

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th February, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon to-day.

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN, (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LeV. WILSON, Messrs. R. G. MAPP, M. E. COX, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., E. L. WARD and G. H. ADAMS, B.A.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES

Prayers are read and the Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 28th January, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £2,520 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1946-47 under Head XI, Waterworks, Item 15, Repairs to reservoirs, mains, etc.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to advance the sum of £115 from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded as a free grant under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act on the terms, and conditions laid down in the Message from the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor dated the 14th December 1943) to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of financing a scheme for a course of training for an employee of the Board of Guardians, St. Michael, in case work for a period of six months in Trinidad.

Mr. SMITH enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to provide a gratuity of £174. 5. and an annuity at the rate of £52. 5. 6. payable in equal monthly instalments from the 21st December, 1946, to Ernest Matthews, formerly Messenger of the Port Health Officer's Department.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £3,640 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expen-

diture for the year 1946-47 under Head VIII, Post Office, Item 6, Overtime pay, by £300; Item 14, Overseas direct mails (Air), by £3,300; and Item 21, Furniture and fittings, by £40.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914 (1914-3), as amended by the Savings Bank (Amendment) Act, 1944 (1944-28).

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Clerical Service Act, 1944 (1944-27).

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting, to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

1. Whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a statement in the London Press, reproduced locally, that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are recruiting, or are about to recruit, thousands of women workers from Germany to work in England as domestics and in laundries?

2. Will Government take appropriate steps to verify the abovementioned statement, in the interest of the unemployed of this Colony?

3. If it is a fact that a shortage of women workers at present exists in England, will Government explore the possibility of emigrating female workers from this Island to Great Britain in an effort to relieve the unemployed women of this Colony who are not averse to working within the Empire?

Mr. HAYNES enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. Was an examination for promotion held for Privates and Lance Corporals in the Police Force last year?

2. If the answer to the above question is yes, is it a fact that certain men were promoted to the rank of Corporal, after the date of such examination, who had not passed same?

3. If the reply to question (2) above is in the affirmative, will Government explain the purpose and reason for such an examination as abovementioned?

4. Does dissatisfaction exist amongst Senior N.C.O's in the Force in connection with the policy governing the latest promotions in the Force?

5. Has Government accepted, and given instructions to follow recommendations contained in paragraph 296 (a) and (b) of the Calver Report?

6. What is the number of (a) Sergeants (b) Station Sergeants at present in the Force who have completed twenty years' service in the Force and have recently sat an examination for promotion? (c) Sergeants who have completed twenty years' service in the Force and did not sit an examination for promotion?

7. Is it the present policy in the Police Force to promote Station Sergeants and Sergeants of over twenty years' service according to merit alone?

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

1. Is it a fact that female Nurses at the Mental Hospital are now being required personally to scrub the patients' rooms and Dormitories?

2. If the answer to question (1) above is "Yes" will Government say why?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

1. Will Government state whether it is the intention of the Department of Highways and Transport to enforce or to rescind the Regulation requiring Motor Omnibuses to have an internal corridor?

2. Is Government aware that the cost of construction of an Omnibus with an internal corridor is greatly in excess of the cost of an Omnibus made as are those at present in this Island, and also that such Omnibuses hold fewer passengers than the Omnibus now in use?

3. Whether there has been any great public demand for Omnibuses with corridors.

4. If the answer to question (3) above is in the negative, will Government intimate to the above Department that the enforcement of the Regulation mentioned in question (1) above is not in the interest of the Community?

5. Whether Stop Poles for Omnibuses have been erected along certain routes to points between four and five miles distant from the City terminus and not on other routes to an equal distance?

6. If the answer to question (5) above is "yes" will Government inform the House of the reason for such differentiation?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914—3 as amended by the Savings Bank (Amendment) Act, 1944—28 is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, a Bill to amend the Clerical Service Act 1944—27 is read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS enters the House and takes his seat.

EXPECTED ARRIVAL OF GOVERNOR-DESIGNATE.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter:

Colonial Secretary's Office,
Barbados,
3rd February, 1947.

Sir,

I am directed by the Acting Governor to inform you that His Excellency Sir Hilary Blood, K.C.M.G., Governor-Designate, is expected to arrive in the s.s. "Eros" on the morning of Saturday, the 8th of February, 1947. The actual time of landing will be notified over Radio Distribution and, if possible, in the Press as soon as definite arrangements can be made.

2. Immediately upon landing His Excellency will proceed to the Legislative Council Chamber to be sworn in by His Honour the Chief Justice, and I am to extend an invitation to you and to the members of the House of Assembly to be present at this ceremony. I am arranging for tickets of admission to be sent to members for themselves and their wives.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

P. F. CAMPBELL,

Acting Colonial Secretary.

His Honour,

The Speaker,

House of Assembly.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant or sums of money for the service of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

COLONY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE WEST INDIES.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for the sum of £1,755 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the colony's contribution to the University College of the West Indies in respect of the years 1946 and 1947.

Honourable members will understand that this amount is merely an estimate and it may have to be revised as soon as the actual expenditure is known. The principle has been accepted by the House. The total expenditure for the years 1946 and 1947 has been estimated and on a population basis this amount will be our share—6.5 per cent. I do not suppose that any controversy will arise out of this. We are very glad that the University College is actually being started and we will, naturally, do anything we are called upon to do to help it on its way. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—We have agreed to contribute to this expenditure and, of course, we will have to do so. But I would be glad if the honourable member will give us a little more information in the matter. I have read somewhere that a site for this University has been selected and can the honourable member tell me when the construction of the building is likely to be started and to what purpose this £1,755 is to be spent? I see that a Principal Designate has been appointed but what I am interested in is to know when they hope to start the construction of the building. If the honourable would be so kind as to give me that information I should be obliged to him.

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. SPRINGER: I could not hear the honourable member very clearly but I gather that he is asking whether any of this money is being spent on the building. Well, the architect arrived last week and I cannot tell yet how soon he will be able to commence. We intend to open a Medical School in October 1948; whether it will be in a new or a converted building is not certain yet but definitely a Medical School will be opened in October, 1948. Meanwhile, the architect will be asked to proceed with his plans with all decent speed. I think one will realize that when you are establishing an Institution like a University, the architectural appearance and design are almost as important as the building itself. None of us would like to erect a structure merely for the sake of constructing it quickly. We wish it to be done speedily, but at the same time not with excessive speed such as would destroy the best qualities of the architect's work. The answer to the honourable member's question is that none of this money is to be spent on the building; it is not for capital expenditure at all. I envisage that most of this money will be spent on salaries and incidental expenses of the first appointees. It is obvious that if we are going to start a Medical School next year, we will have to appoint the necessary medical staff this year in order that they may prepare curricula and make other arrangements for the opening of the school on a proper teaching basis. I may say that this year's contribution is small. As the staff increases and the number of students increases the amount of the recurrent expenditure will be greater.

Mr. WILKINSON: I thank the honourable member for the information he has given me. As he said, it is very difficult to hear in this Chamber but I think I understood him to say that this £1,755 is part of the recurrent expenditure. If that is so, one can well imagine what the expenses are going to be when the University is started.

Mr. SPRINGER: The answer to that is that you cannot run a University on a cheap scale.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE TO INCREASE SALARIES OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of £8,095 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1946-47 under Head XX, Education, (ii) Second Grade Education, item 19, Grant-in-aid:—(1) Combermere School, by £1,652; (2) Alleyne School, by £154; (3) Coleridge School, by £207; (4) Parry School, by £205; (5) Alexandra School, by £310; (6) the Boys' Foundation, by £457; (7) the Girls' Foundation, by £206; (8) St. Michael's Girls', by £668; (iii) First Grade Education, item 21, Grant-in-aid:—(1) Harrison College, by £2,047; (2) Lodge School, by £1,128; (3) Queen's College, by £1,061; to pay a cost of living allowance from the 1st April, 1946, and until the 31st of March, 1947, to

- (a) teachers of First and Second Grade Schools;
- (b) teachers of First and Second Grade Schools who retired at any time between the 1st day of April, 1946, and the date of the passing of this Resolution in circumstances rendering them eligible for the grant of a pension or gratuity, and
- (c) teachers who were transferred from the full time service of the Crown in this Island to the full time service of the Crown elsewhere between the 1st day of April, 1946, and the date of the passing of this Resolution

at the rates, and subject to the terms, conditions and exceptions set out in the Schedule.

It is unnecessary for me to say anything more than that this provides, at the same rates and subject to the same terms and conditions and exceptions, for Secondary School Teachers what the House has already passed for Public Officers. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—Honourable members may be somewhat surprised to observe that the amounts in respect of certain of these schools are so small. For instance, the amount for the Coleridge School is £207, for the Parry School £205, for the Girls' Foundation School £206, and so on. Of course, the explanation is that the salaries received by the masters and mistresses of these small schools are much below the salaries received by teachers of other schools with the same standard of education because of the smallness of the number of the pupils at the former as compared with the large numbers at the latter, and that brings me to this observation: so long as you continue to pay teachers of the small secondary schools salaries which are much below the salaries of teachers of schools with over 200 pupils, you will not be able even to hope to keep a good teacher at one of the smaller schools for any length of time. The question then arises whether it is fair that the Coleridge or the Parry School should not be able to offer a sufficiently attractive salary to keep a good teacher there, so that the boys at those schools can benefit from a sound secondary education such as given to the pupils of the Combermere School. That is a point which I should like to draw to the attention of the Executive. There should be no difference in the salaries which are paid to teachers of these secondary schools who have the same academic qualifications. I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Government that so far as the Coleridge and the Parry Schools are concerned, we are looking forward to increased grants which will enable us to provide one or possibly two additional masters on the staffs of those schools and I commend, in advance, the matter to their favourable consideration.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—I also have a similar grievance in respect of the Alleyne School. We are pretty well in the same difficulty there, in which the junior member for St. Lucy finds himself at the Coleridge and the Parry Schools. I have here the schedule showing the salary scale for assistant masters appointed on or after 1st April, 1945. The scale is as follows:—"B. Graduates—£200 per annum rising by annual increments of £15 to £300 per annum." Now, that is a very fair salary but it is very difficult in these days to get graduates for these schools. Owing to conditions in the country districts, it is very unusual for a graduate to apply; so I take it that "B" does not apply to these small schools at all. The scale goes on:—"C. Non-Graduates holding a Higher Certificate, Intermediate B.A. or B.Sc., or equivalent qualifications—£125 per annum rising by annual increments of £12 10s. 0d. to £225 per annum." Now, that sounds all right for a City school but it certainly is of no use to a country school; it does not attract a proper man to apply for a vacancy at a country school because he has too many expenses to undergo. He has to rent a house while, perhaps, he lives with his parents in the City and hence it is practically impossible to get anybody for that salary. Then the scale continues:—"D. Non-Graduates holding Matriculation or School Certificate—£75 per annum rising by annual increments of £12 10s. 0d. to £150 per annum." Now, this is the class

from which we draw our Assistant Masters and you can imagine what a raw material we get. The Alleyne School, I am glad to say, now accommodates 75 pupils, nearly double what they were ten years ago, with the possibility of their going to 100 pupils. But that will never occur as long as parents cannot get their children taught by proper teachers. I do not suppose it will serve any useful purpose to postpone this Resolution but like the junior member for St. Lucy I am asking the senior member for St. Joseph to bear in mind the conditions at the Alleyne School which are similar to those at the Coleridge and the Parry Schools. To obtain teachers for the Alleyne School, we have to try and get experienced teachers seconded from the elementary schools but at the present moment, the Education Board has stopped that practice and we are practically in a parlous condition. They say that they cannot go on lending us experienced teachers, neither will these experienced teachers join our staff because they lose \$20 or \$30 per month by the transfer. It seems to me rather anomalous that if a person leaves elementary teaching to teach in a secondary school he should be given a smaller salary at the latter. I should have thought that the latter was a step higher than the former but that does not appear to be so and as I tell you it is causing a severe handicap to the future education at the secondary schools in the country districts. I hope that, when the Government is considering the salaries of secondary school teachers, what I have said will be brought to its notice.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman, — The whole question of salaries, as you know, for Teachers and Civil Servants is under consideration. But the speech of the senior member for St. Andrew discloses, as far as the Alleyne School is concerned, that it is not merely a question of salary. He admits that in some cases the salaries are reasonable and yet they cannot get applicants; so there are other considerations which apply to the Alleyne School because of its remoteness and we would welcome any suggestion from him or anyone else which will result in the availability of good teachers for the Alleyne School or any of the other country schools.

Mr. HAYNES: Probably it is very difficult to hear in this Chamber but I will tell the honourable member the difficulty in St. Andrew is somewhere for proper teachers to live. There are no available houses in the parish in which a well educated man can live and his travelling expenses would eat up nearly all his salary. We may be able to get teachers with a fair amount of experience in teaching from the elementary schools but they are paid more at the elementary schools than we can pay them owing to the fact that they are non-graduates. We cannot pay them more money owing to the scale of salaries which are laid down in the scheme for the government of the school and that is where the snag comes in. If the school was situated in a residential area, the difficulty of housing accommodation for teachers would easily be overcome. That is and has always been our trouble down there and will go on for many years; in the meantime we are suffering very badly.

Mr. WARD: I do not think that it is exactly the housing problem which prevents graduates from accepting appointments at these schools. My contention is and always will be that Assistant Masters at all schools should be paid salaries on the same basis. The Education Board has approved of the principle that salaries should be paid to secondary teachers on the basis of the numbers attending the respective schools but in my opinion, it takes the same ability to teach children in a school which has

200 pupils as it takes to teach children in a school with 20 pupils; so I think that the correct thing for the Education Board to do is to standardize the salaries of secondary teachers whether they are teaching at a school with 400 pupils or at a school with 20 pupils. If the Government does not see fit or cannot afford to do so I think they had better shut down the schools because in my opinion they are robbing the children in the particular districts of a proper education. In the parishes of St. Lucy, St. Peter and St. Andrew, we have to take the worst type of teacher to teach children who have the same right to a proper education as that which is given to children in the City schools and I think that the policy of the Education Board, in respect of the salaries paid to secondary school teachers, is a most ridiculous one. We say that we have a Labour Government in power and the Labour members of this House should try to protect the children of the class which they are supposed to represent, as far as their education is concerned. I think that this Government should bring to the notice of the Education Board that it is the opinion of this particular House that the salaries of all secondary school teachers should be fixed on the same basis, whether the number at the school is 200 or 500 pupils. That is how I view the matter.

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. MAPP: In my view, much of this difficulty could be avoided if we were to amalgamate some of these small schools. Take the Coleridge and the Parry Schools. Ever since amalgamation of those schools was in the air but it seems to me that the matter is proceeding at too slow a pace. If instead of having two schools to serve the parishes of St. Lucy, St. Peter and St. James, you had one school with a suitable staff, you could then pay the teachers proper salaries. Another question I would like to ask either the senior member for St. Joseph or the senior member for St. George is, whether the numbers at the Lodge School exceed 200 because I understand that the difference in salaries depends on the numbers attending the schools.

Mr. BRANCKER: Before the honourable senior member for St. Joseph replies to the question put by the junior member for St. Thomas, perhaps I might give him one or two more to be replied to at the same time. Now, the honourable member who has just sat down referred to the promise which the Government of this country gave to amalgamate the Parry and the Coleridge schools. Well, I was glancing through a Minute Book the other day and I observed that the matter of the amalgamation of these two schools was receiving the urgent attention of the Government who had it, apparently, on the priority list in the year 1907. Now and again when the matter has been resuscitated, succeeding Governments would display a similar attitude and as a matter of fact it is one of those perennial subjects of debate. But I have it, on authority, that this matter of the amalgamation of these schools is really high up on the priority list of buildings to be erected by the educational authorities in the near future. Now, the question of this salary scale is a very vexed one. If these schools were amalgamated, undoubtedly there would be more than 200 pupils attending and the masters would be paid on the basis of the number of pupils. Recently we had a master at the Coleridge School who acquired a good London Degree and his salary was increased to \$90 per month but he was offered an appointment at Combermere School at a salary of \$140 per month and, quite naturally, he accepted it;—a master with the same degree and

there can be no question that a master at Combermere School has to work harder than a master at the Coleridge School because the masters at the City schools get an hour off every day while the masters at the country schools, far from getting time off, have to teach two Forms. A master with a Degree will leave a small school and go to Combermere simply because of the system of payment which the Government has approved and so far there is no indication that it will be changed. The situation will be remedied, so far as the Coleridge and the Parry Schools are concerned, if they are amalgamated—; there will be over 200 boys attending the school and the masters will be paid on the same basis that obtains at Combermere. I do not know what is the present Government's intention in respect of the treatment which is accorded the Lodge School but the last I have heard is that although the Lodge School does not have 200 boys, yet inasmuch as the building can accommodate over 200 boys, it is treated as a school with over 200 boys. Anyhow, it will be interesting to hear the official reply to the question of the junior member for St. Thomas. The complaint which we are making is that teachers with academic qualifications at small schools should not be paid less than what is paid to teachers with similar qualifications at schools with over 200 pupils. If you want the teachers of these smaller schools to have the same contented state of mind which the teachers of larger schools possess, why delay in amalgamating the smaller schools? If you are wedded to this principle of not paying a master at a small school as much as you pay a master at a big school, well, then, make the small school bigger so that it can come within the category of schools with over 200 pupils. It is not fair that the children of parents in St. Lucy, St. Peter, and St. Andrew should not be able to reap the benefit of the teaching which can be given them by a master with a high qualification. As soon as a master at one of these small schools gets his Degree, he naturally avails himself of the first opportunity to go to a big school because he gets sometimes a 50% increase in salary. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the latitude which you have given me to put this point before the House.

Mr. ADAMS: I cannot answer any of the questions. I suggest to the honourable members that when the Estimates are before the House, that will be the appropriate time to put their questions and doubtless the honourable member on my immediate right who is responsible for the Department of Education in this House will answer them comprehensively.

Mr. TALMA: I would like to know why such a small amount has been allotted to the Boys' Foundation School. This school is regarded to-day as a big school and not a small one and yet a distinction is always made in connection with it when grants are being given. I cannot understand the reason why. The masters of this school are always terribly underpaid and they work under very difficult conditions. I think this is an appropriate time when a matter like this should be threshed out once for all. There is another point. Since the last Headmaster resigned, the masters at this school have been working under a terrible strain; they are short-staffed. The Boys' Foundation School has not had a Headmaster for two or three years and it was agreed—this is a point I want to make clear—that the salary that lapsed should be divided among the Assistant Masters so that they would be compensated for their extra time and labour. To-day what do we find? We find that now we have adopted the scheme put forward by the late Director of Education to bring this school into

line with the other secondary schools, the Conservative element which said that the inclusion of the provision for a bond was right is now saying that it is wrong. We, the members of the Congress Party, fought against the inclusion of the bond in the scheme and the Governing Body of the Foundation Schools merely accepted the scheme to secure the back pay and increased salaries for the teachers which were long overdue. I want to know this. Why should any little extra emolument which the teachers of the Boys' Foundation School drew during the last two or three years be deducted from their back pay? Why should that money that was paid to them by way of compensation for their extra services be deducted? My father was also a teacher and he went to his grave talking about back pay. I am here to-day to defend that class of worker because advantage is always being taken of teachers. I am hoping that the Acting Director of Education will not see fit to make deductions but will grant the teachers all the benefits to which they are entitled. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the latitude you have given me and I hope that the Boys' Foundation School will be brought into line as far as salaries to teachers are concerned. It is a school 200 strong; it is a big school and not a small school.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I put the question I would like to say that it seems to me that a case is made out for the Government to answer. Some strong criticism has been made and I myself would like the Government to take notice of it. The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE *re* CONFERENCES.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for the sum of £375 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1946-47 under Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, Item 41, Conferences. As will be seen from the addendum, this Resolution is sent down in accordance with a recommendation made by the Conference on Trade matters which was held in Barbados last May and as the result of which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has invited an Advisory West Indian Mission composed of five members to visit London in connection with the forthcoming International Conference on Trade and Employment which, it is expected, will be held in the Spring of this year. The Hon. H. A. Cuke has been appointed as the representative of this island and this £375 is to pay his passage to and from the United Kingdom and his maintenance while he is there. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

SUPERVISION OF THE WEIGHING OF CANES DURING 1947 CROP.

Mr. SPRINGER: This Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £1,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of supervising the weighing of canes during the 1947 crop. The addendum explains that it is proposed to pay the sum of £175 to each of six inspectors and £50 has been added to meet incidental expenses. Honourable members will remember that this is the third crop year in which itinerant inspec-

tors have been attached to the Labour Department under the supervision of the Labour Inspector for the purpose of supervising the weighing of canes and for other matters ancillary to that work. They were very useful in the past and the House is now asked to consider whether their services should be retained in the crop year 1947. I do not think it is necessary to make any further statement at this stage. We are all familiar with the sort of work which these inspectors have been doing and I think that we all agree that the Government should continue to avail itself of their services. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am going to support this Resolution because I find that these itinerant inspectors are performing very useful services. As a matter of fact I would be inclined to increase the number so that they could be readily available at the factories where their services are most in demand. I am wondering — and I throw it out for the consideration of the Government — whether the time has not come when we should find permanent employment for these inspectors. There are employed only during the three or four months of a crop year and if we have reached the stage where they are competent to perform these duties in a sufficiently satisfactory manner, we should not run the risk of losing their services. My point is this. Now that these men are trained to do this work we should keep them as long as is reasonably possible. I do not suggest that we should go to the extreme and pay them at an extravagant rate of salary but that we should find employment for them after their duties proper have been completed. There will be a corresponding increase in the efficiency of their work if they regard themselves as permanent employees in the Civil Establishment of the Colony.

Mr. TALMA: I would like to suggest that although these itinerant inspectors appear to be in order in the present circumstances, yet I feel that great harm is done in not having one almost at every factory. I know that it is impossible to do that at this stage but the time will definitely come when there will be 4 or 5 factories in Barbados instead of 30 or 40 as is the case at present.

THE CHAIRMAN: When we have the four or five factories, that is the time for the honourable member to put forward his suggestion.

Mr. TALMA: This is just the preamble, Sir. The time will come when you will have 5 or 6 factories like the one in St. Kitts and instead of having these inspectors going from factory to factory to supervise the weighing of canes, there will be one stationed at each factory. You, Mr. Chairman, know all about the damage that is being done at present to the peasants at these factories.

The CHAIRMAN: I know of no damage that is being done to peasants at factories.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For your information I state that a great deal of harm is done to the peasant when he sends his canes to be weighed and I am saying that these six inspectors are not sufficient; we want one for each parish at least. That is all I got up to say and I am hoping that the members of the Executive Committee will not only see their way to employ six inspectors in the next crop year but one for each parish, so that the average peasant who sends his canes to a factory to be weighed, because he has no scale beam at his own home, will be able to know that he is getting an honest weight.

Mr. GARNER: I wish to support what the last speaker has said: It is about time that the Gov-

ernment appoint an inspector for each parish. A man cannot be ubiquitous; he cannot be in St. Philip and at the farthest end of St. Andrew at the same time. If I reveal to this Committee what I saw during the last crop it will amaze them. Even if there is one inspector for each parish that will be a small matter, let alone having one inspector travelling from factory to factory all over the island. This is a farce; it is as good as having no inspectors at all because the cane weighers look out for their coming. They keep spies on the look out for them and as soon as the spies see them coming, the information is passed on and a different state of affairs takes place. That is the practice and I think that the Government will be well advised to appoint an inspector for each parish. The peasant would then be able to get a greater share of the canes which he sends to a factory.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Chairman reports the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolutions are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

THE FISHING INDUSTRY CONTROL BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George,—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the regulation of the fishing industry.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill has been before the House quite a long time. There is not much in it but it is a very necessary piece of machinery, I am told, to assist the Fisheries Officer and his Committee in making a scientific approach to the fishing industry. One of the things they are most anxious to do is to have the boats registered so as to be able to keep track of them. Practically all that this Bill does is to provide for the appointment of inspectors and the making of regulations. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and agreed to.

Clause 2. In this Act

“fishing boat” means any boat which is used for the purpose of capturing fish for gain; “inspector” means an Inspector appointed under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that that be Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—This Clause defines a fishing boat as any boat which is used for the purpose of capturing fish for gain. Now, this country has to rely on subsidiary industries. By that, I mean that our fishing industry should be developed along proper lines and I do not know whether the policy of the Government is such that this industry will be developed in the manner in which it should be developed. My view is that it should not continue to be the type of fishing industry that it is at present. I happen to know a little about this industry because I have been living practically on the beach in a fishing centre. If we are to develop the fishing industry we must see to it

that the fishermen have modern boats and not the type of boats which were in existence over 100 years ago,—boats in which the fishermen can remain at sea for two or three days and bring back catches of fish which will supply the needs of not only ourselves but of people elsewhere. Barbados has a redundant population and we should devise ways and means for the development of the fishing industry along proper lines, especially at this time when we have people in high places who have the interests of the fishermen at heart. What are the types of fishing boats we have to-day? There are only two types—the little “moses” and another in which the gear is shifted from one side to the other. I am suggesting that the Government should have in mind the construction of a different type of fishing boat so that the greatest results can be obtained from fishing.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is very difficult for the honourable member to presume what the Government has in mind.

Mr. TALMA: I happen to represent a fishing district and I want to know if the Government has anything at all in mind, Mr. Chairman, as far as the development of the fishing industry is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: It might be proper if the honourable member would table a question to that effect.

Mr. TALMA: This definition of “fishing boat” does not satisfy me. I would like to know from the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House if the Government envisages now or at some time in the distant future providing the fishermen with boats properly equipped along modern lines, so that when they go fishing they will be able to remain two or three days out to sea and get back safely with a plentiful supply of fish.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 is read and agreed to.

Clause 4. Every inspector shall see that the provisions of all Regulations made under this Act are complied with and shall perform such other duties in connection with the fishing industry as the Governor may require of him from time to time.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that that be Clause 4 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: This, of course, is the most important clause of the Bill because the usefulness of it will depend on the carrying out of the regulations and I do not know if the senior member for St. George can give us any indication of what those regulations are likely to be. As regards the remarks of the senior member for Christ Church I do not agree with him that the fishing boats are antiquated or that the fishermen are inefficient. I have a great admiration for the way the fishermen handle their boats and for what they do and I do not think you can improve the boats very much, except to get away from that shifting of the gear for which they seem to have a love. As regards the honourable member's further point about fishermen being able to remain at sea for two or three days, that perhaps is possible with proper refrigeration on board.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member's remarks will be more appropriate when we come to deal with Clause 5.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5. The Governor-in-Executive Committee may make Regulations for the purpose of

- (a) ensuring the safety and welfare of men working on fishing boats or otherwise engaged in the fishing industry, whether on their own behalf or as servants or employees of another person.
- (b) promoting and fostering the interests and welfare of the fishing industry in general.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that that be Clause 5 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—This is a very interesting point. I am referring to sub-clause (a) of Clause 5. Now, Sir, this has been the great bone of contention, so far as the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Act is concerned. We know the manner in which the fishing industry is conducted in this Island. Some of the fishermen own boats themselves and the great majority work the boats of other owners on a partnership basis. In view of the fact that we need all the fish which these fishermen who risk their lives day in and day out can catch, should not the Government itself insure these men and not leave the burden on the owners of the fishing boats? I would like to know if the Government has that in view. I do not know what it has in view, so I am trying to find out if it has anything in view. I want to know if it has in mind the insuring of the fishermen. We must do everything in our power to assist the fishing industry. If you put the onus on the owner of the fishing boat who very often is the fisherman himself, it will mean that the industry will gradually decline. I suggest that the Government takes it upon itself to have all the fishermen insured and not leave it to the owners of the fishing boats who are very poor people and cannot do things of that sort themselves. I think that I am in order on this occasion, Mr. Chairman, and although my questions are seldom answered, yet I expect that the point which I have just raised will be answered.

Mr. WARD: I go further. I feel that if the Government is so interested in promoting the fishing industry, the owners of fishing boats should be protected by means of insurance. At the present moment I am made to understand that it is impossible to insure these boats and I think that some scheme should be formulated for the purpose and should be followed up monthly because it may be said that if a fisherman has an old boat he may carry it out and sink it. In such a case that fisherman would be paid what the boat was valued at before it was taken to sea. At the same time I do not think that if a fisherman has a boat which can be repaired and put into service for a year or two longer, he would sink it. However, I feel that the Government should formulate some scheme for the insuring of fishing boats and see to it that they are valued regularly.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—I too am wondering if the Government should not do something more to help the fishing industry. The fishermen are very poor, hard-working men and I know many cases in which this Workmen's Compensation Act has created a hardship. They have not been able to act in accordance with the law and it is incumbent upon the Government, especially a Labour Government, to see to it that these people are helped. The Government should do everything in its power to make the fishing industry a more profitable industry. The inhabitants now have to rely a great deal on fresh fish to supply the necessary vitamins of which they

have been deprived through not being able to get proper foods to eat. The fishing industry is a very important branch of our economy and I am wondering why instead of using the word "may" in the first line of this Clause, the Government did not use the word "shall". I beg to move, as an amendment to Clause 5, that the word "may" occurring in line 1 be deleted and the word "shall" substituted therefor.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that and in doing so I should like to say that I am not so much interested in the phraseology as I am in getting something done.

The CHAIRMAN: I dislike very much interrupting the honourable member but when it comes to law, does he not think that it is better to leave the draughtsmanship to the lawyers? Sometimes "may" means "shall".

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, — Sub-clause (b) of this Clause 5 states:—"promoting and fostering the interests and welfare of the fishing industry in general". Well, Sir, I do not represent a fishing village but it would help us all if we could get more fish into the country and I am wondering if the honourable members who are members of the Government can tell me if it is proposed to relieve fishermen of the road tax on petrol in order that they may be able to place engines in their boats. I understand from some of these fishermen—I am a keen fisherman myself—that if the Government would relieve them of the road tax on petrol they might be able to instal in their boats engines which would be of greater use to them. I would be grateful for any information on that point.

Mr. SPRINGER: We are all agreed that the fishermen of this country are a most deserving and a most admirable type of men. I, for one, have nothing but gratitude and admiration for them because the risks they take most of us would not take, and I am grateful to them because I need the fish more so than most of those honourable members who have been speaking about fish. The Fisheries Committee is, comparatively speaking, a new one and is now finding its feet. I think I am speaking correctly when I say that one of the biggest handicaps it has had is the absence of an Act of this sort. Its immediate need is to have the boats registered so that they could be properly numbered and all the rest will follow. The Government's fishing policy is being formed and the general purpose of it is to improve the quantity and the quality of the fishing. As far as the suggestion about installing gasoline engines in fishing boats is concerned, I think that will require much more consideration than we can give it here to-day and I will not for one moment attempt to discuss the matter. The junior member for St. James asked whether I could give any indication of the nature of the regulations that are being made; the only regulations in being to-day, as far as I have been able to discover, are those dealing with the registration of the boats. The most important regulations that will be required are undoubtedly the ones to deal with the safety of the fishermen. I do not know if the senior member for Christ Church knows that a high legal luminary has given his opinion that fishermen are not employees and, therefore, do not come within the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act; whether that is correct or not I feel, with the senior member for St. Lucy, that some scheme of Government's control and assistance ought to be devised and introduced by which fishermen and their families and boats may be secured. It is a question whether insurance is a means of safeguarding that because we all recognize that in many cases the premiums they will have to pay under the present rates will be beyond their means if it were

held that they were within the Workmen's Compensation Act. At any rate, I trust that in the not too distant future we will be able to present this House with a proper scheme of protection, including insurance if necessary, for the fishermen of the country. I need not repeat that the whole purpose of setting up this Fisheries Committee is to increase the fishing supply and improve the methods and the quality of the fishing.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I put the question I should like the honourable member to reply to the amendment made by the junior member for St. Philip.

Mr. SPRINGER: It is not a necessary amendment. In this context "may" means "shall", but if honourable members wish to change it they may do so.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the junior member for St. Philip not to press the amendment because it means the same thing.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to withdraw my amendment.

The question that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 6. If any person shall

(a) hinder, obstruct or molest or attempt to hinder, obstruct or molest any inspector in the performance of his duties under this Act or any Regulation made thereunder, or

(b) fail to comply with the provisions of any Regulations made under this Act

he shall be guilty of an offence against the Act and shall be liable on summary conviction before a Police Magistrate to a fine not exceeding five pounds or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that that be Clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like to enquire whether these Regulations have to come before the Legislature before they become law; it does not appear so from this Bill. It is usual that most of the Regulations which are approved by the Executive Committee do not become law until they are accepted by both Houses of the Legislature.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am afraid that the Bill as at present worded does not require that the Regulations should be sent for the approval of the House. If it is felt by the honourable members of the House that such a provision should be put in, it should not be difficult to find a precedent for it.

Mr. WARD: This is a very dangerous thing. We are here laying a penalty on persons in this Bill as if that assurance to which the junior member for St. James referred is not given. I suggest that we postpone the further consideration of this Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER: I would suggest that if the honourable member will make a motion to that effect, such a provision will meet with the general approbation of the House.

Mr. WARD: So long as some provision is put in to protect individuals I am not opposing the passing of the Bill to-day.

Mr. SPRINGER: If we pass Clause 6, it will then be possible to re-commit Clause 5 and add to it a provision to meet the point raised by the junior member for St. James.

The question that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Clause 5 is re-committed.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that the following sub-clauses be added to Clause 5 and be numbered (2) and (3) respectively:—

- (2) All Regulations made under this section shall be submitted as soon as possible for the approval of both Houses of the Legislature and if not approved shall cease to be Regulations from the date of their disapproval but the non-approval shall not affect anything done or suffered under the Regulations between their coming into force and their rejection by the Legislature.

- (3) All regulations made under this section shall be published in the *Official Gazette* and shall be judicially noticed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

The question that the abovementioned sub-clauses be added to Clause 5 and be numbered (2) and (3) respectively is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Clause 5, as amended, stand part of this Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 5, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

RESOLUTION POSTPONED.

Mr. ADAMS asks for and is granted leave to postpone Order No. 3—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to sanction the Regulations made by the Transport Board under section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937-16).

THE FACTORIES BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—Second reading of a Bill to make provision for the registration and supervision of factories and for the safety and well being of workers employed therein.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Honourable members, even though some of us are members of this Assembly for the first time, are well aware of this Factories Bill that was before the Legislature last session but was not dealt with. It was introduced in February, 1944—three years ago—but was not dealt with during that session nor in the session which ended in October, 1946, and it was re-introduced in December, 1946. I think we are all agreed on the urgency of this Bill and I shall do no more to-day than move the second reading and suggest that a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Bill in order to let members of the House, especially those who are connected with sugar factories, give us their advice. The Bill is very comprehensive. It is based on very modern English Factory Legislation and I think that if it is sent to a Select Committee they will find that it has already had so thorough an investigation by members of previous Assemblies—although it was not passed—that their task will be a comparatively simple one. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the House decides to send the Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I appoint members of that Committee as follows:—The senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Adams), the senior member for St. George (Mr. Springer), the junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. Mapp), the senior member for St. Philip (Mr. Crawford), the junior member for St. Philip (Mr. Garner), the junior member for St. James (Mr. Wilkinson), the senior member for St. James (Mr. Walcott), the senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Ward), the junior member for St. George (Mr. Dowding), and the junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker).

THE COLONIAL TREASURER'S (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Colonial Treasurer's Act, 1941 (1941-9).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—As the law stands at present, no person can be appointed to act as Colonial Treasurer unless he has been nominated by the House of Assembly and approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Sometime last year, the Colonial Treasurer was ill and members will remember that there was a bit of difficulty, inasmuch as the House, as far as I remember, was not sitting then, in making a temporary appointment. This Bill serves, in the first place, to correct that situation and make it possible for an acting appointment to be made in the event of the Colonial Treasurer becoming temporarily incapable of performing his duties through illness. Secondly, the House will note that there is a terrible misprint in the Colonial Treasurer's (Amendment) Act, 1941, (Section 1) and that Section has now been reprinted correctly. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am wondering really whether this is the ideal solution of the problem which was presented last year when the Colonial Treasurer, as the honourable member reminded us, fell ill. I am wondering whether we should give up our power, even temporarily, in this way. As is proposed by this Bill, it would be entirely a matter for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to appoint someone to act as Colonial Treasurer. If the Bill means what is intended that it should mean, namely, that this acting appointment in an emergency, should be made by the Governor with the approval of the House I will look on it with much more favour. Although this is only a temporary matter it may result in the prolonging of a decision of that sort. The Colonial Treasurer may be ill for 9 months and I do not think that the acting appointment should continue for that length of time without that approval of the House. I quite appreciate that it would be a matter of urgency and I am also wondering whether another way of dealing with the situation would not be to allow the Chief Clerk in the Treasury to perform the duties of Treasurer, in the absence or in the event of the illness of the Treasurer, with the approval of the Governor. Either of the suggestions which I have mentioned will be far preferable to the one contained in this Bill. We may have an instance of prolonged illness on the part of the Colonial Treasurer and we may have a man acting as Treasurer without the approval of the

House for as long as 8, 9 or 10 months. I suggest that the Government consider the alternatives which I have mentioned. I quite appreciate the necessity that something should be done to meet a situation of that sort when it arises but I do not regard this proposal as the ideal solution of the problem to which the honourable member referred.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am somewhat at a loss to think that the remarks of the junior member of St. Lucy should apparently fall on deaf ears. We seem to be anxious, because we are a Labour Government, to throw all our authority to the wind and I say that we should pay heed to what the honourable member has said. Suppose for the sake of argument a Governor takes it upon himself—because the Executive Committee is only an advisory body to the Governor who need not follow their advice—to appoint someone outside the Colonial Treasurer's Office who is most unsuited and put him to act as Colonial Treasurer in the illness of the Treasurer! Every now and then, somebody helps his friend. We have seen somebody taken from Harrison College and put to do work in the Colonial Secretary's Office, much to our disapproval and this sort of thing should not be allowed to go on; it may cause no end of trouble. I shall never agree to giving the Governor authority to appoint somebody to act as Colonial Treasurer without our approval.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. COX, SMITH, MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, and GALE.—9.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD.—11.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

SELECT COMMITTEES DISCHARGED.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the business of the afternoon, I discharge two Select Committees: the Select Committee appointed to recommend who shall be the respective members of the various Standing Committees and Boards, and the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Speech delivered at the opening of the Legislature.

REPLIES LAID.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—There are some Replies to Questions ready, and they will be laid by the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to Questions No. 2, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew; the Replies to Questions No. 11, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy; and the Replies to Questions No. 12, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. HAYNES: I ask that the Replies to my Questions be printed and circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Replies to Questions are always printed and circulated.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not propose to ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) so as to resume Government Business, so that if honourable members do not wish to discuss the Replies to any

Questions, I presume that we can proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business as it stands on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no Replies to Questions ready to be discussed, the House will proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ADDRESS *RE* ESTABLISHMENT OF SUB-POST OFFICE AT HASTINGS ROCKS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the motion for the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor requesting that steps be taken for the establishment of a Sub-post Office in the vicinity of Hastings Rocks, Christ Church. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph was speaking when the debate on the motion was postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: I seconded the motion in order to be able to speak with a view to having the further consideration of the Address postponed, but I do not know that I have any argument in favour of the Address. I should like to hear some arguments in favour of it. In any event, I shall not be voting for the Address. I just want to make it clear that I do not see any special argument for putting a Sub-post Office in that vicinity in preference to many other districts even in the same parish. It may be that the honourable senior member for Christ Church has a reason for singling out the vicinity of Hastings Rocks for this Sub-post Office rather than the other crowded parts of Christ Church.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the further consideration of this Address be postponed as the honourable senior member for Christ Church is not in his place.

Mr. WARD seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS *RE* DELETION OF PROVISION FOR PUPILS ENTERING FIRST AND SECOND GRADE SCHOOLS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. James.—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the deletion of the provision whereby parents are required to enter into a £5 Bond before pupils are admitted to First and Second Grade Schools.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—The Address reads as follows:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps that the provision in the several Schemes of Government for the first and second grade schools that no pupil shall be admitted to the School unless the parents or guardian of such pupil shall have become bound by obligation in writing to the Governing Body in the sum of five pounds, shall be deleted.

Some people have expressed their surprise that I should be the Mover of the passing of this Address when, during the last Session, I voted for this provision. I did not speak on the matter during the last Session. I listened very carefully and for many days to the arguments on both sides, to the arguments of the honourable senior member for St. Philip and those of the honourable senior member for St. George, backed by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, and I voted for the provision. Since then I have met a large number of parents and teachers.

and I have come to the conclusion that the arguments which were put forward by the honourable senior member for St. Philip were right. The honourable member felt that parents should not become bound in the sum of five pounds so that pupils should attend these First and Second Grade Schools for a period of five years. The honourable senior member for St. George felt that this provision should not cause any hardship, it would not be used to any extent, and it would not be enforced in extreme cases. If a provision like that is not going to be used to any extent, it seems to me that it is better to do away with it entirely, because it is causing an enormous amount of annoyance among both parents and teachers. Just over a year ago we had a very long debate on this question, and I do not think that it is necessary to repeat what was said on that occasion. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second the honourable member's motion. I am one of those persons who voted for this provision in the Schemes of Government for the first and second grade Schools last Session, but since then I have spoken with many parents and teachers, as the honourable member has done and it is their opinion that this particular Clause in the Schemes of Government for these Schools should be deleted. If these parents and teachers feel that it is detrimental to their interests to have this Clause remaining in the Schemes of Government for the Schools, I think that it is my duty to act as they would like me to act. As the honourable junior member for St. James has said, this matter has been the subject of much discussion during the last Session, and more during the Election period. I feel that the time has come when we should realize that something wrong has been done and it is my duty to bow and do what the people want me to do. I therefore have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the withdrawal of the Clause.

Mr. GARNER: I am very glad that I have not got to make any apology for having voted for the Clause during the last Session. I was strongly against it then, and I am still against it now. I think that it is a very good act on the part of the honourable proposer of this Address to have brought the matter before the House. As a matter of fact, if he had not brought up the matter, it would have been brought up just the same. During the Election period, the people were embittered about this matter and they wanted to know what honourable members were doing. Instead of allowing children to have the benefit of free secondary education, a barrier was being put against their getting secondary education! I am very glad that this matter has come before the House to-day. Free education is the order of the day, and it is incumbent on the Government to do the best for the inhabitants whenever it can do so. When you get these various barriers against the education of the people's children, that cannot do the community any good. I would be the last person in the world to prevent any boy or girl from acquiring adequate education. I say that this provision whereby parents are required to enter into a £5 bond before their children can enter the First and Second Grade Schools, bids fair to interfere with secondary education in this island. Some people are embarrassed by it: it is an iniquitous provision. Some parents will never be able to pay £5, and the stipulation is that if parents cannot keep their children in the Schools for a period of five years, they will have to forfeit the money. Some of these parents have never had £5 in all their lives. (A MEMBER: How do they pay school fees then?) It is true that they manage to pay the school fees, but some of them do not have the money. I hope that honour-

able members will see this matter in its true perspective and vote for the passing of this Address.

Mr. COX: I am supporting the passing of this Address. (Cheers). I regret that the honourable Mover of the passing of the Address did not introduce an amendment to the Schemes of Government for these Schools, and have the matter dealt with directly rather than have this Address passed. It will be remembered that when the Schemes of Government in relation to these Schools were being considered by this House, I did my best to have this particular Clause deleted, not because I felt that it would have caused a hardship on parents, but because I knew that people would be very much annoyed when they heard that their children would have to attend these schools for a period of five years, and I also felt that this Clause would have been misrepresented as it has been. The Party to which I belong got much criticism as a result of this Clause having been included in the Schemes of Government for the Schools. The honourable Mover of the passing of the Address was occupying a different position from that which he is occupying to-day when this Clause was passed on a casting vote, but as representatives of the people, the honourable Mover and Second of the passing of this Address did not realise at the time that the Clause would create a hardship on people as they now realise. If they had realised that, I am sure that the Clause would not have been passed. I can only characterise their position now as attempting to upset the present set-up and to make it appear to the people as if they are more or less interested in them just as much, and in some cases, more than the Labour Leaders. (A MEMBER: The Labour Leaders voted for it too). I would like to say that as far as this motion is concerned, I have not heard of any hardship having been created on anybody as a result of the working of this Clause. I am supporting the passing of this Address because I do not want people to be misled, and although the Clause cannot be any barrier in the way of children obtaining a secondary education. I think that it is best for every honourable member of this House to support the deletion of this Clause.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am voting for the passing of this Address on grounds different from those given by honourable members. I am voting for the Address because it is dangerous to allow that Clause to remain in the Schemes of Government for these First and Second Grade Schools. I feel that this Clause must definitely effect a hardship on many people of this colony, people whose children should have the opportunity of getting a secondary education. It is dangerous to allow this Clause to remain in these Schemes of Government for these Schools for this reason: let us take for instance a man who has five, six, seven or twelve children, as has been the case in this colony, and who, according to his means, wants to give his children some sort of secondary education; it is not merely a matter of obtaining certificates (Laughter) but it is a question of assimilating some culture, and that must be the principle behind acquiring some sort of secondary education. The school-leaving age as far as the elementary schools are concerned is fourteen years, and the age for entering the secondary schools is twelve years. This man's daughter must enter St. Michael's Girls' or some other secondary school at the age of twelve years, and according to the Regulations to-day, she must get through the school when she reaches eighteen years of age. Honourable members can quite see the hardship which will be created if the man has children two years apart. He might not be in a position to keep the first child at school for five years. Then he would like

the second child to have some sort of secondary education as well, and he sends her to school for some time, but because of this Regulation that a £5 bond has to be entered into, this man can be told "You have taken away your child from school within the period of five years, and you must pay this £5." I say that this is a dangerous provision because it denies parents the right of giving their children some sort of secondary education. I am one of those persons who cannot subscribe to the idea that if a child attend a secondary school, that must necessarily mean the acquiring of certificates; because many children who have entered the secondary schools have made good citizens without having acquired any certificates. I feel that this House should show their appreciation of this Address this afternoon by voting unanimously for it. This Clause should be taken out of the Schemes of Government for secondary schools because it is causing a certain amount of hardship. Mr. Speaker, I know of several cases in which, the moment that mention was made of this £5, the people realised that there was no chance of their second child attending a secondary school, because they had to keep the first one in school for five years or justify the reason for removing it. If a parent says that he was incapable of paying for his first child, I do not suppose that any Board of Management would be so unreasonable as to carry out the provisions as regards this £5 bond into effect. If a parent can only give a four-year course to his child, honourable members will see the hardship which will be effected on him. I have much pleasure in supporting this Address, and I hope that in the near future, the Government will see that the provision as regards this £5 bond is deleted.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—Before you put the question, I should like to say that a matter of this sort calls for sound and sober consideration on the part of honourable members. Some of us are prone to find fault with others and are saying that they have done wrong; but those of us who have not done wrong must first cast a stone. I am not attempting to impute any particular or ulterior motive to the Government for putting this bond in these Schemes, and I am not making any excuse for being away at the time; but I shall never vote for that. It cannot strike my mind that this £5 bond would make education freer or easier to acquire. I do not associate myself with remarks that because certain members belong to a certain Government it was a question of bad administration; I am saying that for the best part of this debate, nobody has yet got up with any brains and tried to justify it. It can never be justified. I have always heard that if Mohammed cannot go to the mountain, the mountain must be brought to Mohammed. That is to say, if the child cannot go to the High School, the High School must be brought to the child. (Laughter). Not only must the Government appear not to be doing wrong, but they must avoid the suspicion of doing wrong. I admonish honourable members who have been responsible for it, and I also take it that it was done with the best of motives; because the higher a person is educated, the higher he wants his brother to be educated; if he is educated. I, personally, with my smattering of education, often wonder how the chaps who cannot read or write get on. I do not offer any special bouquets to the honourable junior member for St. James for moving the passing of this Address as any special act of grace coming from the heart; I take it as an astute move to show his interest in the hope of moving it before other people can plunge into the hole. (Laughter). In associating myself with the Address, I cannot

but follow the words of the honourable senior member for the City, that there should be a unanimous vote for the passing of this Address. No person can make the discreet move of trying to justify the existence of a thing of this sort on the Statute Book.

Mr. TALMA: I have heard a lot of talk on this matter, but it needs but a few words. The position was clear to me not only to-day, but two years ago when this matter was first discussed. I was told that if you do not know anything about education, you must ask about it. Well, I am not asking anything to-day: I am convinced that what I said two years ago was absolutely correct *in toto*. I had much pleasure in protesting against the implementation of this £5 bond so far as the Foundation Schools are concerned, and I succeeded in getting that provision deleted in respect of these schools. I feel very happy to know that in respect of what I said two years ago, the majority of honourable members in this Chamber think it is absolutely correct to-day. (A MEMBER: Thank God for Talma.) I am glad to realise that members have seen their error. In spite of the fact that it is wrong to speak behind one's back, I say that the introduction of this £5 bond is one of the gravest errors made by the former Director of Education. As we move along, we will probably find that there are several other errors. The introduction of this bond will cause a poor individual, who is trying to do the best for his child, who is trying to give it a little better education, to feel that he cannot afford to send it to a secondary school. People do not quite understand what is meant by this bond. I say that this bond will serve as a deterrent against people sending their children to the secondary schools. They feel that they would try to send their children to these schools for as long a period as they can, but that will mean that they will have to pay this £5, and they cannot afford to do that. I am happy to see that the introduction of this bond into the Schemes of Government for these schools has been found to be unfair and inequitable, and even the members of the Conservative group are convinced that this is so, and are in agreement that this provision should be deleted.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I am supporting this Address. On the last occasion, I voted against the introduction of this £5 bond, and now that I happen to be a member of the Executive Committee, I do not see any reason why I should change my mind. (Hear hear.) I was opposed to it then and I am opposed to it to-day. I am voting for the passing of this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In expressing my unqualified endorsement of the passing of this Address, I do so with very great pleasure since it affords me the opportunity of redeeming the pledge which I made to the electorate three months ago. I think that I may be pardoned for drawing to the attention of the honourable senior member for the City, that remarks about not wanting to hear a single voice in opposition to the passing of this Address, were made in connection with those honourable members on my left who voted for the introduction of this £5 bond on the last occasion.

Mr. SPRINGER: Before the vote on this matter is taken, I should like to say that I have adopted the custom followed on this side of the House, namely, that members of the Government do not vote for Addresses to the Government. That is a sound principle which I hope will be continued. I welcome this Address for two reasons. As the honourable senior member for St. Michael has said, the inclusion of this £5 bond in the Schemes of Government for these First and Second Grade Schools has been fruitful of misunderstanding and propaganda, and I think it has done more harm than good to the community because it has been abused and misunderstood. That

stage having been reached, it will not serve any useful purpose to allow this provision to remain in the Schemes of Government for these schools. Another point is this; I am not at all convinced that this provision has worked any hardship, or can work any hardship on anybody. I would like to point out that, for many years now, under the Bursary Apprentices Act, the parents or guardians of all the apprentices have had to enter the same £5 bond for the same five-year period. That provision is still in existence, and it will never cause any hardship to anybody. Similarly, in this case, no hardship is likely to be worked. Nevertheless, I say that it is probably just as well that this provision should be removed now in view of the general abuse which has been meted out to it up and down the country during the last few months. Its association with the Schemes of Government for these schools is distinctly harmful in the minds of the people. I shall not vote for this Address, but I express my opinion of it as I think it should be expressed, since I am one of those who voted for the provision. I take it that the honourable junior member for St. James must have discovered the error of his ways and is now showing penitence. The honourable member was a member of the Executive when he voted for this provision at the time, and, as the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said, he is an astute politician. He recognizes that it is wise to shift one's sails to suit the wind.

Mr. BRANCKER: I did not intend to join in the discussion, but the hon. member who has just sat down has brought me to my feet. The hon. member has said that the introduction of this provision requiring parents or guardians to enter into this £5 bond before pupils can be admitted to these Schools, does not cause any hardship so far as he knows. That might be so, but I happen to know of certain specific instances in which a hardship has been worked. There are cases in which money was available for certain organizations to award scholarships to enable children to attend secondary schools. The money was available for this purpose but on account of the introduction of this £5 bond, no scholarships have been awarded because no one is willing to sign the necessary bond. Consequently, the money for awarding these scholarships has accumulated and is lying down there. There are other cases, too, in which hardships have been created. I admire the observation which has been made about the Leader of the Opposition, that he has discovered the error of his ways. However, I would put it somewhat differently: I would say that the Leader of the Opposition and his Colleagues have made careful perusal of the Congress manifesto at the last General Election (Laughter) and they at last have discovered what the people of this colony want. It is unnecessary for me to make a confession, as some hon. members have done. I am of the same opinion that this provision should never have been on the Statute Book. On the last occasion the present honourable Deputy Leader of the House rightly argued against its being put there.

Dr. CUMMINS: Like the hon. member who has just sat down, I did not think it necessary to speak on this matter because I voted against it on the last occasion. There are, however, one or two things which have caused me to rise to my feet. First of all, when the hon. senior member for St. George spoke about the bursaries, it was said *sotto voce* that they are free. So also are exhibitions to these Secondary Schools. (A MEMBER: We are not dealing with exhibitions). There are exhibitions which give children the right to attend these Secondary Schools. What I really want to say is this: the

hon. junior member for St. Lucy referred just now to children not being able to take advantage of examinations. I think the hon. member spoke of examinations whereby exhibitions are awarded by certain organizations, and he blames the £5 bond for the state of affairs, because he says that there is no one in the organization who is willing to sign this bond. I should like to point out to the hon. member that this bond is signed by parents or guardians—not by members of any organizations—and I know that it is not signing of this £5 bond which causes these children not to sit the examinations so as to enter the Schools. I think that it is a bit misleading to give that impression, and that is why I got to my feet. There are other conditions governing the entrance to the schools that cause the difficulty.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. junior member for St. James to present this Address.

Mr. WILKINSON: As Your Honour pleases.

ADDRESS RE ESTABLISHMENT OF SUB-POST OFFICE AT HASTINGS ROCKS.

Mr. TALMA: I ask leave to proceed with the first Order of the Day, consideration of which was postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member will have to make a definite motion, that this Order be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to move that Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. GARNER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the motion for the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor requesting that steps be taken for the establishment of a Sub-post Office in the vicinity of Hastings Rocks, Christ Church. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking when further debate on the motion was postponed. The hon. member is not in the House.

Mr. GALE: I think that there is the necessity for a Sub-post Office in a district like Hastings. This is a large residential district, and we know that the General Post Office is very congested. When people go to Bridgetown in order to buy stamps and have their letters posted, they have to wait for a long time in queues. If we have more Post Offices about the country for the benefit of people who live in big residential districts, that will relieve the pressure in the General Post Office. As the position is at present, people have to catch the buses, with some inconvenience, to come to Bridgetown for the purpose of posting letters. I repeat that if there are Post Offices in the big residential districts, that will relieve the pressure in the General Post Office.

Dr. CUMMINS: I think I know the Hastings district very well, and I do not see the necessity for a Sub-post Office in the vicinity of Hastings Rocks. A post box is there already. Higher up, in the Worthing district, there is a post box near the St. Lawrence border. Hastings Rocks is about two miles long letters. I repeat that if there are Subpost Offices there and then another one further up, we will soon have an overflow of Sub-post Offices in that district. I really do not see the necessity for this Sub-post Office there, and I cannot vote for this Address.

Mr. COX: I find myself in the same position as the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. The honourable member has pointed out that this

district is about two miles from Bridgetown, and there is a post box there. Within another mile and a half or mile and a quarter, there is another post box and I cannot see the necessity for erecting a Sub-post Office just for the accommodation of just a few people. I would suggest that the site for this Sub-post Office is in the district of St. Patrick's where it will accommodate not only the people in Christ Church, but also the people of St. Philip. Another site I would suggest is St. Christopher's Village going towards Silver Sands where there are many poor people residing, people who find it difficult to get near a Post Office to post their letters. If that were done, we would be doing something in the interest of a large number of unfortunate people, rather than in the interest of a few fortunate people in the Hastings area. There are post boxes all around the hotels in that district and they can be used by these people. I repeat that I cannot see the necessity for asking the Government to spend a large sum of money merely for the accommodation of a few rich people. I suggest that this Address be amended with a view of asking that Sub-post Offices be erected in those areas where they are mostly needed.

Mr. RAMSAY: I do not see how I could really, sincerely and truthfully vote for this Address, and my reason for not voting for it is that this Sub-post Office will serve the rich people. Some of us are worried about the rich people, but I am not worried about them. I do not think that the purpose of this Sub-Post Office is quite ideal. I have not heard any arguments adduced in favour of it—unfortunately for me, I was not in the House when the honourable senior member for Christ Church explained the position. I think that what the honourable member ought to do is to ask for more post boxes. If there is a post box at each hotel, the Marine, the Balmoral and so on, that would facilitate the posting of letters and there would not be any overflowing. That would be quite alright. If you went to a big country, you will see post boxes every hundred yards apart. You do not see so many Post Offices, and there is the opportunity for selling stamps and so on. If the people in the Hastings district are really suffering, they ought to get some person in the district to sell stamps so that they can buy stamps and put their letters in the post box. On the other hand, there are machines from which you can get stamps; let the Government bring in more of them. I suggest to the honourable member that he should amend his Address and ask for more of these stamp-vending machines. I am not saying that this is a political move although I think so, but I cannot see that any useful purpose can be served in asking this Government to erect a Sub-post Office in Hastings. We all know the Hastings district, paying four cents as bus fare will put you there. I do not see that any real case has been made out that the people in Hastings are suffering any hardship. I am advising this House not to vote for this Address, I do not see that it is necessary. The honourable senior member for St. Michael has suggested that a Sub-post Office should be erected at St. Patrick's; if a Sub-post Office could be put there, it will serve a very useful purpose, being eight or nine miles from Bridgetown. The poor people can use this Post Office but I do not think that it is right to put a Post Office in Hastings district where the buses run every five minutes. I do not see that any argument can be adduced in favour of it. I prefer to have post boxes placed every hundred yards in the Hastings district for the purpose of posting mails, and when it is a question of sending a heavy package, the people up there can catch a bus which will take no more than fifteen

minutes down and back up again. I am very sorry, but I cannot vote for this Address.

Mr. TALMA: The more I listen to the honourable members on my right, the more I am convinced that they know nothing about Christ Church, and probably they never will. (Laughter). The honourable senior member for St. Michael has made the point that if it was suggested that this Sub-post Office should be erected at St. Patrick's, he would be more in favour of that; but he is not in favour of putting it in the Hastings district where the wealthy people live. I would like to be able to teach the honourable member some of this parish. We are not trying to help the wealthy people; we are trying to help the tourists. Barbados is a tourist resort, and Hastings happens to be the gallery of Barbados. There are no fewer than ten hotels in this district, they are becoming jammed and transportation is not at all good. Why should we inconvenience our own people in getting to Bridgetown? This is a question of accommodating the tourists, and not only the tourists, but the wealthy, middle and lower classes. If those honourable members on my right knew anything about Hastings, they would know how to value that district; their arguments do not hold good at all. We are not accommodating the wealthy classes alone; I happen to represent the people who are in the lower brackets, and I repeat that, in this matter, we are accommodating all classes of people.

The question that this Address do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, GALE, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD.—10.

Noes: Messrs. RAMSAY, SMITH, COX, MAPP and Dr. CUMMINS—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, ten honourable members voting "Aye", and five honourable members voting "No". I will ask the honourable senior member for Christ Church to present this Address.

Mr. TALMA: As Your Honour pleases.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to resume Government Business. I should like to inform the House that the Government Business with which I propose to deal is Order No. 8 on the Order Paper—a Bill to amend the Governor's Act. In view of the fact that the Governor is due to arrive on Saturday, and some unpleasant remarks or perhaps harsh criticisms may be made, I am suggesting that we deal with this Bill this afternoon rather than wait until next Tuesday or subsequently. I think that the House will agree with me that it is more fitting to deal with the Bill this afternoon.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended in order to resume Government Business.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

GOVERNOR'S (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The next Order of the Day was called,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890-5.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to take charge of the Order.

Mr. ADAMS: Honourable members are in possession of a Message from His Excellency the Acting Governor embodying the substance of a letter sent to him by the present Secretary of State for the Colonies dealing with the advisability, from the point of view of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, of giving consideration to the addition of a further charge against the public funds of certain items of expenditure incurred by the Governor in addition to his salary. The Message from the Acting Governor is pretty full: it incorporates very nearly everything that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has recommended and all the arguments are therein set out. I suggest to honourable members that, irrespective of popular clamour, irrespective of the traditional habit of feeling that it is the duty of legislators to hit at governors, it is our duty to weigh the matter in the light of cold reason and see whether a case has not been made out for the proposed increase. I am perhaps fortunate to the extent of having to say to-day exactly what I said in the last Assembly when the recommendations of the Cuke Committee were before the Assembly, and the proposal to increase the Governor's salary met with great opposition in some quarters but, eventually, was made. Every argument that could be adduced in favour of increasing the salaries of members of the public service could be adduced in favour of increasing the salary of the Governor; but this is not a proposal to increase the salary of the Governor. As the Secretary of State for the Colonies has pointed out, the general rise over the past few years in the cost of living, and the universal tendency for salaries and wages to increase, have made it necessary for him to undertake a general review of the emoluments of Colonial Governors, including the official salary and allowances of the Governor of Barbados. That is a general review by the present Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Creech Jones and not by some Peer of the realm who wants to help his friend who has a Governorship in the Colonies; and it has come to us in the same manner as he would send it to any other colonial government. It has not arisen from the brains of the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Acting Governor of this island. It is pointed out that in 1933 the House gave consideration to this matter, and in the light of the then prevailing circumstances, the Governor's salary was brought from £2,500 to £3,000 per annum, while the duty allowance remained at £500 per annum. It is suggested that while the salary should be left as at present, the duty allowance should be increased from £500 to £1,000 per annum. To quote from the letter from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, this is what he says:

"In the light of present-day conditions, I am of the opinion that the total emoluments of the Governor now need further consideration, and I suggest that, while the salary should be left as at present, the duty allowance should be increased from £500 to £1,000 per annum. This would be, in my opinion, an appropriate adjustment in the light of the expenses of the office in present circumstances and in relation to the emoluments of other governorships. It would also make more suitable provision than at present for the necessary expenses of the officer required to administer the Government during the absence from the Colony of the Governor himself."

I would like to remind honourable members that the Colonial Secretary, who may have to act as

Governor during the Governor's absence from the Colony, receives a salary at the rate of one-half the difference between the salary of the substantive Office and the salary of the Governor. That has always met with the approval of the Legislature. The Secretary of State for the Colonies goes further and suggests that consideration should be given to certain other items of expenditure which are accepted by most Colonial Governments as a proper charge upon Colonial revenues, but which, in Barbados, the Governor is required to meet from his own resources. It is the generally recognised practice to admit as a charge against public funds expenditure towards the purchase and upkeep of a motor car, or, if necessary, more than one motor car, for the Governor's use, and also the greater portion of the expenses of the domestic staff employed at Government House, leaving as a charge to be met by the Governor the wages of those servants only who attend to the private and personal needs of himself and his family. The Secretary of State then hopes that favourable consideration to these views may be given by the Legislature. I ask honourable members whether they be Conservative, Labour or what not, whether, as a matter of fact, they are not agreed however much they may be like myself in 1944 and even to-day, dissatisfied with the rates of pay in the lower branches of Civil Service—I ask them whether they do not think that a Governor, whoever he may be—we hope to have a Socialist Governor out and out—who has to maintain the dignity of the position of Governor and has to provide entertainment of a sort and on a scale which does not fall to the lot of any other man in this colony, should not be given this increased allowance? Let me repeat, although I hope that it is unnecessary to do it, that when the Cuke Committee debate was taking place not even the honourable senior member for St. Philip was more strongly in opposition to the Government's proposals in respect of the lower grades of employees, than I was, and I say that I still take the view that two wrongs do not make a right. The Executive Committee have agreed with the Secretary of State for the Colonies that the Governor's salary should remain where it is, but they have agreed to send down this recommendation to the House for an increased allowance. We were strongly moved, in fact we agreed to grant this extra £500, by a consideration of the fact that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has recommended that the salary should remain where it is, that the duty allowance should be increased and, in addition, that there should be something given in respect of the servants that are on the regular staff as distinct from those who minister to the private needs of the Governor, and a motor car. We have not gone as far as the Secretary of State for the Colonies has gone; no one could fail to be moved by the fact that over and above what we grant in the Estimates for the permanent staff at Government House, the Governor pays £300 per annum to his servants. Personally, I feel that that amount is too little to pay the staff up there. I hope I cause no offence, but let us reflect, let the most radical member of the House reflect, we would not like to see the Governor underpay his servants. Although the rates of pay are not Trade Union rates, it still costs the Governor £300 a year for his servants and there is much in the argument of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I suggest to honourable members that if they refuse to grant this increase when they have heard the facts, they would be wilfully carrying this Barbadian anti-governor feeling to ridiculous lengths. We would be telling the Governor "You are spending over and above

what has been granted in the Estimates, you are spending £300 a year towards the servants; you have a duty allowance of £500 and you must make the best out of £200 with the number of persons who call at Government House and who expect to be provided for by the Governor." This is a point which I would like to stress very much. You are asking the Governor to meet the people of Barbados and this extra allowance should be granted for what is to my mind of great importance, the giving of parties. I hate parties myself, but this allowance would be used by the Governor in giving entertainment to certain classes in the community, not the members of the Savannah Club alone but also the man in the street and the agricultural labourer in the country. I say that publicly because I wish it to be known to holders of the office that I, for one, and I have no doubt that others look upon the office of Governor as a position of great responsibility and with the train of events in this colony and throughout the West Indies, it is the duty of the Governor to meet the inhabitants of the colony to meet all classes of the people as often as possible in order that he might know at first hand what they are like, let alone what they feel. That has not always been done in the past. I would like to remind honourable members that the salary of the Governor of Barbados, when this was the seat of Government of the Windward Islands, was £4,000 a year. I can almost quote the speech which I made when the Cuke Committee debate was taking place. In 1885, when the Windward Islands were separated from Barbados, the salary of the Governor was £3,000 per annum, Mr. Speaker, and that was sixty years ago. Anybody can see that £3,000 in 1885 is not worth the same as to-day. (A MEMBER: What was the revenue?) The revenue was £383,000 and to-day it is one million pounds. Three thousand pounds in 1885 must be in the neighbourhood of nine thousand pounds to-day. I do not say that we should make the salary nine thousand pounds, but that we let the salary remain at £3,000, and that it is not too much to ask for this increased allowance. I do not think that it is extravagant—it does not seem so to me—to ask for something with which to pay the servants at Government House. If we pass this Bill to-day, we are doing bare, simple justice to the holder of the office. I hope that honourable members will be moved as I was moved; whatever my feeling in the matter was, when I heard of that £300 per annum being paid by the Governor to the servants, that would have persuaded me to vote for the Bill if nothing else. I commend that to the House and suggest that we should pass this Bill irrespective of any consideration as to whether this or that particular person in the Civil Service may not, in our minds, be getting enough. I say, let us do justice here as in any other branch of the Civil Service. When it comes to the Head of the Administration let us not say that we are not doing the same thing for the holder of the office of Chief Executive as we have done for the junior members of the Civil Service. The question of the motor car is not in this Bill, but the House has been notified that the Executive proposes that a car should be provided. In some places in the Colonial Service, a car or two, or in some cases three cars are provided for the use of the Governor. The car is our car just as Government House is our Government house.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that it is better to leave out the question of the car.

Mr. ADAMS: I was merely anticipating every possible objection. I suggest that the dignity of Government House be maintained. When we go abroad and see the dignity attached to Government

Houses and the amount voted in the Estimates for their upkeep and the salaries paid to Governors, sometimes we feel proud and sometimes we feel ashamed of our position in Barbados. That is to say that there are some Government Houses which are rather barns even although the Governor's salary is on a par with ours and he has a motor car. There are others which are elaborate and we may sometimes think that ours is not up to that standard. I further suggest to honourable members that we should not make it appear to the Colonial Office and to possible holders of the office of Governor that we are dealing with a matter of this sort in a way which is merely traditional. I have mentioned that the salary of the Governor of Barbados was £4,000 a year, and then it was £3,000 and it remained there down to the period when there was retrenchment. It was then £2,500 and £500 a year as duty allowance. That continued, as honourable members are aware, until £500 was added to the salary during the last Session as a result of the recommendations of the Cuke Committee. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. The Bill seeks to amend Sub-section (2) of Section 2 of the Principal Act by deleting the words "five hundred pounds" and substituting therefor the words "one thousand pounds."

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I have listened with great care to the observations of the honourable and learned Introducer of this Bill to amend the Governor's Act in the hope that I might have discovered some cogent reason why I should depart from the point of view, at which I have already arrived, in connection with this amending Bill during my deliberation on it before I came to this House. The honourable Introducer of the Bill seems to be obsessed with the idea that we, Barbadians, will oppose by every conceivable argument or even subterfuge, any attempt which is made to increase the salary of the Governor out of a sheer spirit of opposition. The honourable member refers to what he alleges is the traditional attitude of members of the Legislature to hit at Governors, and seems to suggest that that attitude will find itself present in this Chamber to-day; and in consequence, that this Bill may not receive the wholehearted support which he would like. I do not know if my voice will be the only dissentient one in respect of this increase; I must congratulate the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the astuteness of his advisers who have put it to him not to ask for an increase in the salary of the office for fear that might have an unfortunate fate, bearing in mind how the debate went on the last occasion—the 5th of September, 1944—in this House when nine honourable members voted for increasing the salary by £500, and seven voted against it. It happens by a mere coincidence to-day that it is now proposed to seek an increase of £500 in the duty allowance. Honourable members will remember that on that occasion the seven honourable members were—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that there is any necessity to say who the seven honourable members were.

Mr. BRANCKER: This debate to which I am referring is a debate in a previous Session of the House; if you rule it out of order—

Mr. SPEAKER: I know that; I do not object to it, but to-day we are discussing the allowance, not the salary.

Mr. BRANCKER: Peculiarly enough, on that occasion we were also discussing the amount of £500 in respect of the officer holding this office. I was moved to refer to that debate because there are certain arguments which were advanced by certain members on that occasion, arguments which are really well worth reading to-day. I think that it might be helpful to-day in arriving at their point of view in respect of this £500 if it were recalled to the minds of those honourable members what they said on that occasion. I will not mention the names of those seven honourable members who voted against this increase of £500 in the salary, in deference to your expressed wish, Mr. Speaker. I was particularly impressed on that occasion by a few remarks by the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I am sorry that the honourable member is not here at the moment. The honourable member said this: "Why therefore, when the matter is being publicly aired in this House, not a member of the Executive Committee present in the Chamber to-day, other than the senior member for St. James, would get up and lend his voice in support of it? (Cheers)."

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not making any argument one way or the other; he is only quoting what was said.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am quoting that as the strongest possible argument to be used on this occasion. I will make it very brief, Mr. Speaker. The honourable senior member for St. Philip went on: "Apart from him, we actually have to-day two other members of the Executive Committee in this Chamber and they have been conspicuous by their silence. It is not too late to hope that honourable members might hear from them some little justification of the position before us. Now, I am totally in agreement with the remarks of the previous speakers, with the exception, of course, of the senior member for St. James." I will not refer any longer to what was said on that occasion. We are now dealing with the proposed duty allowance increase and not with the salary increase. This point arises, Mr. Speaker, and I noticed that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph seemed to have anticipated that some of us would refer to the question of entertainment which takes place at Government House, as we know it in Barbados. In some of the other West Indian Islands in which duty allowance is provided for this office, everybody is entertained—whom we would call in the vernacular—Tom, Dick and Harry; but we find that, in this colony, we provide this duty allowance and only a select few as they would regard themselves, are invited to Government House except on special occasions when members of the Legislature are entertained there. Except for those occasions, entertainment at Government House in Barbados has been provided only for certain people. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made mention of the Savannah Club; of course the honourable member has tried to persuade us that the entertainment allowance of the Governor was inadequate, and that is why other people were not entertained. (Mr. ADAMS: I have not suggested any such thing). If the amount of this duty allowance is increased, we would be asked to believe that future Garden Parties at Government House will be what they should be—Parties to which persons of every class in the community, anybody however poor, however humble, of whatever colour, provided that they are well behaved will be admitted in large numbers. (A MEMBER: Are you well behaved?) That is the whole point as regards this duty allowance. The honourable senior mem-

ber for St. Joseph has mentioned the sum of £300, which he says is paid annually to the servants at Government House, and he suggests that we should increase this duty allowance because of the payment of this sum, and because there is not sufficient money left to carry on running the establishment, having regard to the status the dignity and prestige of the Representative of the Imperial Crown. I think that what is more necessary to be impressed is that the Representative of the Imperial Crown should see that the kind of legislation which he sends down is in the interest of the vast majority of the people of this colony, not merely the extravagant elaborate style or mode of living of the Officer, the sumptuousness of his living and the extravagance of his entertainment. What we are concerned about is what the Officer does for the poor people of this colony during his regime here. If he does sufficient good, the community is bound to be a happy one, and he will have achieved the purpose for which the Colonial Office has sent him. The days are far gone when we could be impressed merely by the sumptuousness of the Governor's living and the magnificence of his entertainment; it is by the legislation which he sends down that we are impressed—legislation which is in the interest of every type of individual. Mr. SPEAKER, a voice which sounds like that of a lawyer-politician is attempting to interpolate, but I will pass on and treat that as it should be treated.

Mr. SPEAKER, you did not allow the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to deal with paragraph 2 of the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill, and I entirely agree with Your Honour's ruling. It was at least fair to the House for the Executive to give a foretaste of what would be coming afterwards. Five hundred pounds a year, there may be another car soon asked for and so on down the line. Anyhow, we cannot deal with that now. The sum of £300 per annum was mentioned as the cost of the domestic staff at Government House. When you come to think of it, there are about a dozen servants there and this sum does not suggest that they are magnificently remunerated. That sum is not very much in excess of what a large number of households in this colony are called upon to pay. The honourable member has put the cost of the servants in pounds for a year; of course, he points out that these figures are inadequate. The sum of £300 a year is by no means excessive or enough considering the number of members of the staff and what they have to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph only quoted what the expenditure was, but did not say whether it was adequate or not.

Mr. BRANCKER: Three hundred pounds per annum amounts to \$120 per month. That might seem to be a lot of money, but there are many households in this island who pay between \$60 and \$80 per month to their domestic servants, and that is paid out of their own incomes. It is implied that this amount is paid out of the Governor's duty allowance; irrespective of anybody else's salary, their servants are paid out of that salary. The honourable member's argument would be one for increasing the salary; it is not an argument for increasing the allowance. It seems to me that nothing more or less than a subtle attempt is being made to increase the total emoluments of the office of the Governor, and I do not feel that we are justified in doing this at this present stage. One reads in a section of the local Press that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has advised us to pass this Bill. The Secretary of State for the Colonies may be able

to dictate to newspaper editors but not to the Legislature of Barbados as it is at present constituted. I suggest to this House that we view this matter dispassionately, consider to what amount this increase will bring the total emoluments of the office of the Governor of this colony, having regard to the cost of living and the remuneration which is paid to other members of the Civil Establishment. I do not think that it is right, reasonable, just or equitable to attempt to increase the emoluments paid to the Governor, having regard to the grossly inadequate scale of wages paid to the humblest government servants in this island. The position may be likened to a ladder; we have from the topmost rung down to the bottom rung, and their scales remuneration must all bear some reasonable relation to each other. The topmost rung must bear a reasonable relation to the one immediately below it; there is the Governor, the Colonial Secretary, the Assistant Colonial Secretary and so down the ladder. To do what has been asked for in this Bill would be to put this office of Governor for too high above the other offices in this colony. The fact that you are paying more duty allowance to the Governor does not mean that you are going to get a better type of man for this colony, (Cheers). I suppose that there are many of us who would have liked a Harold Laski or a D. N. Pritt in connection with the office of Governor of this colony, but we were disappointed. (A MEMBER: Why not say Sir Oswald Moseley?) The mere fact that we are paying more money does not necessarily mean that we will get a better type of man. That certainly applies to the person at the bottom rung of the ladder; it does not necessarily mean that we will get a better or a worse type of man. It is a matter entirely in the hands of Providence as to whether we will be fortunate in getting our prayers answered. This Bill has been presented to us to-day, but I feel that it does not justify our support and our passing it. Mr. SPEAKER, what happened only recently in this Assembly is fresh in our minds; honourable members will remember that we have decided in respect of other officers that we would pay them a cost of living bonus, which, in this case, would be £140 a year of \$56 per month at the maximum. Everything is included in the cost of living. The humblest of us entertain, but we entertain according to our means and station in life. It might be said that the colony can afford this proposed increase in this duty allowance; how much more then can this colony afford to pay an adequate salary to the subordinate employees at the bottom of the ladder, those employees who do not get a cost of living bonus or anything of the sort? We have been asked to pay this extra increase to the Governor, and I must record my vote against it because I do not feel that we are justified in paying this increase by way of duty allowance to the Head of the Administration at the present time.

Mr. MAPP: On the face of it, a good case has been made out by the Leader of the House. He knows at first hand the conditions that exist at Government House, conditions which make it necessary for this Bill to be introduced. The Secretary of State for the Colonies must consider the needs of the Governor in relation to his needs and what he must spend on entertainments, servants, and so on; but I feel that in this matter a rebuff should be administered to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. (Cheers). I am not convinced by the arguments of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. When the honourable member admits that the staff at Government House is not being properly paid that is a very good case for increasing the

allowance to the Governor. Another point is this; as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, the cost of living has gone up and the Governor has to entertain visitors here. I think, therefore, that a good case has been made out for supporting this Bill. I am not yet in a mood to be convinced by the argument that two wrongs can make a right. We have been told that this colony cannot afford to do this or that; the colony cannot afford to increase the salaries of the members of the Civil establishment. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy has reminded us that the salaries of those who are at the top of the ladder must bear some reasonable relation to the salaries of those at the bottom, but again I do not consider that two wrongs can make a right. We have been told that the expenditure of the colony bears too heavy a relation to the revenue and using the same argument can we not see that if we increase the allowance to the Governor, we will also increase the total expenditure of the colony out of proportion to what it should be? There is this comparison which can be made in respect of the Governor's salary; the salary of the Governor of the Virgin Islands is \$10,000 a year, and there again he has to provide entertainment and pay his servants. The Virgin Islands are very much smaller than this island. I do not see that even if the salaries of the Governors of other British Colonies have been increased that can be made an argument for increase in respect of the Governor of Barbados. As I have already said the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made out a good case, and we cannot blame either the members of the Executive or the Secretary of State for the Colonies. However, as a representative of the people of this colony, I feel that a rebuff should be administered to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, letting him know that on many occasions when increases have been asked for on behalf of the Civil Servants—the Governor is also a Civil Servant—it has been said that they cannot get any increases because the colony cannot afford it, but now we are asked to pass this Bill. I feel that unless the members of the Executive can bring some overpowering reasons in support of this Bill, I shall find myself voting against it.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I have listened to the arguments of the honourable member for St. Joseph, but he has not convinced me that this allowance should be increased. I regard this allowance in the same way as salary, because in days gone by, papers had to be sent down to prove that this allowance was spent. That is not done nowadays. It is said that comparisons are odious, but we have to compare this little island with the rest of the West Indies. (Cheers). If we go into the figures as regards Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados, we will find this: Jamaica's revenue is twenty-eight million dollars a year, Trinidad's is twenty-nine million and Barbados is only six and one-half million. If we consider these figures and also the salary which we are paying the Governor at present, we will find that we are paying him three times as much in proportion to what Jamaica and Trinidad are paying their Governors. Jamaica has an area of 4,207 square miles—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member arguing that the allowance should be based on these calculations?

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am dealing with the Governor's salary and I am making comparisons. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph made comparisons with other West Indian Islands, and I am also making comparisons with other West Indian Islands.

Jamaica has an area of 4,207 square miles, Trinidad and Tobago, 1,800 square miles and little Barbados, 166 square miles. How can you expect us to pay the same amount of salary to the Governor of Barbados as is paid to the Governors of these big colonies? That would be comparing the manager of a rum shop at Pie Corner with the Managing Director of Fogarty's Limited. You cannot expect to pay the same thing in each case. I consider that, in comparison with the salaries paid to Governors of other West Indian Islands, the salary of the Governor of Barbados should be reduced instead of being increased. The salary attached to this office is £3,000 per annum, with a duty allowance of £500. The Governor gets everything for his use duty free which will amount to about £175 to £200 per annum, and his furniture, linen and glassware are provided for him. He has a chauffeur, who, I understand, is supplied from the Police Force and he is provided with a palatial residence. I have visited other Colonies, and I think that this residence can be compared with any in the West Indies. I am not taking into consideration the fact that the Governor is given £236 for the upkeep of gardens, and I am told that he has to keep more gardeners than he would keep otherwise; he is provided with £70 for lighting, £50 for water and with practically everything and he can afford to pay his servants. All of us have to pay our servants, so that there is nothing in the argument of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. I cannot follow his argument at all. My mentality might be a little low (Laughter) but if you take all of the Governor's emoluments, they will amount to over £4,000. If we grant him this additional £500, he will receive an income of about £8,000 per annum. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and myself were in this position, Mr. Clairmonte would have to tax us on that income. I would like to know how this Labour Government can sit here and take the taxpayers' money and the Customs Duties to increase the Governor's salary. If we grant this proposed increase the Governor would be in the bracket where income tax at 13/6 in £ is collected. But he pays no income tax. Let us take other Heads of Departments of the Civil Service; the Chief Justice receives £1,400 per annum the Colonial Secretary, £1,300 the Director of Education, £1,000, and all these gentlemen pay Income Tax! If the Governor cannot live on his salary, what are these gentlemen to do? I say nothing of the poor little fellows who receive £100 and £150 a year. I cannot see that any case has been made out for this increase. If we go further and consider the Prime Minister of England—I am only showing the ridiculous position in which this Labour Government wishes to place this little colony. The Prime Minister of England receives £10,000, but he has to pay Income Tax and when that is taken out from him, he actually receives £3,485. I think that, with this proposed increase of £500, we had better ask Mr. Attlee to come down here and get this job because it is a much better job than the one which he has. (Laughter). I expected that a much stronger case would have been made out in support of this proposed increase. As regards the question of responsibility, the Governor of Barbados has no such responsibility as the Governor of Trinidad which is a Crown Colony. The latter has the deciding vote in the House. The previous Governor of Barbados changed the appointment of the members of the Executive Committee so that this House should have more responsibility, not less. He said that the House wants more responsibility but here we are

asking for less responsibility and more money. (A MEMBER: Where is the responsibility less?) The two things do not agree at all; the House must be a more responsible body than before. When it comes to the question of the work of this island, the Colonial Secretary has to do it; the Governor has responsibility as the Head of the Administration, but he does not do the work. He signs documents. (A MEMBER: Like the manager of a plantation). The manager of a plantation has not got to do as much work as the overseer, but his salary is in much closer relation to that of the overseer than the salary of the Governor is to that of the Colonial Secretary. The Colonial Secretary receives £1,300 a year and pays Income Tax while the Governor receives £3,500 and pays no Income Tax or Customs Duties! A Colonial Secretary, who once acted as Governor, said that the officer up there is like the Pope in the Vatican; he had nothing to do except to curse or bless a few people who visited him. I am very pleased to note that no Governor is here at present and that no personalities have been brought into this debate. I am not speaking against any individual who comes here as Governor, but he has nothing as much work to do as other Governors have to do. Last week we considered the question of cost of living allowances and granted the allowances and if this Bill had the object of granting a cost of living allowance of £140 to the Governor which is the maximum amount, I consider that it would have been perfectly in order. These allowances will be taken off as soon as conditions change but this £500 allowance to the Governor will never be taken off. Do not let us vote for this increase of salary. In 1944 the House increased the Governor's salary by £500 and at that time several members asked why it was not made an allowance. (A MEMBER: I did.) Nothing was wrong with the allowance in those days, but something is wrong with it to-day! I am hoping that things will come down and not go up. I would like to ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to read the Secretary of State's despatch in detail and not merely quote from it. I would like it to become a document of the House; it should have been sent to this House so that honourable members could see it. I do not think that this House is properly conversant with the conditions of the working classes in this island. I ask honourable members, before I sit down, to remember this point; Barbados is paying for a Governor three times as much as what the other West Indian Colonies are paying for their Governors, and if we go into the figures, we will find that his salary is between £7,000 and £8,000 per annum. Can honourable members sit around this Table to-day and agree to increase this allowance? Several honourable members have said that they could not increase the salary of anybody from £700 to £1,000 per annum and I do not see how they can conscientiously say that the salary of a person who is getting £8,000 per annum should be increased. This duty allowance is salary. I beg to move that the words "be now read a second time" of the motion be deleted and the words "be rejected" be inserted in place thereof.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second the motion made by the honourable member who has just sat down. In doing so, I would like to say that I do not think that the members of this House have realised all the benefits enjoyed by the Governor of this Island. I do not think that my colleague has sufficiently emphasized the point in connection with the Customs duties. If

you turn to the Customs Tariff Act, 1921—3 under the head "Exemptions from duty," you will find this: "All articles for the use of the Governor of this island." "The Governor, purchasing any articles whatsoever, shall be entitled to have the duty refunded to him out of the Public Treasury." Now, Sir, that means that the Governor gets all his crockery free of duty for this entertainment. Another big item is the duty on gasoline; I think that I am correct in saying that the duty on gasoline is more than one-half of the cost of the gasoline. I am not in any way opposed to the Governor providing entertainment and if the occasion arises, I shall be willing to vote an extra amount for him. I think that it is unfortunate that this Bill should have been sent down at this time. When we are going into the question of revising the salaries of the Civil Servants, I feel that that would be the proper time to consider making an alteration in the Governor's salary or duty allowance. Government House is a big place, and I quite agree that it must require a considerable amount of money for its upkeep; but, on the other hand, from the figures given by my colleague, it would appear that our Governor is getting more than the Prime Minister of England. We call ourselves "Little England" and we cannot expect to be bigger than "Big England" (Laughter). I think that this is the wrong time to make any alteration in the salary or the duty allowance of the Administrator of this island. If it were so, that a Bill was sent down with the object of giving the Administrator the full £140 which is the maximum amount fixed as a cost of living bonus until the salaries are revised, I, too, would have agreed with it. Probably it was thought quite rightly that it is too petty to send down a Resolution for the Governor. I beg to second the motion of my colleague.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—Before the question is put, I should like to say that I sat most patiently and listened most attentively to the remarks of honourable members, and I want to counsel honourable members, that this is Barbados. Mr. SPEAKER, I am not in the class of a Governor, neither do I presume to know the works of a Governor. I have given governors much trouble. (Laughter). I have been to Government House with many deputations and I consider that the Governor has a tremendous responsibility; it cannot be lightly taken over. Honourable members must remember that the debates in this Chamber will be recorded; most of what we say will be recorded and our grandchildren will have the opportunity to read them. They must not think little of their forefathers. Do not let us pay much attention to the honourable junior member for St. Lucy who says that paying more money does not always mean that you are getting a better type of man. The honourable member has made mention of some names and I wondered why he did not mention Sir Oswald Moseley. (Laughter). Let us be sober and get down to rock bottom. The honourable member engaged in his profession will take his emoluments into account. The better they are, the better he will feel, the better he will sleep and the better he will enjoy himself.

If we want to get a real Governor, we must, in truth and in fact put the salary in keeping with that of other Governors. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy was arguing this morning in connection with the low salaries of the secondary school teachers in St. Peter and St. Lucy, and held that they should receive the same salaries as the teachers in St.

Michael, because they all had the same qualifications. I am using the same argument. Barbados is 21 miles by 14 but we cannot deal with the size of the place in considering this matter. If we pay this duty allowance to the Governor, naturally he will feel better. The honourable junior member for St. James has argued that this allowance should be £140 instead of £500; but honourable members must be careful in this matter. The emoluments and wages of almost every person in this colony have been increased directly or indirectly through the ship labourers and ship carpenters and just a week ago the cane-cutters got fifty cents instead of forty-two cents per ton. I consider that the Governor of Barbados is worth this increase. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has told us that the salary or emoluments of the Governor was £3,000 in 1885 and the revenue of the colony was £383,000; to-day, in 1947, the salary is £3,000 and the revenue is one million pounds! There is a duty allowance of £500. Of course, I do not know what is meant by duty allowance; tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee both salary and allowance look alike to me. (Laughter). As regards the argument about the teachers in relation to the numbers in attendance at the schools, I would like to say that the man in Bay Street, for instance, has not done anything to make the numbers in his school increase over those of the man in Boscobel or at St. Philip-the-less. The honourable senior member for St. James was talking about light and water which is supplied the Governor; the House Surgeons at the General Hospital are also getting light and water and I admonish honourable members that while they can bring up every possible argument, let their arguments be within reason, and do not let us say things to-day that cannot bear the inspection of intelligence tomorrow. If we give the Governor this duty allowance we will be able to impress upon the Secretary of State for the Colonies that we do not want any old-time man who is dying; we want a vigorous, busy man. Thirty years ago we had a certain imbecile Governor; to-day we do not want anybody like that. I heard the honourable senior member for St. Joseph speak about a Socialist Governor; I do not mind whether he be Socialist, Conservative or Liberal; if he is good I am glad for him. I am voting for this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to reply briefly to the points which have been raised. The honourable senior member for St. James has made the point that the whole despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies should have been put before the House. I have told the honourable member that the Acting Governor's Message is taken practically verbatim from the letter of the Secretary of State for the Colonies; what is left out is immaterial. I was reading from the actual letter of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and I presume that the honourable member has the Message from the Acting Governor and will see that practically nothing is left out. The Secretary of State for the Colonies says "I have the honour to inform you" and the Message from the Acting governor says "His Excellency the Acting Governor has the honour to inform the House that he has been informed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies". Anybody who has a nodding acquaintance with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Creech Jones, knows that he would not have given favourable consideration to the raising of the salaries of Colonial Governors unless he was absolutely satisfied with it. When you compare the salary of the Governor of Barbados with the

salaries of Governors outside, you are not going to get the man that you want. I do not know whether I am disclosing any secret, but a Socialist Governor is likely to be a poor man. The Governor of Trinidad has been specifically appointed because he has private wealth; he cannot live on £6,000 a year. I repeat that this proposal has not come from the local Labour Government. This despatch has come down here and similar despatches have come down from time to time on the same point. This is not a question of a Conservative Secretary of State for the Colonies having to help somebody whom he knows quite well. Sir Mark Young was a special favourite of the then Secretary of State for the Colonies. It might be said that a Secretary of State for the Colonies might help his personal friend, but that cannot be said of Mr. Creech Jones. The honourable senior member for St. James has compared the size and revenue of this colony with the size and revenue of Trinidad and Jamaica, but it is not a question of dealing merely with the number of square miles of a country. Jamaica is twenty-five times the size of Barbados and it has a revenue of twenty-eight million dollars. We have a revenue of six and one half million dollars, and by that measure Jamaica should have a revenue of one hundred and sixty-two and one half million dollars. What help does the honourable member bring to the debate when he tells us that Jamaica has a area of 4,207 square miles with a revenue of twenty-eight million dollars? We are 1/25th of the size of Jamaica and we produce a revenue of nearly one quarter of theirs. In short, we are doing six times as well as Jamaica financially. There is therefore nothing in that argument. If honourable members had the time to read the debates in this House in 1944, they would have been spared the trouble of going back to the debate in 1923 when the late Mr. Walter Reece, who one might say had one of the cleverest brains which this colony has ever produced, said this:

"The question really is this: Considering the dignity and importance of the colony and the ability of the Treasury, what would be a fair salary to pay the Governor? In 1895 we paid the Governor £3,000 and really nobody thought it was too much until we got ourselves in very straitened circumstances in 1896 when it was even suggested that the Civil Servants should leave some of their monthly salary in the Treasury as a loan to the Government." I cannot picture Civil Servants to-day doing that. Mr. Reece goes on: "That shows what terrible straits we must have been in when such a ridiculous proposition should have been seriously made. Therefore, we have not got very far to look for any reason why the salary was reduced. I do think that, considering the changed circumstances in the cost of living, if we went back to £3,000 we would be doing what is just and honest. I am not in favour of mixing up the increase to the salary with any question of entertainment, because it raises a rather difficult problem. If the Governor gets £3,000 it will be a matter for him whether he will entertain or not. We are putting the junior Civil Servants on an increased salary. We have pledged ourselves to put their salaries on a scale somewhat in accordance with the present cost of living. Having done that, we will have to go through the Service and put all the others on the same basis."

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that that is more the question of salary.

Mr. ADAMS: I was merely quoting Mr. Reece on that point. He suggested that if we went back to £3,000 that would be fair and the position is the

same in 1947. When the honourable senior member for St. James takes £3,000 and adds £500 and other figures, anybody can do anything with that. I suggest that that is not the method of approach. It is a question of the dignity of the office, just like the say, £45,000 which goes to the King and the £250,000 to the Queen. When the honourable member talks about the cost of the motor car and so on, is that not trifling with our own self-respect? Are we giving the Governor personally anything? Are we not proud to know that we are providing for the dignity of the Governorship of the Colony. Are we not proud to know that there is a motor car provided to take visitors around when they come here instead of having to get a taxi?

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I should like to correct the honourable member's mistake about the motor car; I did not include that in my calculation at all. I made no reference to that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am saying that the honourable member in his calculation mentioned £236 for the upkeep of gardens, £70 for light and so forth. I say again that that is not the method of approach. In the debate in 1923, the late Mr. Graham Yearwood quoted from the late Sir Ralph Williams who was Colonial Secretary and acted as Governor. In those days the House of Assembly were more bitter than we are now. It was said that Governors' wives used to take away the spoons, etc., so great was the feeling that a visitor declared that when the covers of drawing room seats were taken back it was discovered that they were only packing cases. We were quite content in those days to keep the furniture at Government House in that way because we had this feeling against Governors. I assure honourable members that I have put before them all the facts at my disposal. I am as strong a Socialist as anyone else, and I have come to the same conclusion as Mr. Creech Jones that when we compare the dignity of the office of the Governor of this colony with that of other Colonial Governorships and the salaries which are being paid, we would be doing the right thing to put this on the same footing. I feel that the salary of the Governor should be what it is. Like the previous House, I feel that the duty allowance should be separate from the salary, because the Acting Governor loses if salary and duty allowance go together. As regards the question of income tax, the Governor does not pay any income tax for same reason that King George does not pay any income tax. We give the Governor light for the same reason that we give Dr. Saint and the Doctors at the General Hospital; therefore, do not throw that at him. It is a principle that certain officials should have certain emoluments. Finally, I commend to honourable members the remarks of the Attorney General, the late honourable senior member for St. James. I hope that the honourable members for St. James have read the speech which was made by the Attorney General in this House two years ago when the arguments for the increase to the Governor were made. Apparently, history has repeated itself. The Attorney General said this:

"The honourable senior member for St. Lucy stated that I spoke in a low voice because I have a weak case; but there is one argument which I defy the honourable member to get over, and that is the fact that in view of the present expenditure which must be undertaken by the person administering the Government of this colony, he cannot live on the salary that is being paid him." I say that in direct reply to the honourable senior member for St. James when he refers to this £3,000. The Attorney General says that the Governor cannot live on it.

He goes on: "I am speaking what I know and I leave it there for anybody to digest." Apparently the digestion of the honourable senior member for St. James will not take that. The Attorney General pointed out that the proposal did not come from the Executive Committee. As regards the point that paying a bigger salary is no guarantee that you will get a better type of man, I would like to say that we might be unlucky to find a successor to Dr. Saint who is not like Dr. Saint, and salary did not bring him here. I am tempted to say that if this were a vote for the Department of Science and Agriculture, it would have gone through without any trouble. The Attorney General went on to say this: "The Officer administering the Government cannot say that he would entertain so many or so few and that he would not entertain this or that visitor, because it is the island who is entertaining this or that visitor and the salary which is paid to him must be appropriate, otherwise we would find ourselves in the position of not having any person who is worthy of filling the office, willing to come to this island, as Governor. If we fix a salary for the office which would make an officer who came here to administer the Government feel that far from saving he would be losing money, we would realise that we will get men of a different calibre from those whom we have had, so far."

That is the true position which I am asking honourable members to take up in this matter. The Attorney General approached it from the angle that, if we are cheeseparing, we are bound to get men of less calibre coming out here. The Chief Secretaryship in Palestine might be more profitable than the Governorship of Barbados. I realise that honourable members are not likely to be converted by anything fresh that may be said now, and I can only assure those honourable members of Socialist views to take into consideration the argument which has been twice used—and I make no apology for using it again—that nobody who knows Mr. Creech Jones could imagine him sending down that despatch if he did not think that it was right to do it. I may say that if we turn down this proposal, we will be flouting the wishes of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Of course we are masters in our own homes, and we can tell him that he is wrong if we think so. But I ask honourable members before they do so to reflect a little. Nobody in the Colonies knows as much about them as the Secretary of State for the Colonies, apart from an Administrator who has served in different Colonies, and he is not likely to send down this despatch without having carefully considered it. If there are any Labourites who have any remaining doubts as to their duty, they may reflect on the fact that this despatch has come from a Secretary of State for the Colonies who has always preached, and is still preaching, against overloading the top rungs and exploiting those who serve at the bottom. I again invite honourable members to pass this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two motions before the House; one is that this Bill be now read a second time, and an amendment has been moved that the words "be now read a second time" be deleted and the words "be rejected" be inserted in place thereof. The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the 'Ayes' have it.

A division was taken as follows:

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. RAMSAY, SMITH, COX, MAPPE, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and CRAWFORD—9.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, nine honourable members voting "Aye", and ten honourable members voting "No." The question now is that the words "be rejected" be inserted in the blank created by the omission of those words—

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know if I am in order, but I would like to suggest that that motion be withdrawn and put so that the Bill can be read a second time at some later date.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot do that now that the question is being put.

Mr. SPRINGER: If honourable members are in favour of the suggestion made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, they need not vote in favour of the motion which is now being put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the right thing for me to do is to put the question. The question is that the words "be rejected" be inserted in place of the words "be now read a second time." Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Noes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. RAMSAY, SMITH, COX, MAPPE, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and CRAWFORD—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, ten honourable members voting "Aye", and nine voting "No". The Bill is therefore rejected.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed, the House was on the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, adjourned to meet on Tuesday next, the 11th day of February, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.