

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9th March, 1948.

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. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, and E. L. WARD.

Prayers are read.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 2nd March, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable the Legislative Council a Message returning the Bill to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1935 (1935—9) with an amendment.

DOCUMENTS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Reports of the Inspectors of Trees for the parishes of St. Michael and St. Lucy respectively for the year 1947.

Messrs GARNER, S. A. WALCOTT, and BLACKMAN enter the House and take their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:—

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1948.

Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 31st January, 1948.

Report of the Auditor General on the audit of the accounts of the Colony for the year 1946—47.

PETITIONS.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize the said Vestry to borrow a sum not exceeding in the aggregate £4,500 for the following purposes:— (1) to erect a vicarage for St. Bartholomew's Chapel for £2,500, (2) to repair their parochial property known as "Scarborough" for £550, (3) to repair and/or reconstruct the vicarage of St. Patrick's Chapel, (4) to repair St. David's Chapel, and (5) to repair the roof of St. Matthias Chapel.

Mr. TALMA: I beg also to present a petition from the Highway Commissioners of the parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to pay a gratuity of £69. 10. 2. to Florence Williams, widow of their late employee, Walter Williams.

The petition in each case is respectfully worded and I beg to move that they be taken as read.

The petitions are taken as read.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for £129,350 to supplement resolution No. 107 of the 4th November, 1947, to provide for the subsidisation of flour, salt fish, salt pork and balanced animal feed to the 30th September, 1948.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for £8,000 to supplement resolution No. 116 of the 25th December, 1947, to meet expenses in connection with the present emergency.

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Order, 1948," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of sections 3 (1) (c) and 4 (3) of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947 (1947-13).

Dr. CUMMINS: A Bill to amend the Market and Butchers Act, 1890 (1890—14).

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

Mr. FOSTER enters the House and takes his seat.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. TALMA: A Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church to raise a loan to make certain erections, repairs, reconstruction and renewals to certain Parochial Buildings and Chapels in the said parish.

Mr. TALMA: A Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways for the Parish of Christ Church to pay a gratuity to Florence Williams, widow of Walter Williams, a late employee of the said Commissioners.

QUESTIONS

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

Does the Government intend to grant free scholarships to the West Indian University College, Jamaica, as from its first academic year?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Market and Butchers Act, 1890 (1890—14), is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church to raise a loan not exceeding £4,500 to make certain erections, repairs, reconstructions and renewals to certain Parochial Buildings and Chapels in the said parish is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of Christ Church to pay a gratuity to Florence Williams, widow of Walter Williams, a late employee of the said Commissioners, is read a first time.

Dr. WILSON enters the House and takes his seat.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking the leave of the House to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to deal with Resolution No. 3 of Order No. 3 as the first Order of the day. The Resolution covers a number of Departments and it is very essential that it should be passed as early as possible. One of these Departments is the Government Industrial Schools and I am informed that there is not enough money to pay labourers this week.

There being no objection the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 60 be now suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MAPP enters the House and takes his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The Resolution with which I propose to deal is for the sum of £7,428 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-

in-Executive Committee for the service of the colony. Honourable members will observe from the schedule to the Resolution that there are eleven Heads of the Estimates for 1947-48 for which these supplementary votes are being asked and the explanatory notes on the opposite pages give all the information that is necessary. The most pressing items are Overtime Pay for Post Office employees who have not received any since December last and Cultivation, Manufacture, etc., at the Government Industrial Schools. With respect to the latter the sum of £3,450 which was provided in the Estimates for the purpose has proved to be insufficient and, as I said, I am informed that there is not enough money to pay labourers up to the end of this week. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I should just like to let the senior member for St. Joseph understand that this is a very important Resolution, inasmuch as it deals with the overspending of estimates passed by this House.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member state the Head to which he is referring?

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Is the Committee considering these Heads seriatim?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think so.

Mr. LEWIS: The entire vote is for overexpenditure and I say that this House should lay it down as a principle that votes of this nature should be criticized with great diligence. These Heads should be dealt with one by one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can make a motion to that effect, if he cares.

Mr. LEWIS: It is not my intention to hold up the consideration of the Estimates for the coming year but I should like to let the honourable member know that this is not the way in which a vote of this nature should go through this House. I am overlooking it on this occasion but I see a lot of things in connection with this Resolution which should be considered by the House in greater detail. However, in view of the fact that we have the next year's Estimates to consider I shall not press my point.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—With respect to item 23, Stationery, under Head XXXII, Department of Highways and Transport, I notice from the explanatory note that £300 was provided and that a further sum of £100 is required to meet this expenditure for the balance of the year. I wonder if this £300 has proved to be inadequate because of the greatly increased cost of stationery or because of the excessive quantity of stationery that is used by this Department. I have heard that a tremendous amount of writing of Minutes takes place in this Department and I want to know if this additional £100 is being asked for because of that. Overseers who, I understand, should be around and about the country supervising the work on the roads are kept for long hours at their desks writing Minutes and I would like to know the reason for this increase. The reason may be quite satisfactory but I should like to hear it. Then there is item 43, Plant, tools, spares and equipment, for which a further sum of £4,831 is being asked and the explanatory note states that this further sum of £4,831 is required to pay the cost of machinery and material ordered from the Crown Agents in connection with Scheme D. 338 relating to the construction and improvement of roads. I am wondering if this machinery has arrived yet and whether it includes a theodolite which is a very necessary instrument for the purposes of road work, inasmuch as there are one or two members of the staff who are intelligent enough to use it. As to the spares and

equipment I wonder if the Government can inform me who would be looking after these spares and equipment. I understand that the Superintendent Mechanic whom one would expect to be in charge of these things is acting as Executive Engineer and, as such, is travelling about the island in connection with the road work. We want a proper watch to be kept on all this machinery and material. The Superintendent Mechanic should be spending more of his time in this direction and the Overseers be allowed to supervise the work on the roads.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—I was going to raise the question in respect of the same item 43, Plant, tools, spares and equipment, under Head 32, for which this further sum of £4,831, the greater part of this vote, is being asked. Apparently this is expenditure in connection with scheme D. 338 but I am afraid that I cannot remember—I do not know if other honourable members can—what Scheme D. 338 is. However, there is a rule that when we vote money for these Schemes we do so by means of separate Resolutions and part of the money—in some cases all of it—is refunded by Colonial Development and Welfare. I would like to ask the senior member for St. Joseph whether this is the correct method of dealing with a matter of this sort or whether it is not done by means of a separate Resolution. I cannot remember—I do not know if you, Sir, can—what Scheme D. 338 is at the moment. The machinery is about to be shipped and we are notified by this Resolution that the Crown Agents want the money. But there should not be any cause for worry about that because when you turn to the Balance Sheet you see that the Crown Agents owe us several hundred thousand pounds; so a little delay would not put them out. I should like to hear from the senior member for St. Joseph whether this is the right way of dealing with this £4,831.

Mr. ADAMS: Perhaps the explanatory notes in respect of this Head could have been a little fuller. The money is needed to pay for two road rollers that were ordered for quite a long time to do the work specified in Scheme D. 338 which has been approved by Colonial Development and Welfare. The Director of Highways and Transport states *inter alia* in his Minute that the necessity for supplementing item 43 is to meet the cost of two road rollers ordered from the Crown Agents and the Auditor General agrees that it should be included in this Resolution. Sometimes votes of this nature are agreed to by means of separate Resolutions but there is no rule to that effect. As regards item 23, Stationery, the Director states that the increase is due to the payment from this item of the cost of departmental receipt books and forms which should have been charged to Head 29, Miscellaneous, item 5, Government Printing and Binding and which has amounted to approximately £200, and in this connection the Auditor General states in his Minute that it is usual to charge the cost of printing Accounts and Receipt Books, Forms etc. to Head 29, item 5, Government Printing and Binding unless the Department concerned has intimated that it wishes such expenditure to be charged against funds at its disposal. In this case the vouchers were certified by the Director of Highways and Transport to be correctly charged to his Head 32, Item 23, Stationery, and were passed accordingly. The Auditor General goes on to state that he is of the opinion that prior to the creation of the Department of Highways and Transport, all printing required by the Central Road Board was paid for from their

Head 32. This is merely going back to the old practice instead of letting it appear under Head 29, Miscellaneous, item 5, Government Printing and Binding. The word "Stationery" is a misnomer; it is really printing Accounts and Receipt Books Forms.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to remark on what appears to be a peculiar state of affairs. We have what is known as an Advisory Board to the Director of Highways and Transport and we find one who is regarded as a prominent member of that Board coming here to seek information as to what is Scheme D. 338. I would like to know if the policy of that Department is to leave this Advisory Board out of everything that it does. The junior member for St. James is a member of the Advisory Board and I understand that that Board is never called on to give any advice. When one remembers the amount of criticism to which that Department is subjected by the people's representatives and that the people's representatives have sent an Advisory Body there, one cannot help feeling that something is definitely and radically wrong if that Body is not consulted. We get the Chairman of the Board which the Department of Highways and Transport superseded coming here to enquire what the Scheme D.338 is and I have it on good authority that that Advisory Board is never called on to give advice to a Department which spends a lot of Government funds,—a Department that is second to none so far as the levelling of criticism of it is concerned. I am saying that we should go into the matter and discover whether that Advisory Board is necessary at all. It is very peculiar to me that we have a member of this Advisory Board coming to this House and asking for information when he should be in the position of being able to come here and assist other honourable members in passing a vote of this kind.

Mr. WILKINSON: The junior member for the City used the expression "Advisory Board"; that is what it is and the Board is only called on when the Director of Highways and Transport considers it necessary. This matter, for instance, has never been put before the Advisory Board and as regards the estimates of this Department which will be considered later, no member of the Board has seen them. It is an Advisory Board and the meetings are called at the discretion of the Director. To say that the Board never meets is not correct; it does meet occasionally. For instance, I understand that it meets to-morrow in connection with matters relating to Transport.

Mr. COX: I am not prepared to comment very strongly or lengthily at this time on this item because I prefer to deal with it when we come to Head 32 of the Estimates for 1948—49. But judging from the remarks that are made from time to time about the working of this Department, everyone will agree that all is not well over there. I have been informed—and this supports the statement of the junior member for St. James—that a meeting is to be held at the Department of Highways and Transport to-morrow to cancel certain concessions.

The CHAIRMAN: I should not like to interrupt the honourable member but I think it would be better if he did not discuss that matter. A little information has reached me and it is not good for those concerned.

Mr. COX: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, as regards the cost of the stationery which is used by this Department I should like to say that I am one of those who are not in favour of an increase of this amount. As a matter of fact, before this Department was taken over by the Government, it used to use about

£100 worth of stationery a year but since it has become a Government Department, the cost of the stationery jumped from £100 to £300 a year and now the Director has sent to this House for another £100, making the amount for stationery £400 altogether. Compare the cost of stationery used by this Department with the cost of Stationery used by other Departments which are required to keep a lot of records and you will see that in each case the cost is less than that of the Department of Highways and Transport. For instance, the cost per year of stationery used by the Police Department is £325, the Legal Department £118, the Legislature £50, and the Post Office £250; so you will see that these Departments which, as I said, are required to keep many records use less stationery than the Department of Transport and Highways and from what I have been able to understand, this waste of money in stationery for this Department is, as the junior member for St. Lucy has said, due to the fact that every man working in the Department has to do clerical work; whether he be a pecker or a chauffeur or a painter he must waste paper in writing this, that or the other. All the employees over there seem to be watchmen keeping check on one another to see if the other fellow will rob or not and as a result we are saddled with this great expenditure for stationery. This is really an instance of the lighting of a bank note to find a cent. £300 has been provided for stationery and now we are being asked to vote another £100 for a Department which deals with omnibuses and so on! There is something definitely and radically wrong with that Department. When it comes to the question of the Superintendent Mechanic acting as Executive Engineer, it is difficult to understand how that Department operates. It has been said that we must have a qualified man to do the work of the Executive Engineer, that we cannot get a qualified man and yet a motor mechanic who knows absolutely nothing about the construction or otherwise of roads has been placed in that office. As I said, it is difficult to understand the workings of that Department. It would appear as if there is a number of square pegs in round holes over there.

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 Mr. TALMA, the Chairman reports the passing of one Resolution and the postponement of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the Resolution which is passed in Committee of Supply is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT TO MATRIMONIAL CAUSES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Before the next Order is called I am asking leave under Rule 262 to deal with the amendment of the Other Place to the Matrimonial Causes (Amendment) Bill. The Bill which was passed and sent up by this House was originally printed with the year 1947 in it. This House changed it to 1948 but apparently the Bill reached the Other Place with 1947 instead of 1948 in it.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the senior member for St. Joseph is granted the leave which he asks for, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to give a ruling on this point because the explanation given by the honourable member necessitates, in my opinion, an enquiry

into the matter. The honourable member distinctly said that the Bill was passed by this House with 1948 in it and if we have passed the Bill with 1948 in it I do not see that we have any right to consider this amendment. I fail to see where we are responsible for any printer's errors that went to the Other Place. If we can prove that the Bill left us correctly, we have no right to cast any reflection on ourselves.

Mr. TALMA: I happened to have conducted this Bill in this Chamber and as far as I know it was in order. This is a typographical error and a simple matter which does not call for any debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: What actually happened I cannot really remember but the Bill which I signed to be sent to the Other Place had 1947 and not 1948 in it.

Mr. SYMMONDS enters the House and takes his seat.

Leave is granted the senior member for St. Joseph to proceed.

On the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the amendment of the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1935 (1935-9) is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

ADDRESS RE EMOLUMENTS ATTACHED TO GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, —To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 36/1947 relating to the emoluments attaching to the office of Governor of Barbados.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Since last Tuesday some honourable members have expressed the opinion that this matter should be dealt with separately and then the results can be incorporated in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1948-49. I, therefore, propose to deal with it in that way. The Select Committee in their Report recommended (1) an increase of the amount provided for Lighting of Government House from £70 to £120 annually; (2) the provision of an annual sum of £400 towards the cost of Domestic Servants employed at Government House; and (3) the provision of an annual sum of £150 to assist the officer administering the Government to defray travelling expenses incurred by him. The House will remember the history of the Messages sent down by the Governor last year on this subject; that a Select Committee met and recommended the first two of the abovementioned recommendations; that in place of the third recommendation a car should be purchased for the use of the occupant of Government House and that a sum of money should be put in the Estimates for its upkeep. The present Select Committee was persuaded by its Chairman to change that to what is now suggested, that is, the provision of an annual sum of £150 to assist the officer administering the Government to defray travelling expenses incurred by him. I have authority, if the majority of the House are in favour, to make provision in the Estimates for a car for the occupant of Government House and I believe that even those who were opposed on a previous occasion to any addition to the emoluments of the Governor are in favour of a car being provided for Government House and kept with Government funds. I have not had time to trace the exact position in every British colony but certainly as far as the West Indies are concerned my recollection is that there is no West Indian colony which does not provide a car or cars for the use of the Governor except Barbados:

the Windward Islands and Jamaica provide two respectively and each of the other colonies provides one. If the House agrees to the provision of a car rather than the travelling allowance I have, as I said, the necessary authority to put a sum of money in the Estimates for its purchase and maintenance. I desire to say in reply to the speech of the junior member for St. Peter that anybody who remembers the Governor's Message on this subject would at once remove completely from his mind any suggestion that this is an attempt to get around a previous negative decision of the House. The Secretary of State for the Colonies sent, not to Barbados alone, a circular to all the colonies pointing out that in any consideration to increase salaries they should take into consideration the Governors' salaries too and he further pointed out, in the case of Barbados, that it was customary in all the other colonies, not to pay for every servant employed at Government Houses but to pay for those who were necessary for the ordinary running of Government Houses as institutions while the Governors pay, out of their salaries, persons who may likely be termed their personal servants. The House may remember that when this matter first came before us I pointed out at the time that the amount which was being paid to servants at Government House was rather small. £600 a year was being paid to thirteen servants and if you work that out it does not seem as if they were being paid handsome wages,—an average of £50 a month for each servant. Those servants are 4 butlers, 2 cooks, 3 washers, and 4 maids; the outside servants that are paid by the Government are 4 gardeners and 2 watchmen. The Committee felt that we should provide two-thirds of that £600 for the domestic servants employed at Government House and that is why the amount has been fixed at £400. The junior member for St. Lucy in a previous debate said that these are not handsome wages at all and the Select Committee felt—and I am appealing to the House to look at it in that way—that two-thirds of what these servants are being paid may well be paid from Government funds. It is true that these servants are given free uniform, free shoes and a certain amount of food; some have quarters and sleep in; electric light is provided for servants' quarters and the bill is rather high. Some of these rooms, like the Orderly's room, have to be lit throughout the night and this additional £50 does not cover the actual expenses which are incurred for lighting at Government House. As regards the car I personally feel that there should be a car at Government House and if the majority of members feel that way, probably the junior member for St. James would be willing to go along with the majority and let us recommend in our Reply that a car be purchased and that a sum of money be put in the Estimates for its maintenance. The Director of Highways and Transport has worked out what the normal life of a car should be, based on certain mileage and the cost of maintenance is computed on the basis of travelling allowance. We need not state a sum in respect of maintenance in our Reply but a Resolution would have to come down for a sum which would be much less, probably, than £150 a year. I do not think I need say any more and I beg to move that the following Address do now pass:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Messages No. 5/1947, No. 24/ 1947 and No. 36/1947 on the

subject of the emoluments attaching to the office of Governor of Barbados.

The House of Assembly are in favour of

- (1) increasing the amount provided for the Lighting of Government House from £70 to £120 annually.
- (2) providing an annual sum of £400 towards the cost of Domestic Servants employed at Government House.
- (3) providing an annual sum of £150 to assist the officer administering the Government to defray travelling expenses incurred by him.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second the motion and in doing so I merely would like to say that in any of the enlightened islands of the Caribbean the Governor, owing to his standing and status, is granted certain perquisites which according to modern standards are necessary for one who occupies the position of Chief Administrative Officer and Barbados, despite the fact that it pays to be conservative even in so far as matters of this nature go, should try to bring itself into line with conditions that exist in the neighbourng colonies, some of which are smaller and of less importance than Barbados.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—I am a member of the Select Committee and we had a little difficult time because there was a great difference of opinion in respect of what was recommended by a previous Select Committee that went into the matter. As regards the third recommendation, some of the members of the Committee felt that a car should be provided for the Governor and that it should be maintained by the Government. I was one of those who did not think so. I thought it better — and eventually, I think, the other members agreed — that the Governor should be given travelling allowance. It has been suggested to me, since this Report was submitted, that a sum of money should be provided in the Estimates as travelling allowance for the Governor and I think that a sum of \$60 a month is liberal, when you take into account, Sir, that the Governor obtains petrol at probably half the price which an honourable member of this House has to pay. As regards the servants at Government House I was somewhat astounded when we were told that 13 servants were necessary but I was assured by the senior member for St. Joseph that he, after conversations with Mr. Rankine, the Acting Governor, and the present Governor, was satisfied that Government House could not do with less. The wages of these servants amount to about £610 per annum and as the senior member for St. Joseph has said, it has been suggested that two-thirds of that amount should be paid by the Government and one-third by the Governor — roughly speaking £400 and £200 per annum respectively. As regards the first recommendation of the Select Committee which relates to the lighting of Government House. £120 per annum does seem to me a lot of money to be spent on lighting I am wondering now whether the Committee has not been too liberal in increasing the amount for lighting from £70 to £120 per annum. A great deal of wastage can occur, as you and other honourable members and I know, if you do not watch your lights and see that they do not burn unnecessarily. Any person who has lights in his house and has to pay his own bill would naturally take care to see that there is as little wastage as possible but in the case of Government House perhaps the same care may not be taken inasmuch as the Government is granting £120 a year towards the lighting of it. This amount includes the expense on a heating apparatus which, I understand, has not been used because it is too expensive. Yet I feel a little doubtful as to whether the Committee has not been too

liberal in increasing the amount for lighting from £70 to £120.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I cannot agree with this Report. I do not agree with my colleague at all to-day. Earlier this session the Governor asked to give him an allowance of £500. Well, Sir, I consider that if the Secretary of State for the Colonies, when he made that recommendation, had been told that in 1944 the Governor's allowance was increased by £500 he never would have made it. The Governor has had his increased allowance already. This little island pays a proper salary to its Governor when compared with the other West Indian Islands. I consider that we are paying much more in proportion to revenue, acreage and population than they are paying. Here in Barbados we have a population of 192,000 people as against half million people in Trinidad and one million people in Jamaica and if you compare the salary which we are paying our Governor with the salaries paid to the Governors of Trinidad and Jamaica you will see that we are paying handsomely. This House seems to forget that the Governor pays no income tax. Every time any member of the House who is in favour of these increases in the Governor's emoluments gets up and talks he does not say what is to be done with the £3,000 which the Governor gets as a salary, exclusive of perquisites. If we are to increase the pay of his servants and his lighting expenses, what is he to do with the £3,000 he gets? I cannot see how twenty-four members can sit here and give him everything, saying that we are underpaying him. When you come to the travelling allowance I am a little doubtful about that. I believe that he should be given travelling allowance on the same basis as it is given to Civil Servants, — nothing else. Why should his servants be paid and not the servants of other Civil Servants? He is being paid his salary in order that he may pay his servants. Other Civil Servants in Barbados have servants too and Mr. G. H. Adams, not the senior member for St. Joseph, would soon be telling us that we should pay all the servants of Civil Servants. (A Member: Why not?). One honourable member asks "why not?" He has no respect for the taxpayers' money otherwise he would not ask such a foolish question. I consider this is an injustice. It is not quite a raid on the Treasury but it is not too far from it. I certainly shall vote against this Address.

Mr. GALE: Mr. Speaker,—I happen to be a member of this Committee and we went into this question very thoroughly. All the accounts in connection with Government House were submitted to us and after going through them very carefully we came to the conclusion that it does require a considerable sum of money to pay the staff of Government House. The senior member for St. James talks about Civil Servants' servants being paid. The Governor is in a different position from any other Civil Servant. The Governor is the representative of His Majesty the King and it is part of his duties to entertain people. Diplomats and all sorts of other distinguished people pass through here from time to time and it is the Governor's duty, as the King's representative, to meet these people, take them to Government, entertain them and let some of them stay there sometimes. That is not a duty which devolves upon any other Civil Servant in this country; therefore, we must see to it that the Governor is properly provided with the wherewithal to enable him to represent Barbados as it should be represented. I cannot understand this cheap, cheese-paring policy which some honourable members are advocating in respect of the running of Government House and other institutions that are carried on on behalf of the Crown. Everybody knows that the cost of living has increased as far as he himself is concerned and the cost of living for the Governor has also gone up

considerably. £500 is put in the Estimates as an allowance for the Governor but £500 will go a very little way in entertainment at Government House. If the Governor were to give three or four "At Homes", the £500 will be gone and anybody who does any entertaining will know that that is so. As I said, Sir, the Committee did not go into this matter in any slipshod manner. They got the accounts from the Private Secretary and scrutinized them thoroughly before they made these recommendations in this Report.

Mr. GARNER: I think at this juncture I should make my position very clear. I happen to be a member of this Select Committee and I attended one meeting. At that time I was not in thorough agreement with all the recommendations. For instance, Sir, when we came to the question of providing a car for the occupant of Government House I was in favour of the State owning a car for the use of any person who came to the island as Governor. Of course, I intended to put in a minority report but I was very busy at home reaping my crop; that is an open confession. Since I have seen the Estimates for 1948-49 I am thoroughly convinced now that I should not have agreed to anything at all and should have definitely sent in a minority report. Take, for instance, item 12, incidentals, under the Head, the Governor. That includes cost of scrubbing and cleaning and minor incidental expenditure; it is not itemised in the Estimates and I do not know what amount will be charged to that account. I still adhere to my opinion that the State should own its car and that the car should be maintained for the benefit of the Governor. I was very emphatic at the Select Committee about that. The junior member for St. James said at the Committee meeting which I attended that he thought one Governor might want a "Vauxhall" and another a "Packard" but that is not our business. The Governor should take what we give him. If he comes and finds a "Baby Austin," he should take that. We give what we can afford. Personally I feel that if we give a travelling allowance of £150 per annum, in three or four years' time we would have paid out as much money as would purchase a new car and I still adhere to my opinion in respect of a car for Government House, although I did not send in a minority report. Another thing which I have just discovered is this. The Electric Company has reduced their charge for supplying current from 22c. to 18c. per unit and if that is so, the Governor must pay less for lighting; so that this £70 would go a little farther. I do not think I am in agreement with these recommendations to-day. I have not made up my mind up to now but I have been hearing some strong argument against them and if those honourable members who are opposed to them convince me, I make no apology if I vote against these recommendations. On the previous occasion when this House was asked to give an allowance of £500 to the Governor I voted against it and what is more is this: I happened to be absent last Tuesday but I read in the newspaper account of the proceedings that the Junior member for St. Peter pointed out the fact that on the previous occasion the Governor asked for £500 which was refused and now this Committee was recommending that he be given increased emoluments to the extent of £600. That is the charge and I do not want to be placed in the irresponsible position of having done such a thing. It did not occur to me that in the first instance the Governor asked for £500 and now we are about to give him £600. We are very, very kindly disposed towards the Governor and I am not made of that stuff because I know the suffering of the man in the street. I

know that £600 would do a lot of tenantry roads and provide work for a lot of people for a time. If I vote against this address, do not let honourable members be surprised because the other members of the Select Committee knew very well that I was not 100 per cent in favour of the recommendations. There are some things which I feel the Governor should get but since I have seen the Estimates I see that there are a lot of things that are not set out in detail—incidentals for instance—and which can cover a lot of ground. If the protagonists do not produce stronger argument I am afraid I shall have to vote against the Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is—

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—Last year—to be exact, on the 4th February 1947,—we had before us an amendment to the Governor's Act which proposed to increase the emoluments of the office of Governor by the sum of £500. It will be recalled, Sir, that that amendment did not meet with the favour of the majority of this House and it was rejected. To-day we are being asked to support firstly an Address whereby it is proposed that we should increase the emoluments of the office of Governor by sums which actually total over £600. It is proposed by this Address with which we are now dealing to increase the amount provided for Lighting from £70 to £120. So far as this is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I will say that an extremely strong case would have to be made out to justify and increase by 40 per cent. for Lighting, especially in view of the announcement by the Electric Supply Corporation that they have reduced the rate for the supply of current. I am nothing to do with the reason that is given, namely, that it is a gesture to discourage the Government against nationalizing the Corporation but the fact remains that they have announced a decrease in the amount charged by them for a supply of current and in the face of that we are being asked to increase by more than 40 per cent. the amount which we voted for the lighting of Government House in 1947-48. Well, Sir, this Select Committee has proceeded and recommended the provision of an annual sum of £400 towards the cost of domestic servants employed at Government House and the senior member for St. Joseph said just now that last year when we were debating whether or not the emoluments of this office should be increased by £500 I commented that the servants at Government House were inadequately paid. I am of the same opinion. I say now that they should be adequately paid but they should be paid out of the income of their employer. I am referring to the servants who are purely on the domestic staff. I said then that there are people in this island who paid \$60 or \$80 per month to their domestic servants but they are paid out of their employers' incomes. If we are going to pay the servants of the servant who is most highly paid in the Civil Establishment I see no reason why we should not carry that down the line and pay the servants of all the other servants in the Civil Establishment. An honourable member suggests across the table that if we did that we would have all Governors. But, Mr. Speaker, if we pay the servants of the one who is most highly paid, then surely we are making out a case for paying the servants of those who are not so well paid. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, is this. There is now sitting a gentleman who is considering the emoluments and salaries of the public employees in this island.—a Mr. G. H. Adams, C.B.E. I do not know if his terms of reference include the consideration of the salary and emoluments of the office of Governor of this island. But, Sir, should we start by increasing

the emoluments of the best paid person in the Civil Service when we have not yet got before us the recommendations of this gentleman in connection with the least paid members of the Civil Establishment? Should we again make the mistake of starting from the top? We do not know what this gentleman is going to recommend, whether he is going to recommend an increase of pay for public employees or the mere consolidation of their present basic pay and the cost of living allowance. But should we, quite ignorant of what we are going to do as regards his suggestion, increase the emoluments of one Civil Servant, irrespective of what may happen to the remainder of the public employees? Now, Sir, with regard to the third recommendation of the Committee, namely, that we should provide an annual sum of £150 to assist the officer administering the Government to defray travelling expenses incurred by him, I wonder what data the Committee had available to be able to arrive at this figure of \$60 per month for the upkeep of the car of an officer who does not have to pay the driver's salary because one cannot help seeing a member of the local Constabulary invariably driving this officer's car. The suggestion about providing a State car is, I think, worthy of a lot of consideration. It would not belong to the particular individual but to the country in which he resides and certainly if a proposal of that sort was brought to this House it would find favour with myself and would, I believe, commend itself to many other honourable members but when it comes to the running of the car and no chauffeur being paid as such, I do not feel that we would be justified in paying \$60 a month towards the travelling expenses of the individual. I know that two things are going to be said, in so far as the running of this car is concerned. One is that a lot of going around, as is the case at present, is being done by the Head of the Administration. That is highly desirable and I go further and say that the Head of the Administration should visit every nook and cranny in this island. I support that entirely. As soon as a person accepts the office of Governor he should regard it as part of his responsibility to make himself acquainted with everything that is going on in the island. That is what, Mr. Speaker, the holder of the office of Governor is required to do; that is part of his inescapable duty and that is why the salary of the office of Governor is to be so much in excess of that of anyone else in the Civil Establishment; that is why, I suggest, the difference between the salary of the Governor and that of the Colonial Secretary is the difference between £3,000 and £1,300—£1,700. The other thing that is going to be said is that if this money is not voted, people will be thrown out of work. I take it that no honourable member is going to use that argument as a threat that we should vote this money. The payment of the servants at Government House is essential but we realize that the Governor gets £500 as duty allowance to assist his salary of £3,000. I think I am correct in saying that this office is not excluded from the cost of living allowance. (A MEMBER: It is excluded). I am reminded that the cost of living allowance is not attached to this office and if it were attached, one could readily see that it would have carried the salary of this office right up into the sky. The junior member for St. Michael, if I heard him correctly, said that the Governor is in a different position from that of any other Civil Servant and that as His Majesty's representative it is his duty to entertain. Well, Mr. Speaker, he is in quite a different position from that of any other Civil Servant because he is in receipt of a salary of £3,000 a year plus a duty al-

lowance of £500 but he is not under any obligation as His Majesty's representative to entertain everybody who comes to the island. His duty is to entertain what an honourable member on my right would, perhaps, describe as the "Big Shot," that is, another colonial Governor, or a Government official from a friendly country or people of that nature; he entertains people, whom we call for want of a better term people of his class; so do the Colonial Secretary and all the other Civil Servants. Every member of the Civil Service entertains visitors in the same category or social stratum when they arrive in this island. The Barbadian is noted for his hospitality and entertains on every conceivable occasion. When the junior member for St. Michael spoke about the duty of the Governor to entertain I wondered whether he was thinking in terms of certain other West Indian islands where real democratic entertainment takes place and from which members of the Legislature are not excluded. In a place like Barbados, open functions are not held at Government House once in a while and, to use the ordinary vernacular, Tom, Dick, and Harry invited to attend; that is the type of entertainment, if it were taking place or there was any likelihood of its taking place in this island, for which I would be inclined to vote an increase in the duty allowance. That, Sir, is my position in regard to this Address. I did not see the necessity of voting the increase of £500 asked for last year and I have not been convinced of the necessity of voting this £600, for the reasons which I have given and particularly am I averse to doing anything now for the highest paid member of the Civil Service when we are told that as far as the lowest paid and middle members are concerned, we are not making any provision for them yet and that we are waiting on this famous Adams Report. Why should we not wait, before giving further consideration to a matter of this kind, until we have had the opportunity of reading this gentleman's Report and comparing the salaries of every member of the Civil Service in the light of his recommendation? In case there are any honourable members who are sentimentally inclined towards this increase I should just like to remind them that we should not allow ourselves to be swayed in our judgment, by the consideration of the exceptional personal charm, and things of that kind, of the present occupant of Government House. We are dealing with the matter purely as a business proposition, whether we should or should not vote for this Address whereby an increase by over £600 will be made to the emoluments of the office, emoluments which we refused—and in my submission rightly so—to increase by £500 last year.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker.—My attitude, after taking all the surrounding circumstances into consideration, towards this Address is this. I know quite well, Sir, that the history of an increase in the emoluments of the office of Governor of this colony is a history that would somewhat deter the representatives of the people from considering an increase in these emoluments. I would hate to think that such a virtual intimidation would prevent me from doing justice to the dignity and prestige of the office of Governor of this colony but there are one or two questions to which I shall have to address myself before I agree to the increase at this particular time. I do not mean a time when we have not got money or that times are hard or anything of that sort but at a time when we are considering the Civil Service as a whole. I do not see why this particular office should be picked out for treatment at this particular time. I feel, Sir, that if this matter is being gone into comprehensively, it

may be well to await the recommendations of the one whom we regard as an expert on matters of this kind. What I would like to ask honourable members to consider, Sir, is this. We are really considering an alteration in the principle of the emoluments of the office. The principle hitherto, Sir, as I understand it, has been to pay a salary and to provide in that salary, so far as is possible, for some of the items that are now being picked out specifically for consideration. For instance, remarks like those of the junior member for St. Michael would lead me to think that he, at least, thought somewhat of that particular aspect of the matter. If a case is made out that the wages which are paid to servants from the personal emoluments of the Governor of this colony are inadequate I would like to hear what percentage of the total salary is paid in servants' wages because if a reasonable percentage of the salary is paid to the necessary servants and it is thought that it is still not an adequate wage for the persons employed, then I think we should definitely address ourselves to the matter. One of the items which are recommended in this Address would seem to me to be unnecessary and it would need a certain amount of explanation in view of the question I am going to ask now. If the vote for an item like Lighting, £70, is exceeded, could not a supplementary Resolution be brought to this House? Supplementary Resolutions are brought in connection with many items in the Estimates and if we provide £70 per annum for the lighting of Government House and the actual bills exceed that amount, it seems to me that a supplementary Resolution would cover that point. Therefore I am asking for a little enlightenment as to whether that particular recommendation could not be deleted and the actual expenditure, whatever it may be, met subsequently. With reference to the provision for travelling allowance or a motor car I have no doubt, Sir, that there are many points to recommend both systems. At present, I am inclined to the view, if it is considered that the emoluments of the office should be increased and if the House agrees now to an alteration in the principle of paying the Head of the Administration, that further consideration should be given to the purchase of a suitable vehicle for this particular purpose. I can well imagine, Sir, a Governor coming to this colony and arriving before the arrival of his car and he would be placed in the unfortunate position of virtually asking for a lift to Government House; therefore the provision of a vehicle certainly recommends itself to me. As has been pointed out, the prestige of the office is one that has to be kept up and that prestige will involve the expenditure of more money as the prices of goods increase. I know that as far as entertainment at Government House in Barbados is concerned, whether the facts will support it or not, there is a general impression that entertainment at Government House in Barbados does not go sufficiently deep down through the strata of our society to say that it is really entertainment for the people of the colony. I am in a position to say that that is the opinion held inside and outside this colony. It is difficult, Sir, to divorce consideration of a question like this from the method adopted by a particular Governor. We have had Governors who were very exclusive in their invitations to Government House. We have had others who have made a definite effort to give the impression that it was not as exclusive with them as it was with others. But, Sir, commenting upon the attitude adopted by the Head of the Administration in publicly announcing that invitation to Government House to certain parties will include the Heads of the more important Government Departments who have signed the Visitors'

Book, I feel, Sir, that that is tantamount to saying that there are certain Government Departments that are insignificant, that do not carry the significance and the set-up which others carry and I must say, Sir, that I deplore any such comparison in respect of invitees to Government House. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that the Director of Highways and Transport is the authority for the estimate for the travelling allowance. We have just passed new Travelling Allowance Regulations and as far as I know, there was an expert who worked out these travelling allowance rates and I am wondering, Sir, whether that particular expert did not give some assistance in this particular matter. Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, I would hate to think that any intimidation springing from a discrimination on the part of the public of this colony to consider an increase in the emoluments of this particular office should influence me to such an extent that I would not do justice to the office but, Sir, I should like to say that the emoluments of this office were considered not so long ago and a sum was arrived at that was considered adequate for the purpose and the wages of the servants at Government House must have been taken into consideration at the time. It is a very peculiar method to adopt, that is, that when we want to increase the emoluments of this office on this occasion, especially as it has already received a negative vote from this particular House, we should now say that certain specific items should be mentioned separately. I think it would have been much better, when we had the investigation by a Select Committee on the last occasion, if these particular points were not brought out and we would not have them now as separate items to be dealt with but would be considering the matter from the point of view of salary only.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member likely to finish in ten minutes' time?

Mr. LEWIS: I shall be a little longer than that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then we had better adjourn. It being after 2 o'clock, this House now stands adjourned until 2.45 o'clock in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

SUSPENSION OF RULES 61 (A) AND 61 (B)

On re-assembling.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to resume Government Business.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS RE EMOLUMENTS ATTACHING TO GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment for lunch the House were debating a motion for the passing of an Address in reply to His Excellency's Message No. 36/1947 relating to the emoluments attaching to the office of Governor of Barbados. The honourable junior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am expressing some opinions on this matter which I hope will be cleared up in the reply to the points which I have made. I have called attention to the item "lighting" and I notice that the amount is to be regarded as a grant towards the lighting of the Governor's office, Private Secretary's office, reception rooms and Orderly room. I am wondering if an alteration in the note to the estimates would not place this matter where we want it. That is to say, if we want

to pay for the lighting at Government House, let us pay for it whatever the amount is rather than give a sum of money towards it. In other words we are now increasing the grant from £70 to £120 and I feel that we should make a definite decision that we are going to pay for the lighting at Government House and alter the principle of having it included in the direct emoluments of the office of the Governor. I am in some doubt as to whether we are not altering the principle of paying the Head of the Administration; that is definitely causing me some concern. The present salary of the Governor is £3,000 per annum and it includes certain items of which we are asking for specific mention and specific grants if not for full amounts. That would seem to me to bring the entire vote into question. I know that it must of necessity cost a great deal to carry on the entertainment that is expected at a place like Government House. It would strike me that if entertainment is an item which pertains to the dignity of the office, a reasonable entertainment allowance should be mentioned in the items that comprise the Head "Governor" in the Estimates, so that as these matters fluctuate we would be able to increase the amounts specifically. I understand that such a thing as Duty Allowance covers that point but today £500 might be a very small sum for that purpose. The next point is this: I would not like to vote money which would prevent the servants at Government House from getting adequate wages; but if the principal emoluments of the office already includes an amount for that purpose and we take out certain items for which we give grants and to which we would like to give special consideration, the question arises that we are altering a principle; and if an amount included in the Estimates although I may not be a lover of a nominated Chamber, they may not be able to consider the matter in the way in which they feel they should consider it, and they may throw out the entire Estimates. I do not know that I can rule out the possibility of a thing like that happening especially if the Estimates go up very early this time, and they have a lot of time to consider them. The Other Place may say that we have under this Head a definite salary including these items and we have picked out the items for special consideration and they may not be in a spirit of pronouncing upon the altered method unless they throw out the entire Estimates. That is something on which I would like to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. I should like to mention a particular incident known to me and I regret doing so very much. I know that when a previous holder of the office of Governor was here, whether the Visitors' Book was signed or not certain persons in the community were regularly invited to Government House, and when the emoluments of the office were considered and passed by a single vote those invitations ceased.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that has anything to do with this Address.

Mr. LEWIS: I mention that for this reason. I would hate to think that any entertainment or anything is done at a place like Government House to influence a vote for the emoluments of the office. I would hate further to think that any suggestion of retaliation should take place because a vote did not go through for Government House as one would expect it to go through. I have to take this entire question; it has come up for consideration on two or three occasions in a comparatively short period. I am left in the position of expecting that certain points which I have raised should be cleared up one of them being whether an entertainment allowance should not be considered. The Duty

Allowance is a specific item; I believe it includes an allowance for entertainment, which is a very peculiar way of doing it, and I wonder why the opportunity was not taken to put down a definite entertainment allowance so that we could know that we contribute so much to the entertainment at Government House. If things increase, or if there are circumstances apart from any increase—we might have more people visiting the island at a particular time—we could annually budget for an amount in anticipation of visits to the island during the ensuing year owing to an increase in the number of warships visiting the island and things of that sort. I would like an item like that included under this Head so that we will know that the emoluments of the office have a particular meaning, and they should state what Heads would be given specific mention. That is the position in which I find myself with this vote and I would not like to vote against this Address merely because I know that it is unpopular in this particular community to consider the Head of the Administration for an increase in his emoluments. That is a fallacious thing because if we are expecting a certain standard of this office and if other people want an increase in their emoluments or wages, then this particular office should also receive consideration. I understand that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph does not regard this particular item as falling within the category of the investigation of the present Commissioner who is going into the emoluments of people who are paid from the Treasury. I am inclined to the view that it might be a very praiseworthy method of doing it, to consider everybody on this occasion as we did on the last occasion.

Mr. WARD: I feel that this is only another way of increasing the emoluments of the Head of the Administration. We have in this Report a new precedent to depart from what has been the practice in the case of other Governors. I feel that the Head of the Administration should be granted an allowance for travelling to the different parts of the island so that he will be able to see what is going on outside the City, and be conversant with facts which might be brought to him by his advisers. I do not think it is right to take a well-paid Officer with the different privileges and duty allowances which he enjoys above other civil servants in this island and single him out and say that we are going to give him an increase. Not very long ago it was intimated that the Governor has 13 servants and we have not got any special law binding him to have 13 servants; another Governor may say that 10 servants are enough for him. That will mean that he will be taking this £400 which we want to give to-day, pay the servants whom he feels are sufficient to carry on his home and will not use any of his salary at all. We are not simply giving the Governor £3,000 because he is Governor and we allow him so much; in my opinion he has to budget in the same manner as any other individual so as to carry on his household and meet expenses. If we are going to run his house and pay these expenses we are simply giving him a dole of £3,000 to put by annually. I think that we can more beneficially utilize this £400 in these days. I do not feel that the Officer who may be administering the Government would try to underpay his servants; if he tried to underpay his servants they would naturally leave. I feel that at this present moment we should not bother to press for these allowances; we should rather try and get on with the Estimates and we can eventually come back

and thresh out this Report and see what we can decide to do. If we go on to quarrel and fight over this Report I can assure the Leader of the House that it may be a long time before we can get on with some actual work in connection with the Estimates. As some honourable members have said, Mr. Adams is now considering the emoluments of Civil Servants and I feel that his Report should be tabled before we jump to conclusions in relation to a handsomely paid servant of this Government. Mr. Adams may only make recommendations consolidating the Cost of Living Allowance which is now paid to Civil Servants and here we will be definitely increasing the Governor's salary without knowing whether or not we will increase the salaries of other Civil Servants who are employed by this Government. As regards the lighting, I personally do not believe that we need to increase the amount. All former Governors used to light Government House and I do not think that we should increase the grant of £70. We have seen it in print that the price of electricity has been decreased and here it is we are being asked to increase the vote for lighting! I feel that that is one of the most annoying aspects of this Report, and I feel that the members of the Select Committee were more in sympathy with the present holder of the office than they were thinking of the office itself. There is nothing in this Report about Duty Allowance at all, therefore there is no question of any particular duty allowance. If the Duty Allowance is too small owing to an increase in the cost of certain articles and to His Majesty's ships coming to this port more often, I think we should have a definite Head for that expenditure. If we try to force the recommendations in this particular Report into the Estimates, we really do not know what repercussions may set in. It must be borne in mind that we are only one branch of the Legislature and when these Estimates reach the Other Place they may not agree to this particular vote; they may find themselves in a very peculiar position and they may be forced to reject the Estimates or send them back to this House at the very last moment. I think it would be advisable for the Leader of the House to go on with the Estimates and if the House decide later on to increase the salary or give the Governor a travelling allowance, the matter can easily be brought before the House by a special Resolution. If the House agree to the Resolution it will be passed and it can be left to the Other Chamber to agree to it or not. I feel that forcing this matter before the House at the present moment is tying the hands of honourable members. It is a serious thing to think that the consideration of this Report will hold up the Estimates from being passed when the time is getting short, because these Estimates must be passed by both Chambers by the end of this month. I think this Government will be well advised to be very cautious in pressing for these recommendations to be embodied in the Estimates at the present moment. I am not in favour of the rejection of the whole Report; as I said before, I personally feel it is reasonable that the Governor should be given a travelling allowance so that he can visit the different parts of the island and be able to see what is going on; but I am not agreeing to increase the vote for lighting or to the provision of the sum of £400 towards the cost of the servants. The Governor himself knew that the cost of the light and the cost of his servants were embodied in the salary. If there is the necessity for an increase in the Duty Allowance because the cost of certain things has been increased and we were asked to increase it and we

were able to do so, that would be a different aspect of the situation; but at present there are many unemployed people and we are now trying to increase the salary of one individual and forgetting thousands of other people. I am not in agreement with this Report; if it is possible to single out the £150 for assisting the Governor to defray his travelling expenses, I am in agreement with that; otherwise I will move the rejection of the Report.

Mr. RAMSAY: I think that all that is necessary to be said by me has nearly been said. The honourable member on my left says that it has been said. I do not want to give a silent vote on this matter. I want honourable members to understand that there could be nothing personal in this debate; everything hinges fundamentally on the economics of this place. I have to thank honourable members, especially the honourable junior member for the City, for presenting a new phase of the question. If I understand him correctly, his speech was based on the fact that the Government is bringing before this House a part of the salary of an Officer. They have not brought the entire emoluments of the Officer and told us that he is getting £3,000 for this and another £500 for that. He does not pay any income tax and he pays no duty on his clothing, household requisites, gasoline, motor parts and so on, everything for which the average Civil Servant has to pay taxation. The duty on these things is taken off in respect of this Officer whose emoluments we are now discussing. When it is a question of travelling certain discounts are taken off whether he travels by sea or by air, and as the honourable senior member for St. Lucy has rightly said, this Officer knew that he had to employ servants when he was taking this job. He knew the conditions and I feel from my soul that this Officer does not expect these things; he is only trying us out. How in the name of patience with all this hardship — I almost said austerity—can this Officer expect us to rob people to give him this money?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should refer to the office rather than the individual.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am speaking of the office. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I gave the impression that I was referring to the individual; I never meant anything personal in my remarks. In a day like this how can twenty-four hard-headed men—I almost said businessmen—agree to these recommendations when we look at the matter from every standpoint? The honourable senior member for St. Andrew may be doing a little business but he is doing it in a very unbusinesslike manner. (Laughter). There are in this colony people who are assiduously looking for work and cannot get any to do. Of course there are ne'er-do-wells to whom I am not referring. Yesterday morning I passed by the office of the Labour Commissioner and saw scores of people trying to get employment and thousands have been asking me to give them recommendations. I told them to go and put down their names. This is our country and you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for saying that I cannot see how we can do what we are being asked to do. Suppose the Labour Commissioner decides that he will live at Belleplaine or Bathsheba and decides to get a Rolls Royce and a footman with a uniform of brass costing so much to clean it. Would we provide these things for him? The Officer administering the Government must have known that he would have to live somewhere. I counsel honourable members not vote for these allowances. If we vote this money what can we tell our constituents prompted us to vote it? Just sentiment? We have to take all the emoluments into account and I say

that this Officer is getting £3,000 a year multiplied by three. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy has pointed out that every class of individual even a miser has to entertain people in his category. If I went to St. Lucia the person who receives me will give me a few drinks and if he comes my way I also have to give him a few drinks. He will offer me a cigar and I also have to offer him one. I counsel honourable members that they will be doing a duty to this their country if they refuse to vote this money. As a matter of fact, I think this House would go up in prestige and the Governor himself will think a lot more of this House if we refuse to vote one penny more for the emoluments of the office of Governor. I did not want to give any silent vote in this matter and I have said all I wanted to say. I cannot see how this House comprised as it is can really increase the salary which is the best paid in the island multiplied by three.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I believe that the life of a public man calls for serious responsibility and it is not a matter of clamour or popularity or emotional appeal that you make at some times; it is a matter of searching your conscience and dealing with any question which is under consideration in a manner which you feel is the best. With regard to this particular question we have heard a lot this morning and honourable members may feel somewhat intimidated. I feel that any man who wants to come into this Chamber and who cannot face a measure of unpopularity at some time, will never and truly represent the people who have sent him here. (Cheers). It does not take a Solomon to say things that would appeal to people's emotions. We are dealing with the office of Governor and honourable members should address their minds to the question as to whether we want a Governor or not. If we say that we are retaining the office of Governor in Barbados then there are certain things which must accompany that office. If we rule out the office of Governor entirely that is all well and good; but if you have Government House its dignity must be upheld and it is notorious to say that a man can employ as few servants as he pleases. If there is a condition of life at a particular house then it is only natural that there must be a certain number of servants employed there. The Governor is not just like another Civil Servant who can rent a house of any size which his salary affords him to rent and who is not compelled to live in any place. The Governor has to live in the place in which we say he must live and Government House will cause him to employ more servants than would be employed in an ordinary place. I heard the honourable junior member for St. Philip say that when he looked at the Estimates for this year he had to change his mind. That is unfortunate; what can the honourable member see in the Estimates as a guide to him that he must change his mind? What is the difference between the amount voted under this Head last year and the amount voted this year? It is not true to say that the Estimates have guided him in his opinion now; the honourable member was a member of this Select Committee and he is only trying to make an excuse for changing his mind. Last year the sum of £1,270 was voted under this Head and this year the sum £1,275 is to be voted. No honourable can say with any degree of cogency and logic that when he looked at the Estimates this year they cause him to change his mind.

Mr. GARNER: I do not know up to now if I have changed my mind. I do not know that he should be a liar in a thing like this.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member particularly said when he was sitting down that honourable members must not think it strange if he

votes differently (Mr. GARNER: That is different) because he has since looked at the Estimates. I can allow the honourable member to call me a liar but it is on record as to who is a liar in this community. As regards the Governor's travelling allowance I do not share the opinion of other honourable members purely from an economic point of view that the Governor should be given travelling allowance as such. I am in agreement that his means of transportation should be a matter for this Government. I heard an honourable member say that the Governor might not like the car. Well, he can buy his own car but it is the duty of this Government to provide the means of his transportation. It is cheaper for this Government to provide a decent means of transportation for the Governor than to go on paying £150 a year. If we provide a car, that car will remain ours. We do not rent Government House. I do not think that we should make comparisons between the Governor and other people: if you compare the Governor with any other person in the community you will really be making a comparison between two Governors and you can only have one Governor in this island. One aspect of the matter which is annoying is the aspect raised by the honourable junior member for the City in relation to the work which Mr. Adams is doing. We are not now dealing with any increase in the salary of the Head of any Department. I say that it is the duty of this Government to provide the means of transportation for the Governor; but if the House agree to vote this £150 a year I will not vote against that. The position should be as it is in England. If the King wants to buy a motor car, that is his business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask honourable members not to interrupt while the honourable member is speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is the result of Sunday night's activities. Taking all I have said into consideration, this is a question of the office of the Governor and not the personal emoluments. I would not now agree to an increase of the personal emoluments but as I have said, this is a question pertaining to the office.

Mr. DOWDING: Apart from the third item in this Report, the item dealing with the travelling expenses, I have no sympathy whatsoever with the Report. The present emoluments for the office of Governor in this island is £3,000 a year plus these perquisites. After deducting the £500 which is allowed for entertainment one will find that the people of Barbados are paying the Governor the sum of £7,500. As I look at this office, with the change of set up, less responsibility and more offices being added—we have a Financial Secretary, Two Assistant Colonial Secretaries and an extra Secretary—I fail to see that this office is worth more than what the island is now paying. These are cold facts as I see them. I agree that the travelling expenses incurred by the Governor should to some extent be borne by this Government. (Cheers). As regards anything else I emphatically say "No."

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—I am rather amazed to see that the Draft Estimates of which we began consideration last week are now so unimportant that we are spending an entire day discussing this Report, and as far as I see, we shall not touch the Estimates at all today. Then honourable members will be expected to come back here on Thursday even at the risk of failing to attend other important meetings because of the fact that the occasion has been taken to utilize the entire day in the discussion of this Report rather than proceed with the discussion of

the Estimates for which we have a dead-line as everybody knows. What makes the matter of an even greater surprise to me is the fact, as has been emphasized by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, that we have in this colony at the moment a Commissioner enquiring into the entire question of wages of Officers of the Civil Establishment, and it is to be assumed that he will pay due regard to the salary and emoluments of the Governor in the same way in which he pays attention to the salary and conditions of work of all the other members of the Government Service. Only a fortnight ago when honourable members in this Chamber commented on the salaries of the lesser paid Civil Servants with special reference to people employed at Glendairy Prison people like the Baker Instructor, the Carpenter Instructor and the junior warders, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in a tone of admonition or of criticism censured them for emphasizing the matter when, as everybody knows, we have at the moment a competent officer investigating the question of salaries of Civil Servants. If that be the case, I find it difficult to understand how the salary of an official who is already on a fairly reasonable level and is of course the highest paid in the colony, can be of such extreme urgency that we can forego the consideration of the Estimates today and spend an entire session in a discussion of this Report. Looking at the matter calmly, the Governor is paid £3,000 a year; he has a Duty Allowance of £500 and there are other perquisites attached to the office. He lives at a place called Government House and I take it that due consideration was taken of the fact that living there entails extraordinary expenditure. Last year this House declared in specific terms that it was opposed to any increase in the Governor's salary. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has claimed with regard to other matters that he would like some lead by the House before he presents them to the Legislature. The honourable member said that with regard to the disestablishment of the Anglican Church. The Government has been given a lead in so far as this matter is concerned; the Government has been told by a vote in this Chamber in emphatic terms that the majority of members are opposed to any revision of the Government's salary over the line suggested, but the House agreed at the same time to have a capable officer to come here and go into the entire question of wages of Civil Servants and one is justified in drawing the conclusion that should this Officer recommend a reasonable increase in the Governor's salary and a reasonable increase in the salaries of other Civil Servants, the House will ratify the proposal. If that be the position Sir, there is no necessity, absolutely no necessity, for discussing this Report today. We should have gone on with the discussion of the Estimates in the usual way, passed the Governor's Head as it now stands and presumably if we are asked later on to increase the emoluments attached to the office, we could do so perhaps and if we agreed to do so we could say that the increase takes effect as from any date we like. Last year when it was proposed to increase the salary of the Governor I supported the proposal although of course it was not to the same extent as this Report now recommends. But bearing in mind the fact that the Adams' investigation is still going on, I am quite content to wait until that investigation shall have been concluded before I commit myself to anything further. I should like to submit that perhaps the only thing in this Report to which the House might devote immediate attention if it so desires is the possibility of assisting the Officer administering the Government to defray the travelling

expenses incurred in the execution of his official duties. I have not heard up to now any mention made that he is unable to find the few extra pounds involved in defraying his expenses, but I do appreciate the fact that, judged by the standard set by previous Governors, the present incumbent of Government House is doing more getting around than perhaps either of his predecessors did. That is why there is a lot in the suggestion that rather than pay a fixed sum for this travelling allowance, we might include this Officer under the Travelling Allowance Act. We have no guarantee that his successor in office will take it upon himself to get around as much as the present Governor does and in case he does not, he will be entitled to draw from the Treasury the amount proposed here even although he may be doing nothing to justify it. The argument that it is *infra dig* for a Governor to find himself included in the Travelling Allowance Act is ludicrous. He is a Government Official and if he wants to be rewarded for his travelling, we will reward him on the same basis as other Government Officials. If he travels, he will get money for travelling; if he does not travel he will not get it. I cannot recollect, for instance, if Sir Grattan Bushe did much getting around in this colony. If he were asked to investigate any special problem he would go and do it. I remember that he went to Mags Channel at my invitation when I was trying to get the channel widened and deepened; and he met me at Bathsheba to investigate a grievance which fishermen had there. Generally speaking, the previous Governor certainly did not go around the country or even around the City to the extent as would have justified any special provision being made to assist him in his travelling. I repeat that we have no guarantee that the successor to Sir Hilary Blood will take action in the colony by way of travelling which would warrant the inclusion of a specific amount of money in the emoluments attached to the office for the purpose of defraying these expenses. I am in complete sympathy with the Opposition in this matter today for several reasons. We are not completely closing the door on the question; all we are saying is this: "You are a Civil Servant and there are other Civil Servants in the colony some of them being in greater need of immediate financial assistance than you. They have to possess their soul in patience and await the findings of the Adams' investigation and you can do the same, with a full assurance that when the investigation is finished by this impartial investigator we are going to see that any justifiable claims you have will be properly and reasonably treated." It is perhaps justifiably claimed that a Governor by virtue of his office has a certain amount of entertainment and financial responsibility thrust upon him. That is why we are voting today over £5,000 to maintain the office, or rather that is why this amount is included in the Estimates. Some of this amount is fixed by law and we vote the remainder, but the office costs the colony over £5,000. We have other leading officials in this colony, officials who, by virtue of their office also have certain obligations to carry out, and their salaries by no stretch of the imagination approximate that of the Governor who is the Head of the State. The Lord Bishop who is the Head of the Anglican Church gets £1,000 a year; he also gets a free house and other perquisites, but I certainly think that it cannot be claimed with any degree of accuracy that living at Government House and discharging the responsibility of Governor will necessitate the expenditure of every cent of the money voted for that office. It cannot. I am sure that any Governor of this colony can save a reasonable amount of his salary, and when we take into ac-

count the present economic position of the colony I make bold to say that to earn sufficient to defray living expenses and also save something out of a salary is something which very few people in this island can do. In addition to his salary and perquisites the Governor is entitled to a pension after his term of service shall have expired. Let us admit the fact that first things should come first. If we cannot pay more than \$44 a month to the baker at Glendairy Prison, if we cannot pay more money to the carpenter and the warders at that Institution, people who can barely eke out an existence, if we have to wait upon the omnipotent Mr. Adams as to what is fair and just, let us tell the Officer administering the Government that we are quite prepared to listen to any justifiable claims which he might have but he cannot expect us to prejudice ourselves in the eyes of the community by singling him out for discriminatory treatment, while at the same time people who are more entitled to immediate consideration have to tighten their belts and wait. During the course of his remarks my colleague, the honourable junior member for St. Philip, said that after he looked at the Estimates this morning he was inclined to review this matter again. Even if he had changed his mind completely in the short space of a week or two, I should like to remind the House that on an occasion two years ago when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was taunted with having changed his mind almost overnight in an even more blatant fashion, his rejoinder was; "Only a fool or a child cannot change his mind." My colleague said that when he took up the Estimates this morning he got the information from them which was an additional assistance in compelling him to the opinion that this matter needed further revision. What the honourable member meant by that is this; in the notes which appear in the Estimates opposite the page where the Governor's salary and other emoluments appear, certain things are set out and from a perusal of these notes he got his mind refreshed with regard to the things which we supply the Governor. I am sure that there is not a single member of this House, who has any appreciation for the truth, would dare get up and say that he remembers all the things which we supply free to the Governor. He cannot remember them. Although I have been going through these Estimates for years I see one or two items which slip me, items which we supply free to the incumbent of Government House. Certain information has been given which honourable members may have heard for the first time. I am sure that many honourable members do not know, or if they know, they have forgotten that even the gasoline which the Officer administering the Government uses, he gets it at an infinitely cheaper rate than the ordinary consuming public. Very few people know that he pays no duty on the foodstuffs used for the entertainment at Government House; and as regards his groceries, every month his grocers allow him a rebate representing the amount of duty which would be paid on the commodities utilised at Government House. Besides the salary of £3,000 a year which is paid the Governor, I take it that the Opposition have been paying attention to other things and I shall deal specifically with the items mentioned in the Estimates which refreshed the mind of my colleague. In Item No. 7 there is an allowance of £250 for "Furniture" which includes cutlery, linen and the maintenance of furniture at Government House. In other words, this colony furnishes the linen, furniture and cutlery and maintains them. We also allow £70 for "Lighting;" we pay for the lighting of the office in which the Governor does the work of the colony if he does it at night; we pay

for the lighting of his Private Secretary's office and for the reception rooms in which the entertaining is done. So that when the Governor is entertaining people by virtue of his official position, not only do we allow him a special allowance for the cost of the commodities for the entertainment but also a special allowance for the lighting of the reception rooms. It is also useful to refresh one's mind from the Estimates with the fact that we allow a certain amount for water rates, meters and the cost of water used in excess of 3,000 gallons per diem. We pay the gardeners and casual labourers; for the upkeep of ferneries, tennis courts and so on outside the money voted for the Governor's salary. We pay for scrubbing and cleaning Government House and minor incidental expenditure. This year we are providing money for replacing fire hoses which have been condemned by the Superintendent of the Fire Brigade. It is difficult not to appreciate the position of the Opposition. If with the extra expenditure involved in maintaining the magnificence of Government House we provide additional money, certainly we must be pardoned for coming to the conclusion that we must either cry halt to this expenditure or do nothing until such time as the entire question of revising the salaries of all the officers attached to the Government Service shall have been given due attention. It is not an ordinary matter for members of this Chamber to be accosted by junior Government employees who are finding it absolutely impossible to make two ends meet on a salary of £7 or £8 a month. We are faced with an unemployment situation this year and do you tell me that the Governor who is getting £3,000 a year and an entertainment allowance of £500—you pay his Private Secretary and his Clerks, you completely maintain his house—should be given an extra \$240 a month? Let us wait. It is a very good thing that we have succeeded in providing this money last year because in case Mr. Adams recommends that the present expenditure of the Government in maintaining the Civil Establishment is out of proportion to the revenue of the colony we shall have to retrench perhaps and we would naturally have to begin by lopping off what we had put on to the Governor's salary. It is reasonable to the entire community to let things remain as they are until we have a complete overhaul of the situation. If honourable members appreciate the manner in which the Governor is trying to see conditions at first hand by going about the island so as to make himself *au courant* with local affairs through direct contact, then we can, if we so desire, provide him with a little extra amount for travelling and let everything else remain over for another time. Even if we did that I know that we will leave ourselves open to criticism by a lot of people who will remember that a few years ago the Governor on a smaller salary had to pay his own chauffeur without any travelling allowance, and now as a result of an incident which occurred at the Empire Theatre with Sir Grattan Bushe a few years ago and in consequence of which the chauffeur at Government House, who had given years of useful service was dismissed without a pension or any consideration at all—in consequence of that, even the cost of paying a chauffeur no longer falls on the purse of the Governor. He is provided with two people, as an honourable member says, to drive his car at the expense of the taxpayers of this colony. I repeat that even if we provide this travelling allowance we may be criticised justifiably on the ground that recently the Governor had to pay his own chauffeur and we are giving him one free. We have to bear in mind and appreciate fully that the Officer who is administering the Government of this colony

has to incur certain expenses and he has to try and satisfy all sections of the community. That is why some years ago I myself suggested in this Chamber that rather than allow a Governor to go to Sam Lord's Castle or the Crane or any of the fashionable seaside resorts which are patronised by the ruling classes in this colony, we should provide him with a special seaside resort (Hear, hear) to which he could go during the summer months when everybody tries to get some relaxation, and be by himself so as to avoid the possibility of his being contaminated by close association with people whose interests may not coincide with those of the working classes of the colony.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member need stress that very much.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not propose to do so. I for one appreciate what is involved in running Government House. I also appreciate the fact that the Governor must live there because we have put him there and judging from the Estimates we are attempting to reimburse him for all the extraordinary expenses involved in the maintenance of Government House. We cannot possibly add more to the expenditure of keeping Government House in order, and the occupant is paid a salary for running the colony, a salary which I feel will do more than permit him to eke out an existence. I think I am voicing the opinion of the majority of thinking persons if I say that inasmuch as the question of revising the salaries of Civil Servants is under consideration we should await the results. It cannot be claimed that with the present salary and the perquisites attached to the office the Officer administering the Government is unable to maintain himself and his family and that he is heading for the Bankruptcy Court. Many of the arguments which have been put forward by the Opposition are almost unanswerable and if we consider No. 3 of the proposals in this Report and postpone consideration of the other two, it does not mean and cannot mean that we are positively refusing to do anything more; it rather means that if after mature consideration of the matter even if we think that the Governor is entitled to more money at this stage, we have decided to await the results of the Adams' investigation. As a matter of fact, I was appointed as a member of the Select Committee which considered this question and I never attended the meeting for the simple reason that I was almost completely convinced that the matter would not have been considered until after the investigation of the Civil Service Commissioner had been completed. I therefore beg to move that this Address be amended by the deletion of items (1) and (2). I repeat that I am more inclined to the view that this Officer should be included under the Travelling Allowance Act so as to ensure that if he has travelled he will get the money for it and if he does not travel the country will not be saddled with the expense, rather than make this specific provision for travelling expenses which a lazy or an indifferent governor may not incur. I think that the other provisions which we make can carry on Government House and pay the servants there. It was known that the place would take a lot of servants and I should not be surprised if more servants were employed there when the incumbent received a smaller salary, than are now employed because it was fashionable when servants were paid little or nothing for people to have more retainers within the gate because of the pomp and dignity of the office they wanted to maintain. Those are my considered views on this matter at the moment, Mr. Speaker, and I feel that I am discharging my conscience by adopting the attitude which I have adopted.

Mr. HAYNES: This Address is one of the most ill-begotten and unfortunate Addresses that have been before this House for some years. One would have thought that the four members of this Assembly as advisers of the Head of the Administration would have known the feeling of the present members of the Assembly in this matter and would have advised him not to follow up this scheme for increasing his emoluments. The result is unfortunate since we have to express our true feelings and certain views which should not be expressed. This matter was brought up at the last session or the first part of this session on the basis of an additional allowance of £500 a year for the Head of the Administration. It was thown out by a large majority vote (Mr. ADAMS: A majority of one) and yet we are now faced with a recommendation not for £500 but for £600! I would like to know what our constituents would say when we go back to them? They could only say one thing; rather, they would tell me that I have no ability whatever. As the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said, the salary of the present Head of the Administration is such that it should cause him no claims of shortages. He enjoys the allowances which the honourable member has mentioned and I do not want to go through them now and keep back the work of the House. I opposed the increase of £500 a year before and when I got back to my constituents I was faced with the remarks that here it is the Governor cannot live on £3,000 a year but we can live on 16c. or 1/- a day! (A MEMBER: They were your labourers). That caused considerable unrest and at the present state of Barbados an increase in the Governor's emoluments now would cause still more unrest. Like the honourable senior member for St. Philip I do appreciate the way in which the Governor goes around; he does it in a most thorough manner investigating for himself the various activities of the island. A car does not run on nothing and even although the Governor gets gasoline duty free, he still has to spend money. For that reason I am seconding the amendment proposed by the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I am not in agreement with the view that the Governor should be included under the Travelling Allowance Act. I personally know what a car costs to keep it and I do not think that £150 a year is any great fortune; there is nothing to be saved on that. I think that it would be out of the question to include the Head of the Administration under the Travelling Allowance Act. I beg to second the amendment moved by the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope that this Report will be approached in the real spirit of compromise because that seems to be exactly where we are heading. On the last occasion we were discussing a Bill the aims and objects of which were to increase the salary or emoluments of the Governor as fixed by law. Those of us who expressed our opinions then as to why the salary whether it be by way of duty allowance or otherwise as fixed by law should not be increased can justify our position, I suppose, because that in itself will carry a pension and it will mean that you cannot reduce it. Therefore I think that we were justified on that occasion in saying that we were not in favour of that increase of £500. Today I am not in favour of the recommendations in the Report; I am in favour of certain amendments. The last occasion on which the emoluments of the Head of the Administration were increased was in 1944, and honourable members can see what was voted in the Estimates. In 1944 the Governor's salary was increased from £2,500 a year to £3,000 a year and it remains for us to say if in 1948 it is

justifiable for us to argue that the wages of the masses of working people in this colony should have some justifiable increase in their salaries or emoluments whether we should not think in the same terms in relation to the Governor. Is £3,000 worth to-day what it was worth in 1944? I feel that this Report has a lot to recommend it since whatever sum of money is recommended, if it is passed by this House, we will have the opportunity in reviewing the Estimates from year to year to decide whether we will vote that amount or not according to the conditions as they prevail. This is an absolutely different matter from that on the last occasion when we were asked to consider an amendment to the Act which fixed the substantive salary. We have been told that there are 13 servants at Government House and in this Address we are asked to provide the sum of £400 towards the cost of these servants. I say again that the first thing to which we should address our minds is whether with the increased wages for servants and people in that walk of life, the sum of £3,000 is today worth the Head of the Administration what it was worth him in 1944. That is the right approach to the matter. We have also been asked to increase the grant for the lighting of Government House and to provide an amount to assist in defraying the travelling expenses incurred by the Officer administering the Government. I do not think there is anything wrong if we review the situation and reserve our right of revision in respect of whatever is done as to the provision of light, servants or travelling expenses. If, for instance, honourable members feel next year that the Electric Company have reduced their rates, they can cut down the vote as regards lighting. I am not prepared to say that the figures which were put before the Select Committee were fictitious but I am prepared for a compromise. We have been told that £600 a year is required for the payment of servants at Government House and everybody knows that demands are being made by people in all walks of life for increased salaries. We are not Communists yet and there is no point in fooling ourselves that we are going to argue successfully that people must all share and share alike. That might suit some people to argue on a political platform but it will not last very long. I must agree with my colleague that this Address should not be passed and the figures put into the Estimates without the Other Place being given the opportunity to go into the question. I feel that this Address should be passed here and the Other Place be given the opportunity to consider the matter and then a Resolution can be sent down for the required sum. I will not support the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in putting these figures in the Estimates and if he insists on doing that, I will have no other alternative than to vote for the rejection of the Address entirely. I beg to move that this Address be amended by deleting the figures "120" occurring in item (1) and substituting therefor the figures "100", and by deleting the figures "400" occurring in item (2) and substituting therefor the figures "250". My reason for moving these amendments is that the total sum provided would not exceed £500. The argument has been used, and it is a reasonable argument, that the Civil Service Commissioner, Mr. Adams, is now going into the emoluments of the members of the Civil Establishment and we should await the results; but it should be borne in mind that he is not going into the question of the allowances for running Government House. Therefore if we had been asked today to increase any part of the substantive salary which would be fashionable, I would agree with those honourable members who have suggested that we should

wait until Commissioner Adams reports. I repeat that the Commissioner is not going into the question of these allowances and within two or three years we will be in a position to say whether we will vote these amounts or not. The members of the Select Committee have made these recommendations and while there is no minority report, and while it is true that we are not bound by the recommendations, until facts have been given to prove the contrary, we have to accept that the facts which had been put before the Select Committee were sufficient to cause them to make these recommendations. My amendments would be in effect a necessary compromise of the motion made by the honourable, senior member for St. Philip. I again appeal to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that he should not insist in attempting to put the figures in the Estimates whether we agree to the compromise or otherwise. If that is done I have no other alternative than to vote against it.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This question has been debated for the entire day; there are still many honourable members who want to speak and we will go on until it gets dark. I therefore beg to move that the further consideration of this Address be postponed.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the further consideration of this Address be postponed. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY and Dr. CUMMINS—10.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WARD—10.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in a "tie", ten honourable members voting "Aye", and ten honourable members voting "No". I vote with the "Noes". A motion has been made—

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that if any honourable member has any points to raise he should speak before I do.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are not many honourable members who have not spoken. The honourable member who moved the postponement and the honourable member who seconded cannot speak now and they make 17 members who have already spoken.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to know if there are any other points which honourable members want to raise before I reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put it to the House. Does any other honourable member want to speak before the honourable member replies? (After a pause) I do not think any other honourable member wants to speak.

Mr. ADAMS: I sometimes make the mistake of taking too much for granted. If honourable members had taken the trouble to look up previous debates and to go carefully into the matter before them, many of the things which have been said would never have been said. Many of these things would not have been said too if what I referred to in a short sentence had been expanded by me. It is a regrettable coincidence that the sum of £500 appears in the course of debate for the last four years in more than one place. In short, some time ago this House increased the Governor's salary from £2,500 per annum to £3,000 per annum; last session when a Message came to the House the sum of £500 as an increase of duty allowance was suggested by the Sec-

retary of State for the Colonies and therefore honourable members have in their minds this sum of £500; and now the last honourable member who has spoken has made a very moderate appeal to the House and has based his compromise on the sum of £500—a pure accident. Let me remind honourable members especially the honourable junior member for St. Peter who is singing an entirely different tune from the one he sang when the Bill which sought to increase the Duty Allowance by £500 came before the House. The honourable member was strongly in favour of it by his speech and his vote: he had much to say about keeping the dignity of Government House, but other times have produced other speeches. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has himself told the House of his change of front and he has anticipated what must have been in the mind of some of us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of explanation. I should like to ask the honourable member—

Mr. SPEAKER: If you are explaining you cannot ask any question.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I said was that if we think the Governor is entitled to more consideration on account of his travelling we might give him the amount for travelling allowance and postpone consideration of the remaining matters until after the completion of the Adams' investigation.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member has said how far beyond any of us, beyond the wildest spendthrift, he was prepared to go a few years ago. He anticipated what was in the minds of several of us and he thought he would soften the blow by himself letting us know that he went that distance at a time when wages were not as high as they are today. The honourable member gives a most notorious explanation as to why he was prepared to go so far. He was prepared to give the Governor a seaside house and I do not think he would have liked him to sleep on the floor—he was prepared to spend all that money on the Governor who is more than overpaid today!

Mr. SPEAKER: I asked the honourable member at that time not to carry that particular point too far.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Your Honour will recall that I explained that my reason for making that suggestion was that in the interest of the working classes, it would be better for the Governor to be at a seaside resort by himself rather than be at the fashionable places mixing with the ruling classes and getting contaminated by their views.

Mr. ADAMS: That is an argument which satisfies nobody but the honourable member. What sort of argument is that when there was more reason for emphasizing that the Governor should stay at home? God knows what was in the honourable member's mind when he made that suggestion. To-day you hear the argument about these poor people being neglected but the honourable member in his suggestion about giving the Governor a seaside house outshone anybody else in helping a Governor in the 300 years of our history. If you read extracts from Assembly debates you will find that the tendency has always been in the other direction, that is to say, to confine the Governor and cut down his salary. On the question of the Governor's salary and emoluments honourable members have got confused in their minds by using the word "emoluments". If that word had not been used nobody would have said anything about Mr. Adams and his enquiry. What is before us has nothing to do with any emoluments; the question of Mr. Adams going into the emoluments of members of the Civil Service is a vastly different matter. Again, how can it be said that this has

anything to do with Duty Allowance? That would be directly contrary to what the House voted on the last occasion. Imagine us raising the question about Duty Allowance when there was a direct refusal by a vast majority of one? The vote was 10 to 9. I repeat that this is not a question of any personal emoluments. I am not going to refer specifically to the salary of the Governor from time to time; I will just take the figures of some 50 years ago. When we had a revenue of £180,000 the Governor's salary was 1/60th of the revenue; today we have a revenue of £1,574,000 and the Governor's salary is 1/500th of the revenue. The Duty Allowance was £600 and now it is £500. You will find that far from spending money which you have not got, when the colony was badly off the Governor was much better paid. If honourable members are going to be guided by reason then I ask them to listen to my argument; but if they have made up their minds that is a different matter. We had the honourable senior member for St. Lucy who normally is moderate and sometimes reasonable, asking us what is to prevent a Governor from using less than 13 servants and saving that money? At any rate this House can alter at any time these sums of money which are voted, and the Governor cannot take this £400 which may be voted towards the cost of servants and use it for any other purpose, in the same way that he cannot save on his water bill and give a cocktail party out of it. From time to time over a period of years Secretaries of State for the Colonies have been asking this colony to increase the Governor's salary largely because, as they sometimes state in despatches, we cannot get a man who has not got a private income to spend more than he is working for. The time will come when we shall get anything but the right type of Governor we want; we shall get a rich Governor who will hardly knock about certain places but who is far more likely to be a Savannah Club man—a rich man who can afford to spend money. I quote now from the letter sent by the Secretary of State to the Governor and embodied in the Message which came down to us. It was suggested that the duty allowance should be increased from £500 to £1,000 per annum. Paragraph 3 of the Message says this:—

"The Secretary of State has also suggested that consideration might appropriately be given to certain other items of expenditure which are now 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. He notes that at present in Barbados no motor car is provided from public funds, but that in practice the Governor normally finds it necessary to provide for and maintain two vehicles."

Paragraph 4 is as follows:—

"The Secretary of State has requested His Excellency to convey the above views to the Legislature and trusts that the Legislature will see its way to accept them and act upon them. In making this request the Secretary of State wishes to assure the Legislature that he is satisfied that the suggestions which he makes are no more than are necessary in the light of actual experience to enable the Gov-

ernor, without being called upon to draw upon any private funds which he may possess, to discharge effectively and fittingly the duties of his office as Head of the Executive Government and representative in Barbados of His Majesty the King."

Mr. Rankine, the then Acting Governor, added this:—

"Accordingly a Bill is being introduced to increase the duty allowance payable to the Officer administering the Government from £500 to £1,000 per annum. It is also proposed to seek the authority of the Legislature to supply the Governor with a car at the public expense."

In short, what the Secretary of State asked us to do was to ask for an additional £1,000. We did not consider that that had the ghost of a chance of passing this Assembly and the Executive Committee came to the conclusion that it was far better to increase the duty allowance; that is why a Bill was sent down seeking to put on the Statute Book an allowance of £500 extra. Only a portion of the recommendations of the Secretary of State came before the House. On that occasion the House was a comparatively small House and I remind honourable members that the voting was 10 to 9. The honourable member who is now leaving was in England, the honourable junior member for St. Michael was not in the House that day and it is just conceivable that with a full House the Bill would have been passed. Let me inform honourable members that even if the vote for £500 was passed then we would still have to ask the opinion of the Legislature on this question now before us because the Secretary of State for the Colonies has asked us to do so. It is not a question of our losing the first vote of £500 and coming back for it in another way. I appeal to the honourable senior member for the City to see that his suggestion needs a little more consideration, because he frankly says that the recommendations in this Report will mean £600 and, he adds, "let us get £500." But as soon as you do that you make the mistake of saying that we came for £500 and not having got it in that way we are trying to get it in another way. The House rejected the Bill relative to the additional duty allowance and they did not even allow the vote to be negatived temporarily. When the matter first came up the present Governor had not yet come to the island and we had thought that anything which would seem to cause acrimonious debate centring around him should be done before he came to the island. The House having rejected the Bill, the Governor sent down the following Message as Message No. 24/1947:—

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Acting Governor's Message No. 5/1947 on the subject of the emoluments attaching to the office of Governor of Barbados.

The Honourable House has already indicated that it is not in favour of an increase in the Governor's duty allowance. The other suggestions made by the Secretary of State have not yet been considered, namely, that transport for the use of the Officer administering the Government should be purchased and maintained at the public expense and that some portion of the expenses of the domestic staff employed at Government House should be met from public funds.

His Excellency would appreciate the views of the Honourable House on these or other similar proposals.

That is what we are now debating. The House will see that the other similar proposals are left entirely in the hands of the Legislature; so that if we do not agree with the suggestion of the Secretary of State as to the purchase of a car we can make some other suggestion as regards the travelling allowance. If honourable members had borne that in mind from the beginning of the debate the unfortunate remarks about the previous vote of £500, having been turned down and our now asking for the £500 in another way would not have been made. I repeat that if the vote of £500 had been passed we would still have asked the views of the Legislature on these other matters because the Secretary of State has asked us to do so. I believe that I made a mistake when I suggested that the wages of the servants have been the same during the past two Governorships. I have since discovered that those wages are double to-day what they were some time ago and £600 represents the wages as having been doubled. These wages had to go up because the wages of persons outside Government House were going up. Inasmuch as the Secretary of State for the Colonies had said that it is the generally recognised practice for the greater portion of the expenses of the domestic staff employed at Government House to be paid from general revenue, and that the Governor should pay for that portion which may be said to be the personal service of himself and his family, the Select Committee decided on these figures. It is purely an accident that when we considered what was a fair and reasonable division of the expenditure the total amount came to £600. If the amount had come to £200 the recommendation would have been made for £200; and it is not unreasonable, following what the Secretary of State suggests, that we should pay two-thirds of the cost of the servants and let the Governor pay one-third. I doubt whether there is one man who pays his servants £600 a year out of a salary of £3,000. Do you think that a man who works for \$40 a month would pay a servant 8s a week? Let hon. members take the figures and analyse them and they will see that they are asking the occupant of Government House because of his position to spend far more than high officials would spend. This is a very unpleasant duty because nobody wants to pry into the domestic or household affairs of the Governor or anybody else, but I have some other figures which I would regret to give but if hon. members really want to examine this matter in the light of cold reason I shall be forced to give them. We know what happened in Trinidad recently; we know that the Governor's wife wrote to the Press about the amount of expenditure and the same thing is true of any Colonial Governor. Since the Governor has been here, the number of people entertained to table, lunch or cocktails has been on an average of 120 per month; and which of us would want to entertain so many people month in and month out? If I felt so inclined I could read out how officials from anywhere readily push themselves in Government House and you cannot keep them out and they are there apart from those whom, by virtue of his office, the Governor has to entertain. I cannot understand the honourable junior member for St. Peter; he does not understand himself at sometimes. If a warship is in the harbour it is the Commander's duty to call on the Governor and it is the Governor's duty to entertain him; the same thing applies to the Military, Colonial Governors and Government Officers. Can anybody picture an intercolonial tennis or cricket tournament taking place here, or a team coming up here from St. Vincent, Grenada or some

other island and the Governor not feeling it his duty to entertain the team? Expenses of this sort are absolutely inevitable and one cannot reasonably use the argument that the Governor is already handsomely paid and should not be given this consideration. The figures for the month of January and other months show that there were 59 people entertained to dinner, 54 to lunch and 94 to drinks. One or two honourable members, especially the honourable junior member for St. Philip says that if he hears arguments that can convince him he will be convinced; I am therefore endeavouring to put forward arguments and facts so that he can see whether or not there is anything exorbitant that we are asking of the Legislature. Honourable members have heard the facts; they have heard that people are entertained at Government House at the rate of 120 a month, and do they know what it would cost to entertain 100 people a month even with biscuits and salt fish? We have a paltry lunch here and we put down £200 a year for lunch one day a week. We have no drinks, not even coca-cola. (Laughter). We know what it must mean to entertain even one-third of the number entertained at Government House. Some honourable members give cocktail parties in their private homes from time to time. Let them remember what it costs them. Very often some honourable members give a big cocktail party and they are so overwhelmed with the expenditure that they do not give another one for another year or so; but when the Governor is compelled by virtue of his office to give dinners and accommodate people at Government House and he has to do that from January to December, is it unreasonable to ask for an increase of duty allowance? It must also be remembered that the Governor like some people in some other positions must of necessity subscribe to local charities; he cannot refuse a reasonable request. He cannot refuse to attend the opening of civic institutions and by virtue of his position he is obviously expected to give a suitable subscription to the funds of charitable institutions. I am greatly tempted, even although I think it *infra dig*, to quote some figures to show that only a rich man can afford to be Governor of this Island. Before I sit down I will quote the former Attorney General. In keeping with the request of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Select Committee have made suggestions in the way in which they have made them. Let us take the lighting: we have attempted to deal with that in the same way in which we dealt with the matter of the servants, that is to say, we pay for some of the lighting. In the old days the lighting did not cost so much and no money was voted towards it. As soon as lighting by electricity came along, the Legislature, still being cautious in its attitude towards Governors, provided some portion of the cost of the lighting and voted £70. The annual expenditure on electricity is £167.2s.5d. How can you imagine the Governor in entertaining people to switch on a light at the top of the steps and then switch it off so as to save on the electric bill? Can you expect the Officer administering the Government to do a thing of that sort? As the honourable junior member for St. James has told the House, some of the expenditure on electricity has been cut down by discontinuing the use of some electrical appliances. I can assure honourable members that a most careful watch is kept in respect of the lighting bill. As regards the travelling expenses I do not think that there would ever be a majority of members of this House who would seriously suggest that the Governor should be put under the ordinary Travelling Allowance Act where he would have to give day to day accounts of his actual mileage. I do not

suppose that there would be many honourable members who would seriously press that the Governor should be put in that category. I therefore do not propose to say anything much about that. I have had shown me some figures which I hesitate to use; they deal with expenditure in Gambia whence the Governor recently came.

Mr. SPEAKER: There may be circumstances in another country with which you cannot compare this colony and I therefore think you should speak in general terms.

Mr. ADAMS: This is in the category of those colonies to which the Secretary of State for the Colonies refers as paying portion of the cost of the domestic servants and where two cars are provided and not one. However I prefer not to go into any details lest it appear to be a direct reference made to the individual rather than to the office. I appeal now to the honourable senior member for the City. He has made a reasonable request for a compromise but he must see that his compromise needs some further consideration. I repeat again that the fact that these figures add up to £600 is only an accident. I agree that in this House as in any Assembly there is much that can be done by moderation on both sides or by way of compromise. If the honourable member is willing to make a compromise I appeal to him to persuade his friends to see the wisdom of a compromise. I am suggesting to the honourable member that if consideration of this matter is postponed all parties may very well agree to a compromise; but one side cannot very well accept a compromise from an Independent who might only be speaking for himself. I am sure that there is not a majority agreeing as regards either the provision of a car or otherwise and we can easily get together and decide in one way or the other. With the exception of the honourable senior member for James no honourable member has expressed himself as being utterly opposed to these suggestions. Perhaps the honourable junior member for St. Peter might be another exception, but honourable members are in favour of modifying the suggestions. I do not know how many honourable members are in favour of one suggestion as compared with another but I know that no honourable member except the honourable senior member for St. James is wholly opposed to the suggestions. I therefore suggest to honourable members that, rather than haphazardly give a vote which may not represent the opinions of the majority of members whether on one side or the other, they agree to the postponement of the debate in order that we may get together and agree on what we can agree. This is a matter on which we can sit around a table and agree. (Mr. RAMSAY: We cannot postpone it twice). The motion for the postponement can be put again if honourable members are in favour of it; they were in favour of it some time ago.

MEMBERS: Question!

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to remind the honourable junior member for St. Peter of what he said on the last occasion. This is what he said.

Mr. RAMSAY: I would like to know if the honourable member can refer to the debates of the same session.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can leave that to me.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member is ashamed of what he said then that is a different matter; but he can give me credit for having as much intelligence as he has.

Mr. RAMSAY: Human beings have erred and I am one.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member cannot behave himself even if he tries to do so. This is what he said:—

"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."

Mr. SPEAKER: What debate are you referring to?

Mr. ADAMS: This is a debate in a previous session of this House. It took place on the 4th February, 1947.

Mr. RAMSAY: This is the same session. I ask you to rule on the question, Mr. Speaker; I maintain that this is the same session.

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 121 says this:—

"A member may read from the authorised report of the debates, the report of any speech made in the General Assembly during any previous session."

Mr. ADAMS: I am amazed that any member of the House or Officer of the House could possibly make so elementary a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am inclined to rule that this is not the same session.

Mr. ADAMS: The House was prorogued.

Mr. RAMSAY: I want you to rule on the matter, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the honourable member that I am not a machine. Only a machine cannot change.

Mr. ADAMS: The change should be an honest change.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is referring to me as a dishonest man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member want the word "dishonest" taken down? I did not hear the word used myself.

Mr. ADAMS: I will use that adjective on the proper occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: If an opinion has been expressed by an honourable member in a previous session of the House it does not affect the particular question before the House. Honourable members change from time to time and the mere fact that an honourable member expressed an opinion a year or eighteen months ago—

Mr. ADAMS: I am merely making use of the honourable member's arguments in order to show that they were sound then and they are sound to-day. The honourable member went on:—

"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. Let us be sober and get down to rock bottom."

Mr. SPEAKER: What is that to do with the matter before us?

Mr. ADAMS: I am suggesting that the same argument will appeal to the House today. The honourable member continued:—

"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. 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 are 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 to-morrow." The hon. member was talking to his next door neighbour and apparently he has some super-intelligence to-day over that which he was showing a year ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating the merits and demerits of members of the House rather than the Address which he wants to get passed.

Mr. ADAMS: I am using the normal methods which are used when a member is putting forward a view which he maintains is intelligent and it is contrary to the view which he put forward a short time ago and for which he also claims intelligence. I am endeavouring to show honourable members who have been appealed to by certain arguments that if they put side by side the arguments of the same speaker, those arguments should not carry any conviction. The honourable member concluded:—

"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; today 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."

I promised that I would use the arguments of the learned ex-Attorney General when he was dealing with a similar matter a few years before that. At that time an increase in the Governor's salary was asked for and this is what the learned ex-Attorney General said:—

"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." He goes on—

Mr. RAMSAY: The honourable member is reading from his own speech. It is a speech made in this House—

Mr. SPEAKER: You are out of order.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is Chairman of Committees and he does not take the time to read the Rules of the House before he speaks. The ex-Attorney General pointed out that the proposal to increase the Governor's salary did not come from the Executive Committee but from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. On the question of entertainment, this is what he said:—

"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."

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to use any argument which might have been more appropriate on the question of an increase in the salary or duty allowance; the only reason why I referred to those speeches is that in the course of the remarks of at least two honourable members reference was made to the greater desirability of asking, if it is a question of expenditure on entertainment, for duty allowance rather than for what we have asked.

Mr. SYMONDS: I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member thinks that he has discovered a Rule by which he thinks he can stop me I shall be glad to hear it. I have taken the trouble to know my Rules and when new brooms come in and purport to be sweeping they should see how they are sweeping and not allow people to direct them, people who cannot even protect themselves but have to appeal to the Chair for protection. (Laughter). (A MEMBER: I appeal for light). Honourable members will be relieved to hear that I do not propose to go through the points which have been raised by other honourable members relative to the question of salary or duty allowance; but I do wish to point out that Mr. Adams' investigation has nothing to do with what is before the House. The use of the word "emoluments" in such a context is wrong. The

argument of the honourable senior member for St. Philip and some other honourable member that this matter should await consideration until the Report of the Civil Service Commissioner has been put in, would seem to be a reasonable argument at first blush, but if honourable members are persuaded by it I ask them to re-consider their views on that point. Although the honourable senior member for the City has replied to that argument, it is still necessary for me to point out that these things are merely the normal practice and that whatever Mr. Adams recommends has nothing to do with their consideration. I should like to point out that even if we agree to these recommendations, as the honourable senior member for the City has pointed out, it is always open to us to lop them off again. I must remind honourable members that, as it was pointed out across the Table, these are amounts which are voted and sums might be voted against these items and the money might not be spent. If, for instance, we vote £250 for "Furniture" and only £200 is spent then the £50 lapses. Every single item has got to be spent under the Head to which it is allocated. It is not a question of a block vote where you spend on something else what you save under this or that Head. Let us forget any Party question in this matter; I appeal to the honourable junior member for St. Peter who will know that my remarks are merely rhetorical pin-pricks. (Mr. RAMSAY: You are too late). There is only one type of being like the honourable member when he makes up his mind. It does not suit the honourable member to change his vote in the particular circumstances in which he finds himself. If the honourable member interrupts I will have to reply. (Mr. RAMSAY: I will not be intimidated). I suggest that this additional sum be added to the amount for lighting; it was indeed a surprise to me, it was a surprise to other members of the Select Committee that the lighting bill was so high, and I repeat that very great care is taken as regards the light. It is unfortunate for more than one reason that the honourable junior member for St. James and the honourable junior member for St. Michael who were members of the Committee, failed to agree on a compromise; and in the luncheon interval the honourable junior member for St. James was willing to do what the honourable senior member for the City suggested. If honourable members feel that although the members of the Select Committee made these recommendations they are not unalterably bound by them and they will agree on a compromise, then I ask honourable members what are the majority in favour of? I suggest that honourable members should pass around their views on these items. (Mr. HAYNES: Let it be put to the vote and will tell you.) If there is any chance of a settlement being arrived at in this matter, it is of course advisable to have a settlement rather than have all three of the items turned down although that may not be the feeling of all honourable members. I do not remember what are the proposed amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will tell you because I am going to put the question. The question will be that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: We may be able to agree on the first two items and the question of transport can be dealt with later on. My view is that a car should be provided rather than this sum of £150 to assist in defraying the travelling expenses. If the feeling of the House is that we should agree to the amendment of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, I am quite willing to accept it and I will get permission to include the amount in the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member accepts that amendment I take it that I can put the amendment straightway.

Mr. ADAMS: I accept the amendment made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore I will put the question that the Address as amended and accepted by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph do now pass.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable junior member for St. George to be anxious to speak. This is not the place where we put tricks on one another. If the honourable member is agreeing with the majority of the House in accepting the amendment of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, I will stop speaking. If he is getting up to make a speech I have no intention of sitting down at this stage. I repeat that we may not agree with everything that is set out here. The Select Committee have gone further than the suggestion of the honourable senior member for the City, but if there is a reasonable compromise we can agree to it so that the figures can be put into the Estimates next week.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the motion. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it. The question is that the Address with the paragraphs (1) and (2) omitted do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: MESSRS. SMITH, COX, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, HAYNES, DOWDING, MOTTLEY, WARD and DR. CUMMINS—12.

Noes: DR. WILSON, MESSRS. RAMSAY, SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, GARNER and S. A. WALCOTT—6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, twelve honourable members voting "Aye", and six honourable members voting "No". I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to present this Address.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to Thursday, the 11th day of March, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER: We have wasted all day to-day through no fault of ours. The Estimates should have been dealt with to-day and this matter could have been brought up afterwards. I beg to move as an amendment that the words "Thursday, the 11th day of March, 1948," be deleted in order to insert the words "Tuesday next, the 16th day of March, 1948."

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn to Thursday, the 11th day of March, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon. An amendment has been moved that the words "Thursday, the 11th day of March, 1948," be deleted in order to insert the words "Tuesday next, the 16th day of March, 1948". 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 "Noes" have it.

A division was then taken as follows:—

Ayes: MESSRS. SMITH, COX, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and DR. CUMMINS—7.

Noes: DR. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, MOTTLEY, S. A. WALCOTT and WARD—11.

Mr. SPEAKER; The question has been decided in the negative, seven honourable members voting "Aye", and eleven honourable members voting "No." The question now is that the words "Tuesday next, the 16th day of March, 1948," be in-

serted in the blank created. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

The question that this House do now adjourn to Tuesday next, the 16th day of March, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.