THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 2nd May, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m., o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker);* Hon. C. E. TALMA, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism);* His Honour Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker);* Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees);* Mr. N. W. BOXILL, and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, *(Minister of Social Services).*

Prayers were read.

Messrs. LOWE, SEALEY and COWARD entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Due to the number of public holidays recently, I have the honour to inform the House that no Minutes for the past few meetings have been printed. Therefore, there are no Minutes ready for confirmation.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the year ended on the 31st March, 1961.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1962.

An Account of the transactions in Rum in the several districts in the island for the quarter ended 31st March, 1962.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Fifth Annual report of the Housing Authority, Barbados, 1st April, 1960-31st March, 1961.

The Sixth Annual report of the Transport Board for the year 1st October, 1960 - 30th September, 1961.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour, I beg to lay the Rum Duty (Manufacture or Preparation in Bond) (Amendment) Regulations, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: (On behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance):-

Resolution to place the sum of $39,860 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1962-63, No. 1 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the "Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1962" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the thirtieth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour:-

Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "Customs Petroleum Products Bulk Storage (Amendment) Regulations, 1961", made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 10th November, 1961, under the provisions of section 2 of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance and the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour, I beg to give notice of their intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the following Replies to questions:-

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No 6/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the 16th January, 1962, and the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No 18/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter on 13th February, 1962 are ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 28/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the 6th March, 1962, is ready.

2.40 p.m.

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

"WHEREAS the dissolution of the West Indies Federation has been a severe disappointment to all West Indians at home and abroad;

AND WHEREAS the compelling political, social and economic realities of this Century make it imperative for closer unity amongst the remaining Units of the West Indies Federation;

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly endorse the proposal to establish a Federal Constitution of the Units in the Windward and Leeward Islands, and Barbados."

Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion I gave notice of my intention to deal with this matter today, in view of the impending visit of the delegation to the United Kingdom, and I presume that the Honourable Leader of the House has given notice for the suspension of Standing Order No. 5 in order that these things can be dealt with without the restriction of the time limit attached to them. If that has not been done, I will be asking subsequently for leave to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 5. I understand it has already been dealt with; so it is not necessary for me to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will remind the hon. member that in the last occasion he gave notice of his intention to seek leave to deal with this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: On the last occasion I had to seek leave to deal with it today, and I am now asking leave to deal with this Resolution today in view of the importance of this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the hon. member's intimation at our previous meeting, I gave instructions that copies be made available just in case the House gives leave.

Mr. WALCOTT: If it is your request, Sir, that I ask for leave at this stage so that there would be no further delay, I am therefore asking leave of the House that this Resolution be dealt with as the first Order under Private Members' Business or at the completion of Government Business for today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is asking leave that the Resolution standing in his name in connection with the West Indies Federation be dealt with today, and if there be no objection to such leave being granted, leave will be granted.

There being no audible objection, leave is granted the hon. member to proceed with the Resolution today.

Copies will be circulated to all hon. members who are in their places.

There is also another Resolution which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter in connection with the Report on the Farm Labour Programme.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve of the Report of the Mission which investigated the Farm Labour Programme in the U.S.A."

Sir, I may just add that the reason for this is that these Reports have already been laid. I do not know if Your Honour has given instructions for these Reports to be printed, but if Your Honour has not given those instructions, it would be kind if Your Honour would give such instructions, because the purpose of this Resolution is for the Assembly to discuss the Report of the Mission which is of very great importance to the Island as a whole.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for reminding me that this Report has been laid, and I will act accordingly.

Does the Hon. Acting Leader of the House propose to move the suspension of the Standing Orders?

It is now the hour of Question Time and there are certain answers which have been laid.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I thought you had informed me that Standing Order No. 5 had been suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Oral Reply to Question No. 6, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph which he asked.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Leader of the House is not moving the suspension of the Standing Orders. I do not propose to start if it means that I have to start this debate at 3.30 p.m. or whenever Question Time is finished, because we would have to stop at 4.30 p.m., and that would be restricting the whole idea of dealing with a Resolution like this. You do not want to shut people's mouths; you want people to be able to discuss this Resolution at this stage with as much thoroughness as is necessary.

I am therefore moving that Standing Order No. 5 which relates to Private Members' Business be suspended in order that we can go on after 4.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: In as much as the Standing Orders have not yet been suspended, and this is Question Time.....

Mr. WALCOTT: If you remember, Sir, when I intimated I was going to move that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended, you made a gesticulation from the Chair which I took to mean that the Leader of the House was going to do it, and I saw a twinkle in your eye which made me feel that something had been whispered to you privately. I did not want to cross the Acting Leader of the House from proceeding with the motion, and the Clerk himself gave me an approving nod that that was so; so I did not want to proceed with the motion; otherwise I would have moved that Standing Order No. 5 be suspended for today's Sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: My suggestion to the hon. member is that he makes that motion if he sees fit at 3 o'clock, so that hon. members can have the opportunity to deal with the Questions.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is not with the intention of stopping Questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Reply to the Question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has been laid. Will the hon. member now read his Question which is No. 6?
2.50 p.m.

Mr. W. R. COWARD: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Will Government consider the extending of the road from Tent Bay to Foster Hall?

2. If the answer is in the negative, will Government state why?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 6, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is as follows:-

An extention of the Tent Bay Road to Foster Hall will be considered in conjunction with the route of the proposed East Coast Road. A route survey of the East Coast Road is now being made.

Mr. COWARD: I thank you very much for your reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member want to put a supplementary question, or is he satisfied with the answer?

Mr. COWARD: I shall only say that I would be glad if something can be done with respect to the matter urgently.

PLIGHT OF RESIDENTS OF LEEWARD PARISHES IN RESPECT OF QUIT NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next question is in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter - Question No. 18 - about the dire plight of certain residents of the Leeward parishes who have been given notices to quit.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

Is Government aware of the dire plight of certain residents of Leeward parishes i.e. St. Peter and St. Lucy, who have been given notices to quit certain spots where many of them have lived all their lives and whose houses in many instances are in too dilapidated a condition to remove, to wit Heywoods, St. Peter, Clinketts, St. Lucy?

2. Will Government give its most urgent consideration to the question of either properly resiting - on equally attractive seacoast sites in case where the land has already been sold - the houses of such tenants, or - in the case where the land has not been sold - will Government earnestly consider entering into negotiations for the purchase by Government of such land whereby tenants may remain in occupation thereof, or if Government is able to offer in the same area any of its own land suitable for such purpose, will it make some available to such evicted tenants?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, as this is a matter under my Ministry - Housing - the reply to this question is as follows:-

Government is aware that certain residents at Heywoods, St. Peter, have been provided with house spots with prepared groundsels and toilets by the Housing Authority in a new development which adjoins Forde's Pasture. The area has been developed with roadways, watermains, electric mains and street lights. Most of the houses have already been re-sited. The Housing Authority proposes to offer the tenants at Clinketts, St. Lucy, house spots owned by the Authority at Clinketts as soon as the area is approved for development.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in thanking the Hon. Minister, I would like to ask a supplementary question; but before doing that, I would like to draw to your attention that maximum efficiency is one of the things which a Legislature exists for and we do think that the microphones should not be only ornamental but useful; therefore, I would like to see all hon. members being able to make use of these metal instruments. You cannot make use of either of the two in front of me because they are out of order.

The supplementary question which I am asking the Hon. Minister is this. Is the Hon. Minister aware that on the sites at Heywoods in St. Peter, there are tenants who have not been able to find house spots on those areas mentioned by the Hon. Minister? Is he aware that there are tenants who are still not being able to acquire house spots on the site at Forde's?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: In reply to the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, it is beyond the knowledge of my Ministry or me that there are certain tenants who have not yet found house spots. I have visited that area myself to see that light and water were installed. At that time, there were twelve houses already sited and I was told by all the tenants whom I visited that they were awaiting water and lights to be completed in the district before moving their houses. The groundsels and toilets were completed already on the sites.

However, I promise the hon. senior member for St. Peter that I will take immediate action and have that investigated at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister very much.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 3.00 o'clock, it is time for Private Members' Business.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is not my intention to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. My eyes caught the Hon. Leader of the House first.

STANDING ORDERS Nos. 5, 14 & 18 SUSPENDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to suspend for the remainder of the day, Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14 and 18.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14&18 be suspended for the remainder of the day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I would like to suggest to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that he is at liberty to begin the debate which he proposed at the last meeting of this House on the question of the Federation of the Eight. 3.00 p.m.

At the expiration of the time for Private Members' Business, the Government proposes to deal with two of the matters on the Order Paper - Order No. 1 and Order No. 2 possibly; but, in any case, we propose to deal with Order No. 1. None of us knows how long that will take, but the reason for suspending the Rules mainly is to permit the resumption of the debate on the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter at the expiration of Government Business. I trust that that proposal will be satisfactory to the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, that is a very reasonable and sensible proposition which I hope the House will always adopt. I feel that the suspension of the Rules is for the main purpose of expediting business. I have no intention of holding up Government Business in relation to the two Orders which they have to do for the reasons for which I know they want to do them. However, I would like to see at today's sitting that there will be a certain relaxation of time so that when the sitting of the House is suspended the hon. Leader of the House will be more flexible with regard to eating time. That is still a very essential ingredient in the existence of human beings and I would like to see that flexibility exercised rather than we should stick to this rigid 45 minutes for eating in view of the fact that meals are no longer served on the premises.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what motion is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Leader of the House has asked leave to suspend.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Certain Standing Orders.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I have no objection to that proposal.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House has said that if Private Members' Business was not completed at 4.30 p.m. of the clock, then the Government will revert to Private Members' Business at the expiration of Government Business. I am in complete agreement with that suggestion.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF WINDWARD AND LEEWARD ISLANDS AND BARBADOS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon.

it exposes your mind to other people and there are things which you could draw from it. I do not mean that I despise good education and good schools; but as to the point which the Premier made yesterday, the individual cult which the West Indies have nursed has militated against the interest of the West Indies, because there are too many West Indians now, who are not aware of what their position is and they look as if they are lost because these three leaders to whom they have looked no longer exist in the West Indian Federation. I heard some people in this Island say that the reason why they voted for Sir Grantley Adams as Prime Minister was because the Colonial Office would have a lot of respect for him. The Colonial Office respects power, not people. Do you think they have more respect for Sir Grantley Adams than for Nkrumah? Nkrumah had to be respected for the honour of his country; Jomo Kenyatta was put in prison for years, but they have respect for him and today he is going to be the Leader. In the West Indies we have to think in terms of the 20th century and do not let this bogus 18th century talk have dominance in the 20th century where it has no meaning for those who exist in these territories. I hope and pray that when these members go up, well, this Resolution is bound to arm the delegation with greater power. If the Colonial Office does not care to compensate the Federal Civil Servants, they will see something which they have not yet seen. I do not have to do much for these servants because the West Indies want a complete re-orientation. I have heard of a man who used to eat pork but he stopped eating it because he became a Christian; he put the pig in the sea and called it fish *(Laughter)*. Some of the West Indians want a complete re-orientation of their thinking in this matter. The Civil Servants and the middle-class people of the West Indies want a complete re-orientation in order to make them understand that they are living in an area which cannot accomodate the British concept of closed structures which they were carrying on for all of these years. The middle-class people have to get into the melting-pot and realise that they have a part to play in the changing situation. That is why I say what I say and I support the Federal Civil Servants on a matter of principle because, in relation to what the Hon. Leader of the House said last week, I intend to take him up on that outrageous statement about able-bodied men getting money from the Displacement Fund instead of their being put to work. I will let the hon. member understand that able-bodied people are the people who have been displaced and when they are out of a job and they have no employment you have to find severance pay for these people. This talk about paying able-bodied men money has to be erased from our thinking.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. member is being fair to the hon. senior member for St. Philip. What the Hon. Minister was trying to bring home to hon. members is that in a well-planned economy able-bodied men would not be put out of work; and the same money which was used to pay them could have been used in getting employment opportunities for these people. The Hon. Minister did not agree with the payment because these people were able-bodied men; I think he was trying to illustrate that the last Government was guilty of a lack of foresight and went as far as to make the greatest callous approach to the economic survival of these people.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier did not have to say that. When the Resolution was being dealt with, I led off the debate and I said that I did not accept displacement money as a final answer for men who were between 35 and 40 years of age, but that you must find work for them. I did not accept the payment of displacement money as an answer to the matter; I do not talk about giving able-bodied men money, because when able-bodied men want food you have to give them money or work. If you have not got any work for them then you have to give them money. It is a question of what you say. It is a Conservative concept that when a man is a strong man he should go and look for work but what work? Getting through somebody's window?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. When the hon. member says that this is a Conservative concept he looks across this table and says that I am a Conservative. The Party to which he had the dishonour to belong (Hon. E. W. BARROW: The misfortune to belong.) well, the Party to which he had the misfortune to belong, accused me of feeding able-bodied men. But able-bodied men have to eat too; so do not talk about any Conservative concept because it is no Conservative concept at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was looking at you, Mr. Speaker,..... *(Laughter)*.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the only direction in which the hon. member should be looking.

Mr. WALCOTT: I want everybody to understand that the Conservative concept is not only a political Conservative concept; there are other politicians and they have a Conservative concept. The hon. member must not think that every statement which is made is directed towards him. I find it very difficult to know what the hon. member's political philosophy is, as I have already told him; I find it very difficult to label the hon. member. I would say that the hon. member is anachronistic in his political philosophies because at one stage he comes out with the most rabid Socialist ideas and without a moment's notice he comes back with a concept which is in the middle of the road. Then in the next moment he goes so much to the right that you think he is Franco.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I thought the hon. member was going to say that I was like Sir Grantley. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not labelling the hon. member with this concept; it is part of the thinking of a community that begins to grow owing to its background, because the economic background is being held in the hands of people who have been Conservatives, and it is difficult to change. It is not unusual in Barbados to hear people say: "Look! that big man would not go and look for work!" I am not telling you that there might not be some big men who find it difficult to work, but they say that, although there are no jobs for them. They look at this situation as though there are jobs abegging and people would not go and accept a job. The reason why I say that is because as thinking gets higher we get to the idea that if a Federation goes to the Metropolitan Government and demands substantial economic aid, we are begging somebody for something, and therefore we cannot have independence.

I would like to say, Sir, that Barbados happens to be the only territory in the whole Colonial Empire where you get that concept prevailing in the territory. All the other territories have been saying openly and broadly that economic aid is not a question of surrendering their rights for independence, but economic aid is what they need.

On the question of the Federal Civil Servants, I say that I regard it as outrageous - and my Union supports the Federal Civil Servants - to attempt to tell them in this context that they are not worthy of this sort of thing. I hope that if it is the responsibility of the delegation that is going to London to discuss rewards to the Federal Civil Servants, they may be able to say that those who can be absorbed in a new Federation will be absorbed. I hope that the Federal Civil Servants themselves can be absorbed and that those who are absorbed would not be asking for compensation, so that they would show a sense of responsibility, and that their pensionable rewards will continue when they go into the new service, and it would not be expected of them to demand any further rewards from the people. We feel that those who cannot be absorbed into the service should be rewarded, and we want to say that that is the concept of a right thinking person, because this whole country believes in severance pay, and when a person becomes redundant, he should be rewarded. For that reason, such persons should be rewarded.

Mr. Speaker, I end by saying that this Resolution is not a Party Resolution; it is not a controversial Resolution; it is a Resolution that is fit to be passed in all of the eight Legislatures of the West Indies, and I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that I could carry this Resolution as it is worded

in all eight Legislatures, and it would meet with the approbation of the people of those territories. I feel that in this Legislature we have the right to pass a Resolution like this, and I would ask the Premier not to be caught too flattered with the idea that because Barbados among The Eight has a little higher level of revenue than the others, he can react as Trinidad and Jamaica have reacted. I will ask the Premier not to repeat those old Bajan ideas that had been repeated by his predecessor as a Premier that Barbadians can teach everybody how to read and write, and that Barbadians know more than anybody else.

I will say, Sir, that as a man who has dealt with West Indians, we in this present age have to regain something for Barbados which Barbadians have lost in the eyes of other West Indians. They have become arrogant, stupid and bigoted, and whenever people go to sit down among them, they consider themselves better than the others. I am asking the Premier not to give this impression, because among West Indians in the last five years, I can say that from the very fact that a man was a Barbadian, no matter whose son he was, no other West Indians were getting up to support him for what he was worth because he was a Barbadian, because the Barbadian had created an image of bigotry, arrogance and stupidity. The fact that there are Barbadians living in other territories do not prevent the image from being created. I have seen it happen at conferences, and I can feel it, and it was added to by statements which Barbadian leaders were continually making.

I want to say, Sir, as a Barbadian, that we have to stop at this stage any idea that this thing would not happen in Barbados. When they threw stones in Trinidad, people said it could not happen in Barbados. Similarly there was an incident in British Guiana. If the circumstances prevailed here, it would happen the same way, because if you go to a function and people cannot get in, they break down the gates; they would not walk up like somebody going to take sacrament. All these things can happen in Barbados, and I do not want people to believe that Barbadians are archangels. They may be more docile when it comes to their political rights, because they have no hills to run to. We are not like Jamaica, Trinidad, St. Lucia or Dominica. You cannot hide in Barbados for a month. Wherever you go everybody knows you. If I go anywhere to have a seabath, you will hear somebody saying: "you are here, Skipper; I wanted to see you!" If I go to Foul Bay, I would hear somebody say: "Skipper, is that you there?" Barbados is too small for a person to hide. For that reason the Barbadian has been forced to be politically docile, because in expressing himself he would find it very difficult. That is why very few members in this House could have come here at my age. They could not come here when they were so young, because somebody would squeeze them.

Mr. Speaker, you know that I was one of those young members who came here ready to be squeezed at any time. You cannot squeeze me, because I have nothing to be squeezed out. For that reason I can speak this way because I am uncommitted to any of the political Parties. I have brought this Resolution in the name of the people of Barbados and in the name of the people of the West Indies.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must second this motion. If the hon. senior member for the City would like to speak first, I will give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: In other words, the hon. member merely rose on a point of explanation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief on this matter, because I believe myself as the Hon. Mover of the Resolution has said, that if this Resolution had been taken to the Chambers of the other seven territories, it would have the unanimous approval of the members in the Legislatures.

3.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City is inaudible to most hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I may be inaudible, but I do not know what sort of microphones these are, which are before me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like to say that hon. members on this side of the House have suffered more in this respect than anybody else. I know that the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not like members of the House to say anything of the people whom we employ, but I want to say that there is as much justification in my opinion for the people employed in this House as the people who supervise this equipment to see that the microphones are in order because if we are going to pay people just to sit down in here and not to render assistance to this Chamber at all then I cannot see any reason why we need them.

If the Editors of newspapers of this Island think it right to pay people to come in here and for three and four hours those people do not write anything to put in the newspaper, it is a matter for the Editors. Of course, our Reporters do a reasonably good job, sometimes an excellent job, but one must look critically at some of the Officers and see if they carry out their duties and see if there should be a salaries revision for them on a downward scale rather than an upward scale.

I say this. As long as I have the finances of this Island in my hands, I am not going to allow people to be paid under false pretences.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise to second the Resolution so ably moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. There is much in what he said. Actually, I too feel that it is time that you get proper things in here. These microphones which we have are unsightly, not working properly and everything else in that respect. (A VOICE: Mr. K. R. Hunte supplied them.) I do not care who supplied them.

However, Sir, I rise primarily to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. Speaking on behalf of my Party, if this Resolution is carried to the Legislatures of the seven territories, then we would have a unanimous decision. Although we are all of different political ideas, I was mindful yesterday morning when we were gathered together at the May Day Service at St. Mary's Church of the Address which we heard from the pulpit. There is no doubt that we in the West Indies have one thing in common although we are a mixture of people. We, in Barbados, so often say it does not matter.

I suppose the Hon. Premier has not announced yet that I will be one who would be selected to go on the delegation next week to England, but I wish to say that I am one who is selected and I am very thankful that this Government has recognised that the Opposition has a part to play. I can assure this House in no uncertain terms that I would be one to see things in the Barbadian way and in the West Indian way. I am more than mindful that West Indians must take some exception to the words "economic viability" but I do not take too much exception to that because I believe that there must be some economic viability. That does not necessarily mean that economic help is not going to be given to us. There is no British statesman who is so stupid to think that you can bring these impoverished units together without economic assistance. I am not going to accuse them beforehand of refusing it. I see this statement in the Press very often but I do not believe it. I have very much faith in the British people and their policy for doing things. Therefore I would be the last person to believe that they would be so stupid in order to gather the fragments of the units of the West Indies together as not to give us economic aid. Most of the leading Socialists in the West Indies criticised what they now consider to be right when a Conservative leader asked the British Government for two million pounds to tide us over the period of years. They considered that he was a lunatic outside of a mad house. It was not until Sir Winston Churchill said that when they did so, they were only compensating us for what they got out of us when King Sugar reigned in these parts that they now see that it is the economic position which really and truly has caused the West Indians to be one against the other.

Sir, we all agree that the leaders of the West Indies — Sir Grantley Adams, Mr. Norman Manley and Dr. Williams — proved to be very incapable of governing us and forming us into a nation and we do hope that under the present leadership, we would be able to speak with one voice. I am selected as a member of the Barbados delegation and it is too late for the Hon. Premier to stop me from going. I wish to say that I am not among those who believe that the British Government must give grants-in-aid to St. Lucia, Grenada, Antigua, whether it is £200,000 a year or less and the leaders in these parts must say, "Give us that money but you must not tell us how to spend it." That is all nonsense and it is doing the West Indies absolutely no good. May be, I am saying something which will prevent them from coming together, but how can people expect that if you get economic assistance, the people who give you it should have no say in the spending of it, especially when you have had such reckless people around there squandering money? I say that you must have people who would see how the money is being spent.

Sir, we in Barbados have been paying our way with the exception of the subsidy which we get for our sugar. I have the Conservative political philosophy and we have obtained a heritage of which you should be proud. We are the only territory in the West Indies that has never gone cap in hand to the British Government asking them for money to run our affairs. You do not have to see our Estimates and okay them before the amounts are spent. Above all, we have not the worst slums in the West Indies. We have our hard times. Fortunately or unfortunately, the people of Barbados have been blessed with more children per square mile than any other territory; yet still we have been able to carry out many of our social reforms, even though it may not be to the extent of Trinidad which has its vast quantity of oil that is worth $40 million or that of Jamaica which has its vast areas of land.

4.00 p.m.

I whole-heartedly support the Resolution. We must go to the Colonial Office as one. I do not intend to go to the Colonial Office and say that any territories in these islands — in fact, I do not intend to say that I agree with you about economic viability; that is economic nonsense. I think more of what Sir Winston Churchill has said, that is, "We are paying you for what you did in these parts". We must be able to see those who have caught the eyes of the masses in the other islands. I do not believe that all of the people at the Colonial Office are just dunderheads; it is a question of convincing them. I do not believe that they are people who do not know what they are talking about. I have had the opportunity of talking to some of them and I came to the irresistible conclusion that there are some of them who know more of the West Indies and of Barbados than what some of us know. We feel that it would be better for us to face the world as one Federated West Indies; we feel that it would be better for us to face the world as a nation, than to face it as just Barbadians, St. Lucians, Vincentians and so on. Therefore, it would be much better for us to come together in federation as one nation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that anybody would waste any time in talking at length about this matter. We are like the fingers of the hand; we cannot be separated from each other. Whether we are Liberal or Conservative, we are in the West Indies and we have the same thing in common, that is poverty. It is better for us to have leaders in the West Indies who can stand up to the Colonial Office; I am not a man of letters, but I know Barbados and the West Indies and I can match myself against anybody of letters and learning. We shall go to England and make our position clear. We want to be one nation; for the future of our children and for the future of our children's children we want to be respected. Some of the leaders have caught the eyes of the masses in the West Indies and they have not conducted themselves in the proper way in England in order to get grants-in-aid. Let us call a spade a spade. I will not pat people on their shoulders when they are doing a lot of nonsense. How can we have starving people in Barbados and see that the Premier is doing a lot of nonsense in his office? I am not blaming this present Premier for doing that, but how can you have some people in mud-huts and other people who have come from among these same people, have removed themselves from the people and they are saying: "I have got to have all sorts of things in my office?" I do not ask anybody to help me on any platform. The people must realise that a lot of harm is being done if the leaders are going to be like what I have mentioned. We have a leader who has been trained in the way in which the Premier has been trained; he has been trained, he is learned and he will be able, in many respects, to guide us along the proper lines. I was one of those who said that Sir Grantley Adams was the man to lead us because I was so impressed and the hon. senior member for St. Peter told me that I was making a big mistake when I said that on a platform. But I was impressed in that way; I felt that Sir Grantley Adams was well respected and the hon. senior member for St. Peter pointed out to me that the powers that be respect anybody who has power. I am surprised and I came to the conclusion today that these persons who are learned just in the humanities and who are making pretty speeches are not always the best persons. I have come to the conclusion that those who can work out schemes to put before the Colonial Office are the people whom we want. Naturally we must have people who are learned in economics to be able to go to the Colonial Office and set out the matter as it should be set out. When people are right they are right; if the Colonial Office can find money from the British taxpayers, we should say that it is their duty to find us money and they are only paying us back what they took from us. If they are going to do these things, they should be told: "If you are spending money in this way and in that way, I do not see that; if you are capable and competent why should you not be spending money and developing these countries?" You can give some people £100 million to develop Barbados and at the end of five or ten years Barbados will be in the same place in which it was at the beginning; but you can give some other people £20,000 to do it and their mentality is such that they will be able to work out something which will be of benefit not only to Barbados but to the West Indies.

4.10 p.m.

There is plenty I have to say on this matter, but I would prefer to wait until I am out of this country, Mr. Speaker, when I promise faithfully above all things that we should be one on the question of a Federated West Indies. If the hon. senior member for St. Peter does not mind, I would like to suggest to him one slight amendment. The second paragraph reads as follows:-

"AND WHEREAS the compelling political, social and economic realities of this Century make it imperative for closer unity amongst the remaining Units of the West Indian Federation;"

Mr. SPEAKER: That has been corrected to read "West Indies Federation".

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure the hon. member would not have said "West Indian" Federation. I might be wrong, but there are such learned members on the other side, and I am thinking of the Minister of Education, that we should not allow this Resolution to pass and give an opportunity for people to pick holes in it. I would like to suggest that it should read.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Have you got a complex on how to read English?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member must not take umbrage. I am closer to the hon. member in friendship than anybody else, but this Resolution must be presented to the Colonial Office, if it passes, by the Honourable Premier; so that the Colonial Office would know that he has the undivided force of the Legislature behind him. I am only making a suggestion and you know it has always been my policy to make suggestions. How could I find fault with the hon. member's Resolution? I am, however, wondering whether it should not read "AND WHEREAS the compelling political, social and economic realities of this Century make it imperative for closer unity amongst the remaining Units of the West Indies Federation."

The Resolution then goes on to read:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly endorse the proposal to establish a Federal Constitution of the Units in the Windward and Leeward Islands, and Barbados."

On behalf of my Party, I do give my whole-hearted and undivided support to this Resolution, and I do not think it even necessary for many of us to speak any further on this, but we shall be able to go forward with one voice, one aim and one destiny, that is, Federation and the coming together of the people in these areas; and above all — and this is where I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter — let us show those three stalwarts, those three University men — and hon. members on the other side should not take umbrage when I speak of University men — that people other than University men are capable and competent and have the sincerity of the masses of the people at heart, and they can bring together the people of the territories where such great men as Oxford graduates have failed.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution, and hope that the hon. member will accept the amendment. I think we should go forward with one aim and make it clear that whatever conception politically we have in these territories, we have one thing in common, and though we are the poorest of poor in the Commonwealth, whether or not we have economic viability, it is our intention to come together, and above all things we feel it is absolutely necessary and it must be so. I do not want to quote the various islands of the British Commonwealth as the hon. member has quoted, but I do feel it is absolutely necessary for the British Government to let us have financial aid.

Mr. Speaker, I want to sound this as a warning: as long as I am here and alive, I shall not be a party to any of these big highfalutin salaries. One of the first things we have to cut out when we go to the Colonial Office and form a Federation is these highfalutin salaries. We want a strong Federation with a strong Central Government, but we do not want to take a few people because they come from bottom and give them highfalutin salaries. We cannot afford it, and those people who have been taking advantage of and bleeding the masses in Barbados, St. Vincent, St. Lucia and Antigua ought to hang their heads in shame.

As far as the Federal Civil Servants are concerned, I shall be the first to ask the Colonial Office if they have gone mad to suggest paying an Englishman and not a West Indian. Are they going to pay Wylie who was Attorney General here and not Gomes who is a West Indian? If the people in Barbados can hear me, that is how I am going to talk, because if they put me out of the hotel, I am going to my son's flat. I am speaking loudly and flatly, and in ordinary Bajan too. If jobs can be found for them in the territories, I am not agreeing that they should have any big lump sum of money. Do you know from whom the money is coming? It is coming from the people who buy salt fish and rice and wear pumps, and not only those of us in the Legislature. If such jobs as they have now can be found, or in other words, if they are not degraded, they should not be compensated also. I understood quite recently that some of them have gone to parts of Africa, some have been taken back in Jamaica and in Barbados; but for those who have not been able to find jobs, I am at one with the hon. senior member for St. Peter to let the Colonial Office know that we stand as one Unit, that they are making fun and are looking for a riot or a revolution. We want them to get it straight that they cannot shut us down, although Adams said that if people opened their mouths he had a war ship to shoot them down. I say we will have to let them know where to get off. Cut an Englishman and cut a West Indian and see if you do not see blood. Look at the wife of an Englishman and at the wife of a West Indian and their children and see whether they must not eat.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk some straight talk. I want to say that I am a Conservative and I am not ashamed to say it; but I believe in God and I believe that God has had a hand in allowing other political philosophies and ideologies to be lurking around the West Indies; otherwise you would realise the devilry that West Indians would see. I am a great admirer of Bustamante.

4.20 p.m.

Cuba is next door. I am not going to England; I am going to America. You want to protect your population of nearly 2 1/2 million people. I want the people to move freely among the islands. Where did they get the bloody idea from?

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member say "bloody" or "ruddy"?

Mr. MOTTLEY: "Bloody" is quite in order; there is nothing unparliamentary about it. If there are two members who can talk their talk and can speak to the masses in a way which they can understand, they are the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself. Neither of us is afraid.

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

Sir, as I was saying, neither of us is afraid. What we know that we have to say, we say it and we do not care anything about it. What we know is this. We can make the masses understand what we have to say better than many people in Barbados and we are sure that we can make Colonial Office understand what we have to say.

Barbados has a reputation for integrity and the leaders who go from here are going to maintain that reputation. The only difference is that the representatives today have a greater interest in the masses than the representatives before.

Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting the Resolution and I do hope that it will pass this House without any division. Of course, I am absolutely certain that that will happen. I do hope that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would make his contribution. I see that he is willing to do so. Speaking for myself, I go further and say that the other Islands as one body should say: "We want a Federated West Indies. This is something which you took from us yesterday and we are asking you for what you took from us."

Sir, I have read where a Mr. Rees Williams said that it mattered not to him what the old woman wore, what the labourer wore, whether she wore shoes or not as long as the British consumer got cheap sugar. That is the statement which shocked me when I read it. I have that clipped out of a newspaper which I will take along with me for the benefit of the Hon. Premier. I would be the first to remind them of that. Mr. Rees Williams said that; and a little after, Sir Winston Churchill said that when King Sugar reigned, that was the only salvation which they had. I have much pleasure in supporting the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. CORBIN rose to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My eyes caught the hon. senior member for St. Andrew first.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, I am glad that this Resolution has been brought before the House today because I am in sympathy with it and wish to see the eight remaining units of the West Indies Federation continuing in a Federation. Jamaica and Trinidad have no doubt gone astray from the West Indies Federation and I think it is expedient that the others should join in a Federation.

I would give you my reason for saying that. Trinidad with her great $200 million budget and Jamaica with her $250 million budget believed that they were the vine and the other Eight were the branches; therefore, they believed that we would have to be nourished from them and they pulled out of the Federation with the idea that we would perish. We realise that we are the branches: but God Almighty is the Vine and the same God Almighty who helped them will help us too and will give us the same support to continue together.

Some time before they actually did so, I was looking that Trinidad and Jamaica would have pulled out of the Federation because in the Federal Parliament in Trinidad some of them left us suspended in mid-air. However, the

Eight are still surviving and what we want the other members of the British Commonwealth to realise is that we, the Eight, ever had it in mind to federate. We realise that unity is strength and we know that if we unite together it will give the other members of the Commonwealth some proper understanding which would make them render kindness towards us. We believe that the Commonwealth is in favour of our federating and if we do so they will continue to render kindness towards us. We need all of their help; therefore when the eight units are about to join themselves to go to London to plead with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, I trust that the God of Heaven will kindle their affection and enlighten their understanding to the knowledge of the truth and they will perform their services to the Federation as we expect them to do. We, who are not members of the delegation should not sit idly by but should pray that they would do their duty and we trust that the Commonwealth will ever be in sympathy with us and give us their support. Unity is strength, but divided we fall.

Sir, we hope they would be successful and I trust that those who are at the head of the administration of the Islands will carry within their bosom the universal thought throughout the territory to give to each and every one. I agree, Sir, to this Resolution and I support it wholeheartedly and trust that it will be a means of making a success of what the Eight set out to do.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, I have been briefed that at this hour the House will revert to Government Business.

STATEMENT BY PREMIER re FINANCIAL SITUATION OF ISLAND

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to make a Statement arising out of a statement which was made by me in part of the debate of the meeting last week. This is a matter of considerable public importance.

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

4.30 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Statement which I want to make is as follows:-

"There appears to be some misunderstanding about something I said in the House last week. It has even been suggested that I am withholding certain facts. This is untrue: I believe in letting the people know the whole financial situation in this island. I have the greatest confidence that this Government intends to put right the island's finances, however unpleasant may be the task.

The quickest and best way of doing this is to let the community know that the island is suffering from the enormous expenditure on increases in wages and salaries and that increases which are not covered by increased production can only lead to inflation and a fall in the value of money. At the moment our currency is strong." I would like to repeat that: "At the moment, our currency is strong. The currency backing in securities (market value) and cash is $4 1/2 million over the currency issued and in circulation. The market value of securities (mostly U. K. Government) held by the Crown Agents for the Currency Board is over £18 ($87) million. The redemption value is £20 ($96) million approximately." The present market value is $87 million but the redemption value is approximately $96 million.

Your Honour will forgive me if I have to repeat some of these matters, but I do not want the gentlemen of the Press to say that they do not understand what I am saying. I think it is at this stage right to explain to the businessmen in this community that, with the application of the increase in the fiduciary issue, I find it necessary to make this statement.

"The Board has cash on deposit with the Crown Agents of £2.4 ($11 1/2) million; and debentures of the Governments participating in the Currency Agreement of a value of £2.2 ($10 1/2) million. This last part of the Currency Fund represents the fiduciary issue. The parties to the Currency Agreement are considering increasing this."

If I may interpolate at this stage, when I make the statement that this Government was considering an increase of the fiduciary issue, this is something which has been canvassed by other Governments as well, who contribute to the Currency Board. Barbados is not the only country which is contemplating taking such a step in the Eastern Caribbean. "I am sure that it will be appreciated that whatever action we take will be based on the soundest financial principles and that we do not intend to weaken the currency. This also means that a stop has got to be put to the salaries and wages spiral.

Last week I mentioned that the Savings Bank owed the Government $600,000; $100,000 of this advance has already been paid. The Government advanced this cash to the Bank as usual to meet the heavy withdrawals before the crop. Such advances are always repaid by the Bank when deposits increase during the crop. If Government had not made such advances the Bank would have had to sell investments in the present state of the market at a loss. The market value of securities held by the Crown Agents on behalf of the Bank is £2.2 (10 1/2) million." In other words, the Savings Bank has $10 1/2 million in securities. "Local investments of the Bank amount to $7.3 million, and the Bank has $290,000 in cash. If the investments held for the Bank by the Crown Agents do not have to be sold before their dates of redemption the Bank will receive their face value which is £2.8 ($13 1/2) million.

The latest financial statistics available show that the total assets of the Barbados Government Savings Bank are valued at $18 1/4 million as compared with $24 million in the Jamaica Government Savings Bank (a country with a population of 1,700,000) and $14 1/2 million in the Trinidad Government Savings Bank." The Jamaica Government only has a matter of 30% more assets than the Barbados Savings Bank has. The Trinidad Government Savings Bank has less assets than the Barbados Savings Bank; they have $14 1/2 million as compared with our $18 1/4 million. "Our Bank's overseas investments are proportionately much higher than those of the Jamaica Bank — £2 million and Trinidad Savings Banks.

This should be enough to restore the confidence of any doubters — any misguided persons who think their money is not safe.

I have given these statistics so as to correct those false impressions which are made from newspaper reports from time to time. It is not that the newspapers report what hon. members have not said; it is that they publish what hon. members have said completely out of context, so that the general public cannot understand the nature of the debate which is going on and the reason for which certain statements are made from time to time. In so doing, the newspapers perform a great disservice to this community as a whole. Up to today I drew attention to the fact that the gentlemen who occupy the Press Table come in here and sit down for three or four hours at a time and then they go to the telephone or after they have wined or dined well, they go down to the office and draw from the dim reserves of their imagination. I do not think that, in these circumstances, the gentlemen of the Press are entitled to sit at the Press Table so that they have a ring side seat to the dereliction of other members of the public. They enjoy the privilege of coming in here so as to do their jobs. I am not afraid of criticism where criticism is due. Your Honour will remember that on one occasion the Daily Press decided to ban anything which I said in public or in this House for a whole year because I said that there are only two races in Barbados — the gentlemen of the Press and mankind. Sometimes I have to resort to that definition of the division in this community.

4.40 p.m.

Now, Sir, I would like to make it clear that I have made the official side of my Statement, because I do not want to over-tax the powers of the gentlemen of the Press or their

mental resources by making the official part of the Statement too involved for them to cope with; but if you will give me just a little indulgence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have thought this is such an important matter that I should be permitted to dilate upon the Statement which I have just made, and to again state on the floor of the House the circumstances leading up to and subsequent to the debate which went on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier means that just to give an official statement without giving the reason would not serve the purpose?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It would not serve the purpose; it would only tend to complicate matters a little more. I have read out certain figures here to show the financial position of the Savings Bank, but members may not fully appreciate all the implications of what I said, and it is very important that the general public should know as well. That part which I have read, which I indicated is the official side of the Statement, has been carefully checked and rechecked and nothing I have said here is inconsistent with what I said on the last occasion when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was aggrieved over the fact that the displaced workers at the Deep Water Harbour had not received their lump sum grants. I have pointed out that this Government approved of the payment of these grants, that there were the necessary amendments to the Regulations which were made by the Displaced Workers Board, and that it would be no fault of ours at this stage if they have not received these grants. But I did tentatively suggest that the fault may not be that of the Board either, because of the inordinate degree of increases in salaries and wages, especially at this time of the year when the receipts coming into the Treasury are at a very low ebb.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we do not receive the same amount of money into the Treasury week by week, and coupled with that we had the reckless disregard for the principles of sound financing by the last Government, so that the reserves which we would normally be able to fall back on have been depleted. The Deep Water Harbour itself has not been paid for. May I just with your permission, Sir, digress for one moment?

I am a firm disbeliever in capital punishment. As a matter of fact, I can disclose now, Sir, that the Legislature will be asked shortly to consider a Bill which will bring Barbados into line with the United Kingdom in that score. If I wanted capital punishment retained, it would be retained for offences against the people and offences against the State, and it would be retained for those criminals who masqueraded under the banner of representatives of the masses, and sabotaged the economic future, for selfish reasons, of the people of this Island. I think people like that ought to be tried for treason, and I will go further and inform the House that certain ex-members of this Hon. Chamber have been going up and down Roebuck Street canvassing the merchants to send their money out of Barbados in order to embarrass the colony even further. In other words, they are prepared to cause alarm and despondency to wreck the economy of this Island if they have not succeeded in wrecking it already for their own selfish reasons.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can call names, and I have full information on all of them. They are being followed although they do not know it. I can tell you all the merchants whom they went to in Roebuck Street. One masquerades as a journalist — a sheep in sheep's clothing. I do not read the particular newspaper; I have not read it for about seven years; but people come and tell me that it said so-and-so this week. I have my hands fully occupied looking after the portfolios which are under my charge, and I do not have any time to worry about what somebody says about me or writes in a newspaper about me. I believe in reading things which are constructive, but one of these gentlemen writes the most vituperative articles against members of this House, because he no longer enjoys the confidence of the people of his former constituency, and because he has now joined the industrial reserve army of the unemployed like the Federal Prime Minister. All of these aim at undermining the Government of the country, and I want to say this: I may sound like a dictator in saying that Mr. Nkrumah, the Prime Minister of Ghana, is right when he passes laws which exercise restraints on people who undermine the security and the economic viability of the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no greater traitor to this Island, to the working classes, and even to the vested interests who put money into the pockets of these same traitors than the man who goes about trying to destroy the confidence of people inside and outside of this Island by malicious propaganda. In that category I would put the now departed Prime Minister, because shortly after this Government was elected he thought fit to say in London — I have a full tape recording, and what was put in the Press is not even a quarter of what he said — that this Government is a wild Government. I will show him how wild this Government is, and whatever we do we will do constitutionally, because there must be a dividing line drawn between allowable conduct and insanity and crime.

The whole basis of society is founded on tolerance, and we have got to get intolerable to people who are traitors to the Island of Barbados, who have no ability to do anything but to wreck the economy of Barbados and the West Indies as a whole. They are people who have prostituted the art of Government, and I thought it would be charitable to say they did not know what they were doing; but I consider that these people are as subversive as the worst form of international Communist that you can get, without even the ideology of Communism. Not one of these people would be prepared in time of a national crisis to take up arms on behalf of the people of the British Commonwealth or of Barbados, and I think that it is the height of temerity on their part to talk about wild people in the Government of Barbados.

Now, Sir, I have said that they are wrecking the economy for this reason: I said yesterday and I have said before and I make no apology for it — I do not want to be misquoted and I am going to say it very deliberately — that if this Party had been in power in 1961, no Civil Servant would have had one cent increase in salary. We have to be realistic. This country has budgeted for a deficit; there was not even a Minister of Finance, but finance was allocated to a man who did not know the difference between that term and some of the lowest terms of animal life.

4.50 p.m.

We had for a time agitated for Key Scale workers to get increases of salaries because it was disclosed in the report of Mr. Jacobs, the Salaries Commissioner, that a man with a small family could not live on a salary of less than $203 a month and the average Key Scale worker was getting less than $100 a month. This Party was agitating that some consideration be given to those people who were living not on subsistence level but below subsistence level.

The cost of living rose by 11.2%. In between that time, the Civil Servants were granted a cost of living bonus of $9.00 per month and in addition to that, they were getting their normal increments which they get from year to year. No clerk in Broad Street nor any carpenters or masons get this. Civil Servants get increments which would normally take care of accidental increases in the cost of living. Along with that, it was never urged at any time that the Civil Servants were unable to live. In addition to their normal incremental scale of increases, they got from the Government loans for motor cars which no Minister can get. Some of them live in houses owned by the Government and some have had sums up to $20,000 and $30,000 in order to purchase houses. Some have gone and taken loans up to $20,000 and $30,000 from the Agricultural Bank at a rate of interest of 3% by saying that they are turning agriculturists and wanting to buy land for that purpose. I think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would be making replies on this matter as a result of certain questions asked by the hon. senior member for the City.

This Government is not going to give any Civil Servant any increase unless there is an international catastrophe or sudden inflationary spiral thoughout the world or some exorbitant increase in the cost of living between now and the next election which we have already given notice of; therefore, any Civil Servant would only be wasting his time

stretching out his hand for any salary increase from the Government. We intend to go to the people of this country on the basis of the constructive work which we hope to do in recreating the economic position of the country on a sound financial basis.

I want to tell the Civil Servants that if they do not like the money which they are getting, they should resign from the Service and go and find a job with somebody who can pay them the sort of money which they want and let us find a man who is going to take the sort of money which we are paying out.

This House had made sacrifices. No Minister can come and ask me for any increase. No Minister can get a loan from the Government to buy a motor car. We have refused to give increases to the Reporters, the Steno-typists, the Librarian, the Clerk, the Marshal and the Messenger of this House up to now. We may have to do it between now and 1964 — some other time — but not now. We have refused to do it because this House is setting an example to the community; so you can see that the burden is being shared not only by hon. members, some of whom have to travel from the farthest part of St. Andrew, some of whom have to stay in here without any food during the time they are here but by the staff. As a matter of fact, I have to go outside the House when I see the woeful look on the face of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. It is a look of reproach which I cannot endure after the shades of night have fallen.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since this new Government came into power, I never sat here until 11.00 o'clock with a sad face. I never did it. The latest time I sat in here was six o'clock; therefore I think the Hon. Premier is speaking of somebody else.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that when the House has to sit until late I see the hon. member looking at me reproachfully when the shades of night come. I know the hon. member would take this in the right spirit. I honestly feel a certain element of guilt in this but I want to introduce an atmosphere of realism about this.

Here you have a Government which had budgeted for a deficit of $1.2 million, or something like that, which actual deficit was far in excess of that, and yet you found them bringing down somebody from somewhere out in Africa much against the wishes of the same Civil Servant, whose terms of reference included the term that he should look at the present salaries of the Civil Servants bearing in mind the ability of the finances to meet any special increases. God knows what would have happened if the Civil Servants themselves had been called upon to regulate their own increases.

That was one of his terms of reference. When therefore the Government brought in the Report, certain false statements were published. Right down to the end of December, they were saying that the colony had $13 million in reserves. Because of that, Mr. Jacobs, the Salaries Commissioner, said that the Government could confidently expect a surplus of $3 million. There has been a recession of trade and business all over the West Indies. The national income fell from $100 to $98 million and we are not quite sure of what last year's figures would be, but it probably would be down to $96 million. The population is increasing normally at the rate of 2.1% and the national income is falling by a similar figure. So instead of our getting in this country an increase in national income *per capita* which would be keeping pace with the population of the country, we are finding that the national income is going down. It was in these peculiar circumstances, because it was election year, the financial wizards of the last Government decided to mortgage the future of this Island, to sacrifice the unemployed and grant to the Civil Servants salaries which will in the final result amount to something between $4 million and $5 million per year.

This is the same kind of situation as a business concern showing a loss in operations during a particular financial period and the employees of that business concern going to the management and telling him: "We want an increase in salaries, not for any particular reason but because we must have an increase."
5.00 p.m.

And the management says.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I do not want to stop the Hon. Premier, but my patience runs out. The hon. member cannot make a Statement in which he is arguing a case in which no hon. member can participate. This is Parliament. The hon. member must get the understanding that this is not a rum shop which he is running. If the hon. member does things like that, then we will have a fight in here. I have something to debate here. We said that we would adjourn at 4.30 p.m. of the clock in order that the Government may proceed with the Police Resolution. That was a solemn undertaking and the hon. member has to honour things when he comes into the House. I am not going to sit down on my rights as a Parliamentarian. After all, I know Parliament; any Minister can make a statement at any time and it is something which is laid in the House. The hon. member cannot lay what he is saying; that is nothing to be laid. What he says about the other Government may be all right, but he can do that when he starts to debate the salaries Resolution. I cannot sit here and have things being done in that way. There are Rules of the House and you have to abide by them; hon. members have to abide by the Rules. The Hon. Premier has to subject himself to the Rules of the House; otherwise it will be broken up.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member considers that he is right, I do not agree with him. The hon. member and myself are like two ladies and I use the word "ladies" advisedly, who, when they have finished their household work, chat with each other over the back paling. *(Laughter)* They are arguing from different premises. If the hon. member would give me a little indulgence, I will say this. I agree that the official Statement has been made and I asked for leave to extend it because of the unfortunate misunderstanding which was created in this matter because it was not fully reported. This matter is of vital importance to this community today and I am saying that tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock will be too late for me to dot the 'i's and cross the 't's. If I may set the hon. member's mind at rest, I will not be very long now. I was merely giving an illustration so that no member of the public will be in any doubt about what I am saying. If the last Government makes.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are trifling with the finances of this colony.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is right. I drew the matter to the attention of my colleague as to how Your Honour was allowing the hon. member to take advantage of the situation. I did not draw the matter to Your Honour's attention....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is not now in the Northern District Council.

Mr. SMITH: Your Honour is there to rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member continue his point of order?

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member has the opportunity and time when we are discussing the other Resolution to say what he is now saying. It is not fair to us for him to be going on like that now. I would not say anything in the first instance, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter has drawn the matter to Your Honour's attention and you are still permitting the Hon. Premier to go on like that. The Hon. Premier is wrong. I know it will be said that if this had happened at the Northern District Council, I would have caught at it long ago.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member reminds me of the Roman Emperor who was fiddling while Rome was burning. I would have finished my remarks already. In the

course of a debate in here last week, there was some misinterpretation and misrepresentation. I assure hon. members that tomorrow morning will be too late for me to explain this matter. If I attempt, during the discussion of the Resolution dealing with the Police salaries, to make this Statement, the hon. member would say that I am saying something about the Police. Despite the fact that what I have said may seem to be harsh, despite the fact that it may seem harsh to trot out things about the last administration of this country, I have to say these things. I want to conclude this matter briefly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Premier keep his mind on the financial implications of this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: A man who is losing money should not pay out more money to run into greater debt. If that is their method of doing business, well, that is not true. Every single Government in the West Indies is more or less stretched out because we have development programmes and we have demands made upon the slender reserves of Government in one way or another. The Money Market has been very difficult over the past four years. We have a trade deficit of $40 million but there is no reason for despondency or alarm at all. The applications of the reserves, having been exhausted by the last Government to finance a capital project, could be equated to a situation where this country with an income, let us say, of $25 million pays $18 million for a capital project out of its cash reserves. That is equivalent to the United States Government spending $60 billion and attempting to pay an amount out of its gold reserves which are in the vicinity of $16 1/2 million.
5.10 p.m.

Those are the financial implications of the irresponsible financial procedures of the last Government. For the United States Government to perpetrate against the people of the United States an act of the enormity as that carried out against the people of Barbados, they would have to spend $60 billion and attempt to pay the amount out of their gold reserves which are only $16 1/2 million.

Now, Sir, I should like to say this in conclusion; I want to say to the business community, to the people who have savings and to anybody who puts money in the Government Bank of Barbados, that that is as safe as if it were in the Bank of England. The fiduciary issue in the United Kingdom is far in excess of the gold reserve of the Bank of England. I cannot offhand give you the exact figures right now, but I think the fiduciary issue in the United Kingdom must be at least of the order of £25 million. The gold reserves in the Bank of England would hardly be more than £254 million which is a ratio of ten to one. The backing of our currency in Barbados is in excess of the amount of currency which we have in circulation, but the Barbados Government Bank does not as a rule send up to London and call for some of its money, because round about Christmas time which is the middle of the hard times, as it were, people go in and draw money for Christmas, and we usually finance them out of the Treasury.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Treasury normally is not worried about this situation. They owe us now $500,000 from the Bank, but it is only that this is the normal method of financing. The Treasury itself has not got any money because of the last genius that we had as quasi-Minister of Finance in the Government of Barbados. It was the Premier himself who thought that finance was spelt "fine ants"; that is the gospel according to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. That, Sir, is the situation.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, it may go down in the records that the hon. member says that the gospel of the hon. senior member for St. Peter is as he has said. I know what he means, but I am talking about the records, and I think that the hon. member should make what he means clear. *(Laughter)*.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think I would like to make it clear that I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter say on more than one occasion that so monstrously inept was the gentleman referred to — and I hate to have to refer to this — that history should know what these people have done to the people of Barbados. This is the kind of thing that makes you believe in the guillotine, the timbrel and the law of the open trench, because any other method of punishment for these people would be too decent. I do not like to sound harsh, but I think a crime against the whole country as was created at Nuremberg when they tried to crucify 200,000 people, and ignorance of that magnitude is a crime against humanity.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Premier made a statement to the effect that the gospel according to me is to spell finance "fine ants". I may be dead and gone, and I would like to make it clear that that is the gospel of the person to whom the Hon. Premier made reference and not my gospel.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think what I was trying to illustrate was that that is the only charitable interpretation that the hon. senior member for St. Peter could give to the gospel according to St. Thomas; and that is as true, as the hon. senior member for the City would say, as John 3: 16. I would like to make it clear that if I have said something today which sounds harsh, I have good reason for saying it, and if I say I considered the last Government a crime against humanity, I am serious in that, because people acted in ignorance. I have been criticised in the last four or five days for speaking about the economy of this Island, and I would not like them writing or saying three years from now "look what the situation is", as if we had created it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want the world at large to know that we are not afraid to tackle the task, but we have been up behind the eighth ball. We intend to carry out our programme and policy. As a matter of fact we are considerably on the way to implementing all the proposals we have put to the electorate. We have introduced free secondary education and we have introduced the crash programme. We have had to honour the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner because they were passed by the last House, and today we have certain proposals to put forward with regard to the police. We have a duty to the standard of living of the people of this country, those who are unemployed, those who are living in conditions of squalor, and those who are living at and below subsistence level; and I would be lacking in a sense of duty if from time to time I did not let the people know what the situation of the country was, so that they would be able to see the mess that was being made.

In the United Kingdom, every Bank has to publish its Balance Sheet every Wednesday; so what I am saying now or what I said last week would normally appear in the *Financial Times*, in the *Economist*, in the *Observer* and many other papers throughout the length of Britain week by week; but the difference between that economy and Barbados' is that very often the reserves in England go down at this very time of the year. Every Christmas, the Bank of England would increase its fiduciary issue by £20 million because there is a greater amount of money in circulation in England. There is full and complete backing of our currency in Barbados which there is not in England. The people in Great Britain understand financial institutions, but you had a situation of financial ignorance in Barbados not only amongst the members of the last Government, but amongst people in the community, and along with that you have mischief-makers who have no visible means of support, who are parasites in this community, going from business-place to business-place in Roebuck Street and encouraging Barbadians to be traitors to this country by sending money outside the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is time that we have to be very firm how we deal with people like that in future, because I say they are traitors to this community, and that is the main purpose why I am making these remarks. I would like to reassure members of the public that the position of the Savings Bank of Barbados is utterly sound, but that I have merely asked them to pay back the money to the Treasury. How they do it is a matter for them; they can sell off some of their security. They do not need that money normally speaking, but when at Christmas they have greater

demands, they send across the yard of the Public Buildings and draw upon the Accountant General as a short term method of financing; but at the same time the same Savings Bank has loaned to the Government $7 1/2 million; so the Savings Bank is an entirely viable institution.
5.20 p.m.

The Savings Bank Act says that every deposit and the interest on it is guaranteed by the Government of Barbados. In addition to that, we are introducing legislation of which I have already given notice which allows the Savings Bank to pay an even greater rate of interest than it is paying now and I would not have been doing that if the Savings Bank was not solvent. On top of that, we are introducing legislation to prevent the people of Barbados being robbed; so no one can accuse this Government of allowing any kind of loophole whereby the finances of our country could become jeopardised in any way — any more than what they are. We are already on the upward trend, I am very thankful to say.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I add in conclusion — and it is very important that this statement should be made and I will do so briefly and to the point — because of what happened last week, those people who can invest and who can put money in the banks or invest in mortgages should get out of this country if they want to send their money out of the country. They should go to South Africa or some place like that if they do that. This is the only country in the Caribbean which a few weeks ago guaranteed the free convertibility of sterling and said that we would impose no restriction whatsoever on repatriation of capital or dividends to any country outside, even if it were in hard currency.

I think those people are either lacking in commonsense or lacking in a sense of duty to the community in which they enjoy a healthy relationship if they are prepared to live here and just hold up the rest of the community to ransom by picking up their money and sending it outside. If they have succumbed to the blandishments of the members of the former Government who are extremely subversive, it means that they have less intelligence than the people whom the people of this country rejected. Therefore, I urge all of those fortunate people who have more money than their immediate needs, to invest that money in Barbados, in industries, in Government Bonds, so that the economy of the country would be healthier than it is today.

I should also say that this country can boast of a Government which is not prepared to pull wool over the eyes of the people and this Government feels that the people of this country must get acquainted with the financial implications of certain measures, that they must study the finance market and study the implications of the everyday transactions of business life and not to be fooled by people who do not have the good of this community at heart.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members, that is the Statement of the Hon. Premier with its causes and explanation.

ORDER NO. 1 POSTPONED

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to substitute for the first Order of the Day under Government Business the Resolution which was circulated to hon. members for the sum of $39,860 to provide for increased allowances for the Police.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy 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 to deal with the Money Resolution of $39,860 to which reference was made.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

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

5.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the passing of a Resolution that the sum of $39,860 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1962-63, No. 1 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. This supplementary Estimate of the sum already referred to, is required to provide, with effect from the 1st April, 1961, the allowances for Policemen and salaries for Band Cadets as revised by the Committee appointed to review the remuneration of members of the Police Force. As hon. members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, a breakdown of this $39,860 is as follows:-

Washing allowance		$26,000	
Plain clothes allowance		3,600	
Subsistence	,,	4,000	
Detective	,,	3,000	
Bicycle	,,	560	
Uniform	,,	1,100	$38,260

Then there is another amount for the salary of Band Cadets; that amount is $1,600 and that makes a grand total of $39,860. In other words, what this Resolution seeks to do, is to provide what is known normally as back pay for policemen and Band Cadets in so far as the allowances given to them are concerned. I do not think that there is any need for any further explanation of this matter; I think that this is satisfactory to hon. members and I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I think that the hon. member would have to expect that a matter like this should be dealt with comprehensively. This is only supplementary to.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, there is a Resolution to approve a Civil Establishment Order which I would have preferred to have debated in the House and which deals with these increases. I do not think that there should be much point of difference on the question of these allowances, because they are really minor things and we wanted to get them out of the way so that we can concentrate on the main question of the increases.

Mr. WALCOTT: I agree with the Premier but the only difference is that we are not really in order in not debating the Resolution for the money to pay these salaries. I have a point of difference because the Order has been sent down and the Civil Establishment Order is a money Bill. This is not establishing posts but increasing the salaries of posts which have already been established. We would agree to the Civil Establishment Order as it stands and we would be agreeing to salaries before we have the Resolution before us. There is no money Resolution presented to us dealing with the Civil Establishment Order and I prefer to discuss the Resolution for the amount of money for which this Civil Establishment Order calls. This Order would commit me to agree to all of these salaries when there is no Resolution in respect of which I could debate this part or that part. You are really sending to me a money Bill which is an Order which includes all of the increased salaries.

If the Hon. Premier will read the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment Order, he will see that from the explanation, they intend subsequently to send down a Resolution providing for this money. If the hon. member would read the Addendum to this Resolution, he will see that it says this:-

"The immediate cost of implementing the proposals is estimated to be $417,000 or $85,000 more than the Jacob's recommendations.

It will be necessary to seek provision by supplementary Resolution in order to meet the cost of increased allowances and revised salaries for Band Cadets."

What I want to point out to the Hon. Premier is that if you do not have a money Resolution you will have two debates on the same matter; whereas, you should have the Resolution in respect of the sum of $85,000. The Civil Establishment Order only sets out the order for the increases and in order to shorten the hon. member's time, I was taking the opportunity to point out that the allowances to the Police Force are part of the salary which you pay to policemen, but you separate the allowances from the substantive salary. You cannot get a detective unless you have the salary for him. All of these things are subsidiary allowances to the substantive salaries which you are paying. Suppose we say that we intend to get rid of the allowances! Would you be calling upon me to agree to allowances before I begin to deal with the salaries? It is not my intention and I do not think it is the intention of hon. members to go out of their way in this matter.
5.40 p.m.

I said earlier that the policemen in Barbados have been very patient and have shown a measure of sense and tolerance, and I think in all that the Hon. Premier has said about Barbados' responsibility, he will have to pay a high commendation to the members of the Police Force for the exemplary manner in which they have performed the duties of this country in maintaining law and order, despite the fact that their salaries have been under consideration for a long time, and they were without what they were rightly entitled to as their increases.

I do not want to anticipate too much what would happen; but if the Hon. Leader of the House does not have the Resolution now, what I really want to ask him is how he can pay these men the money even by the Civil Establishment Order. If you pass the Civil Establishment Order, that does not give you money. All the Civil Establishment Order is going to give you is the right to pay; but you have not budgeted for it yet this year, and you need a new budget of $85,000. All I am saying to the hon. member is that he has set out in the Civil Establishment Order what he wants to pay to people, but he has indicated in the Addendum that he is going to have a Resolution. I thought that the Resolution would come down simultaneously with the Order to pay people money so that you would have money to pay them, because you only have it on paper now.

Under the Civil Establishment Act, Mr. Chairman, the Commissioner gets one salary and you propose to give him $9,120. That is what we are going to discuss in the Civil Establishment Order, but it does not give us the money yet, and as stated in the Addendum just as you have stated here in connection with these allowances for which you are passing a Resolution, there is an Act which says that you have to pay allowances, but you cannot pay the allowances until you have the money. Under our Constitution an Order to establish a post does not in itself create money. Under our Constitution, you have an Order to add to the Establishment another post, and this is the Civil Establishment Order not changing the post, but changing the salary. I hope the Hon. Premier understands the point I am making. If you look at the Civil Establishment Order, you are not creating any post or adding to the Civil Establishment; you merely want to regularise the salary attached to the Commissioner's post; so you have to pass this Order. You have to do two things; one is that you have to pass an Order which says what the post is going to be, and after you have passed this, the Hon. Premier would not have to come back here next year to get approval for paying the Commissioner $9,120. In this Order, you are not creating the post of Commissioner of Police, Deputy Commissioner or Superintendent; what you are doing is putting in the Civil Establishment Order the amount of money you are substituting.

I have some views on the Police which I could express on the allowances, but it is dependent on what the members of the Government want to do. If I want to debate the Police business all at once, I can debate it now under this Resolution, because the Resolution is a Police Resolution, and I can talk anything concerning the Police - Police allowances, Police pay, bicycle allowances, subsistence etc. I believe that operating in the Government's mind is that if we debate it now we can talk as long as we like, but if we debate it in the House we can only talk once. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Oh, no!) But that is real. You cannot talk twice in the House. You can only speak on the Order once in the House. You gave us a report which was submitted by these people, and in it you talk about the allowances you are going to give these men.

This Report which agrees to the allowances, Mr. Chairman, is signed by Messrs. Field, Dear, Mahon, Gittens and Sargeant, and on page 10 it says that "in fixing the salary of the Commissioner, due regard was given to the responsibility of the post and the salary scales recommended for the ranks below. Mr. Gittens held the view that the Commissioner's salary should be fixed at $9,480 and so maintain the *status quo* between this post and that of a Permanent Secretary, and the Deputy Commissioner should get $8,160.

We recommend that the allowances should remain as fixed by Mr. Jacobs as follows:-

Washing allowance $48; Plain Clothes allowance $96;" then there are Bicycle Allowance, Uniform Allowance, and Subsistence Allowance, and Detective Allowance. What I am pointing out, Mr. Chairman, is that this Report which I have on the Police Committee must be read together with this whole debate, because they are the ones who went into the Jacobs' Report, because Jacobs made recommendations which had been rejected by these people, and Mr. Carew submitted a Minority Report. Are you going to settle the allowances for the Police in one debate and finish with that and not have to come back with a Resolution for Plain Clothes Allowance, Cork hat Allowance and so on? That is my way of dealing with it, and I cannot deal with it in five minutes. We have to read the Report and see whether we agree with it.

In my view, the Hon. Leader of the House should accept that even though now we are dealing with Washing Allowance and Plain Clothes Allowance because they form part of the allowances, when it comes to the question of salaries the Minister will have to reply to these things, and therefore the Report should be read together with this as it includes these things. However, I am going to deal with the Resolution, and if Your Honour feels I am wrong, you will call me up. I would like to say, Sir, that in looking at this comprehensively, my view is.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member goes on to the Resolution, I think I ought to explain certain matters of procedure. This is a rather complicated matter. I had to check it myself and I had it checked three days ago, and I checked it again just now. In Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949-5 which is on page 642 of the Laws of Barbados, it shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee from time to time by Order to do a variety of things among which is "to determine the emoluments to be attached to such offices." Perhaps I had better read the whole thing. It reads as follows:-
3.50 p.m.

"It should be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee from time to time by order -

(a) to establish offices in the public services of this Island;

(b) to determine the number of persons who may be appointed to such offices;

(c) to prescribe the qualifications to be possessed by persons appointed to such offices;

(d) to determine the emoluments to be attached to such offices; and

(e) to authorise the payment of the cost of passages of officers and their families travelling outside the Island."

Then subsection (2) reads as follows:-

"(2) An order under subsection (1) of this section may contain such incidental, consequential and supplemental provisions as the Governor-in-Executive Committee thinks necessary or expedient for giving full effect to the order; including provisions -

(a) for making in any enactment regulating the number of offices in respect of which, or the number of office holders in respect of whom, salaries may be paid, such modifications as may be expedient;"

"(b) for the adaptation amendment or repeal of any enactment relating to the appointment, powers, duties, rights and liabilities of any officer holding any office specified in an order or bearing the same style and title as an officer appointed to any office specified in any order."

Now, Sir, under subsection (7) of the same Civil Establishment Act of 1949, which is still existing legislation, it is stated:-

"All moneys payable under the provision of any order made under section three of this Act shall be charged on and paid out of the revenues of the Island, on the warrant of the Governor."

In other words, the procedure of making a Civil Establishment Order for creating a new post or paying an increase to a new post or downgrading a post is done by a Resolution of this House. The House passes a Civil Establishment Order. It is made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and after it is approved by Parliament - and approval of Parliament is provided for under subsection (4) of Section three of the Civil Establishment Act - it is laid before the Legislature and approved by a Resolution of each House.

In other words, it is not a Bill. We have to lay the Order and get a Resolution of the House passed, and then you get a Resolution of the Other Place to concur in it and after that, the money is paid out on a warrant signed by the Officer administering the Government. In other words, you do not bring down a Resolution for money.

If hon. members would look at the Departmental Estimates for 1962-63, they will see that all of these salaries are provided for and fixed by law; so it is not necessary for us to pass another law authorising the payment of that money. The Governor authorises the payment of that money by warrant.

We are not bringing down any more Resolutions with respect to the increase of the Police salaries, but the matter which the hon. senior member for St. Peter is now debating is the question of the allowances. As far as I am concerned, it is a matter of supreme indifference to me which Resolution is done first; but as I explained at first, I thought that we could get the allowances out of the way because they cannot be considered controversial because there was not much difference of opinion on them, even by Mr. Jacobs and the Government. The position is that hon. members can reduce the allowances but it would be against the constitution to increase them.

Sir, when it comes to these increases, this Resolution must be backed up by regulations made under the new Police Act - the Police Act, 1961, Chapter 50, but these regulations for some peculiar reasons were not laid before the House. I have a copy of these regulations. However, when we deal with these two Resolutions, this one in Committee of Supply and the other in the House, that would be the end of the matter.

It appears that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is prepared to proceed on the Resolution dealing with the allowances and I would sit down and give him the opportunity to do so; but I must point out that there will be no more money Resolutions on this matter and when we finish with this matter today, we would have finished with it once and for all. I would forewarn the hon. member that I do not let the Legal or the Financial Department send any half-way legislation to me.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, the Premier is right. A Civil Establishment Order gives the Governor the authority to pay the money after we have passed the Order. What I was pointing out to the hon. member was that in this matter it was not only dealing with the Civil Establishment Order, but it was also dealing with the allowances which were bound up with the payment of salaries to the same people whom the Order is dealing with.

The Civil Establishment Order deals with the Commissioner of Police as well as other officers, but there is a Resolution before us which would provide the Commissioner of Police with an allowance. The Hon. Premier said that there is no difference of opinion, but in this recommendation, one side asks for more allowance than what they are getting. You cannot look at allowances distinct from salaries. However, the position is right when the Hon. Premier corrected me and said that it is not necessary to bring down a subsequent Resolution for the amounts which are provided for in the Civil Establishment Order because when you agree to the Civil Establishment Order, you agree to the amounts to be paid. The new thinking of the House is that a Civil Establishment Order is as much a money Resolution as a Resolution which is passed by the House in Committee in the ordinary way. I do not blame the Hon. Premier because this precedent has crept into the House from the time of the former Premier. Prior to that, any Resolution like this would go to the Committee. The other Premier called a Resolution like this an abstract Resolution which you should pass in the House and it was not necessary to go into Committee. My view is that the importance in passing a Resolution which deals with a report by the Commissioner is that it should be dealt with in Committee. The Hon. Premier says that it is a matter of indifference to him how you proceed with it. If we agree today to these items, all that is required is to move that the Civil Establishment Order do now pass and when you second it, you cannot amend it. The late Mr. "T. T." Lewis fought against the method of debating things like a Civil Establishment Order in the House and not in Committee. What he said is true. When you have an Order like this, you bring down all these posts together and you commit the House to all. You cannot take out any of them if you do not agree with them. If you want to do that, you will have to amend the whole Order and bring it down again.

6.00 p.m.

What I would propose to say without any further comment on that, and this is a general comment, is that I agree with the minority Report in a general way, and I would say that the Premier has his forebodings about the financial position about the colony. I do not think that anybody in his senses would like to see the colony getting bankrupt, but I feel that the time has come when you should have some proper investigation into the Police Service and determine what are the real needs. I am not a Police expert, but I believe that, in a country which is moving with a lot of mobile transport, the days of policing the rural areas must be on a different basis from the old days when a motor car was unknown. I spoke to someone who is not a Barbadian and this person told me that on the ratio of the population we have in Barbados, with the number of policemen we have, if you went to the United States of America, you would see what an astronomical figure you would have as policemen. He referred to the United Kingdom and said that the ratio of policemen you have should be in ratio to the population. You operate from certain areas, you operate by means of mobile transport, and you become more effective. Certain ares are patrolled and certain areas are not patrolled be-

cause of the type of safety you know exists. You do not patrol certain beaches because if people want to commit suicide, you do not worry with them if they want to leave this planet.

Without making the posts which you have redundant, there should be some means of saying that as to those who retire by the process of time, you will not be called upon to replace the same numbers until you go into the matter. I agree with the Premier that you have to teach people and train them for efficiency and hard work. That is one of the things with which I agree. People do not become efficient by working easily; they have to be trained. I would suggest that the Police Force should be the subject of a close investigation as to its needs within the context of modern days. We know that the population is growing and among the problems which you have in a country in which the population is growing is the question of law and order becoming more complex. When the population is growing in education, this matter of law and order becomes an easier one to deal with. When people are educated the conflict of the law is not so great. People like ourselves do not give the policemen any trouble. One day a policeman looked at my car and said that something was coming off; I told him that he should look for the people who were breaking into other people's homes. He saw that the number plate was coming off the car but he did not know about people who did not pay their licences. We have to deal with issues which are other than the normal issues. The majority of people are the normal people because they commit themselves to proper civic duties. I cannot say how a modern Police Force should be run, but the mobility of the Police Force should be something which would add to its efficiency. Speaking for myself, when I go to London, New York and other big cities, I do not see a lot of policemen on the streets unless there is a parade going on. You do not see a number of policemen in Fifth Avenue in New York, for instance, unless something is going on there. I think that the days are coming to an end for having a sort of redundant force or men to do jobs which are not necessary.

When you come to the structural arrangements, I am making this point in relation to the Civil Establishment Order or the Resolution to approve that Order, and I will deal with the allowances as well. If you are getting rid of people, well, get rid of them; but if you want policemen, you do not want any half dead, hungry people like those who are looking to beg you for a quarter. You want people whom you have to pay or otherwise you are looking for trouble. I feel that this salary of $100 a month, which is $1,200 a year, is not enough to start off a policeman.

6.10 p.m.

Now I have seen certain things here. I have nothing against the groom, but if you are going to give a groom $88 a month, are you going to give a policeman $12 more? Even with the groom he is going to reach $100 by increments of $3 a year. I will tell the Government that the time has come when it must revamp the whole Civil Service and not call certain people Civil Servants and call others by other names. You should deal with them in their own setting. I do not agree with the Report's reasoning, because they said they went into industrial wages and do not accept them; they accept Civil Service wages. That could not be right.

Mr. Chairman, the Government has just agreed that a man who goes and pulls bush in the crash programme should get $20.56 a week; so do you mean that a policeman is not worth more than $100 a month? $25 a week is $1,300 a year, and I cannot see you paying a policeman in Barbados less than that, provided he is a person who can read and write and not one like in the old days when you had a policeman who was big and strong enough to arrest people. He used to carry out law and order and therefore you had to get a strong man! Nowadays you do not hold a man anymore; a van comes up and you tell a fellow to get in. I had to go up to District "C" twice yesterday with a man. Yesterday a fellow put in too much steam and felt that he could talk anyhow to a policeman on a Highway. He did not think the policeman could arrest him because he was in a motor car; so they took him to the Station and I had to go there for this man. Those are the problems that you will get occasionally, and that is why you want a Police Force.

I am not making any criticism about the Committee which presented the Report, because I believe I will go on a Committee and somebody will come back and say that the Committee did not do well, but I do feel you must look away from these things. The reason why I say so is because we have a lot of idiots in Barbados. Would you believe that I went to Government House decently clad to present a Resolution on behalf of the Civil Servants and some idiot spent four cents in sending me a picture in which I appeared coming from Government House with a note saying "Imagine you coming from Government House in shirt and pants!" You would believe, Mr. Chairman, that I went there in a bathing suit. You would believe that I was invited to a dinner party at Government House. That is why we must have policemen. It is just like when the now Minister of Education was in the Opposition and brought in something to demonstrate the plight of Old Age Pensioners. They said that he carried a basket of goods in the House.

I say that, Mr. Chairman, because the concept is that a policeman is a glorified watchman, and Government House is somewhere that whenever you go there you must wear a tie or else somebody would ask: "Where is your tie?" Imagine in a tropical country somebody is asking you where is your tie! I went the way I did to Government House on purpose so that people would not feel that if they do not have any jacket or tie, Government House is not for them.

Mr. Chairman, people have the idea that you can give a Bobby anything. Policemen will forgive me for using the term "Bobby", but that is the English term. I would say quite frankly that I hope the Premier and his Cabinet will give this close consideration. There can be no evaluation under the sun to calculate how you can give $20 a week as your minimum salary in Barbados to a labourer or a minimum salary of $20.56 a week less four cents or a penny for a stamp leaving $20.52, which if multiplied by 52 gives just over $1,040 a year, and you are telling me that a policeman to begin with is not worth $100 a month. Moreover I am a Trade Unionist and I know differentials. If a man can get $20 a week which does not include Bank Holidays, Sundays, Christmas Day or working at night, I do not care who agrees with me, that is a differential in itself which is worth 50% and not 45%. Any man who is called upon to work every day in the year or any day in the year deserves a differential in his basic emoluments which puts him in a position higher than anybody else as his counterpart; therefore I agree with the Minority Report.

The minimum salary on which I think you should start any policeman in Barbados today is $120 a month, and complete your pyramid from there. I am a cruel man when it comes to paying people. The Premier and these other people seem to be afraid of the Civil Servants since they have got into power. Why are you paying them a travelling allowance? To go where? Why not stop that?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have allowed the hon. member to go on, because as I explained to him before, I really agreed with him that members of the Civil Establishment should have been dealt with first; but at the same time it is my duty to point out that it is competent for this House to grant increased allowances under the Police Regulations without interfering with the structure of the Police Force at all. So it is really a matter of indifference which we debate first.

The only reason I rose on a point of order is that if the hon. member is going to criticise the Civil Establishment Order, he has not allowed me to explain certain things or what the structure is going to be; so let him reverse his thinking of my agreeing with these persons, as I have disagreed with nearly every person who had something to do with the police salaries, including the Civil Service, Mr. Jacobs and everybody. I arrive at my own independent conclusion and I take responsibility for it, and if the Police can find somebody who can manage the financial affairs better, they can go to him.

Mr. WALCOTT: I agree with the Premier, and he knows that I would have to arrive at my independent conclusion, because I do not have a Cabinet to help me. I did not accuse

the Premier of agreeing to the Civil Service salaries. I said that the Premier agreed not to refuse these allowances where he can save money. So far as I am concerned, you can lock me up. The Premier is a lawyer but I am not. If I were Premier, from the time I took over office, I would tell everybody who is not an expatriate that he was born in Barbados, he was recruited here and he should stop thinking of going to England.
6.20 p.m.

That is $75,000 a year which we can save. When a man works for $800 or $900 a month and he cannot save enough for when he wants to go away, then I do not know. How does a business man get money to go away? A lot of these people in the Service get a lot of motor car allowances too. You are paying a lot of car bills for these people too. I saw one of these officers driving up and down and I said to somebody that he is only driving about to increase his travelling allowance. He says that he has to see So-and-So and he takes up his car and drives around and get 28 cents a mile for doing that. Our money is going that way.

Sir, I want to say to the Hon. Premier that I am not opposed to these allowances as such. I agree with the Resolution. I will refrain from discussing the Civil Establishment Order now. I will do so after the Government has introduced it, if there is any need to say something on it. I have the report of the Committee with me and so far as these allowances are concerned, there is not much in them that one can talk about. You have said that these people have agreed with the allowances.

Mr. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that members of the Barbados Police Force are definitely not satisfied with the recommendations of the Jacobs Report and my advice to hon. members today is not to rush this matter through for the simple reason that in 1925 when the Conservatives were in power, the salary of a policeman started at $28 a month, a bank clerk's salary started at $35 a month and clerks who were at firms like Plantations Limited, Manning & Company Limited and Messrs. J. H. Wilkinson, started at $25 a month. That meant that a policeman got $3.00 more than a clerk who worked at one of those firms, and $5.00 less than a bank clerk. Today, the salaries of these people have gone forward and left that of the policemen a far way back.

I am asking hon. members to come to the rescue of members of the Barbados Police Force. I am sure that they are short of policemen and they cannot get people to join the Police Force because the salaries are not attractive enough. You look at a bus driver and offer him $30 a week and you look at people who are policemen and give them $22 a week. Under the crash programme, you gave a man almost $22 a week to do the work of a labourer and that was for five and a half days a week. A policeman has to work all the time. If a policeman wants to get married, he cannot get the time to go and get married. Another thing is this; owing to the way in which he has to work, he cannot do anything else to help himself. I think it is a disgrace.

As a business man, I do not want to place any more burden on the Barbados Government; but at the same time I would rather that you adjourn consideration of this Resolution until you are able to handle these people better.

I will say that it takes a policeman three seconds to make up his mind, and if it takes more than that time, he is liable to turn the whole of Barbados upside down. He has three seconds to solve cases which sometimes take a Police Magistrate three quarters of a day and a good lawyer to do. These people are in a position to pull him to pieces. To give you an illustration, I will only refer you to a case in which a policeman by the name of Skeete arrested a white woman on one occasion and that turned the whole Police Force upside down.

I repeat that policemen are not satisfied because they feel that the Civil Servants had no right at all to be in the enquiry which was held in their case. If you ask me what I think of the general run of Civil Servants, I would say that some of them are a pack of independent dodgers. A policeman cannot dodge work. He is called upon by people from overseas for advice. He is responsible for law and order and the slightest thing that happens, he has to be there. If you are sick, you call for a doctor, but if anything happens to anybody, you call for the policeman. Yet you can only give him $25 a week to work whole time. I am asking hon. members to come to the assistance of members of the Barbados Police Force and to do what they can for them.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, we have been dealing with the allowances to policemen but some amount of latitude has been allowed other hon. members and they dealt with the Civil Establishment Order too. My colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, told me that after some explanation he sat down and refrained from dealing with it. But it was a long time before he sat down.

I want to make a few observations. I have in my hands the Report of the Committee appointed to review the remuneration of the members of the Barbados Police Force and although I have had it for some time, I have been only able to look at it just now. Like my colleague, I do commend the patience which has been practised by the members of the constabulary in that they had a long break before they knew what was actually given to them by way of allowances. Quite apart from that, I am dependent on the Police Force; therefore, I have great respect for the duties which they carry out in this country; therefore, I am interested in them and their welfare. Last year I was made to understand that constables were leaving the Force in great numbers and at a rapid rate and I was very much concerned about it. As a matter of fact, I think it would be of some concern to every interested citizen in this Island. One day I was in conversation with a man when quite a young policeman said to us that he did not intend to renew his contract and he was getting out of the Force at the earliest opportunity. That does not augur very well for the future of our Police Force if young men are not going to stay in it for more than a couple years.

I do believe that has been some concern of the Commission which enquired into the Police Force and the conditions of work. That is why I pay some respect to the Minority Report which has been submitted because I see there that it seems to weigh on what the young constable who enters the Force gets and it goes into the extraordinary duties and the extraordinary circumstances that confront young policemen and which would not necessarily confront a Civil Servant or a young clerk.
6.30 p.m.

That is absolutely true. I understand that on days at Police Stations in the country when the Inspector goes down to carry out an inspection, that day might be the off-duty day of a constable, but that constable has to wait at the Station for the inspection and it may mean that he may lose that off-duty day and not be compensated for it. That is the sort of thing which obtains in the Police Force but which obtains nowhere else. That is where the hon. member is justified in saying that the beginning salary should be extraordinarily weighted as compared with the beginning salary of a teacher or that of a Civil Servant. No Teacher, Clerk or Civil Servant begins to do any extraordinary work which the policeman is called upon to fulfil. It is plain justice and sheer commonsense to go into the conditions of service of that nature and try to make an adjustment and offer due compensation.

There is another thing which makes some appeal to me in the Minority Report; it is that when certain constables have put in a number of years' service, they usually quit the service because the maximum salary for them, if they do not get any promotion, is just over $200 a month. These Policemen should be encouraged to remain in the Service and not just drop out; they should be encouraged to go on to a salary at which they think it possible and convenient to remain in the Police Force. With regard to men who have had that experience, although they may not be as agile as they have been once, their experience should be of assistance to other constables.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving me that latitude which has been extended to other hon. members. I do not

think I have much to say on the question of allowances, but at the same time I do not think that this opportunity should have been allowed to slip by without making these observations. It was only yesterday at 9.30 o'clock a.m. that I got the Resolution which seeks to approve the Order. As to the Report of the Committee, I have seen that today for the first time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I regret that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not now in his place. He started off quite irrelevantly, I think, on this discussion before the House, I allowed him to go on because, in any case, sooner or later he would make the remarks he wanted to make when the Resolution to approve the Order came up for discussion. However, I am surprised to hear a Trade Unionist of the hon. member's experience — and I regret to say these things when the hon. member is not here; but we cannot hold up the debate, I am surprised to hear a Trade Unionist of the hon. member's experience attempting to compare the position or the salary of a police constable with that of somebody who is entering the crash programme or of somebody who is a Civil Servant. The hon. member said that in the crash programme we paid people $20.50 a week and he compares that with the commencing salary of a police constable at $100 a month. The very thing which we are discussing gives an entirely different slant to the position which he has tried to put before the Committee.

This Resolution seeks to provide the sum of $39,860 for paying special allowances to policemen over and above their salaries, and if the hon. member had studied what he was doing, he would not begin first and foremost by attempting to compare somebody in a crash programme with a policeman for whom we are asking for allowances alone over and above the salary. These policemen get a washing allowance and we are asking for the sum of $26,000 in that connection. They also get a plain clothes allowance for which we are asking for the sum of $3,600; they get a subsistence allowance in respect of which the back pay comes to $4,000; they get detective, bicycle and uniform allowances which total $4,660. There is nobody in this Committee who is more sympathetic than the hon. member is towards the just claims of the policemen, but he should not try to distort the true picture either by accident or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, the Minority Report recommends a salary of $100 a month. (MEMBERS: Are you right?) I was saying that it was irrelevant to discuss the salary question with this Resolution, but rather than give the public a wrong impression, we allowed hon. members to break the Rules of the House and do that. I am now replying to those irrelevancies. The Minority Report recommended a starting salary of $100 a month and it recommended a jump to $120 a month after completion of training.

Mr. SEALY: Is that correct?

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. If I read from the Minority Report aright, this is what is set out there:-

"In my opinion, the question of police salaries must first face the basic problem of a maximum salary for the constables. They constitute the largest section of the Force, and they number among them the men whose loyalty must be retained at all costs, and whose integrity must be kept intact if law and order is to be maintained in the community, and if the Police Force is to remain a contented force.

On the basis of a maximum salary of $2,522 - let us say $2,520 - I would recommend that the minimum or starting salary of the constable be arrived at by giving him ten years of actual police life before he reaches his maximum salary.

My scale for the constable would therefore be:

$1,440 x 120 - $2,520. "

That is if I am reading correctly. I do not know if the hon. member is right.
6.40 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Peter has not interpreted the information rightly. The position is that the Minority Report recommended a commencing salary of $100 whilst in training, and a salary of $120 at the completion of training after six months. What has the Government done? The Government has said that it will give $100 to begin with and at the end of his six months training, he will get $110 when he is going on patrol with somebody else; but at the end of the first year when he is a full-fledged policeman, he would get $120. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, a full-fledged policeman is not starting at $110, but at $120 a month.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter went further than that and compared the commencement salary of a Civil Servant with the commencing salary of a policeman, although he must know that special provisions have been made for people entering the Police Service with the same qualifications as those who would enter the Civil Service. When we come to the Order, it will be explained to him and the Committee that the salary for a man entering the Police Service with comparable qualifications to those entering the Civil Service is far higher than when you enter the Civil Service; therefore his argument falls to the ground. The position is that much of his discussion was irrelevant on the motion before the House, but in as much as we allowed it at that stage, any further explanation which we have to make will be made when we consider the Order for providing these new salary scales.

The question that the Resolution for $39,860 do now pass was put and resolved in the affimati ve without division.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, amd Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1962, be the next Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1962

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is made under the Civil Establishment Act of 1949, and as I explained in the course of the debate in Committee on another Resolution, if this Resolution is passed, it will not be necessary, in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Establishment Act, for us to come back to the House with a money Resolution in order that these salaries should be paid.

If I may give a very short background of the present Resolution, Your Honour will remember that a Salaries Commissioner was appointed to inquire into the salary structure of the Civil Service including the Barbados Police Force, and I believe it was some time in October that the Report was debated and approved by the Legislature in 1961.
6.50 p.m.

In view of the fact that the main branches of the Police Force have put in very strong objections against the recommendations made by the Salaries Commissioner, the Government appointed a Committee comprised of Mr. Justice Field; Mr. J. S. B. Dear; Mr. J. A. Mahon, an agriculturist; Mr. C. D. Gittens, the Auditor General; but as a result of the General Elections, the Committee referred their terms of reference to the present Government as to whether it was the Government's desire that they should continue with

their revision or their review of the Salaries Commissioner's revision of salaries.

The Government on 15th January, 1962, indicated to the Committee that they should carry on with their investigations but added another member to the Commission in the person of Mr. Garfield Sergeant, Barrister-at-law, who is a person who has had some experience of the Police Force before he became a Barrister; so the Commission was actually strengthened.

I mentioned these dates because the members of the Police Force should know that this Government was not delaying the implementations of any proposals but was trying to arrive at some kind of sound conclusion out of the phantasmagoria of facts of what was going on from time to time.

From 15th December until the present moment, the members of the present Police Force have not drawn any kind of increase at all because they refused to accept the increases which were recommended by the Salaries Commissioner, Mr. Jacobs. If they have not drawn the increases, it is because they elected not to draw them and because they did not want to compromise their position with the recommendations. I should mention that the Police Force from the Commissioner of Police all the way right down to the Police Constable have shown a remarkable degree of unanimity in their rejection of the Salaries Commissioner's Report; and in Barbados when one rejects recommendations for increases of salaries, it is axiomatic that the rejection is based on the increases which have been promulgated and not through any humanitarian and charitable processes. That is only natural. We have had no complaints on this matter to this Commission as to the sort of general conditions of service in the Barbados Police Force. We have had no complaints that the conditions are bad; therefore, we are not concerned with any of these matters. But members of the different delegations certainly urged the hardships which the Police have to undergo for making out extenuating circumstances as to why the Police should not be treated in the same manner as ordinary Civil Servants. In other words, they want to say that a policeman's lot is so hard that special consideration should be extended to him in considering the remuneration which he draws at the end of the month.

Before I present the Resolution, I would like to say that it has been my privilege over a large number of years to work with many members of the Police Force in the Law Courts. I, in so far as any citizen should do, have always tried to comply with the law; therefore, I have never come up against anything with the Police Force. I doubt that there is any member of the Police Force with whom I am at enmity or who is at enmity with me.

If therefore we have arrived at independent conclusions in presenting this Resolution, it does not spring from any anxiety to diminish the status of any member of the Police Force or to impose on those very worthy members of the Public Service any unnecessarily harsh conditions at all. But we have examined very critically in the light of the Island's finances, in the light of the increases which the Civil Servants have got, and all the recommendations which have been made, and we have taken as a basis of comparison matters which have been set forward very clearly and even matters which had not been set forward at all, even by Mr. Jacobs or by the Commission - and by this, I am not attributing anything to the fault of the Salaries Commissioner. I have gone to the Island of Trinidad. My visit had several purposes; but on one occasion I had discussions down there, to satisfy myself that no injustice was done, with officials of the Trinidad Police Force, and unofficially, I looked at the conditions under which they had to live. I also talked to certain legal officials of the Trinidad Government and I am satisfied myself on very close examination of the circumstances that the recommendations which we are bringing down in this Resolution for approval by the House do not create any hardship on any member of the Police Force.

The gazetted officers, the N.C.O's, and the Constables of the Police Force had everything possible in the way of representation. They were very well organised. It is attributable to organization and the way they went about this thing that they have received bigger salaries and this applies to all ranks. If the hon. senior member for St. Peter was in his place, he would be able to confirm that it is an essential element to collective bargaining that the people who want to get more always ask for more than what they expect to get and the people who are responsible for making this disbursement always offer less. That is one of the aspects of human behaviour which we do not have to go into very deeply; we have to accept it as a behaviour pattern which exists.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 7.00 p.m., time for the suspension of the sitting.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think I can finish my introductory remarks in ten minutes and then, perhaps, Your Honour can move the suspension of the sitting. I was saying that it is one of the principles of collective bargaining that the people who want to get more always ask for more and the people who are responsible for making the disbursements always offer less and, therefore, somewhere along the line a compromise is effected and this usually works out to the satisfaction of all.

7.00 p.m.

The Police have a quasi-military aspect which is considered by people who believe in civil liberties to be unsavoury. Fortunately, we are moving away from this militarism in the Police Force, and we are coming closer to the concept that a policeman is a civilian member of the community whose duty it is to protect the public and not to persecute the public, because the public is paying for the running of the Police Force.

There is a lengthy extract or there are several lengthy extracts from the Report of the Royal Commission on the Police under the Chairmanship of Sir Henry Willink. The Willink Commission on the Police in 1960 was used as a base reference by the Commissioner of Police, the Gazetted Officers and Counsel on behalf of the other ranks of the Police Force. That Commission was quoted at length in the Report submitted by the Committee on the Commissioner's Report - the Committee which sat as a Court of Appeal on the Commissioner, to what avail I am not quite certain. Although recourse was made to the Report of the Royal Commission, all parties appear to agree in the final analysis that these considerations were hardly impelling in a situation such as we have in Barbados, but they were worthy of note. That is how I interpret what was said and you will have the Report of the Committee before you.

The upshot of the appointment of this Committee was that on the 13th March, 1962, two Reports were submitted. One was signed by the Chairman and four of the members and the other Report was signed as a Minority Report by Mr. Hugh Carew disagreeing with the proposals which had been put forward by the Committee. We have just dealt with a Resolution in Committee of Supply and we have thereby voted a sum of money to the tune of $39,000 odd as an increase in the allowances given to the Police. We have already disposed of that Resolution but perhaps I may indicate what these allowances amount to. A washing allowance has been agreed to in the sum of $26,000, a plain clothes allowance $3,600, a subsistence allowance $4,000 and the detective allowance is $3,000. These are the new allowances. Normally, a policeman who is getting a washing and a plain clothes allowance will get an additional $15 a month over and above his salary. If he is a detective, he will get an additional $25 a month. The washing allowance is basic and is payable to all members of the Force below the rank of gazetted officers. Those members who carry out duties where bicycles are used get $36 a year and it is interesting that those were the proposals made by the Salaries Commissioner.

I do not want to go into detail as to the way in which we have arrived at the salary scales as have been set out, but I would like to make a comparison between what was recommended by the Salaries Commissioner, what was recommended by the Committee, what was recommended by

Mr. F. H. Carew in the Minority Report and what the Government, after taking into consideration all relevant considerations, considers just and equitable. You will see, on an examination of the different figures in so far as the Police Constables, non-commissioned officers and Inspectors are concerned, that the Jacobs Report has been improved upon. The incremental rate has been increased by us: but so far as the senior officers are concerned, we have decided that the rates recommended by the Salaries Commissioner are just and equitable.
7.10 p.m.

At every single stage the police are represented. When Mr. Jacobs came here the police submitted memoranda and were represented. When the Commission was in session the Commissioner interviewed the Commission and pleaded a case; the Gazetted Officers from the Deputy Commissioner all the way back down appeared *en bloc* and pleaded their case, and the Constables and non-Commissioned Officers had the benefit of Counsel even if they did not have the benefit of Clergy. I think Your Honour will appreciate what I am driving at when I said they did not have the benefit of Clergy.

You know, Sir, that at one stage of English Legal History, there was a certain verse from the Old Testament, and if a person was caught by a policeman in the commission of an act or offence, he was presented with the Old Testament and asked to read this verse. If he could read the verse, he was released by the police; but if he could not read the verse, he was executed the next morning. They used to call that verse the "neck burst" verse, because if you could read it you could save your neck, and this dispensation which was granted was granted on the grounds that only Clergymen could read the "neck burst" verse, because Clergymen were the only people who were educated in those days of the Dark Ages; so when I say they did not have the benefit of Clergy, I mean that the Old Testament was not presented to them so that they could save their necks. I know that Your Honour is well versed in the mysteries of English Legal History, but I only explained that for the benefit of other hon. members, and I am sure that the policemen would not mind my making that witticism.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they did have the benefit of Counsel to argue a case for them, and sympathetic consideration was given to all ranks of the Police Force by all the members of the Committee with the exception of the Auditor General who did not go as far as the Majority Report. Proposals were sent up to the Cabinet which, from 13th March until late last week, we were considering. We could not work without interruption because various members of the Cabinet have had to leave the Island from time to time, and naturally these figures and so on had to be processed through the Establishment, especially the Financial Department.

Now, Sir, the Majority Report, if I may sum up, recommended a salary for the Commissioner of Police of $9,600. Mr. Jacobs had recommended a salary of $9,120, and the Commissioner used to get a salary of $8,160. Mr. Carew recommended a salary of $9,600. The Deputy Commissioner was before the Jacobs Report getting $7,200 or $600 a month. Mr. Jacobs recommended that he should get $8,160 which is the salary which the Commissioner was getting before; the Majority Report recommended $8,400 for the Deputy Commissioner and Mr. Carew recommended the same salary.

Similarly there is a Senior Superintendent of the Barbados Police Force who was getting a salary of $5,760 rising by increments of $20 a year to $6,240, which is $520 a month. Mr. Jacobs recommended $550 a month to $590 a month; the Majority Report recommended a flat salary of $590 a month, and Mr. Carew recommended the same.

When we come to the Director of Music and the Superintendents, they used to get a salary of $380 a month rising by increments of $16 to $460. Mr. Jacobs recommended that they should get $482 rising by increments of $16 to $530; the Majority Report recommended that they should get $500 a month rising by increments to $560 a month, and Mr. Carew recommended the same. The Assistant Superintendents used to get $294 a month rising by increments of $12 to $368. Mr. Jacobs recommended that they should get $350 rising by increments of $14 to $466; the Majority Report recommended that they should get $360 rising by increments of $20 to $480, and Mr. Carew recommended the same.

With respect to the Inspectors and the Inspector of Weights and Measures, they used to get $220 a month rising by increments of $10 to $280. Mr. Jacobs recommended that they should start at $275 and go up by increments of $12 to $337.
7.20 p.m.

Now, the Majority Report of the Commission recommended that they should start at $280 and go up by increments of $10 a month to $340 a month.

Now, from the Inspectors down, you will find that Mr. Carew begins to disagree with the Commission. Mr. Carew at this stage recommended that the Inspectors should start at $310 per month and go up by increments of $10 to $340 a month. The Station Sergeants used to get $200 a month. The Jacobs' Commission recommended that they get $255 which would be an increase of $55 a month. The Majority Report of the Commission recommended that they should get $270 and Mr. Carew recommended that they should get $280 going up by increments of $10 to $300 per month. Therefore, you can see from the rank of Inspector back down Mr. Carew differs with the Majority Report.

A Sergeant of the Local Constabulary is at present on the scale of $174 per month rising by increments of $6.00 a month to $192. Mr. Jacobs recommended that they should get $225 per month rising by increments of $10 per month to $245 a month. The Majority Report of the Commission recommended that they should get $240 a month going up by increments of $10 to $280 a month. Mr. Carew recommended that they should get $250 a month going up by increments of $10 to $270 a month.

Corporals are getting $142 per month rising by increments of $6.00 to $166 a month the maximum. Mr. Jacobs recommended that they should get $194 per month rising by increments of $6.00 to $215 a month. The Majority Report of the Commission recommended that they should get $210 per month going up to $220 a month. Mr. Carew recommended that they should start at $220 and go up by increments of $10 to $240.

The present salary of a Constable is $80 a month and it goes up by increments to $149 a month. Mr. Jacobs recommended that they should start at $100 a month which is the starting point for a Clerk in the Civil Service, and go up by increments of $8.00 to $180 a month and then by a special increment to $191 a month. The Majority Report of the Commission recommended that a Constable should start at the same $100 which Mr. Jacobs put him at and then he should go up by increments of $10 to $200 a month and after a period of five years he should receive another increment of $10 to put him at $210 a month and then a final increment of $10 after 17 years service to put him at $220 a month. Mr. Carew recommended figures close to that but started the Constable at $120 going up by increments of $10 to $210 per month and then a five year increment of $10 to bring it to $220 and then another five year increment to bring it to $230 a month.

That, Sir, is roughly the position of the matter which came before the Cabinet to consider. Now, if I may turn to the Schedule of this Civil Establishment Order.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. How long do you propose to carry on? Are you finishing off for good or are you adjourning and returning later? You have to remember that we were in here from 2.30 p.m. and this is now 7.30 p.m. I would like to know what you intend doing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I appreciate the hon. member's predicament. The night is dark and he is far from home. I

am just finishing the Schedule. We will adjourn for one hour and then come back. It is very unfortunate that we should have to return but the Police are anxious to get some kind of money. On top of that, members of the Government will be going to the United Kingdom on Sunday and as from tomorrow, there will be Ministers from the other Islands arriving - as a matter of fact, some are already here - and we are having a conference with them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is anticipating whether the adjournment will be forthcoming in a short time.
7.30 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 8.30 p.m., of the clock.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 8.30 p.m. of the Clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL (AMENDMENT) ORDER 1962

On re-assembling,

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

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the Hon. Premier was addressing the House on a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1962 made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 13th day of April, 1962, under the provisions of Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949. The Hon. Premier may continue his address.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the sitting of this House was suspended, I gave a comparative table showing the different salaries recommended by the Majority and Minority Reports of the Commission which was appointed to go into the recommendations of the Jacobs' Report relating specifically to the Police Force. I also gave a table showing the salaries which the members and officers of the Force were receiving before the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner. I will now deal with the proposals which the Government is putting up for the approval of the Legislature. *(ASIDES)* Does the hon. senior member for the City want to speak?

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was asking for my Report. I was not interrupting the Premier. I have an address and it is the duty of the persons responsible to mail my Report to me. These things should not be laid in here because you do not know whether hon. members are coming to the House or not. I want to have my Report so that I can follow the Hon. Premier while he is speaking.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will now deal with the recommendations which were put forward for the approval of the Legislature under this Civil Establishment Order, 1962. As to Head 12 - Police - for the Commissioner of Police we recommend that he should receive a salary of $760 a month and before that, the Commissioner was receiving a salary of $680 a month. That is an increase of $80 a month over and above the salary which he was getting before and it is in excess of a 10% increase. The Deputy Commissioner is recommended for a salary of $680 a month which is also an increase of $80 a month over and above the salary which that Officer was receiving before. The Senior Superintendent will receive a salary of $550 a month by increments of $20 a month going to $590 a month. The Superintendents will receive a salary of $482 a month going to $530 a month. I should mention that the Senior Superintendent was receiving a salary of $520 a month before, so that perhaps he will not come in at the point where he will get an increase of $70 a month.
8.40 p.m.

The Superintendents receive a salary of $482 to $530 whereas they were getting $456 per month before; they will be increased by roughly $74 a month. Similarly the Director of Music gets the same salary. The Assistant Superintendents go from $350 by increments of $14 to $446, whereas the maximum was $325 per month before. The Inspectors go from $280 to $340 whereas it was $252 before; so there is a considerable increase of $88 a month. The Inspector of Weights and Measures gets the same salary. A Station Sergeant who used to get $200 a month will be receiving a flat salary of $270 a month. Sergeants will go from $240 to $260 by increments of $10 a month, therefore in two years they will receive their maximum salary. They were getting $186 a month before, so there is an increase of $84 a month. Corporals will go from $210 to $230.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Hon. Premier made a mistake in what he said Station Sergeants would get.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to cancel what I said about Station Sergeants. They will receive an increase of $70 a month, and they were getting $200 before. Sergeants go from $240 to $260 in two years, and they were getting $186 a month. Corporals will go from $210 to $230 and they were receiving a maximum of $166 a month before. They started at $142 and went up to $166, so you can see that there is an increase of $64 a month. The Constables who received $80 going up to $140 now will start at $100 and go up to $210 a month.

Now we have done something else that neither one of the Reports recommended. The Commissioner explained in the memorandum which he submitted, as hon. members will see in their Report, that he had great difficulty in recruiting suitable persons with the necessary qualifications into the Police Force, and having recruited them, he was experiencing great difficulty in retaining their services. The Committee which was appointed to go into the Jacobs Report did not recommend any special increments for special academic qualifications. If this therefore is the main factor - the difficulty of recruitment - the Cabinet thought fit that some special inducement should be offered to people with better academic qualifications, and what we have decided to do is to give an increment automatically for two subjects at Ordinary Level and an increment for one subject at Advanced Level, so that in any case the maximum number of increments does not exceed four. You will find that actually set out in the Schedule, but that is a matter of policy which we are asking the House to endorse. I would just like briefly to explain that a bit more fully. I said that for two subjects at Ordinary Level or for one or more subjects at Ordinary Level there should be an award of one increment, and for two or more subjects at Advanced Level an award of two or more increments.

Now a member of the Civil Service after the Salaries Revision starts at $100 a month. At the end of one year a member of the Civil Service will be getting $110 per month. In order to get $100 a month as a Long Grade Clerk in the Civil Service, you must have at least four subjects at Ordinary Level to get into the Civil Service at all. Now you do not need any kind of subjects to get into the Police Force; you pass an Entrance Test, and the Commissioner himself has stated....if hon. members will not allow me to continue, I will give way, because I have been here as long as and a little longer than they have been. (Mr. WALCOTT: You took up a lot of time with your Statement today). I have another Statement to make too.

As I was explaining, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Commissioner himself in his letter to the Committee made certain statements, and one of the statements was to the effect that contrary to the recommendations of the Department of

Education who apparently scrutinized the papers of candidates for entry into the Police Force, he has had to accept people far below the necessary academic level in order to get recruits at all. We feel that if they have a young candidate wavering between going into the Civil Service with four certificates at Ordinary Level, he should be given some special inducement whereby he can make a fair kind of choice in electing whether to go into the Civil Service or into the Police Force. We have done two things. Mr. Jacobs only recommended an increase to $96 per annum as the incremental scale for constables. We have made it $120 per annum which is the same as the Civil Service. In addition to that, a constable going in starts on his training at $100 a month, and at the end of six months when he finishes his training, he immediately gets $110.
8.50 p.m.

If he has four subjects at Ordinary Level, he gets $130 a month. If he has two subjects at Advanced Level, he will be getting $150 per month within twelve months of his entering the Police Force.

Now, the salary which a Policeman got at the end of a year's service was $80 per month plus an increment of $8.00 which would bring him up to $88 a month. The only difference between our proposals and the proposals put forward by Mr. Carew is that Mr. Carew recommended a salary for a Police Constable of $120 a month as soon as he came into the Force and at the end of the year another $10 increment which would bring him up to $130 a month. We have recommended $100 per month when he is in the Training School and when he comes from there, he goes up to $110, and then up to $120 which is $10 less than what Mr. Carew recommended.

With the additional provisions for academic qualifications, we feel that this would act as a spur not only to get people to join the Police Force who have these qualifications — and the Majority Report did not recommend this; as a matter of fact, they were opposed to the idea of giving any additional increment to these recruits — but we also felt that it would be an incentive to members of the Police Force who are already in it, if they did not possess these qualifications, to go the Evening Institute or to take courses under the training programme which we have and qualify themselves in subjects of their own choice and which would be geared to the kind of career which they would be suited to in the Force so that they would be better qualified to become Inspectors and Gazetted Officers of the Force. We feel that these incentives are a good thing; so the Government has gone beyond the Report of the Committee and we are adding on $10 at the end of one year to the salary of a Constable who has got any of the academic qualifications. Mr. Carew made no recommendations as to these academic qualifications.

Now, Sir, it means that it is possible for a Constable coming in under our recommendations to get $160 a month if he has the necessary qualifications whereas according to Mr. Carew's recommendations he still will be at $120 a month no matter what qualifications he has. This, we think, would go a long way in answering the stricture made by the Commissioner that there was no incentive to recruit qualified members into the Police Force. I paid a visit to Trinidad and I found that the Trinidad Police Constable at the end of one year would be receiving $130 a month. The maximum which a Police Constable in Trinidad gets is $200 a month whereas our maximum for a Police Constable is $210 a month which is the beginning of the scale for Corporals. Our corporals start at the same place as the Trinidad corporals.

I have been working on a different formula, but there is no one satisfactory formula that can apply when it comes to the question of salaries and salary differentials between people in the same service and between one territory and another, because your formula would get very complicated and you may find youself bogged down in the intracacies of differential calculus. You may find yourself having an exercise in D Y equations. You cannot devolve any one formula as can be seen from the report of the Salaries Commissioner on what the Police Commission in England did and what the Committee here in Barbados attempted to do, but in so far as what they did, they did make some gallant attempt to arrive at some formula.

I should mention that the neighbouring colony of Trinidad has a budget of over $250 million which is ten times that of the budget of Barbados. They start out without one penny of taxation by getting $40 million in oil royalties. Their receipts from oil royalties are over 70% the total revenue of the Government of Barbados; so with these comparisons of salaries of the Commissioner of Police of Barbados with that of the Commissioner of Police of Trinidad or Jamaica or British Guiana, I notice after careful examination of all the submissions that no mention was made of the national income per head, the immediate resources, or the Government revenue of any of the territories. You cannot pick out a salary of one territory and apply it *carte blanche* to this Island of Barbados unless you are prepared to introduce all the other factors which are taken into consideration. I can spend hours tearing to pieces some of the arguments which have been advanced, but it would be undignified for me to do that.

How we have arrived at these figures is really a matter for us, but I have given an indication of the kind of increase which these proposals embody as an indication that in truth and in fact it was not a question of what was put up to the Council or what the Police Commissioner feels the Gazetted Officers and N.C.O's should get and what he himself should get; but compared with what they were getting before and getting now, you will see that substantial increase has been granted to the members of the Force and that increase was over and above that granted to the rest of the Civil Service. I will go so far as to say that if any increase in the Civil Service were wanted at all, these increases for the Police are quite justified. However, if we are going to quarrel about whether somebody should get $10 a month or $5 a month more — and there is absolutely no quarrel over the allowances granted — we are going to find ourselves involved in a mathematical argument which in the final analysis would be nonsensical. It must always be borne in mind that I, as a Minister of Finance, take full responsibility for anything here and I believe that I know more of the finances of this colony than previous Ministers of Finance, and even although there be limited methods of amelioration, yet I take full responsibility for them.
9.00 p.m.

I have just given some figures to show what the average increases are and I do not think there is one increase which is less than $50 a month. The cost of living from 1956 to 1961 has not risen more than 11 points, and if the Police were satisfied with the Godsall revision in 1956, then they have no grounds for being dissatisfied with this one; but it may be that there is dissatisfaction over the conditions of service. I read that the Commissioner said that these men should be on duty for eight hours and they should stand by for another eight hours. It may be that this stand-by period is irksome to the men; it may be so. I do not think you could argue that because it has been decided by the hierarchy that these men must be penned up for an additional eight hours, or say that because they are penned up or pent up for an additional eight hours when they are not out on the beat, they must get an increase of $10 more. That is a good argument for a 100% increase. You will see that the Police Association asked the Committee to examine the general conditions of service and that may be the underlying cause of discontent in the Police Force.

In contradistinction to the opinion expressed by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the Police are anxious to get their money. (Mr. WALCOTT: Not any money.) These proposals involve the Treasury in the order of $300,000. I will give you some of the percentage increases now. I do not deal with the conversion tables. The Band Cadets, and there are as many of them as they want, start between $40 and $50 a month and the proposal is that they should get between $50 and $65 a month. That is an increase of between 25% and 30%. The Constables who were getting $80 a month will get an increase of between 25% and 40%. The Corporals who start at the bottom of the scale get a 38% increase. We must remember that the national income of Barbados has declined, the Government revenue has declined and that the cost of living index has only

risen 11 points in five years. The Corporals go from $210 a month to $230 a month representing a 38% increase. You will find that there is a tapering off because the theory is that the higher up the ladder you go the smaller is the percentage increase. As regards a man who is already drawing a salary over and above what Mr. Jacobs says is necessary, as soon as he goes higher and higher the question for him is not a question of existence or subsistence or how many more luxuries he will be able to afford. In the $800 bracket you cannot argue for the same percentage increase as you would argue for the man who is getting $100 a month. Very often a fellow who is getting $100 a month has a larger family to support and he has a family at a more tender age than the man who is reaching the top of the ladder whose children are coming out of the University. Those in the lower category are the people who have the family responsibility. We feel that the people in that category are more desirable of an increase than the people who are higher up. If there is anything wrong with that, then I must take full responsibility for it.

When you come to the Station Sergeants their increase is 30% on what they were getting before. They go from $200 a month to $270 a month. For Inspectors the increases go from 27% to 21% at the top of the scale; but while all of these percentages are decreasing, the actual amount of money that the Officer is receiving at the end of the month is not necessarily decreasing. Although the percentage is decreasing the amount of money is increasing; although the increase is a substantial one, yet the percentage increase in the case of those at the top is below that of the ones at the bottom. The Commissioner gets the smallest percentage increase which is an increase of 11%. The same thing applies to the Deputy Commissioner; they are getting an 11% increase but the increase on the salary is $80 a month.

9.10 p.m.

Now Mr. Jacobs stated in no uncertain terms the salary which we have recommended here for the Commissioner. Mr. Jacobs said that in the new constitutional position which we have in Barbados, it must be realised that the Permanent Secretaries as happens in Jamaica and in the United Kingdom are directly responsible for several Government Departments. The Committee recommended a salary for the Commissioner which was in excess of the salary given to Permanent Secretaries, as a matter of fact, a salary in excess of that enjoyed by the majority of Heads of Government Departments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what new situation has arisen in this Island of Barbados that the Commissioner of Police should be catapulted? We are not trying to create a Police State in Barbados whereby we want to make anybody Commander-in-Chief of the Air, Land and Sea Forces. We have to have a sense of order when we are looking at the structure of the Civil Service, and I do not think that it is appreciated that the Cabinet are the Directors of the affairs of this country, and that each Minister is a Managing Director of several Departments; then you have sub-Departments under each Minister. It is fatuous that in Barbados a Minister gets a smaller salary than the Commissioner of Police, and a smaller salary than a Permanent Secretary, because Barbadians have not conditioned themselves up to now to the new constitutional status which they are enjoying, and it is only because as a matter of principle that I am not prepared to preach one thing and practise another that I do not regard the whole situation as ridiculous. I see no justification for increasing the Ministers' salaries just because those of other people were increased.

I know that hon. members will get up and champion their causes — to talk and not to count the cost — and say that we are not looking out for the people and we are not giving them what money they want; but I would like to tell the Civil Service, and I do not particularly mean the police now, that it has been brought to my attention — let me put it that way and I would not like you to press me — that certain people grumble because we did not accept lock, stock and barrel what had been put up by the different sections of the Barbados Police Force. (Mr. WALCOTT: We will not press you, we will squeeze you.) I say if we did not do so, it is because we wanted to do justice to the greatest possible number, having regard to all the special circumstances which are operating, and there is no one formula which we can apply. I think that the people who grumble would be doing a great disservice to this community if they are prepared to go into the Treasury at the end of the month and draw a year's backpay and draw the increases in salary. If they say that they can get better salaries elsewhere, I invite all those Civil Servants who feel they can get more money somewhere else to leave right now and get the money they say they can get. They are blackmailing the people of this Island by talking about dignity of office and all the arduous duties; and I am not referring to Police Constables. How many of them have left the Civil Service between 1956 and 1962? Do you know who left? The ones who left were the young ambitious Police Constables who felt they were not getting a fair break, and we have tried to do justice to them. How many officers have left? That is almost a rhetorical question. Name one. How many Police Sergeants have left? They will get an increase of $70 a month; so if they did not leave when they were getting $70 a month less, do you think they are going to leave now that they are getting $70 a month more?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is time that these people have a sense of perspective. They are not fooling anybody. There are a lot of Civil Servants strutting about like an army of occupation giving people the impression that they are some privileged element in the community, and that the Almighty has endued them with qualities possessed by no other section of the community. If they feel like that and have somewhere to go, they should not take our money and grumble; they should go to the place where they say they can get money. Name one that can be employed elsewhere!

Anyhow, Sir, let us come back to the Police Constables. We are doing our best to maintain the numerical strength and morale of the Force, and I think maybe they have a legitimate case that as time goes by they may be entitled to a revision at that level. The Minister of Trade is calling for people for the London Transport, and he cannot even get them. (Mr. WALCOTT: You are making sport.) Those are facts, Sir. (Mr. WALCOTT: If a man has venereal disease, you cannot send him.)

I hope the Reporter is not taking down what these members are saying. I am very serious about this, because....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing too many voices.

Mr. WALCOTT: Every house has a domestic servant, and you say you cannot get them for England.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. Peter ought to know, as I said, — it is true that he was not in here.....

Mr. WALCOTT: You can get them.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Could we have some order, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I expect that hon. members would at least on this first occasion give me a hearing.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have pointed out that a policeman who has been in the Force longer than 17 years — and there are a large number of them — gets an increase right away on the conversion tables of at least $51 a month, nothing to do with his allowances which have also been increased. He will get backpay for approximately 15 months at $51 a month with an average increase of between $65 and $70 a month over and above what they were getting before. The people who left the Police Force were not the Sergeants, Inspectors, Superintendents, the Deputy Commissioner or the Commissioner. As a matter of fact, we recruited some of these people since the Godsall Report. To the people who are arguing that their salaries are not adequate and are trying to compare salaries in Barbados with the salaries in Trinidad, I say "yes, compare them now at the level that most of us are concerned about, the level of the constable." The constable in Barbados is getting more than the constable in Trinidad when we finish with this Report here tonight, and I think that is justice.

9.20 p.m.

Trinidad as I pointed out gets $41 million oil rights without imposing any taxation on anybody in Trinidad.

Another thing which I said before and repeat now is that all of these people who are grumbling and building empires and all that kind of thing and causing the Government a lot of trouble are not concerned with where the money is going to come from. I want to say that with respect to these increases given to Civil Servants, we did not use that as a reason to depress the salaries at all, but we had to approach this matter with a sense of realism. It would be an attractive idea to accept the Minority Report of Mr. Carew; but if we accepted it, as most of us on first inspection wanted to do before we went into the ramifications of this whole thing, we would have thrown Barbados out of context with the rest of the West Indies if that was the criterion. British Guiana has 81,000 or 86,000 square miles with only a half million people as population. Trinidad has a budget of $250 million as against our $26 million or $27 million and yet we are able to pay salaries here in Barbados which are nearly as attractive as that of Trinidad and, as a matter of fact, some are a lot more attractive when you take other factors into consideration. Do not let us be misled. I feel that we have tried to do justice by and large to all ranks in the Police Force.

To sum it up, these therefore are our proposals for which I take full responsibility. We have in short implemented the Majority Report with the following modifications: the salary of the Commissioner of Police would be fixed at $9,120 per annum which means that he gets an increase of $80 a month. The Majority Report recommended that he should get $40 a month more than that. I think that it is only my duty to point out — and I do not want to be misquoted on this — that there is something which does not appear in any of these Reports. I feel if the Committee was doing its job, Mr. Jacobs was doing his job and all the matters were put on the Table, that it certainly would be of interest to the Committee to know that the Commissioner of Police gets another $80 per month from the Regional Training School and that he would not be receiving this if he were not the Commissioner of Police of Barbados. We put that aside. This does not appear in the Estimates because it comes under the sum of the Training Fund. The Windward and Leeward Islands contribute to that; therefore, we have left it out. The salary of the Commissioner of Police which is $9,120 is not based on that but based on his proper position in the hierarchy of Barbados.

I do not know the justification for giving the Commissioner of Police this additional $80 a month. When I say the Commissioner of Police, it is not a question of the occupier of the office whom I am speaking about. Let us look at it this way. If he is carrying out these duties which he carries out at the Regional Training School during his official hours, I want to say that I know of a precedent in which the money had to be paid into the Treasury because it was argued by the British Treasury that where an officer — and it refers to a technical officer — was given additional emoluments for duties which he was carrying out during the Government's time, that money would have to be paid into the Treasury. It was argued that he is doing that work during the Government's time.

I want to underscore that we did not take this into consideration in fixing the salary of the Commissioner of Police. But we put it at the position in which Mr. Jacobs, the super duper expert, said it should have been put. Any of us would do with a little $80 a month extra which is what he is getting. This has nothing to do with the extra money which he is getting from the Regional Training School but that is one of the emoluments of the Commissioner which he draws. If he were not the Commissioner of Police of Barbados, he could not get it.

Sir, I notice in one of the recommendations that officers in Trinidad and those places get a house allowance, but do not let anybody run away with the idea that we are trying to pull down the mighty from their seats and exalt the humble and meek. We are leaving the mighty in their seats for the time being, whether I am in this Government or on the other side.

As I have said, no where do I see the Committee referring to this as one of the necessary conditions of the service and taking that into consideration. Why? Suppose he was getting twice as much, would they not mention it? We did not take this into consideration, I repeat, because we felt as Mr. Jacobs had said that he should get $9,120, we should give him that.

Sir, we want to maintain law and order and the people who are responsible for it should not try to create disorder and produce an atmosphere of unsettlement in this Island over $10 or $20 or even $30 for that matter. I know what I am saying. They may not be paid to deal with anybody like me. However, I say that I am the Minister of Finance and I take full responsibility for it. Anybody who does not like it can resign and go to the people who say that we can pay you more than that.
9.30 p.m.

I am not talking about everybody in the Civil Service who sat under the last Government from 1956 and the Government waited until Election year to review salaries and gave cost of living increases and increments every year. They are supposed to cushion the shock. I cannot cater to people's propensity to live on a scale of the expatriate millionaires who come down here and who use Barbados as a playing ground. We have to look at the basic facts and realities in this country. As far back as 7 years ago the first Five Year Plan was introduced without anyone approaching the affairs of this country. I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter say that this is not the affluent society. There is no question of having cabin cruisers, three cars in the garage, and three television sets. I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter say, on more than one occasion, that there are people in this country who are getting on as if we have the affluent society here in Barbados; they are not concerned about the unemployed. I want to say this as a generalisation; I mentioned when I addressed the Civil Service Association some weeks ago and the newspapers did not elect to print it, that when it comes to the Civil Servants' increases, if we had to borrow the money we paid out in increases alone in Civil Servants salaries as interest, the increases would have serviced a loan of $58.3 million. If we did not have to pay those increases we could raise a loan of $58.3 million with those increases alone and the amount is going up every year. With the increments and with Parkinson's Law applying, the recurrent expenditure goes on every year. Professor Arthur Lewis calculated that in providing one primary job in Barbados, the multiplier effect would be two secondary jobs plus the basic job. That would call for an investment of $10,000 (B.W.I.) currency. In other words, we could have provided 5,800 basic jobs with the increases which we are giving to the Civil Servants, and, using the internal multiplier effect, that would work out at something like 17,400 jobs in this island where there is so much unemployment. That is the price which the community has paid for this cheap attempt at politics.

I am not talking about the increases for the Police Force because when I talk about that, these increases do not come in at all. I am one of the people who have always agitated for an increase for the non-commissioned officers and other ranks of the Police Force because their salaries, in my opinion, were completely unrealistic. Everybody who has been in this House for the last few years would know that. I have also campaigned for an increase for the Key Scale workers, but I do not want anybody to think that, in introducing this Measure tonight, I have tried to discriminate between the officers and other people because that is unadulterated nonsense. I think we have given realistic increases to the members of the Police Force, but it is time that the Civil Servants realise that the price which the community is paying is 17,400 unemployed people who could have been working at a capital investment per job of $10,000 and there are those unemployed who may be going to bed hungry tonight. If I appear to be a bit outspoken on this matter, it is not that I begrudge anybody anything. No member of the House should criticise this Government if we decided that the disparity between the salaries of Ministers and their Permanent Secretaries should be maintained. This is the only firm in the world where

the Managing Director gets less money than the floor walkers; but we are satisfied with that because we are aware of the realities and it is not a situation which was created by us.
9.40 p.m.

I hope that contrary to what the hon. senior member for St. Michael thinks, the policemen will be getting their salaries soon. I would like to say that if the Honourable House passes this matter tonight and the Other Place passes it this week, it is entirely a matter for the Police Department when they get their backpay and so on. It will be out of my hands. I have given instructions that the backpay, going back for the last fifteen months or whatever it is, should be paid out and they should get their increases by the end of the month. As a matter of fact, the purpose of this exercise here tonight and our meeting on a day when we do not normally meet is to ensure that there will be no impediment against these people who have been beseiged by their creditors for such a long time, and that those who have held out for their democratic rights should be suitably recompensed.

In conclusion, I only want to say something I started to say to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. As a Trade Unionist, the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows that the basic principle of collective bargaining is that the side that wants to get more always asks for more than they expect to get; (Mr. WALCOTT: Those are old-fashioned ways.) and the side that has to make the disbursements always offers less. I am very glad to hear that the Trade Unionists have come to such a stage now that they do not have to observe the basic principle of collective bargaining. There seems to be an identity between the Union and management, and therefore they have achieved a millenium. We have not approached this problem of salaries from that point of view. I think that after all I have said, hon. members will be satisfied that the Government has tried to do justice to all ranks of the Police Service, and to put the emphasis where the emphasis is due.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had a long session from the Premier and I must say that I sympathise with him. I sympathise with him in the same way I would sympathise with a good employer, but at the same time I have to point out that even an employer who is willing to pay more says he cannot pay any more. The attitude of the Premier today is not that he does not see there is room for more. The only thing I would say to the Hon. Premier is that he made his speech about the Civil Service in the wrong place. The mistake which you made about the Civil Service is that you are still afraid. Have you told the Civil Service how you feel about it in unvarnished language? Now Peter is not paying for Paul; Paul has to pay for Peter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to show the hon. member some of his own analysis, because he says he can pull the Report to pieces. I can tear it to pieces too and I can tear his argument to pieces. The Hon. Premier should stop this academic stuff about policemen. When you want to grabble a criminal, a man does not have to read Shakespeare to deal with him; or if a man had a pen-knife at a "singing" in the Orleans or a bull pistle and is kicking up and breaking up, you cannot talk about Keats or Shelley.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I object strongly to the hon. member maligning my constituents by talking about people in the Orleans. Why doesn't he say in Speightstown?

Mr. WALCOTT: If you had a man in Mile-and-a-Quarter, Speightstown, or Indian Ground kicking up with a bull pistle, you could not tell the man about Keats or Shelley; you have to grabble the man and look strong enough to get him. I want to show the hon. member in passing why he is not recruiting more people through the Labour Department. The whole point is that the methods are wrong. You cannot talk about recruiting labour unless you include those people who know something about the whole structure of labour employment; and if you are going to ask Civil Servants about recruiting labour you will always make the same mistake. You will never be able to cast the net wide enough. You can get all the people you want, but the basic problem may be the educational system in which you are producing too many idiots who cannot convert pounds, shillings and pence to dollars and cents, though they may have a good, clean bill of health. They cannot convert pounds, shillings and pence to dollars and cents, though that is something which you had to do in third standard in my day out of your head, and if you got a piece of paper on which to work it out, your fingers would be knocked off. Under this new age grouping you are calling the classes "Forms" and not "Standards" anymore, and after going through all these Forms, they cannot fill out a form.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to tell the Hon. Premier in passing that it is a sad reflection on Barbados with its educational system that you cannot find 100 people a month in a population of 200,000 people, with a labour force of over 100,000 people of whom 60,000 are employed permanently and over 30,000 are unemployed. The reason for that is because nothing has been set up to examine the situation to see why it is that you cannot get 100 people a month. You cannot get these people because you have set about in a fashion in which you give a man a card and for 18 months he has to be returning to the Labour Department. You want to have a system in which you pull out the people whom you want and who are fit to be recruited. Go and look at the list of people going to America. There are also dozens of girls wanting to go to Canada, but some of them have gone to England on their own because you could not recruit them through the Labour Department. There was a girl from Lonesone Hill who for three years was trying to go to England, so I told her to let her father sell his cow; and the mother told me that she got a job the day after arriving in England. When you send all these girls away what is going to happen? These women mean "votes", and I will have to look for fresh votes.
9.50 p.m.

I want to point out to the Hon. Premier something about the incentive to join the service. I will show him an analysis of the Police Force first of all. The Barbados Police Force is a force of 680 men, of which 76% are Constables and Writ Servers, 15% Corporals, 4% Sergeants, 3% Station Sergeants and 2% Inspectors. I do not talk about the few above that. Now, when you come and look at a structural arrangement like that where 98% of the people are getting a salary of less than $300 a month, is that any encouragement for anybody with school certificates to come and join that branch of the Service? A Senior Clerk with ten years' service gets more than $300 a month. I repeat, 98% of the total Police Force will never work for $300 a month. That percentage of your total complement is working for salaries of less than $300 a month which is the equivalent to a Senior Clerk in the Civil Service.

The Hon. Premier and I have similar views on what should be our structure in Barbados; therefore, he knows that I do not share the view that the Civil Service must be a structure for all and sundry. A man who works in the British Munitions does not come within the structure of the British Civil Service or of a man working in the Foreign Office, but the idiots here who created the Service have put all and sundry in the Civil Service structure. They have taken up the man who is working with the peck, the man who is the carpenter and all like them and have called all Civil Servants. They tell him that he is in the same structure as the Chief Justice. What kind of ignorance is that? How can that be so when those two people are not recruited on the same basis?

What the Hon. Premier is now experiencing is that the 4,000 employees in the Service are coming up at one time for a review of their salaries on an unscientific basis. I told them in here years ago that you cannot have a structure in the Civil Service where on the same basis one person is recruited on an academic basis, and another recruited to shoot labour. The one who is recruited to shoot labour has to be compared on the same basis as the labourer in the canefield.

When you get this sort of arrangement, the Hon. Premier must know that if he has inherited a system like this, some time you will have to change it. I repeat that your whole structure is wrong.

As I have said, 98% of your total Police Force is working for less than $300 a month. Look at the Order and you will see. The Station Sergeant is put at a salary of $3,240 per annum. Your Senior Clerk gets a salary of $3,960. The Senior Clerk at the Labour Department gets $3,684 and the highest point that 98% of the total Police Force is going to reach is a salary which is less than that. In an age like this when you reach the stage that 98% of your whole Service in the Police Force is going to get a salary of less than $300 a month, let us ask ourselves which boy with any School Certificates is going to enter that service. Two per cent can only be Inspectors and you have above them four Assistant Superintendents, one Director of Music, three Superintendents, one Senior Superintendent, a Deputy Commissioner and a Commissioner.

You talk about academic qualifications: but in Barbados now you are finding it hard to recruit somebody for the London Transport Service which is a service in which you go to collect bus tickets. Do you believe you are going to recruit through this avenue somebody to be Assistant Superintendent? Do you think that somebody interested in becoming an Assistant Superintendent would be coming in at $100 per month or even at a higher point than that as you have said? Who are the ones who are going to start from the bottom with the ability to be a Commissioner? Therefore, let us analyse what you have put down. There is no cadet in the Police Force unless you are talking about the Band Cadets who are getting lunch coppers. There is only one Director of Music; therefore, you have to think of a class in which they can earn a salary.

An analysis of people in the Police Force with other people in the Civil Service cannot be made and I maintain that the time has come when the members of the Police Force should think of themselves as an organisation by themselves. Policemen are foolish in this sense that they should have a strong police organisation to present their case. With all due respect to Your Honour and the Hon. Premier, I say that lawyers cannot present industrial cases because whenever I meet lawyers around a table negotiating for the other side they are always wrong. They are always looking for precedents. We, in the Trade Union, do not look for any precedent to work on; we look for present day circumstances to work on.

According to your scale, a policeman starts at a salary of $100 a month. Now, this is what you have to bear in mind. You take him to the Training School; therefore, he cannot get food from home. A man living out must pay more than a man living home because when you get a little work out of the pot at home you pay less because everything is going back home. When a man eats out, it costs him more. That is why when we have to go outside, you pay us subsistence allowance.

I want the Hon. Premier to examine this structure very carefully. I am not making any comparison between Trinidad and Barbados because the national income is different and the sizes of the populations of both countries are different. So far as the Commissioner of Police is concerned, I will tell the Hon. Premier that I am more revolutionary than he. You are making sport. You cannot justify a salary in Barbados at all in the whole structure of the Civil Service where you pay a man $900 a month and within the same economy your national income is less than $500 a year. You have a bogus Civil Service structure where you pay people $900 a month. Your national income is less than $500 per annum. The average agricultural worker who is the backbone of this country and who works with the commodity from which the biggest taxation is being paid works for wages amounting to less than $800 per annum and you are telling me that an officer in your service is to get more than that per month. When you do that, you are maintaining a privileged class structure where you will have a community divided into the haves and the have-nots; and because of that, you are maintaining a society which is divided in two, one half looking to see which are the most expensive things they can buy and the most exclusive places where they can live. You are creating a middle-class aristocracy who will look upon the other half as their domestic servants and want to know what is happening when they have to employ a servant at $5.00 and $6.00 a week. I am not a member of that class and will never be. I will always revolt against that; it has no meaning in my breast.

A policeman is recruited from the salt of the earth.

10.00 p.m.

I want the Premier to understand this: do not produce this academic basis as the criterion of a policeman. Some policemen have attended Secondary Schools and everybody will be going to Secondary Schools anyhow. The boy who went to a Secondary School is not going to work with the London Transport Executive; he is not going to be any carpenter or mason either. Do you think that a boy who went to a Secondary School is going to take up a peck and go into any crash programme? He is not going to do that because you will have people saying: "Look! he is pulling up bush and he went to a Secondary School!" That is the case because these jobs were not brought up to respectability. After slavery, if you are not a porter you would have to be a school teacher. Nearly every old-time policeman says that he was a school teacher; the policemen therefore was next to the school-teachers. The money which was being paid to school teachers was too slight and before the second World War, before 1939, teaching was a sort of "nay nay" job. You live in a sort of society in which you have to get a different kind of passport and you went on teaching because money came quicker.

I am saying that a salary of $100 a month for a policeman at the beginning cannot be adequate. I will give you the ones who are not going any further than a Constable. I will tell the Hon. Premier that if you have a child who is as bright as Euclid he cannot get into a Secondary School, the reason being that there is no room for him. Children are not being turned back from these schools on the score that they are not bright; it is because there is no room in the schools for them. You have today six per cent of the total Police Force as Constables or Writ Servers at the point at which you say they will be receiving $2,520 per annum. Seventy-five per cent of the total Force will not reach there; 15% will become Corporals and 4% will become Sergeants. If you have 75% down at the base and you add 15% to that, you will find that you have 90% at the base; and what percentage will you work out to become Inspectors? You are waiting for people to get stripes. You will find that 76% of the money is paid to the Constables, those who do the policing in Barbados. The salary which you pay to these people, this salary of $100 a month as a beginning, cannot be justified because they will be residing there for all time. The Premier, on any kind of economic theory, could not justify the position of a Station Sergeant as being inferior to that of a Senior Clerk. He could not justify that based on any economic position. I would like to say that a Station Sergeant is far more important within the context of our society than a Senior Clerk. When you have a man at the position of a Station Sergeant, that is the highest limit to which some of these men will ever rise. These men, vis-a-vis some of the people in the Civil Service, work harder than Civil Servants. No employer could ask me for a man who has to work day and night on shift, but who does not get a substantial differential. The wages for which a man works in the crop season are more than what he works for out of crop. Whether the economic position is good or bad, you should examine it and you should also examine your structure. If the structure is not a proper one it will fall down again; if you have a structure in which you have law and order as an important element of your society but within that element the top people cannot rise up to a proper standard — do you expect the daughter of a Station Sergeant to go and head out canes? A Sergeant is expected to own a home and what average do you leave for him as savings so that when he reaches a certain age he will own a home?

10.10 p.m.

Do you want a man to work on the basis of winning money at the Races or on the Pools? When you come to the structural arrangements, you have to look at the Island's economy. I would like the Hon. Premier to reconcile his statement with what he put in the manifesto of his Government when he said the Island's finances were healthy. I will read the relevant portion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand that the hon. member made a statement which I must refute.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am looking for the statement in the manifesto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will not find it. The hon. member said that we said in our manifesto that the Island's finances were healthy, but if the hon. member looks at the back, he will see where we said that the last Government had depleted the financial resources of this Island.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not dealing with the back; I am dealing with other than the back. I am not like a lawyer; so I am going to read both.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member can find the part, I would like him to read the whole context.

Mr. WALCOTT: Obviously, I do not have anybody in the dock who is going to prison; I am the only person in the dock. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not underline all these things when I found them. There are some which I have underlined for instance, "The D. L. P. will immediately after election as the Government of this country amend the Trade Union Act to provide peaceful picketing."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not hold back the House by wading through the whole manifesto, but the part on finance which the hon. member wants me to read is the one in which he stated that "The present state of the Island's finances is a matter of grave concern. The Barbados Labour Party has exhibited utter irresponsibility and lack of foresight in the management and manipulation of our resources.

The Island's savings are now depleted. There is no money in the General Revenue Balance and the Revenue Equalisation Fund was recently committed by the Government to provide advances pending the raising of loans which may never be realised.

If the crash programme for the relief of unemployment which the D.L.P. proposes is to move into high gear, it will be necessary not only for Barbados to revise our economic thinking, but a new government will have to reconstruct our financial institutions to meet the growing needs of a changing economy.

The party therefore propose the following measures:-

1. The establishment of a Central Bank which will be able to keep the whole condition of supply and demand for loanable funds under review and to advise on credit expansion or contraction.

2. A Finance Development Corporation and the encouragement of mortgage rental insurance schemes to stimulate the building industry.

3. A Small Business Loans Board to provide assistance at low interest rates to retailers and small scale manufacturers of furniture and other commodities.

4. The reduction of tax from 40% to 12 1/2% specifically for investment companies in order to encourage an inflow of foreign investment. At the same time the party will give guarantees for the repatriation of capital and profits to such business concerns.

5. Foreign Insurance Companies will be invited to make a larger contribution to investment within the island without prejudice to the right of the government to review the position of insurance laws as a whole.

6. Motor Vehicle Insurance Companies will be invited to set up a fund for the payment of compensation to persons injured by uninsured vehicles. This is in accordance with a voluntary agreement now existing in the United Kingdom between that government and insurance companies.

7. Revision of the present method of auditing of public accounts.

8. A Central Tenders board."

The point I have to make that was made in the Manifesto, is that in the beginning of the Manifesto there is a statement about the healthy position of the Island; but the Manifesto is divided into various Heads, and I do not know if the Premier is responsible for the writing of all. However, there is a part which I think deals with tourism and trade which speaks of the healthy climate of the Island. That is not the essential point I want to make at this stage. What I want to point out is that the Premier cannot now come and say to policemen that their present position would create a burden on the community, when their relative position in the community is lower than all the others, because in a Force of 680 policemen, 95% will be earning a salary of less than $300 a month. What future have they to look forward to? I will tell the Premier that what happens now in the Police Force is that every time a boy enters the Police Force and is bright, and starts to move off, he leaves because the avenues for any bright boy reaching the top are too narrow.

Sir, I know policemen now who would leave the Force and go into other jobs. I know some who have left and gone into the main Service. Some Police women went into the main Service for the same reason. What scope have Police women? I do not believe that the thinking of Barbadians is that you can put a woman in charge of a District; so you can see where a police woman would be narrowed down to the position of a Sergeant. In Barbados there is tendency even among the lower paid people to believe that big people have a right to live well, because Barbadians are imbued with an innate inferiority complex. I heard the hon. senior member for the City say, although he did not mean it in that way, that some of these people were not born great and want to live like great people. I understand what the hon. member means, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is systematic of our thinking to regard greatness with privilege, and that is why we Socialists do not believe in privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a person is not born in any particular position from any particular thing; you are born like a child and you have to live and grow up. I am satisfied in my mind that the starting salary in the Police Force is not attractive. $100 a month is not a comparable salary in Barbados with the industrial wages which are paid. I told an employer on one occasion that I would not sit down around a table and discuss a wage of $10 or $12 a week with him. When the hon. member talks about collective bargaining, there is no collective bargaining with me. Many of the hotels have been paying $9 a week, but I tell them that I do not sit down and waste time with that kind of talk. Either they will pay their employees better wages or get out of the business, as they are not yet ready for business. They want a domestic servant to whom they can give a pair of old pants or boots, or give the clothes which have become too small for their children.
10.20 p.m.

They have to look for somebody with a different mentality from mine to talk to. We do not discuss with employers this kind of bogus wages. I must tell the Hon. Premier that I have long passed the stage arguing with such men who have not reached the understanding that a living wage must be the criterion to run a business. Therefore, the Government has to understand that one of the first charges on a community must be law and order. You have to be protected because as a Government you are going to have some people in the community against you. You must have a contented Police Force because there are some people who want to bribe the members of that Force. I am not of the subversive or obsequious type who is looking about to get people to undermine other people. I regard the Police Force as a force for the protection of all of us. The Government wants the services of policemen more than I. Members of the Government want policemen to carry about their despatch boxes. I do not want anybody to carry about my brief case. If anybody comes and grab my bag, I would want to know why.

I am not saying this from the point of view that I want to get policemen joining the Workers' Union. As a matter of fact, they cannot join any Union; but I am satisfied that

the sort of representation which they should have had, they did not have and the Civil Servants of Barbados have worked against them. Civil Servants openly said that policemen should not get the same money as what they get because they did not have the same academic qualifications as those who entered the Civil Service; and because policemen do not have enough of their own to represent them and to point out their structural arrangement and to show that they cannot rise in the Barbados Police Force as Civil Servants can rise in the Civil Service and therefore, their initial salary should compensate for the risk and danger which they have to go through with, you get this sort of salary that is being paid out to policemen.

Do you know what it is to put a young policeman on a particular beat? We had something at the King George V Memorial Park yesterday where there was a crowd of over 15,000 people. When you have something like that, you cannot maintain law and order with young policemen. You have to look for the older ones.

You say that you cannot give policemen any more money. In 1956, you increased the salary of the Chief Justice from $800 to $1,000 a month and along with that, you gave him a house to live in. Around about Christmas time that year, you increased the salaries of the other people and said that they were glad for the money for Christmas, and when you did so you came back with an increase for the Chief Justice giving him another $100 more. I can talk as I like because a Chief Justice can only lock me up. A lawyer in this House of Assembly may not agree with your giving a Chief Justice $1,100 but would talk with his tongue in his cheek when it comes to anything for the Chief Justice. I am not a lawyer; so whenever I go before a Chief Justice, I would be in the dock. I say this: a Chief Justice of Barbados has to live in Barbados; therefore, if the Barbados national income is no more than $500 per annum, you should get a Chief Justice to work for that. Look and see what it costs you already in the Civil Service! I would just say this to the Hon. Premier. He won the election on the 4th December last when the salaries of Civil Servants were already decided upon by the former Government.

The Hon. Premier said on a former occasion that the President of the Civil Service Association told the former Premier that if he gave Civil Servants a cost of living allowance he could wait until election year and make the salary increases. Now, if you watch the situation, you will see that a number of Civil Servants in the top brackets have borrowed money for housing, many of whom are able to build their own houses and the man who is not able to build his own house has not been able to get any money to borrow. Do you think it is sport? A policeman cannot get sufficient money to get a house and the man who has already got his money and a house and who can get money from a solicitor to borrow, in order to get a cheaper rate of interest, you give him a loan of $10,000 and $11,000. Some of those fellows put themselves in the position where they tell a solicitor to come and press him so that the Government would loan them this money. I have made an analysis of the money loaned out for housing and I have found out that more than 70% of the money is loaned to the people in the top brackets while the ones at the bottom are still struggling to get something to build a little eighteen by ten house.

If I stand alone, I am standing alone; but I want to tell the Hon. Premier that I am satisfied in my mind that we have not yet done anything for the man at the bottom who is responsible for all of these things which we have about here and who have brought about this change. It is still always a trouble in this Assembly whenever it comes to dealing with the man at the bottom. It always has to be a bitter debate to get $8.00 more for them.

I do not agree with this increase to $100 a month for the starting salary of a policeman. If he is not worth a starting salary of $120, nobody in Barbados is worth their salary. The Ministers of this Government sat and criticised the $90 a month which Ministers got for travelling allowance and since they have been in office they have not given up part of it as a gesture of their dissatisfaction. Not one of them has said that he is going to give back $30 a month and make it $60 a month as it was before. I work harder than some Ministers as regards travelling and I draw less. I get more cursing too. But all of us who make a contribution to public life do not make it on the basis of the dollars and cents which we receive.

I speak knowingly about this matter. This recommendation by the Committee for the Police Service is not fair to the members of it, and I defy anyone to show me a service in which 98% of it cannot draw a salary of $300 a month in 1962. How can that represent a fair earning capacity for the people in it especially when it is a service which is responsible for law and order?

10.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the analysis which I have given, I do not think that anyone can say that a service with 98% of the people who cannot draw a salary of $300 a month, represents a fair earning capacity in that or in any service which you regard as maintaining law and order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down was rather lengthy but I do not intend to be an lengthy as he has been. As a matter of fact, I intend to be very brief at this time of the night. I have listened to the hon. member very carefully and before I even attempt to reply to his remarks or to remarks of the Hon. Premier, I say that I think we should get through this Resolution. I have been born and have found myself in a society and I believe that whether you usher in Socialism or whatever "ism" you call it, we will go out and find this same form of democratic society. This Resolution which is before us makes it abundantly clear that the rank and file of the Police Force are dissatisfied with the recommendations of the Jacobs Report and they have every reason to be dissatisfied with those recommendations. If there is one thing which I want to make abundantly clear it is this; I am not going to fool anybody; if you are going to have a Police Force in Barbados like that of any of the other islands, you will have the general rank and file drawing less money than their superior officers. That is either so or it is not so. That will go on and no matter who tries to revolutionize it, it will be so. No longer can the white collar worker boast of making higher returns and getting a better salary than either the mechanic or the artisan.

Let us examine this situation as it presents itself to us. It may be that I am being accused of saying that I am aligning myself with the Government in a matter of this sort. In my way, I am responsible for a certain area; I see figures which will be presented to me by the Government and therefore I will be cautious. I will not stand in the way of anybody getting a reasonable salary. I said, when I was campaigning, that I did not believe in the Jacobs Report. I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that some of the things which the Premier said at the Civil Service Association meeting should have been printed. You will always have your Commissioner, officers and subordinates; the Commissioner of Police has always been paid a higher salary than the others and the quarrel of the hon. member is that the opportunities are so limited that the maximum salary of those in the lower category should be more than what it is. None of us will have any quarrel with the hon. member about that, but it must not be taken that anybody attempts to undermine the discipline and orderly running of the Police Force in this island. Tonight if somebody knocked at your door and you answered, there was no reply and the knocking went on, you would not call for the Premier; you would call the Police. If somebody drops down dead, you are going to call for the Police. I am saying that the Police Force is important in the structural set-up of this island. The people who did harm to the Police in this colony are the Civil Servants themselves. I make no apology to any Civil Servant in this colony for what I have said. The whole idea is that the average boy who gets a smattering of education at a Secondary School over his brother who did not get into the Secondary School thinks that he is superior to his brother.

Until the arrival of Colonel Dickens in this colony, people were regarded as puppy dogs. I have seen some of

the biggest asses in Barbados with certificates. I went to a Bank the other day to convert a few dollars into pounds and it took somebody half an hour to make that conversion. I was making fun; I could do it in my head; but because I saw the limited or unlimited pigmentation, I watched for some time. The average policeman does that conversion in a few seconds and he is finished.

As to the Resolution which is before us, this idea of paying for certificates is so much nonsense. The idea of the Executive saying "We will pay you or put you up many increments" is so much nonsense. The average boy goes in the Civil Service with a School Certificate with four subjects and starts to work. Youngsters with no Certificates at all start to work and the majority of them have the idea that "I have acquired this certificate." The Minister of Communications has not acquired any certificates and I do not refer to him in any derogatory way. You have somebody who will get up and pull off his coat and say: "I must get a salary for this advanced work and I will not do anything at all."
10.40 p.m.

I will tell you what I agree with the Government in, and I hope the Hon. Premier is not sleeping. I do not like the idea of the Premier doing like the last Premier, that is, closing his eyes and not listening. The last Premier used to do that and caused me to curse him sometimes. What I would point out to the Government is that a lot of young men who have joined the Police Force never had an opportunity of going to secondary school, but they are teeming with ambition. You know that recently certificates were presented by the Commissioner of Police from some school in England. The holders on their own initiative took subjects that are of great value to the Police Force.

Now may I without sounding sacrilegious ask the Hon. Premier what good is a certificate in Scripture or Art to a boy entering the Police Force? There are men who sit down at night and study photography and finger printing which would raise the standard of the Police Force, and I would like the Premier and his Government to say that those who have gained something for burning the midnight oil should be compensated. I would suggest to the Hon. Premier that rather than saying that those who enter with certificates should be given something, that those who have gained certificates from private study be also given. I have been told that Lawrence Gay taught Superintendent Bourne, and the only secondary school he saw was when he passed by Harrison College. It was a tribute to his Headmaster that he went to England and came second in the whole lot of Commonwealth students; and there is no doubt that he was up against people with a lot of certificates.

I would like the Government to say that increments will be given not only for School Certificates, but that out of the total number of policemen in the Force, those who equip themselves to such an extent that the necessary qualifications would be of benefit to the Police Force should also be given increments. If a man joins the Force and elects to walk about and is perfectly satisfied, that is a matter entirely for him. That is a suggestion which the Government should consider and not only the question of four certificates at Ordinary Level or two certificates at Advanced Level. The average boy in Barbados with Advanced Level certificates is not going into the Police Force when he realises there are over 447 members in the Force, and he has to wait 17 years and pray for some of the men to die. He has to wait 17 years though he may have Advanced Level certificates. I am going to gamble with you today that of course in England you will find men with Advanced Level certificates joining the Police Force, and in the United States you will find men with College degrees joining the Police Force, but there is an opportunity, being in a big area, of becoming in four years' time a Captain or a Lieutenant because of the qualifications, and because there are so many within that category.

What do we have here, Mr. Deputy Speaker? We have one Commissioner, one Assistant Commissioner, and one Senior Superintendant, which post I have been unable to understand. Then there are three Superintendents. There are some things which are so obvious, that it is not necessary to draw it to other people's attention. Do not come to the conclusion that the rank and file of the Police Force are all fools. They have been asking this simple question, and they want it answered. You have taken over the Government and you have made certain promises. I am the last person to suggest that the Commissioner's salary should be brought down - I do not care who agrees or disagrees - to the level of a constable. You have a service and you must have a man at the head of that service. I understand the Premier to say that he receives an extra $80 a month, and if he is satisfied, that is a matter for him. Now you have an Assistant Commissioner, but the rank and file is asking this simple question: do you make jobs to suit men or do you let the men suit the jobs? The rank and file of the Police Force want to know the necessity for a Senior Superintendent. Of course, the answer is fairly obvious to most of them, and it is causing a sort of under-current.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are three Superintendents and a Director of Music whom you have put on the same basis. Then there is an Assistant Superintendent, a Land Inspector and an Inspector of Weights and Measures. While I am on this, I would like to ask why this post has not been filled. How long has it been vacant and why is it not filled? Is this just a misnomer? What are you looking for? Why not recommend somebody for the post? Are you going to keep it open for five years? When is the last time an Officer was in this job? Those are questions I want answered tonight. You have here an Inspector of Weights and Measures. If that is here, he must be a policeman; he cannot be a Sanitary Inspector, because you are dealing with Policemen's salaries. He is a separate and distinct person altogether, and I would like to know why this post has not been filled. Can you not find anybody in the Service good enough to recommend for this job? Are you looking for someone with Advanced Level certificates or School certificates or someone with mathematical qualifications?

When we come to the question of Station Sergeant, I heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter laying down the structural set-up in this country. In this category you have gone no further than in the days of Mr. Graham Yearwood and C. P. Clarke when a Station Sergeant was paid on the basis of a Headmaster.
10.50 p.m.

The Station Sergeant was the man whom you had in your district. You also had your Minister of Religion and your Magistrate who was the big McGuffy, not that he was respected but you feared him because he could lock you up. The first two were well respected and they were people who went to the homes of the people and made their wills - that is the Station Sergeant and the Schoolmaster. They were people of the same social standing and they were paid the same salary.

That is why I can speak with some authority on this matter. I looked around the Police Force and found people in it who came out of the Teaching Service, people who had taught for $5.00 and $6.00 per month and who then went into the Police Force and got $16.00 a month with the understanding that if they got promotion to Station Sergeant that they would get a salary which a Headmaster would get.

This is where I disagree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. We have found ourselves in this society. Do not let us fool ourselves; we have not been able to change it. I have been raised in it; I was born in it and the same argument can be raised all around in a circle. The people to whom you owe the most in this country are not the Civil Servants; they are the people who were in the fields. I am thinking of the old women who load the canes. One day as I was travelling along I stopped and looked at them and I said to myself: "There was my grandmother at one time!" I have spoken to the richest men in this country and told them about this. I have always felt that the people to whom you owe the most are the people who get the least. If you can find a name to describe me as, then I say, call me Socialist, reactionary Conservative, or even Communist if you like, it does not matter to me. I say that you have created in Barbados, and most particularly by the last Government, a

privileged class. Let me repeat, Had I something to do with it, I would not have voted that salary for Permanent Secretaries. I have never met anyone who was getting a salary of $600 a month going to a shop and saying, "Trust me with these few items; I have no food for my children."

This is where I have to agree with the Hon. Premier. I have seen it in the City Council. If this Government had come in here and had implemented the Jacobs' Report and then come in here with these salaries increases for the Police Force, I would be the first to lead the policemen to revolt and to tell them that they have no right to accept what you offered them. But you have not paid these salaries to the people at the top in the Civil Service. They were paid that by the former Government. I will not lead the policement to revolt against what you are doing today; I am no party with those who know the financial position of this Island and say that you can pay more. You cannot give them more.

What the hon. senior member for St. Peter said is true. You have compared a policeman's salary in the past to that of a Long Grade Clerk, but the difference between them is this. You had the school teacher who was responsible for training the youths and yet you still took him in at a salary below that of a Civil Servant. The reason why you have done this is because Civil Servants had the opportunity of sitting down with Mr. Jacobs and telling him a lot of lies. Mr. Jacobs was told that this Island could stand $3 million recurrent expenditure as a result of these salaries' increases and within a month after, the Income Tax Department said that the money had fallen short by $1,100,000; therefore, the Civil Servants were either lying or fooling themselves so as to get themselves in this position. They had this opportunity because you had a lot of Ministers who were allowing the Civil Servants to run the Island. I think those Ministers should be relegated to the limbo of forgotten things and I say that if you get yourself in the position of the last Government, you ought to go. That is my view.

I am not saying this now; I said this on platforms. I agree with the Hon. Premier. There are a lot of Civil Servants who tell you that they can do better. Where can they do better? They cannot do better than what they are doing now. I have worked until I have such a stomach condition that I can hardly eat. Their idea of work is that they should come in at 9.00 o'clock and leave at 4.00 o'clock. I am speaking of some of them; I do not mean all of them. They do not have to vote for me because I say so; as a matter of fact, they never voted for me. They come into work, take their jackets off and then sit down and read the newspaper. You should see the discourtesy with which some of them treat people who have to be served by them. People come and stand in a line for half an hour waiting to be despatched and then some uncouth servant would come up and ask you if you want something — as if you have come to look at them. The people have become dissatisfied with Civil Servants because of the discourteous way in which they are treated by them. That is a fact.

I say that I would be the last to undermine the structure of the Police Force. I know what is the financial position of this Island. I am in a party with people who know the financial position of the Island at their fingertips.

You have put members of the Police Force in the grade of the Long Grade Clerk. The hon. senior member for St. Peter says that 98% will never earn a salary of $300 a month. You are carrying Constables from $100 to $220. The Commissioner of Police has said that he is finding it difficult to get people to join the service. I, myself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can say that I find it difficult to get nurses. I have just got a letter from a nurse in England. She wrote and said that she heard that there was a vacancy of Matron at the Nightingale Home and that the salary was going to be increased by £150 and the Matron would also be getting a house to live in. If that were so, she would be interested in applying for the vacancy. I wrote her back and said that, as far as I am concerned, I can assure her as a Registered Medical Nurse, a midwife and one who was trained in child care that she would have a reasonable chance - a ten to one chance - of getting the job. However, I received a subsequent letter from her informing me that she had obtained a job in Canada at a salary of $400 a month to start with. 11.00 p.m.

When the Commissioner of Police says that it is difficult to get people to join the Police Force, there is no lie about that and there is nothing strange about it. They take people in the Police Force at the age of 20 years and the average man wants to get married when he gets to the age of 24 years or 25 years. I have told my son that he can have all his fun now because when he gets married he will not have the chance of getting all the fun which he is getting now. A man figures that he will get to 34 years before he gets a certain salary and he takes a gamble and leaves the country. A lady told me that her son has left the Island in order to join the British Army and I said that that was a gamble. She said that her son was working for $100 a month and I told her that that was a gamble which I myself had taken.

The Hon. Minister of Trade once said that they wanted so many workers in the United States of America and the Premier said that they wanted so many. I say that when the Commissioner of Police says "I cannot get men to join the Force," that is nothing strange. I have received a letter from a young man who got $60 a month from working at an ironmongery in this island; he went to work in London and he got £15.10s. a week. I am saying that you cannot hold back people, and what I am saying now also applies to the Nurses. A young man at the age of 20 years who joined the Force before 1939 would not be prepared to put up with what these people are experiencing now.

Let me tell you something now. I was in politics when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a clerk at Lashley's; the hon. member was one of the few people who had the guts to talk out. When he was talking out I told him this: "Boy, what are you doing? You have a wife and a child." I admired the hon. member who had the guts to talk as he was talking. I took time off to study things because when I came in here I wanted to speak *ex cathedra*. Some fifteen or sixteen years ago you would not find any clerk behind any one of the counters of the stores in Bridgetown speaking to you in a certain manner. They would first, so to speak, look under the bed to see if anybody was behind the curtain. But a clerk told me one day that I must take care how I vote for this or that measure, and the floor walker was right there. The average clerk nowadays will tell you just what he thinks. And I would say that it is a question of the age in which we are living.

In the Schedule to this Order you will find that there are 447 Constables in the Police Force and it is proposed that the salary of a Constable should be in the scale of $1,200: 1,320 x 120 - 2,400; 2,520. I do not believe that we should have any increment which is less than $10 a month. An increment which is less than $10 a month is all nonsense. The average policeman who employs a servant will find that as soon as she hears that he is getting more money, she will also ask for more. I hope that the Hon. Minister will tell us something about this Inspector of Weights and Measures. When you start of the basis of a Long Grade Clerk, that is a kind of synchronizing what you have done with the Jacobs' Report. That is how I see it. But it does look to me that where the Police went wrong is that they are such an important Body in this country. I am not talking about the Teachers at Harrison College, or at Combermere; I am talking about teachers who must mould the minds of the children of this country. If you had the Jacobs' Report to deal with, would you tell people that because you had certain people who are in the rank and file - in fact, I might say that apparantly there were so many yard fowls and stooges in the last Government that they were very much afraid of victimization because they were hardminded people. You had two men in here - I will call their names - you had Mapp and Cox and it was a relief to the community when they were removed.

It was stated in the *Beacon* that I was lying when I said that they owed money to the Transport Board. I challenge them now to say that the Manager of the Transport Board did not issue a written statement to the effect that the Bar-

bados Labour Party owed that amount of money. I challenge them to deny that.
11.10 p.m.

I feel that with this salary scale which we have in front of us today, there is a question which we could very well address to our minds, but I agree with the Hon. Premier and his Government. I happen to know that the question of finance in this country is a very difficult one. However, having put it on the basis of a Long Grade Clerk and carrying it to $210 a month, what the hon. senior member for St. Peter would see is that this means it would take a tremendously long time, because these Inspectors are comparatively young men.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I said it would be the survival of the fittest, what I meant was that of these 447 odd men, it is not a matter of service, but a matter of those men who equip themselves for the positions which would be offered in later life. We cannot in Barbados with our limited financial resources decide we are going to make another ten or twelve Inspectors. We cannot decide to have a Police Force with all Inspectors and no constables.

While I agree to starting at $100 a month subject to the economy of this Island, I am saying, fearless of contradiction and without any apology whether or not Police vote for me, that going to $220 seems reasonable. What I do say, however, is that it would have been infinitely better, if the Jacobs' Report had not been implemented, if the rank and file of the Police Force could have been given an opportunity to go to what you offered a Senior Clerk over a period of years, because there are several of these 447 men who will never reach beyond $220 a month, and that is why I said it was the survival of the fittest. If this Government did not implement the Jacobs' Report, but had set out how they would fix Police salaries and the general run of Civil Servants, though I am not condemning all Civil Servants, I would never have supported the Jacobs' Report, because I did not know then the financial position of the Island. I personally feel that the Premier is right from that point of view, and I would have been his strongest supporter in here.

I believe that one of the reasons why the Jacobs recommendations were implemented to give the Permanent Secretaries the salaries which were given to them, was that the Government thought they would have won the election and would have come back and asked how on earth one could pay a Permanent Secretary more money than a Minister. I want to tell the Ministers over there that they have to stand for that for three years. As I said, the only reason why the last Government implemented the Jacobs Report in 1961 was because they wanted to make their salaries $1,000 a month. If people want to live in luxury and take advantage of and disregard humble folk in this country, and be removed from them, then I have got to talk, because you can say I am a Conservative, and you may even say that I have money, but I worked for it and saw double to get it; so it does not make any difference.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some excellent Permanent Secretaries in the Service who would hold jobs in any country, but I have seen in this country people who were taken from jobs - for instance - from Combermere School - at $160 a month and pitchforked into jobs at $600 a month. The last Government made jobs to suit people, and if anybody annoys me, I will say why they did it too. I have never worked for $600 a month since I was born; therefore I do not believe that any of us would attempt to undermine the structure of the rank and file of the Police Force. We feel that what should have happened at the time is that they should have made recommendations, but the Government disregarded the views of the policemen. Do you know how the members of the last Government felt? They felt that every time a member of the Government walked past a policeman he should salute him. Whether or not they were members of the House of Assembly, you could be polite to them; but you did not have to be subservient because they were elected members of the House of Assembly. I heard that one of the last Ministers reported to one of the Officers that it was a fact that certain policemen would see them walking down the streets and would not spring to attention and salute, though they were regulating traffic. He wanted a policeman to leave off directing traffic which might cause an accident, and come to attention and salute. That is all nonsense in my opinion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am agreeing to the Resolution as it stands, and it says here that the minimum cost of implementing the proposals is estimated at $417,000 or $85,000 more than the Jacobs recommendations. I do not think that there is much more I can say on this, but I hope that the Police Force will realise that this Legislature, regardless of what Party is here, is more conscious of their responsibility and their position in this country. If you want an ambulance, if there is a fire, or if something happens in a household, everybody suggests sending for the Police, and therefore they should be given some consideration.

I should like to remind the Hon. Premier of what I said at first, and it is that I do not subscribe to the idea of two increments or four increments for Advanced Level subjects or School Certificate subjects, but I would suggest that if a man in the rank and file of the Force equips himself with police scientific knowledge as has happened recently here, some consideration should be given to him. He should be given an increment also in compensation for burning the midnight oil, and there could be no dissatisfaction among the general rank and file then, because I doubt whether anybody would disagree that if a man goes into the Force and takes a chance by studying by correspondence course at one of the Colleges which would be of use to the Police Force, he should be given some consideration.
11.20 p.m.

But, Sir, I repeat, you are really not going to get me to come into the rank and file. The inducement which a fellow has with certificates at the Advanced Level when he is in the Government Service is far greater than what you are offering for him to join the Police Force. That part is not worth the paper on which it is written. However, a lot of young men in the Police Force are at present taking correspondence courses in fingerprinting and such things and I believe that they should be given the consideration of getting extra increments and the like. The Hon. Premier said that if you had four subjects you would get an extra increment. It all depends on what those subjects apply to. There are boys who have only attended elementary schools and they have joined the Police Force. Go into that service and hear what those boys are doing! They have made themselves into first class Policemen and they are as good as some of those Civil Servants who have one or two certificates. I will repeat what Colonel Dickens, a former Commissioner of Police, said to me. He said that a Police Force has to be made up of people from all walks of life. In those days, there was a man who was called Matthias McCollin, and Colonel Dickens said that you must have a man in your Force like Matthias McCollin too. Some hon. members should know that man.

However, Sir, we of this Party believe that this Resolution should be supported and I hope that it would bring great satisfaction to the general rank and file of the Police Force. I do not see how you can appoint more Inspectors than you have now. You do not need anymore in a small place like this. I know of a young man who joined the Police Force and who had come second in the School Certificate Examination for that year in the entire Island. He joined the Police Force and nobody knew that he had such qualifications until a Police horse threw him down and he became ill. After he got better, they told him to go into the office and they found out what good work he could do there. He is now a Police Officer in Trinidad. We all know that his salary today is more than that of your Assistant Commissioner here. But what is the point in arguing that? That is like arguing that the salary of the Mayor of the Bridgetown Municipality should be that of the salary of the Mayor of New York City.

The actual revenue of Trinidad, as the Hon. Premier has said, is twenty times that of Barbados. Let us be factual and real. Our actual salaries which we pay out cannot be compared with those of Trinidad. I was at pains to scan the Jacobs Report and I found that some of the salaries of our Civil Servants compared favourably, if not better, than some

in Trinidad. That is why I say that that Report was rushed through and the whole idea was to push it through because the former Government Party thought it would help them in the election campaign. When the policemen at the time made their protest, it is a fact that the former Government thought very little of them.

I am supporting the Government with this Resolution and I hope it will be passed. I hope no one would vote against it. We must bear in mind that we are dealing with the Police Force which is the disciplinary structure of this entire Island. Besides passing this Resolution, I think we should let it go on record that we appreciate on behalf of the people of this country the calmness with which the Police Force took this entire matter and the confidence which they showed the Government at present in waiting so patiently and calmly to have this matter dealt with. I am fully conscious to know my position, the Hon. Premier's position, your position and the position of the man in the street and I know that an honest man's position is only secured so long as your Police Force is satisfied and when each member knows that he can give his family something better than he could give two or three years ago. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is singing no solo. I could not see myself how you could bring in a Report to give policemen a standard salary of $300 a month but I say this after consideration. Let us look at this matter squarely.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I said that 98% of the members of the Police Force have to work for a salary under $300 a month and that includes a Station Sergeant. I did not say that the Police Constable is going to rise to $300 a month. I said that the maximum salary did not give them as much as a Senior Clerk.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said that I agreed with the hon. member and I went further and said that if this Government was responsible for increasing the salaries of the Civil Servants according to the Jacobs' Report, then they would have had the opportunity to cut off some from those who were getting big salaries. If they were able to do that, then I believe that they could have brought the salaries of these policemen up to that of a Senior Clerk. As I have said, I belong to a Party whose members know everything about the finances of this Island; therefore, I know what is the position as regards that.

Let me say for the last time and in conclusion that not only should we pass this Resolution, but it is such an important matter that we should let it go on record - and I hope that the Hon. Premier or some other Minister of the Government would do it - that we are grateful to the Police Force for the patience and tolerance which they have shown in waiting for this matter to be dealt with. It is a long time which they have waited, although it is true to say that some amelioration of their condition was shown forth by this Government at Christmas time. We should place on record our appreciation of their loyalty because kind words can turn away wrath. I think we would be doing a great justice to these people of the country if we were to place that on record.

11.30 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I promised the Premier when I was reading from the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party that I would point out what was stated there. I have now found what I was referring to and it is on page 12 of the Manifesto. The passage reads as follows:-

"The Party is of the opinion that in addition to the obligation of the State to provide its citizens with maintenance in old age in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work, that the comparatively prosperous position of the colony the high level of taxation and generally burdensome cost of living, entitled the community to a comprehensive system of Social Security with a minimum of delay."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should just like to tell the hon. member that that is a different thing from saying that the island's finances or the Government revenue is in a healthy position. As he quoted from the financial part of the Manifesto, I should like to say that we pointed out in detail where the then Government Party had wrecked the finances of the country and that they had left absolutely no money in the General Revenue Fund. But there are a lot of prosperous people in Barbados and the community is a comparatively prosperous community as you look around the rest of the West Indies. As the Chief Minister of Antigua, Mr. Bird, had to point out, not only locally but to the Secretary of State for the Colonies that there are countries in which the national income is one-quarter or one-sixth of that of Barbados. When the hon. member is quoting, let him quote adequately and in the right context.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I come to the next Order of the Day, I desire to make a Statement. But perhaps I had better wait until the hon. senior member for St. Peter winds up his motion on the Resolution dealing with Federation. I will ask leave to make the Statement after that.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1962.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will state the reason why I am anxious to deal with this Bill. It may seem to be a mere formality but I will never miss an opportunity of reminding the public of Barbados of the kind of irresponsibility with which we have to put up. The Executive Committee Act of 1891 states quite clearly that at the end of every financial year all the supplementary Resolutions for expenditure from the Public Treasury should be embodied in an Appropriation Bill which should be brought down for the approval of the Legislature. You will find in the Standing Orders of this House that what I have just said is also set out, and in the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions you will find that it is stated quite plainly that no money can be spent from the Public Funds of this Island unless it is voted by the Legislature.

I should like to point out that for a period of about eight years the last Government Party has never passed a supplementary Appropriation Bill and they have had unauthorised appropriation to the tune of $17 million out of the Public Treasury of this Island. I want to get this Bill done as soon as possible after 31st March and therefore I will be carrying our the law. That is what I want to do. I will not have these matters held up in any Government Department as long as I am Minister of Finance.

All of these sums of money amount to $3,580,735. All of these sums of money have been the subject of Resolutions during the course of the Financial Year, 1961-62, and they have not been included in the Appropriation Bill 1961-62. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON being in the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Preamble be postponed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

11.40 p.m.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW; seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Bill is read a third time, I did not find the Bill and I wanted to draw to the Hon. Premier's attention that we are now passing this Appropriation Bill in which there is a sum of $1,295 for Commonwealth Technical Training Week. What we find is passing strange is that this Government, in agreeing to something like the Commonwealth Technical Training Week, turned down a request which was made for the first time by the Barbados Workers' Union for assistance in sending someone to that course. What I would like to make clear to the Government is that we are not like those organizations which have some backing. We pay our way, but we feel that in things of such a general character where the other territories are contributing, Barbados is not in any extraordinary position when it makes a contribution. I say that because I heard the Premier say he does not like this individual cult. I do not like it either. I know I have to die and that is why I do not believe in this individual cult.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is really out of order because he has been in Parliament long enough to know that on the third reading of a Bill only verbal amendments are made. A debate does not normally take place, and if he overlooked something which he should have spoken of in the Second Reading, that is very unfortunate. I did not interrupt the hon. member because I did not want him to think I was preventing him from making his point. I have told the hon. member already that the first time I heard about this matter of an application being made to the Government was yesterday. I told the hon. member that I will look into the matter, because unfortunately certain people have been brought up in the wrong way, and feel they can make decisions without referring them to the Government. I think I have asked the hon. member to forget the matter this time and we will have it investigated. I do not want to make anybody personally responsible for this, but certain things never get to us at all – let me leave it at that – and that is one that certainly did not. I knew about it yesterday for the first time, but you see what was happening before was that the tail was dragging the dog.

The question that this Bill be now read a third time was put and resolved in the affimative without division.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

THE LAND DEVELOPMENT DUTY ACT, 1962

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2 on the Order Paper stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision for the imposition of duties on sales of land in areas where the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake substantial expenditure from public funds, to impose betterment charges on development of lands in such areas and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is a very important Bill, but it has already passed this Chamber. What actually happened, Sir, is that it went to the Other Place and all the land owners in the Other Place started fulminating about this being a capital levy measure and that kind of thing. This House unanimously passed this Bill already, and therefore I do not think it should take us any time at all. I regard it as an insult that the Other Place.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir, this Bill has not been circulated.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It was circulated weeks ago.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I wonder if there is any haste for this or whether it can be postponed, because I do not remember having a copy of the Bill.

11.50 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think that we should hold it over until the next meeting because we do not want hon. members to be at a disadvantage. I want hon. members to consider this Bill very carefully because it is one of the most important Bills we have had coming before this Chamber. We passed it here last year. We are not in a position to go on improving people's land, especially wealthy people, and then the Government is not to receive any revenue for so doing. This Bill seeks to provide for the participation by Government in the benefits to be derived from enhanced values accruing to lands in areas where the Government is undertaking, or proposes to undertake, substantial expenditure from public funds.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to suggest to the Hon. Premier that this Bill was not circulated.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know why it was not circulated.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would suggest that you postpone it because it is a very important Bill.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will postpone it. This Bill did come up before the House last year. It is a far reaching piece of legislation similar to legislation which appears in the United Kingdom and the United States on this matter. I will give hon. members the opportunity of considering it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You mean when hon. members are fresh?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Whether they are fresh or not, I will give them the opportunity of studying it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that brings to an end Government Business for the Day.

RESOLUTION *re* FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF WINDWARD AND LEEWARD ISLANDS AND BARBADOS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As Government Business has been completed, we revert to Private Members' Business.

Earlier today when we left over dealing with the Resolution *re* Federal Constitution of the Windward and Leeward Islands and Barbados, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew who is not now in his place was addressing the House. I do not know if any other hon. member wishes to continue the debate.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it does not seem as if any other hon. member wants to speak and I will not keep back the House. This Resolution was introduced by me and I regard it as an important measure. But since members of the Government have shown such a lack of enthusiasm of something of a fundamental nature - I have been in Parliament long enough to know how members feel or do not feel over anything presented - I therefore beg to move that this Resolution be withdrawn.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I seconded the motion for the passing of that Resolution and I do not agree with the hon. member asking that it be withdrawn now. I do not think it should be withdrawn.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I want to make a Statement. I do not like the way in which debates are conducted in here now. You have too many people talking across the floor. Of course, it used to happen before. I intimated that I had a Statement to make and I do not like this kind of pique which the hon. senior member for St. Peter suffers from. I do not know if the hon. member is interested in only what other members would have said. All he had to do is to put the motion. It is not that we are not in favour of the Resolution. There is this idea of wasting time and repeating what other hon. members have said. I do not intend that to be a reflection on the hon. member, but at this late hour, why span out a debate by repeating all the arguments which the hon. member has already amply covered?

The reason why hon. members have refrained from adding to the debate is no indication that hon. members are not in agreement with it.

Sir, I had intimated that I had a Statement to make arising out of the debate, and then I will sit down. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has dealt fully with the subject and I would like to ask for permission before the hon. member withdraws or does whatever he intends to do to make this Statement on this matter. I make it in the normal course of the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, before the Hon. Premier makes his Statement, I would like to say this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken already.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was speaking on a point of order. What I do not agree with is the hon. senior member for St. Peter getting up and withdrawing the motion. This is too important a matter. I do not know what statement the hon. member is going to make. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is an independent member and I represent the Opposition. I made a speech supporting this important measure which he brought to this House. I cannot see in any way how the Government Party can refuse to vote for this Resolution. However, I think some hon. member of the Government Party should intimate the way in which they feel about this matter. They should intimate if they feel just as I feel. I think some hon. member from that side without prolonging the argument should say a few words just for the sake of the record. I am not going to allow the hon. senior member for St. Peter to withdraw his motion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, if I can find a report of the debate, I would get what the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City said on the matter and say that I adopt it. I have no original views to make because this is a general Resolution. The Official Opposition Party appears to agree with the Resolution and the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is an Independent has been a member to a Barbados delegation dealing with this matter. The hon. member moved the Resolution and he knows how I feel about the matter. He should know that in view of the fact that we are participating in this discussions with the other Units we approve of the Resolution.

Sir, I would like to take the opportunity of this debate to inform hon. members that a delegation from this territory would be proceeding to London on 6th May, this year - that is on Sunday next - in order to take part at the invitation of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the discussions on the future of the Federation of the Windward and Leeward Islands and Barbados.
12.00 midnight.

The delegation comprises the Hon. Minister of Development Trade, Industry and Labour; (the hon. senior member for St. Philip); the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (the hon. senior member for the City); the Attorney General, The Financial Secretary, the Cabinet Secretary and myself. According to the time table which has come to us, the Conference is scheduled to start on the 9th May and at this stage it is difficult to say how long it will last. The Chief Ministers of the Windward and the Leeward Islands, as a result of a decision made in Antigua, have foregathered in Barbados for a preliminary discussion on the comments which the Secretary of State for the Colonies has promised to send down on the Report of the Barbados Conference relative to Federation held earlier this year. A meeting between the Chief Ministers of these areas and the Barbados delegation will take place on the 4th May and some members of the Windward and Leeward Islands will be leaving for London on the 5th May. The Barbados delegation will be leaving on the 6th May.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also like to read a telegram dated 30th April, received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies which might really appear to be irrelevant in so far as Barbados is concerned. However, I think it should be made public that the decision to include the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on this delegation was taken long before this telegram arrived, as the hon. senior member for the City, who is the Leader of the Opposition, can inform Your Honour. This telegram was sent on 30th April, 1962 (1910) and it was received on the 30th April, 1962 (1705) it reads as follows:-

No. 85 IMMEDIATE

Addressed to Governor Barbados No. 85, Administrator Antigua No. 51, Administrator St. Kitts - Nevis No. 46, Administrator Montserrat No. 21, Administrator, Grenada No. 34, Administrator Dominica No. 31, Administrator St. Lucia No. 51, Administrator St. Vincent No. 36 repeated to Governor-General The West Indies No. 180.

My telegram No. 74.

FEDERATION OF BARBADOS, LEEWARD ISLANDS AND WINDWARD ISLANDS.

I have received messages from Opposition parties in several territories requesting representation at the Conference.

2. As I explained in my telegram under reference, although H.M. Government have agreed that federation appears to offer the best solution to the problems of the area provided certain conditions are met, it is necessary to explore these problems further. In consequence, I do not envisage that it will be possible to take final decisions immediately as a result of this conference. Recommendations of the Conference will have to be published for the consideration of Legislatures and public opinion before the stage is reached at which final decisions can be taken. In these circumstances I will leave it to each individual unit to decide to include representatives of the Opposition in its delegation.

3. Please explain my views on this subject to Opposition Leaders in all cases where they have made representations.

SECRETARY OF STATE "

Naturally, in the new democratic atmosphere which prevails in this composition of Government, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not have to make any recommendations. But there is an interesting part of the telegram which is germaine to the Resolution which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has moved today and which reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the dissolution of the West Indies Federation has been a severe disappointment to all West Indians at home and abroad;

AND WHEREAS the compelling political, social and economic realities of this Century make it imperative for closer unity amongst the remaining units of the West Indies Federation;

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly endorse the proposal to establish a Federal Constitution of the units in the Windward and Leeward Islands, and Barbados."

Now Sir, you will remember that some time ago I promised that before any final decision was made, this Government would publish a White Paper. We had hoped to have that done before the end of March in order to make sure that the Budget and that White Paper would be laid before the Legislature and that there would be ample opportunity for discussion. I am aware that certain members of Parliament have been getting apprehensive lest we have forgotten the pledge which we have made. I think that the telegram would explain the main impelling reasons why this Government has not initiated the debate, because shortly after the Conference held in Barbados it became apparent to us, although not to every one, that any Conference held would have to be preliminary and any final signing of the Constitution would take place at the first Conference after the Conference in Barbados.

We had to send a telegram to London and we are awaiting copies of the comments which the Secretary of State for the Colonies informed us that he had despatched on the 30th April, and which should have arrived here in Barbados at the latest by yesterday. Up to 9 o'clock tonight, those comments have not yet arrived.

Those are the things which we intend to study on Friday with the Chief Minister of the Leeward and Windward Islands. We will then, as far as possible, attempt to reach common agreement on the approach of these things before we go up to London, so that when the representatives of the eight territories arrive in London, we will not be canvassing for information or opinion at that stage. We will have a united front to present to the Secretary of State for the Colonies either accepting or rejecting his opinion. When we get up to London for the Conference, those are the issues which will have to be decided because we have submitted a comprehensive constitutional draft to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and only those matters which he has commented upon as being in dispute and which need modification or improvement – only those matters will be discussed at the Conference. Without pre-judging the issue, the financial implications of the Federal Constitution will be the one which, I believe, will cause the most protracted debate.
12.10 a.m.

When we get these matters settled, it is at that stage that we will return to the Legislature so that not only the Legislature but the general public will be brought into the picture and we will have something which can be used as the basis for discussion. It will then be put to both Houses of the Legislature to approve or disapprove as they did on the 27th January, 1953 with the Draft Constitution of the illfated Federation which is now on the way out.

I would just like to inform the hon. senior member for St. Peter that in so far as the Resolution which he has introduced and moved is concerned, he has the unqualified support of this side of the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as one of the delegates to this Conference, I should like to inform the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the House that there are two main reasons which prevented me from taking part in this debate tonight. One is the lateness of the hour, and the second is the reason just given by the Hon. Premier. The conclusions arrived at in London will again have to be referred to the territorial legislatures for discussion; therefore since that is the case, there is no point in detaining hon. members tonight to discuss in detail issues which we will have again to discuss some time in another month or two.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to the Constitutional proposals, and has said that they were more or less agreed on and submitted in some detail to the Secretary of State. As hon. members are aware, the Secretary of State for the Colonies has signified on more than one occasion that the entire future of this proposed Federation rests on the possibility of the eight federating territories satisfying him that they can have a viable economy. Now it is along that line that I intended to talk this evening, Sir, but I am sure that my remarks can remain for the occasion when we debate the conclusions arrived at in London later this month. I merely want to say this at this stage: hon. members will recall that since June last year, I had proposed in this Chamber an economic union between Barbados and the Leewards and Windwards, even before the collapse of the present Federation became evident, and now I even adhere to that more strongly. Personally, Sir, I have no doubt at all in my own mind that these eight territories between them can work out a viable economy, and as a matter of fact, the several grant-aided territories between them are grant-aided to the extent of between $10 million and $12 million a year, and if even we add our own financial difficulties to that, it means that what is needed is an expansion in the national income to provide another $15 million a year in the national income of the federated territories. This is not difficult, Sir. At the moment Trinidad alone supplies The Eight with about $15 million a year in exports,.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I do not claim to have the ability or experience of the Hon. Minister of Trade. I am perfectly clear on what he is saying, but I am wondering whether it is in the best interest for him to make the speech he is making now. I think most of us can take advice from each other, and as we are going to have a Conference next Friday, I would suggest that it is not in the best interest of the Island to say what he is saying now. I know only too well what the hon. member is saying.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member suspects that he knows what I am saying. I could not be so dumb as to say what he thinks I intended to say. What I am saying is this: at some time or other the economic proposals for a viable economy for The Eight have to be made known, and of course the country is entitled to know what are our specific proposals for providing this viable economy. I am not saying what is self-evident, but what I want to say is that in the attempt to expand the national economy of these eight territories, there is one single item which we import into these eight territories from Trinidad which amounts to about $15 million a year, which the colonies themselves cannot supply to one another.

Having said that, Sir, I merely want to indicate to hon. members that at the appropriate time we will discuss the proposals which we intend to present to the Secretary of State for the Colonies to satisfy him that in the process of time or at the proposed time when the grants-in-aid come to an end in another five years, these colonies would be able to maintain themselves economically.
12.20 a.m.

These proposals would be put before the public in due course but I merely want to indicate to hon. members that what may appear to be unwillingness on the part of the Government delegates to participate, does not spring from any apathy.

Mr. WALCOTT: As the hon. member has said, it is late and it was not my intention from the beginning to do more than what I have done. I felt I should do something in this respect because it is a national matter. I must thank those hon. members who have spoken in favour of the Resolution. I do not have to thank hon. members of the Government because it should be the Government who should have brought down this Resolution.

The Hon. Premier said that I am a sensitive man. I am a sensitive man. I have been in politics too long not to be sensitive. I sense things a long time before anything takes place and it is because I am sensitive that I brought this Resolution. The Colonial Office has an idea that if eight

territories such as ours come to ask for anything and they have not the backing of Parliament behind them, it is not going to take them on. We of the Trade Union, when it comes to important matters dealing with Colonial Office have to tell them things. We do not beat around the bush when we have to tell them things. We had to tell the French Government what we thought of the position in Algeria. We of the Trade Union sent a body of people there to look into the matter. Barbados and the other seven Units are still begging Great Britain to give them their rights because they do not have any backing from the people. All that they are saying is that they are going to join themselves in a Federation and we are telling you under what terms you should go in. The British Government did not make any move in respect of a sugar agreement until an Australian delegation went to London to negotiate on behalf of the Australians. The Australians have a reputation for being hard bargainers and, therefore, they do not give in too easily. The British Government in the end had to give in to their demands and it was not because the Australians do not have to depend on them. The Australians' attitude is that they are trading and they do not have to beg for anything.

Great Britain has passed an Order-in-Council which is going to affect this Island and all this suggestion that they are treating Barbados differently from the other territories is nonsense. If you have a riot about here it is not the British Parliament which is going to deal with it. If you have what happened here in 1937, the Secretary of State can act without any Parliament sitting. Therefore, the position of these eight territories in the West Indies now is that if they do not move quickly, the British Government will go on to push you back and try to disintegrate you and there is the attitude of actual disintegration going on now. Dr. Banda for several years said that he did not want to be in any Federation with Rhodesia and they were those of us in these parts who said that we were going to send a delegation up to London and tell the British Government to vote against keeping Dr. Banda in the Union. The British Government did not listen to him until they killed a lot of people in that territory. Lots of them lost their lives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the hon. senior member for the City for the support which he has given to this Resolution. I will tell him that as a member of the delegation which is going up to London, he should not say too much to interfere with what the other people of the other territories are spending in their respective territories. He can say what we want to do. He can say that we are federating and we do not want to have a unitary state. Some of these colonies do not have the sort of governments which we in Barbados have. Some do not have a Local Government along with the Central Government. Mr. Bird of Antigua would look in your face and say that Antigua is not smaller than Barbados but yet it does not see the sense of having a Local Government along with a Central Government. He will tell you that we spend in Barbados on administration more than they spend in Antigua.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will be the last person to go on this delegation and attempt to interfere with the internal running of any of those territories. What I did say was, why it is unfortunate that some of the leaders should adopt the attitude which they have adopted. I would never interfere with the internal running of any of those Governments. I would be the last to interfere with Mr. Bird or Mr. Joshua.

Mr. WALCOTT: All I say as regards that is that you have to examine people and look at them as they are. Unfortunately, Barbadians are a little more British than some of our other neighbours, but we have to be content that we are not the only people in the Federation. Barbadians do not go in for the things which the people in the other territories go in for because Barbadians are extremely jealous of their position. We give a house to the Governor, the Chief Secretary and the Chief Justice, but if you start to give a Minister a house, Barbadians would shout for "murder". It is not a question that the economy would prevent your giving a Minister a house, but it is that the background of the people are different from that of people in the other Islands. The people of the other Islands would feel that you should put a Minister at Government House and then they would dress him up and give him all the things that he wants. But it is not so with the people of Barbados. Mr. Bird of Antigua is a very simple man; but if Mr. Bird says that he wants to live at Government House, the Governor would have to go and Mr. Bird would live there.

When we have to enter into a Federation like this, hon. members have to be very careful not to give any person the impression that we are sort of too critical because it will only spoil the whole thing.

Finally, Sir, I want the hon. senior member for the City to understand that, so far as this Resolution is concerned, we are not passing any measure for any Trade Union; you are passing something for the people of Barbados. I am a man who makes prophecies. I know that there is going to be a time when you are going to come in here and ask this House to pass something for you hurriedly. I am going to witness you summoning the House hurriedly to deal with this same question for you.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 29th May, 1962 at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

12.30 a.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MR. MOTTLEY

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave of absence for two months from my duties as a member of this House as from the 6th May. *(ASIDES)*. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for this leave because I have known that the present Prime Minister of the West Indies left this country without having been granted leave and something happened and a bye-election had to take place. (Mr. WALCOTT: Members should ask for leave of absence.) Suppose you are ill and a period of forty days elapses and you have not been granted leave! What will happen?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave of absence for two months from his duties as a member of this House as from the 6th May. Unless there is any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. *(After a pause)*. There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR THE PREMIER AND LEADER OF THE HOUSE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and myself I am asking leave of absence for one month as from the 9th May.

There being no objection, the leave asked for was granted.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 29th May, 1962, at 2.30 p.m. of the clock. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No", I think the "Ayes" have it.

This House now stands adjourned.

12.35 a.m.