker but he was a man who was currently engaged.

We want to save the community from misery. We did not want to start the Port until we have the displacement machinery. We collected information which the Government did not have. We assisted the Government in setting up this Board. I served on this Board dealing with sugar ex-wharf. Ask the Labour Commissioner, if he did not have my co-operation, what would happen in these days? I do not want to appear to be boasting although it may seem so. I was not going to give the workers that money in a lump-sum; I would put it in a Fund. They say that I built a bungalow; I said: "Yes, but you are still not getting this money." We have vision. I say that where there is no vision the people perish. (ASIDES)

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I pointed out that I would ask leave to make an amendment to Section 6 of this Bill when we go into Committee on it. I was informed of an error which was made and I intend to deal with it when we reach the Committee stage.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the hon. member. When the hon. member got up on a point of order, I believed that his ancestor was a slave driver. It is a good thing that those days are over. The whip would have been in my back. (Hon. M. E. COX: You deserve it.) I would hold on to you like an old dog. (Laughter).

In recruiting labour for the Deep Water Harbour, we found ourselves in a difficult job. There is no use carrying old men down there. We have found that we have to carry an active labour force so that the older people would go to the wayside. The age of 60 years is the one that we will ask to be made 58 years. When we discussed this matter with the Minister, we said that the administering authority should have the power to vary payments; and a man should be paid his money rather than make him come two or three times for it. I would like the Government to give closer attention to the proposal which the Union has made to them. We, in Barbados, should endeavour to set up a national Committee to deal with this matter.
11.30 p.m.

I would like the Minister to bear in mind the question of a levy. With regard to the problems on Federation and the question of no freedom of movement, I am worried to know that we have to start our own freedom of movement here. I am sorry that the Premier did not have a debate on that so that we could tell him what to do when he goes up to London; and you would get freedom of movement. I am not asking to go on the delegation, but if I were in Trinidad you would get freedom of movement. There would be freedom of movement or the whole thing would break up with me too. You must be able to utilise some sort of guts. As a boy I always liked to fight near home, because when the blows got too wicked I would not have far to run.

Now the point I was making, Mr. Speaker, is that we should have a conference on a national basis and make the best of what we in Barbados should do, because I am of the considered opinion that apart from the Deep Water Harbour there is the problem of unemployment, and our colleagues in the West Indies may feel that we in Barbados do not appear to be doing enough on our national front, and it looks as if we in Barbados are getting more children and looking to them for employment; so they close

their doors. We want to say that it is not so and I for one feel that the best thing we can do at this time is to form a National Committee.

The other matter I think which would dispel a lot of fears is that Government must show a magnanimous spirit by appointing members of the Opposition to the Deep Water Harbour Committee. Members of the Opposition are politicians, and if you put them on the Committee, they would serve on it for the benefit of the Nation. We will all have to live here, and anything we can do to increase the prosperity of the country in which we live is for the betterment of the people we serve. I cannot appeal to the Premier who is leading this delegation to London to examine what I have said and see if it means anything.

The last point I want to make to you is that we will co-operate with those who want to co-operate; those who do not want to co-operate will get no co-operation from us. We do not want unity for unit's sake; we want unity with a purpose. If you are prepared to cooperate with us the way the Premier co-operates with us, all well and good; but if your attitude is that we can only serve on your Boards by doing what you say, that is where the clash will always come. So, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this Bill; there is no objection we have to it other than those points I have made, but in view of the fact that the Minister gave his historical background, it was necessary that I gave mine also.

I therefore beg to move that further debate on this matter be postponed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I intimated to the Leader of the Opposition that in view of the fact that some of us would be leaving the island early next week and may be away for sometime, there are quite a few important Bills on the Order Paper which we would like to have disposed of before we leave, and I suggested that we meet three days in succession and try to get those Bills passed. I think of course we can pass them in two days, but we would like to meet each consecutive day to have them passed, and we may have to meet on Thursday.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, 24th May, at 12 noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.38 p.m.