



SUPPLEMENT TO The Official Gazette

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

BRIDGETOWN, BARBADOS, 13TH DECEMBER, 1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd November, 1948.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Dr. J. A. LeV. WILSON, Messrs. M. E. COX, K. N. R. HUSBANDS, A. E. S. LEWIS, H. D. BLACKMAN, E. D. MOTTLEY, H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., and E. L. WARD.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 26th October, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. MAPP enters the House and takes his seat.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. George a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 30th September, 1948.

PAPERS LAID

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

Message No. 33/1948 from His Excellency the Governor, with reference to the Address from the Honourable the House of Assembly dated the 5th October, informing the Honourable House that provision will be made in the next quarterly schedule of additional appropriation for payment to Mr. Beresford Yearwood, Assistant Messenger, of £10 in respect of extra duties resulting from the vacancy in the post of Head Messenger and Librarian.

Message No. 34/1948 from His Excellency the Governor transmitting for the information of the Honourable the House of Assembly a copy of a letter from the Chairman of the Standing Cleser Association

Committee suggesting that a Conference be held for the purpose of examining the questions arising from Resolutions 4, 5 and 9 of the Conference on Closer Association held at Montego Bay, Jamaica, in September, 1947.

Message No. 35/1948 from His Excellency the Governor informing the Honourable the House of Assembly that should the Civil Establishment Bill which has been introduced into the Legislature be enacted, the Governor-in-Executive Committee proposes to make orders as in the drafts attached hereto.

Report of the Committee appointed by His Excellency the Governor to consider what steps can be taken to prevent cane fires and to reduce the acreage of cane burnt.

Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT and FOSTER enter the House and take their seats.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of £2,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to assist in the repair of houses which were damaged as the result of heavy rains and high wind on the 5th of July, 1948. (Cheers).

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to provide for the establishment of offices in the public service of this Island, for the numbers and remuneration of public officers and for the purposes connected therewith.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers Act, 1907.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. DOWDING: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor.

1. The House of Assembly begs to draw to the attention of Your Excellency the fact that under the Capital Rehabilitation Fund, peasants and estates have to produce evidence to the Rehabilitation Board that they have incurred expenditure of a capital

nature, before payment can be made on canes delivered by such peasants and estates for the crop years of 1947 and 1948.

2. The House of Assembly realizes that in the case of peasants the production by them of evidence that they have incurred expenditure of a capital nature will be an impossibility.

3. The House of Assembly, therefore, respectfully requests that Your Excellency immediately take the necessary steps to authorize the Capital Rehabilitation Board to pay the amounts due to individual peasants, irrespective of the production by them of evidence that they have incurred expenditure of a capital nature.

Mr. DOWDING: Of my intention to ask the House, later in the day, for permission to take this Address as Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to provide for the establishment of offices in the Public Service of this Island, for the numbers and remuneration of public officers and for the purposes connected therewith is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890, is read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers Act, 1907, is read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

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

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

RESOLUTION *re* ACQUIRING OF LAND AND CONSTRUCTING ROAD LEADING TO THE BELLE PUMPING STATION
POSTPONED.

Dr. CUMMINS asks for and is granted leave to postpone the further consideration of the Resolution under Order No. 1—Resolution for the sum of £7,000 (to be subsequently refunded from loan funds) to meet the cost of (a) acquiring land for a road to connect the Belle Pumping Station with My Lord's Hill and for stores buildings and quarters for engineers and resident staff; and (b) constructing the road.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Chairman reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas,—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Government.

Dr. CUMMINS: Before I move that Your Honour leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply I want to make a few remarks. It is my intention to proceed with Resolution No. 2 under Order No. 2, but I know that there will be controversy as to whether the House should deal with this Resolution before it has dealt with the Civil Establishment Bill, of which I gave notice earlier to-day. Copies of

that Bill has been distributed among honourable members and if it is the desire of the House that we should deal with the Bill before proceeding to deal with this Resolution, I am quite ready and willing to accede to such a request. But I have been made to understand that there is a ruling of the Whitley Council, that any Bill which affects the Civil Establishment of this Island should be scrutinized by them before it is dealt with by the Legislature; therefore, I have no alternative but to proceed with the consideration of Resolution No. 2 under Order No. 2. That being so—

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The honourable member said that he knows that there will be controversy as to whether the House should deal with Resolution No. 2 under Order No. 2 before it has dealt with the Civil Establishment Bill, of which he gave notice earlier to-day and before an expression of opinion has been given by the House on that point, he is about to proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I crave Your Honour's indulgence in making my point. The senior member for St. Thomas has stated that in view of the fact that there will be controversy in this matter, he wanted to know whether the House would deal with the Civil Establishment Bill, of which he gave notice earlier in the day, before it has dealt with the Resolution. He went further and stated that he understood that there is ruling of the Whitley Council that any Bill which affects the Civil Establishment of this Island should be scrutinized by them before it is dealt with by the Legislature. My submission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Whitley Council has no power over this legislative assembly and I am asking Your Honour to give a ruling in this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has made his point of order. I suggest that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas make a motion that the House go into Committee of Supply in order to regularize the matter.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I do not know if honourable members are aware of what is happening but if they have points to make about procedure I suggest that this is the time to make them. You cannot let the House send this Resolution to the Committee of Supply and then, in Committee of Supply, debate points of law and constitutional practice and procedure. If the House feels that this matter has reached the stage when it can be sent to the Committee of Supply, then the Committee of Supply, when the matter reaches it, will have to confine its debate to what is sent to it and not the question as to whether it is correct or not that what has been sent it should have been sent to it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am interested in this matter from this point of view: whether we should pass this Resolution and then find ourselves in the position that the Auditor General will be unable to pay this money. That is the point which I want to make and I am sure that the senior member for St. Thomas, in his reply, will make clear to us the instructions which he has on it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a Resolution that supplements Estimates under Heads of Departments which this House passed sometime ago; some of those Estimates are fixed by law and the law by which those Estimates are fixed will remain the same, after we have passed this Resolution. That is another point which I would like the senior member for St. Thomas to clear up, in respect of this Resolution. Some of these salaries, I repeat, have been fixed in accord-

ance with the provisions of certain Acts and in accordance with the entirely new procedure of special Resolutions. My own personal opinion is that the particular Acts and special Resolutions should be amended before the proposed salaries in this Resolution can legally be paid. For instance, the Department of Science and Agriculture Act makes provision for such offices and at such salaries as shall be fixed from time to time and approved by the Legislature by Special Resolution; that, to my mind, is the only way the personnel of that Department can be paid, if there is a law to that effect. Resolutions for supplementary expenditure have been presented to this House in an entirely different form; they are usually accompanied by a schedule which is passed Head after Head. It has been laid down by an ex-Attorney General in this House that an addendum to a Resolution is not law; therefore, when we go into Committee we can talk at random about a certain thing but we cannot postpone the particular Head to have it re-considered. The addendum to a Resolution is usually in the form of an explanatory note rather than a schedule to the Resolution and I have no doubt that the senior member for St. Thomas will be able to explain that to us. Now, just in case we go into Committee of Supply on this Resolution, there are certain general remarks which I would like to make about the particular Resolution. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this House is in a rather unfortunate position as far as this Resolution is concerned. Several months ago, this House voted money for a Commissioner to come to Barbados and go into the emoluments and conditions of service of government servants and the re-organizing of the structure of the Civil Establishment—which was subsequently added to his terms of reference. I understand, Sir, that when the Commissioner first came to this island, he said that he was unable to carry out the latter part of his terms of reference, namely, the re-organizing of the Civil Establishment, and Sir, he proceeded merely to deal with the emoluments of government servants and the conditions of service. In my opinion, the money which was paid to him was paid illegally because the terms under which money is paid from the Treasury can only be made or altered by this House and if he could not carry out the second part of the terms of reference, he had no right to carry out the first part, unless this House previously agreed to it. To substantiate that statement, I will instance the purchase of the Cotton Spinning Plant and the building of the New Pay Ward "A". In each of those cases, a Resolution was sent back to this House informing it of alterations which were about to be made to the original proposal and seeking its approval and I fail to see why this House should not have been informed that the second part of the terms of reference could not be carried out by this Commissioner and let this House agree to his doing one portion of the work and not the other. The next thing is this—and it is in keeping with an almost prophetic remark I made at the time when this investigation was about to be made. The Commissioner submitted his report and what do we find? We find that a local Committee was appointed to investigate the expert's report—the identical thing I said at the time—and I understand that this local Committee which went into the Commissioner's report never even asked him to attend one of its meetings to explain why he came to the conclusions he came to nor did they have the courtesy or the decency to send him a copy of the report which they made on his report. Another unfortunate position in which the House finds itself is this: The Commissioner took a long time to do his work; the local

expert Committee took a long time to look over his report—I understand that they had the assistance of the Whitley Council and the Civil Service Association—but now the House of Assembly, whose members will be blamed for all the anomalies and will have to account to these people for all the injustices whether wittingly or unwittingly committed, has to try and get through the matter, without sending it to a Select Committee, without expert guidance, at two or three meetings in open debate. I say that that is a most unfortunate position in which to place the people's representatives at the end of the legislative session when the time should be devoted to the clearing up of certain non-controversial but essential matters on the Order Paper. I repeat that that is a most unfortunate position for this House to find itself in. The next thing is that included in this matter is the principle of back pay. Back pay is very good when it is doing justice; but very often employees are willing to accept what is offered them and in a few weeks after they received it, they start to grumble again and another Committee has to be set up to make enquiry all over again. I have had the honour of being a member of this House for the past seven years and I do not remember a session—perhaps I do not remember the year that has passed without this House having to deal with salaries and conditions of service in either some section of the Civil Establishment or the entire Civil Establishment, from the office of Governor down. You may have the Police to deal with at one time; you may have the Unestablished Staff to deal with at another time and so it goes on and my humble opinion is that it will continue to be so until the people's representatives are given sufficient time to sit on a Committee with the persons recommending salaries to be paid and do a good job of the whole thing. I understand too, Sir, that some of the Departments that are included in this Resolution, whether they receive all or some of their money from the Treasury, have had no representation whatever before the local Committee—absolutely none! I do not wish to mention Departments specifically now but I would like the senior member for St. Thomas to tell me exactly what would be my position when we go into Committee of Supply on this Resolution. Can any of these Heads be properly postponed, seeing that they have come to us in the form of an addendum and not a schedule to the Resolution? I would like him to tell me whether it is his considered opinion that we can, without doing harm to the persons who are involved, proceed with this Resolution before considering the Civil Establishment Bill. Another thing I would like him to answer under one specific Head—Education—is whether if the schemes which affect the teachers of secondary schools are still in existence, we can alter the salaries paid under those schemes. If those schemes are still in existence, would it be a breach of faith or a breach of contract if we give the teachers of secondary schools less? That is another thing I would like to know. So far as I am aware, all those instruments laying down the scale of salaries to be paid and things of that sort will have to be brought to this House and be amended before the proposed salaries for teachers of secondary schools in this Resolution can be legally paid. Those things are worrying me and I should not like to think that I sat here to-day, agree to the passing of a Resolution to increase people's salaries and then discover, when it is pointed out to me, perhaps by the Other Place, that I did not know what I was doing; that the Auditor General cannot comply with the wishes of the House because, at present, he has more than one wish before him—a wish under

Act, a wish under a special Resolution, a wish under a Scheme for Education and this Resolution as well.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I can clearly see, now that a motion has actually been made, that this Resolution will be discussed in preference to the Civil Establishment Bill; therefore, it is necessary that any observations which are to be made in connection with the Resolution should be made at this stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply for the purpose of considering this Resolution. The honourable member will speak to that motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Whatever observations I have to make on the Resolution, I think you will agree that I am in order if I make those observations now.

I can only say that I am not prepared to argue, with my limited experience, what is parliamentarily correct, constitutionally correct or otherwise, but I do feel that to bring a Resolution of this nature and magnitude before the House at this stage of the session,—a Resolution which hinges on certain Acts in the Statute Book of this colony,—without those Acts having been first amended, is nothing short of an attempt to railroad this House into the position of saying "We either pass this Resolution *en bloc* or we throw it out." As my colleague has said — and I heartily agree—it took the expert about five months to make certain recommendations to the Government of this colony. Then after those recommendations were made, it took a Committee, appointed by the Head of the Administration, eminent, learned, distinguished, and gallant men, to report upon the expert's report and, Sir, this elected Chamber was favoured with a copy of the expert's report but until we came here to-day, not one of us could say that we knew anything about the report of the Committee which actually sat on the report of the expert. I am going to say this at the outset: Let us disabuse our minds of any question of Party politics, as far as this matter is concerned. Let us look at it purely in the light that under our present Constitution we are elected as the representatives of the people and, as such, we are responsible for the spending of the public money of this colony. Now, Sir, we are being asked to do what?—to pass a Resolution for a sum of one hundred and forty three thousand nine hundred and one pounds from the Public Treasury to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement provision under various Heads of the Expenditure Estimates 1948-49 as shown in the Schedule for the purpose of paying certain salaries and allowances at increased rates for the year to the 31st March, 1949. Well, one need not be a parliamentarian, one need not be a trained lawyer, one need to have only a little commonsense to understand that the wording of this Resolution is absolutely incorrect because this sum of money is not to supplement the sums of money that have been voted in the Estimates of Expenditure. It is going to be argued, I expect, by the introducer of the Resolution that this Resolution is creating no precedent; whether that is so or not I cannot say. But I can hardly imagine that any Government would have the temerity to send a Resolution like this to this House and expect us to go through it overnight, so to speak. This is one occasion when we, who are elected to this Chamber, should stand on our rights. I am going to lay the blame for this on one person alone, that is, the Head of the Administration and I am doing so for this reason: Anyone with a knowledge of conditions locally, who thought it would be a wise thing to

appoint a Committee to go into the expert's report, should have appreciated the fact that it would be unwise to select the personnel of that Committee from one Political Party in this country. There was, I can only say, behind an action of that sort either a lack of understanding or the desire not to see things as they really are. If there is Party politics in Barbados, there is not yet Responsible Government. If under a democratic form of government, the Opposition is not given the opportunity to take part in discussions and make their own recommendations, then I say that the fault lies on one man in refusing to see the wisdom in appointing to that Committee which sat on the expert's report someone from among the Opposition; it was the display of a lack of foresight.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have given the honourable member a certain amount of latitude. The honourable member must bear in mind that the motion before the House is that the House go into Committee on this particular Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Your Honour appreciates the fact that I would have no opportunity when the House is in Committee to speak in a general way on the Resolution. The Chairman, knowing him as I do, will confine me to the several Heads in the Resolution and will not allow me to indulge in any generalities. As the result, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the dissatisfaction and unrest which existed among the employees of the Government, this Commissioner was appointed, and some of us, at any rate, have taken the trouble to read the recommendations contained in his report. Now, in the addendum to this Resolution, it is stated in paragraph 1:—"This Resolution is to give effect to Government's decisions on the recommendations relating to the emoluments of existing staff contained in the Report of Mr. G. H. Adams, C.B.E., Civil Service Commissioner, which was presented to the Legislature on the 1st of June, 1948."—as much an inaccurate statement as has ever been made in Barbados.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This statement in the addendum refers to those two large blue books which were laid on the table of the House on the 1st June, 1948.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank Your Honour for reminding me of those two large blue books. But we are now dealing with a Resolution which is separate and distinct from anything that is recommended by Mr. Adams, the Civil Service Commissioner, and I cannot help commenting upon the fact that not only is it separate and distinct but we have not even had the opportunity of seeing what the Committee which sat on the Commissioner's Report actually recommended. Now, Sir, I appreciate the necessity for giving the Government the necessary authority to pay money to its employees who are in need; but, Sir, read Mr. Adams's report and then read the details of this Resolution. I can only describe the action of the persons responsible for this Resolution as being generous, excessive liberality, so far as the employees in the higher brackets of the Government Service are concerned. On the other hand, what about the employees who have been crying for financial assistance for some time—the people of the unestablished staff and the people who are employed in the middle and lower brackets of the Service, people who if this Resolution was passed as it is, would be coming back to us next year or before the end of this year asking for further consideration—and rightly so? Read the details of this Resolution and digest them! I repeat that whoever are responsible for this Resolution have gone out of their way to be excessively generous to the employees in the higher brackets of the Service and have attached to them salaries which I hope this

House will scrutinize very carefully before they are passed. But unless all the members of the Government are deaf, they must know that there is great dissatisfaction over this Resolution on the part of the great majority of government employees. Take, for instance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people who are referred to in what is described as the "Key Scale" in this Resolution. It is a recognized fact now, that as a result of the increased cost of living it is necessary to increase people's wages. It is considered that the cost of living has increased to such an extent that certain people should be given £250 a year more—in some cases £400 a year more—but the wages of people in this "Key Scale", for whom the cost of living has also been considerably increased is to be increased from \$1.12 to \$1.28 per day, when private employees are paying more! Are we to be satisfied with a state of affairs like this? Some of these employees who could never secure a job outside Barbados have landed in this island to receive £1,200 a year and overnight you want to give them £400 a year more: yet you can recommend only 2c. an hour more for labourers who are employed by Departments such as the Department of Highways and Transport and expect us in this House to say that that is fair treatment to these labourers! I can hardly believe that this recommendation meets with the approval of the Barbados Workers Union because the demands which they make from private enterprise are far in excess of what the Government has sent down in this Resolution. Again, take the Nurses at the Barbados General Hospital—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member that the details of the Resolution can be discussed if and when the House goes into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am just generalizing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member, I am sure, will have ample opportunity when the House is in Committee of Supply to discuss the various Heads in the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I was pointing out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to give higher salaries to officials who are already highly paid and little or nothing to employees who are at present very poorly paid. I do not want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to go against your ruling; but take the nurses at the General Hospital. Rather than a recommendation for an increase in salary for the nurses, it is recommended that their salaries should be reduced and the imported Sisters from England have been recommended for an increase. If that is an incorrect statement, let the members of the Government in this House get up and deny it. There are some of us who feel that while this Resolution should be seeking to better the living conditions of certain people, when one thinks of it seriously, the people who, we feel, should benefit most by the Resolution are not going to benefit. I pass on to a different phase of the matter. As I said before, I am not posing as a legal or parliamentary luminary as to be able to say whether this procedure is in order or not; but I do say this: As long as the members of this House enjoy the right and privilege of election to this Assembly in a democratic community, they should be treated at least with the respect of being given sufficient time to consider matters of this sort. As to whether the Auditor General can pay this money or as to whether this Resolution could be passed without amendments to certain Acts, I do not know; but I sincerely hope that a reasonable explanation will be forthcoming.

Mr. SYMONDS entered the House while Mr. MOTTLEY was speaking and took his seat.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I should like to get your ruling on this point. There is nothing against the attitude of the senior member for the City but I want to know from you, Sir, if it is fair to the senior member for St. Thomas who is the introducer of this Resolution. Before the senior member for St. Thomas has explained the Resolution to the House, we find other members getting up and making speeches. I do not consider that it is fair that honourable members should make speeches on this Resolution before the honourable introducer has made his introductory remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not quite follow the honourable member's point of order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: My point of order is this: We are about to discuss the Resolution and it is not fair to the senior member for St. Thomas who introduces it that other honourable members should make speeches before he has made his introductory remarks. If this is going to be the procedure, then any honourable member will be able to get up on a point of order, as the senior member for the City did when he first rose to speak, and make a speech on a Measure before the introducer of that Measure has made his introductory remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable senior member for St. Peter that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas was speaking when the honourable senior member for the City rose to a point of order. Then the honourable senior member for St. Thomas rose again and moved that the House go into Committee of Supply. It is not for the Chair to have suggested that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas should have spoken at greater length. It was after he completed his speech and his motion was seconded that the honourable senior member for the City began the speech which he is now making.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: My point is that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas should be allowed to make his introductory remarks first. I take it that the senior member for St. Thomas made the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply, so that he could make his introductory remarks, as has been the procedure in this House up to now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Peter rose to a point of order and interrupted—quite correctly—the honourable senior member for the City while he was speaking.

Mr. COX: I too rise to a point of order. I have been a member of this House for the past four years and the manner in which this Resolution is being dealt with is quite contrary to the practice. Whenever a Resolution of this nature comes before the House, the introducer of it makes a motion that His Honour leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. If that motion is agreed to, the House goes into Committee of Supply, the introducer of the Resolution makes his introductory remarks and then the Resolution is debated if it is necessary to do so. But what do we find in this instance? We find that a motion has been made that the House go into Committee of Supply on this Resolution and yet we are discussing the Resolution in the House. This procedure is rather strange to me and I am surprised at it. I have never seen it before.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There seems to be some confusion of thought as to whether or not discussion may take place on a motion that the Speaker leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. Discussion on such a motion is permissible, as it is on any other motion. Honourable members should confine their remarks to the motion

before the House and give their reasons why the House should or should not go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I respect Your Honour's ruling. This procedure seems strange to me and I rose to get Your Honour's ruling, so that your direction in this matter can be more or less followed in the future.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I very much appreciate what the honourable senior member for St. Peter has said, particularly the comment which he made when he said that he hopes the ruling of the Chair will be followed in the future. The honourable senior member for the City may proceed and he should confine his remarks to the reasons why the House should or should not go into Committee of Supply on this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank Your Honour. It may have escaped Your Honour's notice that the senior member for St. Peter was not in his seat when the introducer of the Resolution made his remarks in connection with the Civil Establishment Bill, of which he gave notice earlier to-day. It is childish for honourable members to take umbrage at my remarks.—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member to proceed with his argument whether the House should or should not go into Committee of Supply on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The point I was making at the time when the senior member for St. Peter interrupted me was this: While I do not challenge the veracity or wisdom of any of the statements which might be made as to whether this procedure is in order, I contend that we should be given greater opportunity to study the Resolution—I am not thinking so much of any Bill which may hinge on it—and the salaries set out in the appendix to the addendum to the Resolution. I contend that my colleague was right when he said that before we actually decide to go into Committee of Supply or otherwise, the honourable introducer of the Resolution should tell us (a) who is responsible for this salary scale before us, (b) where is the report of the Committee that was appointed to report on the Adams Report and (c) if, in his opinion, the passing to-day of this Resolution as it stands can be regularized, so to speak, after the laws which actually fixed the salaries of officers mentioned in the Resolution have been amended. I feel, Sir, that unless we are in possession of information of that nature we shall be like the blind following the blind; there are no two ways about that. I am not exaggerating one whit when I say that. Even if we agree that the suggestion that this Resolution is in order is correct, then we are still at a loss to understand why the recommendations have actually reach us in this form. It may be argued, Sir,—I am now anticipating the argument of the senior member for St. Thomas—that the necessity for rushing this Resolution through the House is because of the unrest and dissatisfaction among Civil Servants during the past ten months; but the Government has actually taken five or eight months to prepare some sort of salary scale to put before us and we are expected to approve of it in a day or two, because at this time of the year the majority of the people, as set out in the details of the Resolution, who are in receipt of inadequate salaries would certainly like to know that they will be receiving their back-pay before Christmas. Well, Sir, I would be the last person to stand in the way of any person receiving back-pay or an increase of salary to which he is entitled, although in this case, the increased pay is only 16c. a day for some and as much

as £10 per day for others. If that is going to be the argument of the proponents, suppose I say this: Although we cannot bind a succeeding House, rather than pass this Resolution with the haste which is suggested—if we find ourselves back in this House, not as Party against Party, not because there is the Election around the corner—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the honourable member confine himself to the reasons why the House should or should not go into Committee of Supply on the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is exactly what I am doing. I am throwing out this suggestion: If, not as a Party but as the elected House of Assembly of Barbados, we agree to the principle of retrospective pay in respect of increased salaries, then do you not think that honourable members can be given the opportunity to study more carefully the salaries of the people in the bottom brackets, as against the salaries of those at the top? I go further. Whether you like the Other Place or not, whether you agree with existing conditions or not, as long as you enjoy the present Constitution by which legislation must be passed by both Houses of the Legislature before it actually becomes law, do you not consider that opportunity should be given to this House and the Other Place to discuss these proposals in joint Select Committee? It can be said that only one other elected member, besides the Leader of the House, had any knowledge of what was being done in respect of this Resolution, and I put forward my suggestion, rather than that we should pass, in haste something for which we may be sorry later on, because it is evident that in these proposals some employees are being taken care of and others are being neglected. I agree with the idea that the majority of these employees would want to receive this back-pay for Christmas because they would like to have a little enjoyment at least once in the year and would it not be better to pass an amended Resolution allowing all persons whose emoluments are under £600 a year to receive their back-pay and increases? Because, argue as you like, persons in receipt of over £600 a year can tide over affairs in December and at Christmas time even if they have families. I am always willing to display the spirit of compromise. I see the apparent danger if this Resolution is passed as it is. I am satisfied that the Government has the best motive in sending it down to this House, because these employees have been clamouring for over a year and inasmuch as Christmas is approaching and the House will shortly be dissolved, the Government would like us to pass this Resolution, so that these people may be able to get a little money to spend. To that, I say "Yes"; that is an argument that will appeal to any Barbadian but I go further and ask: "Can you say that that argument alone is justification for passing these proposals *en bloc*, not knowing up to now who are responsible for these recommendations?" Many of these proposed salaries will have to be reduced and possibly the money put to the salaries of those at the bottom. Apparently, certain honourable members take exception to my suggestion about looking at this matter from the point of view of an elected House of Assembly and not from the point of view of Party. However, I shall sit and await the reply of the honourable introducer of the Resolution, in the hope that he would convince those of us who even at this late hour may have the best intention.

Mr. GALE: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The two honourable members for the City have spoken on this Resolution and I must say that I agree with the junior member for the City when he said that

he is very doubtful about this Resolution being passed in its present form. This is a Resolution for £143,901 to increase salaries which are in the Estimates. We do not vote salaries in the Estimates. What we vote are amounts that are not fixed by law. The salaries in the Estimates are provided by law and are not voted by this House and I fail to see how we are going to jump that stile in this matter.

We are being asked to set aside precedent,—that is to say, the passing or the amending of an existing Act before a Resolution of this nature is passed,—and to pass this Resolution without any precedent. The senior member for St. Thomas gave notice earlier in the day of a Bill to which this Resolution relates and my opinion is that that Bill should be dealt with before this Resolution is passed. We are attempting to put the cart before the horse if this Resolution is passed to-day. Another point is this: As the last speaker said, we have had no time to consider any of the proposals in this Resolution. We have been furnished with copies of the Adams Report. A Committee was appointed to go into that Report and we, as members of the House of Assembly, know absolutely nothing about the findings of that Committee. This Resolution has been placed before us and we are just to apply the rubber stamp on it, so to speak, and pass it without any enquiry or any debate on the different proposals which have been put forward in it for the Government's employees. We are not allowed to scrutinize these proposals and say what we think the several officers should be paid. I cannot agree to that. It is very unfortunate indeed that, after the Government has spent money to get an expert here to go into the salaries and conditions of service of Civil Servants, that expert's report should come to this very sad end because when we read that Report and these proposals, they certainly do not agree. These proposals are promises which have been made to government employees and about which we know absolutely nothing. We who are the representatives of the people and are supposed to hold the purse strings and to say what we, as the House of Assembly, think about the recommendations in the Adams Report, have not been able to go into this matter in any way whatever or to make any recommendations of our own whatsoever. We are asked to fix salaries for the whole Government Service by means of this Resolution without any debate on the issue whatever and it is very regrettable that such a thing has happened. We know that the people employed by the Government are anxious to receive the additional remuneration which has been recommended for them; but, Sir, I think the Government has bungled this affair very badly. It is one big bungling from beginning to end. In my opinion this Resolution is out of order. Even if we pass it I cannot imagine the Auditor General paying the money in this way. As I have said, it is regrettable that after all the labour of a whole year, this Resolution should have been put before this House at the end of the session practically, when we have not sufficient time to scrutinize these proposals. As the last speaker has said, it would be better if this Resolution was postponed, so as to give the House of Assembly the opportunity to go very carefully into the matter because we are about to fix salaries now for all time. We are not giving a war bonus; we are fixing the emoluments of all the people employed in the Government Service,—emoluments which must stand for years,—and we should be very careful how we do that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I shall endeavour to confine my remarks to the Resolution before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: From the point of view of the House going into Committee of Supply, or not, to deal with it.

Mr. WILKINSON: I should like to say, first of all, that to a large extent I agree with the remarks of the junior member for the City. To me, this is a new method of dealing with increases of salaries for Civil Servants and, like the junior member for St. Michael, I think that the Government has, in this instance, placed the cart before the horse. I agree with the junior member for the City that if we did pass this Resolution, it would not be worth the paper on which it is written because I do not believe that the Auditor General would have any authority whatsoever to pay the sums of money that are contained therein. Even if the junior member for the City and myself are wrong, as far as our opinions are concerned, and this money is paid under these conditions, what would it mean if the correlating Acts are not amended and passed? It would mean that the salaries which are fixed by law would remain as such and unless the Acts fixing those salaries are amended, I fail to see how the Auditor General could pay these increased salaries and wages. No, Sir! I believe that the Government on this occasion has excelled itself in putting forward something that is not workable. I would be a bit stronger in my remarks than the junior member for St. Michael and say that I consider that this is an insult to this House. After the expert took five months to make his investigations and submit his report, that report was referred to a Committee which took another five months to consider it—ten months altogether—and then the Government calmly sends down this Resolution without even letting the members of the House see the report of the Committee on Mr. Adams's report. I am presuming that the members on the other side of the table have not seen it. In some instances, that Committee has jumped the salaries which the report recommended and in other cases, it has reduced them. But we have not been given any explanation and it is obvious that you cannot expect men of intelligence—even of average intelligence—to decide, in a few hours' time, something that took an expert and other people ten months to get through. It is asking too much of this House and I repeat that even if we did pass this Resolution I do not believe that any of these people would get this money. I do not see how the Auditor General could possibly pay money by means of this Resolution alone. The addendum to the Resolution is not law; it is a guide and is put there for the information of the members of the House and if the Auditor General was called upon to pay the money voted in this Resolution I am pretty sure that he would refuse to do so. To-day, Sir, is the second day of November and we have been informed that the Legislature would be prorogued on the 23rd instant; therefore we will not have sufficient time to consider carefully this matter which has such far-reaching results. I should like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with your permission to comment on one Head in this Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable member to defer his comments until the House goes into Committee of Supply on the Resolution. I know that the honourable member will accede to my request even more readily than some other honourable members.

Mr. WILKINSON: To put it broadly, Sir, several Heads of Departments have been recommended by the expert for a certain salary. Somebody—I don't know who; whether it is the experts on the Committee that went into Mr. Adams's report or the experts on the Executive Committee—has seen fit to

send down this Resolution with proposals that do not tally with the recommendations in Mr. Adams's report and that is what we should like some explanation about. That is why we agree that this Resolution should not be sent to the Committee of Supply to-day. If you would refer to the addendum, Sir, you will notice that certain officials would have to pay house rent varying from 5 to 10 per cent of their respective salaries.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member likely to speak much longer?

Mr. WILKINSON: Yes, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then in that case, it being after 2 o'clock I adjourn this House until 2.45 o'clock in accordance with Rule 40(a).

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 68, standing in the name of Your Honour and the replies to questions No. 87 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 84 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (a)

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business.

Mr. DOWDING: I object to leave being granted to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Dr. CUMMINS: Honourable members seem to be in favour of the suspension of Rule 61 (a) only and I am therefore asking leave to move the suspension of that Rule.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

MOTION THAT HOUSE GO INTO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the House was adjourned according to the Rules, consideration was being given to a motion that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with one Resolution. The honourable junior member for St. James was speaking.

Mr. WILKINSON: I was saying that I should like to be given some more information on this question of house rent. If you look further down the addendum to this Resolution you will see that the question of duty allowance is also referred to. Taking everything into consideration I am of the opinion that the Civil Establishment Bill should be passed first and then the Resolution. In the normal course of events, as the honourable senior member for St. Thomas would know, you would appoint a Select Committee of all Parties of the House to consider the Resolution and the Bills which are necessary to be considered. Even at this late hour, although it will be asking a good deal of honourable members to give up their time so as to get through what would be quite a lot of work before the end of the session, I think that honourable members should be asked to give up that time to get through the Bills and the Resolution; that is the only solution of the difficulty in which we now are. I do not see

how we can pass this Resolution to be of any value and therefore I throw out the suggestion to the honourable member in charge of the Resolution that even at this late hour it might be wise to appoint a Select Committee to go into the Bills and the Resolution.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want to make a few remarks on this question because I feel that this is a question which should be taken most seriously by this honourable House if we realise that it is the votes of the labouring classes in this colony which have put all of us here. I want to say most strongly that those who have advised that a salary scale such as this be sent down in relation to the unestablished staff—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to deal generally with the Resolution and when we go into Committee of Supply he can deal with the details of it. The motion now is that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution. The honourable member can give reasons as to whether the House should go into Committee of Supply or not.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I am leading up to that. Now is the time for us to decide whether we should or should not go into Committee of Supply and what I am going to say will perhaps have some bearing on that aspect of the matter. This Resolution seeks among other things to attempt to do something for the labouring classes; but what I notice about it is that while the Heads of Departments and those who are receiving very handsome salaries indeed—not that they should not have more but they are already receiving handsome salaries—the masses of those who are employed by the Government, those who really represent the people who have put all of us in this Chamber have been overlooked. I see that in this Resolution people are being given \$80 and \$100 per month more while others are not even getting \$1 per month more. That is, in my opinion, a most unjust thing. I cannot see how any set of men advising the Head of the Administration could be so stupid at this time with the Elections just around the corner (Laughter) as to come before honourable members and ask them to support this sort of thing. This is deliberately insulting every labourer in the colony; this is an attempt to perpetrate an injustice. If this is an age in which labour is being represented, how can people who have been put here to represent labour so insult labour by subscribing to a thing like this whereby you are going to give in some cases \$1 per month more to some people whose salaries amount to only \$30 or \$40 per month and \$100 per month more to people who are already getting handsome salaries? There is something definitely wrong with this Resolution. I know that there are thousands of people employed by this Government who have been anxiously looking forward to the passing of such a Resolution in order that they may obtain the relief which they require; but I cannot agree to the passing of this Resolution. I am not in favour of the House going into Committee to deal with this Resolution at all; I feel that it would be fairer if at this stage we send the Resolution back to the Government late as it is, and ask them to do what is fair and just to the labouring classes who are enumerated in the Resolution. This is an age in which we say that we are representing Labour but this Government is a Conservative Government with a Labour name attached to it, they are perpetrating the system whereby you are taking a favoured few and giving them large salaries and in respect of the labourers who are looking forward to a new

day you are continuing the system of snobbery. If you continue that system, if you look down on the porter and say—

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order. The question before the House is whether we should go into Committee of Supply to deal with this Resolution or not, but I have not yet heard one argument as to whether we should or should not go into Committee of Supply. As far as the honourable junior member for St. George is concerned, he is speaking about something which is absolutely foreign to the motion before us. I thought that ordinarily the introducer of the Resolution would elaborate on it when the House is in Committee of Supply and then honourable members would have their opportunity to speak. So far the introducer of the Resolution has not been given the opportunity to elaborate on the Resolution at all; and in fact the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is quite in order to speak on the motion that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, although it is not the usual practice for honourable members to speak on such a motion. In the case of a Bill there is a motion made that it be now read a second time and what is called a second reading speech is made by the introducer. This is the case of a Resolution and honourable members can speak on the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply. I have asked honourable members to avoid dealing with any details which they can ventilate when we are in Committee of Supply and to confine themselves to giving their reasons as to why we should or should not go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MAPP: On a point of order. Are we to judge that the honourable member is speaking on the motion that the House do now go into Committee of Supply?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Any honourable member is entitled to give his reasons as to why the House should or should not go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SYMMONDS: That is exactly the point which I am trying to labour. I feel that we should not go into Committee of Supply on this Resolution as it stands. This Resolution should be sent back to the Government and let them do what is right to those whom they are insulting. Time after time during the present session the Government has been sending down Resolutions in which they have insulted people like the labourers, cantoneers, lorry loaders and especially the porters. If we say that there is a New Order or if there is dignity in labour, the Government cannot continue to pick out certain people and say to them: "You must continue to starve while others receive fat salaries." That is a disgrace and I am seriously suggesting to honourable members that they should return this Resolution to the members of the Executive Committee who have so ill-advised the Head of the Administration and ask them to do what is right to the labouring classes of this colony. It is time that we stop preaching one thing and practising another; the Government should set an example by doing what is right to the labouring classes and therefore I am not voting that the House go into Committee of Supply to consider this Resolution until the Government does what is right to the under-privileged in this colony.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable junior member for St. Michael in his speech earlier today referred to this Resolution as having been bungled and he and other honourable members professed to

be amazed that a Resolution of this sort could be sent to the House. Frankly, I am amazed that they are amazed. We have to bear in mind that the present Resolution has been sent down to us by the present Government, and we also have to bear in mind that the Government which has sent it down has been able to achieve the power which it has by rather questionable methods.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the motion that I do now leave the Chair and the House to go into Committee of Supply. I am sure that the honourable member will be co-operative.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will be co-operative. This Government has achieved power by rather questionable methods.

Dr. CUMMINS: Is Your Honour allowing those remarks, that this Government has achieved power by rather questionable methods?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the actual motion before the House.

Dr. CUMMINS: I am asking if Your Honour is allowing those remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member objecting to them?

Dr. CUMMINS: I am objecting to them, Your Honour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The relative Rules dealing with the remarks which have been used and to which the honourable member is objecting, are Rules 125: "No member may use the Sovereign's name irreverently in debate nor for the purpose of influencing the House in its deliberations" 126: "No member may use the Governor's name irreverently in debate, nor for the purpose of influencing the House in its deliberations" 127: "No member may use offensive words against either branch of the Legislature, nor against any statute unless for the purpose of moving for its repeal." 128: "No member may refer to any other member by name." and 129: "No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House." In so far as those Rules are concerned, in my opinion, there has not been any infringement of any of them.

Dr. CUMMINS: You mean then, Sir, that those words are not unbecoming or offensive in your opinion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The words must be offensive or unbecoming to any member of the House before there can be an infringement of the Rule.

Dr. CUMMINS: The remarks refer to four members of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has not referred to any member of the House; he has referred to the Government using the word comprehensively or ambiguously as it may be regarded.

Dr. CUMMINS: I realise that there is no use arguing the point.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The definition of "Government" implies that the four members of this House form part of the Executive and when a member of this House makes remarks like those which have been made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip, that the Government has achieved power by questionable methods, that is the type of language which, if spoken outside the House, is slanderous and it is a matter for the members of the House to say if those remarks do not infringe Rule 127. I would like to know, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, if under our constitution the Governor-in-Executive Committee cannot be considered as a part of the Legisla-

with the general principle of the Civil Establishment Bill. I do not believe that there is a majority of honourable members who are prepared to accept this Bill as it stands; neither do I believe that there is a majority of honourable members in this Chamber who are willing to provide the proposed salaries for Heads of Departments until such time as there has been a complete re-organisation of the Civil Establishment and we know where we are with regard to the number of new offices which will be created and the salaries attached to these new offices. Judging from the trend of events within recent months we can fairly safely assume that these posts will be filled by imported officials. Englishmen who were formerly employed in various parts of the Empire and who are now out of employment will be brought here if and when the Legislature of the colony agrees to the Bill as it stands. This Bill should have contained some proposal for putting the appointment to and the control of public offices in this colony in the hands of a locally-appointed Civil Service Commission in order to ensure that the highly-qualified men which we have in this colony and elsewhere in the West Indies are appointed to posts which are now in existence and also to posts which the Bill may seek to create.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable member that the motion before the House is that the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate that. Even in the Resolution itself I am sure that some of these salaries have been fixed on the level on which they have been fixed purely because some of the influential people in this colony feel that these posts will be filled by imported officials. The salaries would not have been put on the proposed level if it had not been for the fact that it is confidently expected that imported officials will fill these posts. Although Your Honour has ruled against any reference in detail to the Resolution before us, I am sure that you will permit me to quote two instances in order to substantiate my allegations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to go into any details. He may recall that I also stopped the honourable junior member for St. James just before the luncheon interval. All these instances may be dealt with individually in Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Should we go into Committee on the Resolution as it stands, we are agreeing in principle to the increases in salary of certain important posts in the Government which the Resolution recommends. I say that, in my opinion, the time before us between now and the end of the session is too short, much too short, to enable us properly and carefully to decide on the full question. I am quite willing to deal with the salaries of Heads of Departments and other officials after we have passed the Civil Establishment Bill, after we have been able to put in the Bill the amendments which we think should be in it, after we have been able to ensure that important posts will be filled by qualified Barbadians or West Indians and after we have been able to ensure by legislation that everything pertaining to the appointment of local officers, to their promotion, to the training of men—in short after everything pertaining to the general appointment of men to the Civil Service of this colony is under the complete control of a fully-qualified local Civil Service Commission. Honourable members will have recalled, for instance, that the position with regard to appointments—

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 3.30 p.m. the time when the House proceeds with private members' Business. Before that takes place I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the honourable Legislative Council a Resolution for the sum of £3,600 to meet capital and recurrent expenses in respect of Dodds Plantation until the 31st of March, 1949. It has been passed with an amendment which is written on the Resolution. It appears to me that the amendment might constitute a breach of privilege and I will have to give the matter my further consideration before it is dealt with. I suppose that the matter might be dealt with at the next meeting of the House.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B)

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61(b) in order to proceed with Government Business.

Mr. DOWDING: I object.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61(b) so as to proceed with Government Business. An objection having been taken, I shall put the question. The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to proceed with Government Business. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The following division was taken.

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, SYMMONDS, HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, LEWIS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD GALE, WILKINSON, MOTTLEY and Dr. CUMMINS—15.

Noes: Messrs. HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WARD—4.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, fifteen honourable members voting "Aye" and four honourable members voting "No." The honourable member may proceed to make the motion.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

MOTION THAT THE HOUSE GO INTO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business arrived the House was considering a motion that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with a Resolution. The honourable senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As I said earlier I am going to vote against the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with this Resolution, and I am going to propose that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed for the express purpose of having the Government go through the Resolution and delete all posts which carry a salary of more than £600 a year and send back the remainder of the Resolution to the House with certain additional amendments. I am going to make that motion because I want to impress on the House the absolute necessity of seeing that we have some local body with complete control over the Civil Service before we agree to the salaries

which are over £600 a year. How can we sit here and agree, for instance, as it has been proposed in this Resolution to pay the Head of the Medical Services £1,300 a year when as honourable members will recall that only recently when the post became vacant a highly-qualified medical practitioner was recommended for appointment to the post and local officials that this person who was recommended for the post was unsuitable for it purely because he was a coloured man.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to avoid going into details and confine himself to the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sure that honourable members will appreciate that if we refuse at this stage to deal with posts which carry salaries above £600 a year we should give some reasons for not dealing with them. I feel that the salaries which are now proposed for the new posts which we are about to create make it absolutely imperative that qualified people be appointed to these posts despite the fact that they are West Indians or that their colour is, in the eyes of certain people, unsuitable. My reason for suggesting that we should deal with all salaries from £600 and under is because I know that the people who receive these salaries are badly in need of some assistance especially at this time of the year. They have been unwarrantably denied it for the last six or seven months and with Christmas just around the corner, it will mean a lot to the average worker of the unestablished staff or the average elementary school teacher if he can receive the back pay which will accrue to him under the proposals for increasing the present salary. Even there I propose that there should be certain amendments; it appears to me that with regard to the unestablished staff the financial resources of the colony, even apart from the handsome reserves of the colony, looking at the matter purely from the estimated surplus which we have been told we will get from the year's working, will afford an increase of four cents an hour for these workers rather than the two cents an hour increase proposed in this Resolution. I therefore propose that the further consideration of the Resolution be postponed with a view, as I have already said, to the deletion from the Resolution of all salaries from over £600 a year and upwards; and we will give a definite undertaking to those officials who will not be attended to now, that we will consider the matter during the next Legislative Session and any increase which they are given will apply as from the 1st of April this year. For the moment we are only dealing with employees of the Government Service who work for £600 a year and downwards, and we are insisting that the workers of the unestablished staff be given an increase in wages of four cents an hour instead of two cents an hour, which, I understand will cost £20,000, and we are also insisting that there be a slight modification in the proposals with regard to elementary school teachers and policemen. The amendments in respect of these teachers will qualify those of 20 years' standing for the maximum salary proposed whether or not they have obtained Certificate "A", or whether or not they are products of the Rawle or Erdiston. So long as they have had 20 years' experience in teaching they should be entitled to their maximum. I do feel that the House would be failing to represent the interests of the large body of Government employees if it acted contrary to what has been suggested in the remarks which I have made relative to the motion which I now intend to propose. I beg to move the following amendments: That all the words of the previous motion be deleted and the

following substituted therefor; that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed with a view to the deletion of all the salaries of £600 per annum and over, and an increase to four cents per hour of all employees in the Government Service to which the Resolution proposes to give an increase of two cents an hour and that the elementary school teacher be entitled to the maximum salary of his class on the attainment of 20 years' service irrespective of whether he or she holds Certificate "A" or the Certificate of Erdiston or Rawle Institute.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I presume that those amendments would increase the charge on the revenue. What the honourable member should do is to move that the further consideration of the Resolution be postponed and give the reason for it so that if the Resolution is postponed the Government will know what the honourable mover and those who support the postponement have in mind.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I sincerely hope that honourable members will support the motion for the postponement on the express terms which I have suggested even although the terms themselves cannot appear in the motion. We are postponing this Resolution for a specific purpose. I want to make it perfectly clear that in moving the postponement of the Resolution it is not my intention that the matter be held up unduly. I am quite prepared to return here on Thursday of this week and it is not impossible for the Executive to hold a special meeting tomorrow to discuss the matter and let the House be summoned on Thursday so as to deal with it. Few meetings can be held between now and the end of the session and we have also to bear in mind that the Other Place is entitled to some reasonable time to consider this question; therefore the new proposals which I am suggesting should come before the House not later than Thursday of this week. If we are going to pay some attention to the question of providing some additional remuneration for the unestablished staff in the various Government Departments and we are also adopting the suggestion which I have made with regard to the elementary school teachers, at the same time the Government will be well advised to consider the possibility of revising the suggested increases applying to members of the Police Force and the Fire Brigade. At the moment the increases are highly unsatisfactory; in some cases they are only 6/6 per month and I think that this section of Government servants is entitled to better consideration. We have got to bear in mind that the increase which I have proposed in respect of the members of the unestablished staff, an increase of four cents an hour, will only give them an increase in their present wages of \$1.76 a week. These employees are now getting, I think \$6.60 per week and the increase of \$1.76 will make the amount \$8.36 per week. That amount, I submit, is not extravagant and it is still insufficient to enable these employees adequately to cope with the current cost of living. Were the House to agree to less than that amount for the unestablished staff, that would be an absolute betrayal of the trust which the people reposed in us when they returned us to the House as their representatives. If the Executive refuses to implement our suggestions then we shall have to decide what course of action it will be necessary to pursue in order to give effect to the recommendations which I feel firmly convinced the majority of the House will support.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am glad to hear that honourable members are not going to be disheartened this afternoon but they want to meet again on Thursday; therefore I can have time now to deal with this question with which honourable members have been dealing for the last six hours. I must say that I have

heard a lot about the Whitley Council but it is only last night that I met the Executive of that Council and it is surprising to hear in connection with this Resolution that some of those gentlemen who have let the Whitley Council are accusing the four members of this House on the Executive Committee of doing something which they know the four members of this House are not responsible for doing. About four or five months ago the Civil Service Commissioner called me to his office and I can speak with honesty and authority on this question because I know more about fixing wages in the Key Scale than any other honourable member of this House. I know that a lot of employers including those on that side of the House pay the wages which they pay whether voluntarily or by force. When the Civil Service Commissioner called me in the presence of the President of the Civil Service Association, I made it clear to him that the minimum increase which you should pay the people in the Key Scale would be four cents per hour. I made it clear to the President of the Barbados Workers' Union, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, that I would not pass an increase of anything less than four cents an hour for the unestablished staff. (Hear, hear). This is no back-hand information; this is not anything which somebody has heard recommended and come to tell it to the House. As the Secretary of the biggest Trade Union in this island I have to deal with the fixing of wages which are paid to people in this island. I am not just talking on behalf of Labour so as to get votes; I am not so fortunate as to get people to lend me money to buy a house and allow me to pay them back however I can by running a newspaper. I want to say that in respect of the recommendation of a four cents an hour increase for the unestablished staff I made that recommendation having regard to what I know similar workers in the island are paid. I told Mr. Adams, C.B.E., that in respect of pensions for people, you cannot pay people small wages and tell them about drawing a pension 40 years hence; I made it clear that you cannot propose pensions for people on that ground but it is your duty to pay people a wage which would equate a minimum of approximately \$8 a week. That was done nearly six months ago. Honourable members can see what is set out on page 33 of Mr. Adams' Report. When we come to this Resolution, speaking for myself and for some others, I can say that we do not look on this Resolution happily. Many people have met me, policemen, postmen, cantoneers, and so on and have asked me about this Christmas money. I have told them not to expect any money by this Resolution for Christmas, because, as far as I am concerned, I do not feel like passing the Resolution as it stands. (Hear, hear). It is a big job to deal with salaries; these things cannot be worked out so quickly even if we meet next Thursday. Do not let us fool the public that if we postpone this Resolution today we can meet next Thursday and pass it. I cannot promise honourable members—

Mr. CRAWFORD: Since I made the suggestion that we should meet on Thursday and deal with this Resolution, I protest against the remarks of the honourable member. It is not a question of fooling the public that the Resolution can be brought before the House on Thursday; it is perfectly simple for the Government to increase the rate of pay for the unestablished staff to four cents an hour and make the other necessary adjustments.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: We are not talking about people who do no hard work. I am quite prepared to agree to the postponement of this Resolution, but I will be fooling anybody in the Government

Service if I make him believe that I can come here and deal with this Resolution next Thursday. This is no joke; it is not only a question of dealing with names, you have to go right through this Resolution. I am not passing anything until I digest it properly. I will not do for one what I do not intend to do for all. After meeting the President of the Civil Service Association and he heard my argument relative to an increase of four cents an hour for the unestablished staff, I asked him why that increase was not recommended for this staff. He replied that every cent that was added made £10,000. I said that they could add something to people who have not been given anything. Some of the members of the Whitley Council were afraid to stand by this seemingly high increase of £20,000; they were saying that rather than give these people nothing at all they would give them half a loaf. On the last occasion we had a patchwork scheme and the people soon came back to us again. The Whitley Council is purely the Committee of Management of a supposed Trade Union and honourable members know the history of it. The position is this. As Secretary of the biggest Trade Union in the island which deals with wages concerning a big group of people and as a member of my Party, I felt it was my duty to get the opinion of those people who are supposed to be the representatives of the Service, and they were afraid of the high cost which would be entailed if this increase of four cents an hour were offered. Before the honourable Leader of the House left here I told him my position with regard to this four cents an hour increased rate and I can say that I had his assurance that he felt that it is a reasonable rate. The President of the Civil Service Association who was present at this discussion can prove if I am right or wrong. We sat down together and I told the President what I thought the rate should be. If anybody is doing that, I say that he is taking a good lead. As regards this Resolution I am in a somewhat difficult position in connection with giving any office over a certain amount any increase at all. (Hear, hear). It is not a question of reviewing the position; I have already reviewed it and have put certain people on a basis where they can live. I want to make it clear that so far as I am concerned, speaking broadly, I am not giving anybody who is working for more than £1,000 a year one cent more. That is my opinion. I do not want to particularise because on the broad principle there are many things that I can speak about. I want to draw this one matter to the notice of the House. We have appointed a Financial Secretary, and if Your Honour will pardon me I would like to say that we passed the Bill giving the Financial Secretary £1,250 a year and I believe that it slipped honourable members when they also added the £140 Cost of Living Allowance. I do not believe that honourable members intended that the salary should be that amount plus the Cost of Living Allowance; but sometimes we catch at the shadow and lose the substance. We passed this amount before we realised what we were doing and even to this day we are paying for it. I have made my position clear to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. I have told him that I cannot vote for this Resolution because I am not in favour of it. As the honourable senior member for the City has said, this is no Party issue and it is not fair to accuse the four members of the Government of what has been sent down. This is a matter which was being dealt with for the last ten months and the Whitley Council has asked something about Christmas. I would not be so unfair or dishonest to myself or to honourable members as to accuse the four members of the Executive Com-

Estimates were before the House and also when the Civil Service Commissioner was going into the question of salaries and wages, I intimated that nothing less than \$10 a week was adequate for people in this class. As a matter of fact even that would be inadequate when you consider the rise in rentals, the increase in the cost of food, and so forth, day in and day out. When an individual is paid \$5.72 a week we can well realise that it is very difficult for him to exist, let alone to live. When the Civil Service Commissioner recommended an increase of a penny an hour for employees in the Key Scale we got together and discussed the matter with the Leader of the House who decided that it was a bad recommendation. The Leader of the House sat as a member of the Committee appointed to deal with the question of wages for employees and he assured us before he left this island that he had recommended an increase of four cents an hour for Key Scale employees and that was accepted. That recommendation was also supported last night at the Council meeting of the B.L.P. by members of the Whitley Council. Having the assurance of the Leader of the House because I know him to be a truthful man, I told many people what the position was and now to our great surprise the Resolution has come before us with the penny-an-hour increase which the Commissioner had recommended! When it is a question of increasing the wages of the poor, unfortunate people who have to do the spade work—at night through mud and water you can see employees of the Waterworks Department trying to mend pipes which lead to some rich man's house—we are told that the island cannot bear this heavy expenditure. There is nothing for them; we are told that if you increase them by a penny an hour the additional expenditure would be £20,000; yet we passed a Resolution to pay the Financial Secretary £1,250 a year and now an additional £200 a year has been recommended for him although the colony cannot bear this heavy expenditure. If you look right down the scale you will see that in respect of the people who can never spend the money which they work for unless they go to the clubs and get intoxicated at night, their salaries are increased to the tune of £150 and £250 a year and so forth. When it comes to the people who really do the work, the poor people who are only scrambling for food, we are told that they cannot be given anything more! I should like to say here and now that I did not come in here on that ticket neither am I prepared to contribute to the perpetuity of that vicious and wicked system which used to exist before, that is, to give the people at the top the hundred pounds and the people at the bottom the cents. I support most strongly the statement of the honourable senior member for St. Peter that he would not vote one cent more in respect of salaries which are already high and on which the recipients can live. We have to send back this Resolution to the Government; I have told the honourable senior member for St. Thomas that in no uncertain terms. We are appealing to the people whom this Resolution tends to help to be patient because it is in their interest that we are postponing the Resolution. We are trying to bring about something better in so far as their wages and conditions of service are concerned. It is hard to find that after we have spent so much money to bring a Commissioner out here, his Report can be regarded as a mountain which laboured and only brought forth a mouse. Much time has been spent in preparing this Report and I am sure that we have people in this colony who know the set-up and who could have dealt with this matter, who would have got through with it very much sooner and I feel that much better recommendations would have been

made in connection with the various salaries and wages recommended. As far as the teachers and the police are concerned, we all know that the increases which are proposed for them do not bring any tangible and immediate relief. In other words, I am told that if a policeman is now receiving £156 per annum instead of his going to his maximum, he will only be given £4 more from the 1st of April by way of back pay and that will be £160 a year. I regret to hear that because I really thought that the position would have been just as in 1946 when we increased the salaries and wages of people and they reached their maximum immediately. Let us take, for example, a man who is reaching his retiring age: he has another year or so to go but he cannot get a pension on his maximum salary when he retires. I feel that an adjustment should be made whereby people who are reaching their retiring age should be given their maximum salary immediately. It is true that we have to be mindful of our financial resources but it is equally true that if we could tax the people who should be taxed we would be able to collect the money so as to pay these employees. That is why I know what a great disservice was done to this island when some so-called Labourites voted against the increase in the companies' tax. We are told that that increase in the companies' tax would have yielded £80,000 and that amount would have paid these employees. One-half of that amount would have paid the employees of the unestablished staff if the Government had been able to collect that tax. You hear people talking about the poor man's interest but when the poor man's interest is to be looked after, they manoeuvre out of the position. That state of affairs has been exhibited in this House on many occasions. In spite of what the position is we have to pay the poor hard-working people something on which they can live, we cannot continue to say that we have not got this or that and yet we can tack on a lot to the salaries of the already well-paid Heads of Departments. I am sincerely hoping that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas will agree to the postponement of this Resolution. Like myself I know that the hon. member is a true Labourite and he likes to see the people in the lower brackets get a wage on which they can live. I have been told, and it is regrettable, that this proposition of a four cents an hour increase for the people of the unestablished staff was not sent up to the Executive at all. The Whitley Council took off the other penny and the original recommendation was sent up. When people try to indite the Executive for having taken off the penny, that is, in my opinion, most deplorable and dishonest because we have it straight from the horse's mouth that the penny was taken off by the Whitley Council. This is a sour pill but I really do not think that the Whitley Council as it is constituted can really represent these Key Scale people. I think that the Key Scale employees need to be associated with Trade Unions in order to get proper representation. I do not think that there are persons in the Whitley Council who are sufficiently interested in the welfare of these Key Scale employees as to present their case. The argument that if you add a cent an hour to these people that will cost £10,000 more cannot hold water because the first thing you have to consider is what will it take a man in this category to live on. As I have said on a previous occasion a man is not a wild animal and you have to allow him at least three in family; you have to pay him a wage which will enable him at least to get the bare necessities of life for himself and his family. If we take that into consideration we cannot come to this House and say that \$5.72 or \$7.00 or \$7.84 a week is a reasonable amount for a man in

these days. The people who draw \$200, \$300 and \$400 a month have not had any sympathy for the people in the lower brackets; they will not say—"After all we can live on these salaries and let us arrange something on which those in the lower brackets can live." On the contrary we find that those who work for more than they can spend unless they want to spend the money lavishly, are given increases of £200 a year and over while the people in the lower brackets are given increases of a cent an hour every year. That is a most disgraceful recommendation. A watchman who got \$1 a period is now to be given \$1.50 a period. That is calculated at 12½ cents an hour but if the watchman works over the period he is paid 12 cents an hour! I thought he would be paid time and a half for the extra hours. That is the sort of recommendation which has been made and I feel that we should take into consideration the fact that these employees are human beings and that decent recommendations should be made for them. There are many things which, in my opinion, should be regulated before this Resolution is sent back to this House. As I have said, the Resolution has been debated different from the usual custom and for that reason many of the remarks which would have been made, on it have been omitted. I am still hoping that the Executive will re-consider this Resolution as quickly as possible and send it back to the House next Tuesday if possible and let us sit all night and deal with it. Let us have this Resolution in an amended form before us and if we sit until morning, if we sit every day considering it we would be doing a good service to the community because the poor people whom the Resolution will benefit have been looking forward to an increase in their wages more especially the back pay for a very long time.

Mr. WARD: I suppose everyone can see exactly the trend which this debate is taking. The policy which has been adopted today in bringing forward this Resolution before the Civil Establishment Bill is contrary to what I have ever seen. The Bill sets out the particular salary and the work which the individual must do for the emoluments which he will receive; but under the policy which we have adopted today we are fixing the salaries and then saying what work must be done. In my opinion the House is doing the correct thing in postponing this Resolution. If the Government can force certain methods on its own Party we on this side of the House do not intend to adopt any Resolution or Bill without giving it careful consideration. I would like the Government to know that there must still be some intelligence in this House and we demand our right to consider all vital Resolutions and Bills before we haphazardly pass them and then be made ashamed by the Other Place or be sorry for what we have done. During my time in this Chamber we have always tried to be cautious and to do things which we felt were right for the benefit of the colony. Now, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, about ten months ago we voted money to bring an expert out here to go into the question of the organisation and the emoluments of the Civil Service and after the expert has reported and presumably a Committee has reported, the House is in such a confused state that this Resolution comes out of the blue, not from the Government, because the Government members do not seem to know very much about it. The House is practically rejecting this Resolution which deals with the emoluments of the Civil Establishment of this island. I do not feel that there could be a worse state of affairs where, after paying over £2,000 to bring an expert out here and then having a Committee to make a report, the matter has to be again

brought back to the House. In the first instance I feel that the House should have had a proper Select Committee appointed to study the emoluments of the Civil Servants. In that case I am sure that this Resolution would be passed by this House and the people concerned would be getting their remuneration between now and Christmas. I never intended to vote for this Resolution as it stands today if I voted alone, because I feel that one week is not sufficient time for us to go into these figures. It is plain that the emoluments set out in the Resolution are of a standing nature, we are consolidating the present salaries with the Cost of Living Allowance which is being paid and in this matter we have to bear in mind the financial and economic position of the colony. I do not think that we would be justified today in coming to a conclusion which would be forced upon us in connection with something for which the Government does not seem to be responsible. I still lay the blame on the members of the Executive Committee who represent the Government in this Chamber because they brought forward this Resolution and they must have some information about it. I am pleased to see the courage which some of the members of the Party forming the Government have shown and I feel that this is the only way in which we can get proper representation for our people. Although people may belong to a Party I feel that everyone has the right to an opinion and he should not be forced to any vote if he feels that his conscience is against what he is about to do. I feel that if we travel along that road the future will be more uplifted and not be so much on the downward slope. I will deal now with the salary scale. I feel that it is ridiculous—I would not use a stronger word—but it is out of all reason to increase the salaries of some people by \$80 and \$100 a month when other people who are fighting to exist on low wages are not really getting any increase in their wages. I feel that we should give increases so as to try to help people to tide over their difficulty where the cost of living is concerned. I do not see where an individual who is drawing £1,000 a year would need such a substantial increase as compared with another individual who is drawing \$7 or \$8 a week. Some miscalculations have been made and I am in favour of the suspension of this Resolution. It is surprising to see that the Government have had the audacity to bring down a Resolution of this sort when they knew that they were doing wrong. The Party forming the Government knew that it was doing wrong to bring forward this Resolution and therefore the Executive of this Party is weak. I do not think that honourable members should allow the Government to force on them something which is out of proportion to their way of thinking. There is no excuse on the part of the Government if they did not realise that this state of affairs would have taken place; If they failed to realise that, that is due to a lack of knowledge of the requirements of the people. If that is the type of representation which this island must have then I am sorry for the future. I am not against any particular Party or creed—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must not dilate on that point because there is no motion before the House dealing with Parties, creeds or things of that nature. The question now is that the consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. WARD: I agree. In my opinion this Resolution should not have been brought before the House because the Government knew that they were doing wrong in sending it down. I feel that this Resolution was only sent down to force our hands and for

vote catching. They propose to give a policeman an increase of \$1.50 per month and to give a high official an increase of \$80. a month! There must be some catch in that. I must say that when this Resolution comes before this House for consideration again many people will be surprised because the salaries will have to be cut. I do not think that we should pay £1,500 or £1,600 a year to imported officials who are sending money to some other place when our own people are paid small salaries; we have to save our people from starvation. I am not against paying reasonable salaries but I will not be satisfied to sit in this House and allow salaries to be fixed where certain people would like them and allow others to live on a pittance weekly. I am not saying anything more because we are only supposed to speak on the motion and show whether we should go into Committee on the Resolution or not. I would not like any honourable member to feel that we can go into this particular Resolution carefully in a day or two. It must be borne in mind that an expert took five months to submit his Report and ordinary men like us cannot go into this Resolution in any day or two. I am supporting the motion for the postponement of this Resolution so that one which will do justice to all the individuals concerned can be brought forward.

Mr. DOWDING: I have been sitting here for approximately five hours trying to find out why this House has found itself in the position of having before it a Resolution with which, as far as I can see, none of the members agree. I can come to only one conclusion; if we were in Australia I would say that we are completely bushed. (Laughter). This House having passed money to import an expert from across the seas now finds itself in the position of not knowing what exactly that expert was called to do in relation to the worth of what he has done. It seems to me that this Resolution has been put before us for a specific reason. As a matter of fact one reason I can think of, is the employment of Russian tactics of duress, that with an election hanging over us we would have to pass this Resolution as it stands. But every honourable member is not going to pass the Resolution as it stands and so we find ourselves in the position of having expended on an expert—I forget what the amount of money was—but money which could have been kept so as to assist in raising the salary scales in this Resolution. The last occasion on which I spoke about bringing experts out here I think it was something like £9,000 which the House had spent or was going to spend on experts. What I am trying to say is this; I am under the impression that this Resolution has been brought here for the purpose of railroading it through so that politics in the not distant election will reach fever pitch and the fever will rise higher and higher. It appears to me that some of these experts both imported and those at present among us, are advising those who should advise them. I cannot see any other reason for it. It is obvious that this Resolution is greatly in favour of these so-called experts. I do not feel that this House has been treated in any way with respect when it is considered that every member who has spoken so far is completely against the Resolution. It only means that the whole time of the House has been wasted today through the lack of advice by those who have obviously advised the sending down of this Resolution. If we are going to have things done in this way I feel that some strong step should be taken in matters of this kind in the future. By postponing this Resolution I think that the House will be doing the wisest thing which could possibly be done. The

elections are hanging over us and the Resolution is put before us at this time! I am grateful that honourable members on this side of the Table have spoken in the way in which they have spoken. Realising the position which we hold as responsible members of this House we go carefully into matters which are put before us whether they be put before us on the advice of experts or on the advice of those who advise the experts who should be advising them.

Mr. MAPP: This situation can only be described as rather ironic and I must certainly say that over a period of many years the salaries and the course of events in this colony relating to the conditions of service of Civil Servants lead us to a point where we can only say how terrible! This Resolution has come down to us to-day as a result of recommendations made by a Commissioner, who came out here to investigate the salaries and conditions of service of Civil Servants. Like most honourable members I am most dissatisfied with this Resolution. I, for one, am aware of the very hazardous course which has led up to the sending down of this Resolution. The recommendations have passed through the hands of Mr. Adams, C.B.E., they were transferred to the hands of a Committee, they went before another Committee and they have now come before the House. One must indeed sympathize with the Civil Servants of this colony. Speaking as an ex-member of that Body I am well aware of the pitiable plight through which the members of it must pass before they can be paid something decent. I will caution those who may be interested in this debate not to lose their proper sense of balance or their perspective in viewing this entire matter. I cannot lay the entire blame for this state of affairs on any supposed weakness of the Executive Committee or indifference of the Government because they adopted a democratic procedure. The teachers should be told to get a proper organization and the workers should be told to see that they are properly organized. When the Government has adopted a course which was brought to bear on the Report of the Commissioner after discussions with the representatives of the workers you cannot lay all the blame on the Government. As I have said, the Government has adopted a democratic procedure and every democratic procedure is lengthy in progress. This debate has been absolutely tiresome; the one object is to postpone the Resolution and the debate should have been stopped ever since. I did not feel like speaking at all because I do not see that the Government is to be blamed in this matter. (Mr. CRAWFORD: Who is to be blamed then?) We had evidence given before the Commissioner who made a Report; that Report was submitted to the Whitley Council which is supposed to represent the workers in the various branches of the Civil Service and it cannot be said that the Government has adopted a wrong course. Obviously they did not; the workers had the chance of saying "We want such and such a thing done." I myself disagree with this Resolution especially when I know that the Leader of the House was in favour of the payment of twice as much as has been recommended for the unestablished staff. I do not agree with the silly arguments which appeared in the Press in connection with this matter. Unless the workers say that they are dissatisfied and they must have some other organization to represent them, must the Government not refer the proposals to the Organisation which represents the workers? I am not excusing the form in which this Resolution has come down to the House; all I am saying is that we should not, for political reasons, say that the Executive Committee is inept and the members are entirely to be blamed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: One honourable member distinctly said that the proposals before us in the form of this Resolution have been agreed with by the Whitley Council, and therefore the Executive brought them down.

Mr. MAPP: The Whitley Council did agree to the proposals and they stated that the increase of four cents an hour in respect of the unestablished staff would cost too much. If the honourable member means to put the question direct to me I will give him the information which I have, and it is that the Whitley Council did agree to the proposals and they brought up the matter of the increased cost. Obviously somebody in the Whitley Council has given one person some information and has given somebody else some other information. This debate has taken a course which, to my mind, is very unfortunate: The honourable member in charge of the Resolution has admittedly said nothing on it; before he could get the chance of saying anything on it an honourable member made a motion and I say it is unfortunate that we did not have the Government's side put before us more explicitly. We must have both sides of the matter. If the representatives of the Whitley Council have made wrong representations then let the workers get other representatives. I do not want to depart from the motion which is before the House, namely that the consideration of this Resolution be postponed; but these recommendations have always been top heavy and the old practice is being perpetuated. I know that Civil Servants from abroad can spend their holiday in Barbados and the Civil Servants here cannot even go to Bathsheba to spend a holiday. I agree with the criticisms which have been made in connection with this Resolution but it is unfortunate that the Resolution could not have been debated properly. I do not see that there is any sense in prolonging this discussion; let us put an end to this interminable debate.

Mr. BLACKMAN: What I want to say is that the Whitley Council worked with the Civil Service Commissioner all the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member seconded the motion that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I am speaking on the amendment. I just want to say that the Whitley Council in Barbados is entirely different from the Whitley Council in England. In England there are Ministers who are responsible for Departments and the members of those Departments who are on the Whitley Council carry out the policy of the different Ministers. Therefore any decisions made by the Whitley Council are binding on the minister. In Barbados we have no ministers and the Whitley Council is a law unto itself. The Whitley Council does what it likes and I take it that the members of the Executive are not bound by the decisions of the Whitley Council. We have no Ministers and therefore we cannot be guided by the Whitley Council.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am speaking on the motion that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. I would just like to say that whether or not I vote for the postponement of the further consideration I cannot do so on the grounds that any salary scale should be left unconsidered during this particular session. To my way of thinking, to do that would be tantamount to class legislation,—something of which a legislative Chamber should never be guilty. We got the Civil Service Commissioner to come here to deal with the entire Government Service and it is our duty to see that justice is done to the entire Service, since the Commissioner has pointed out that some remedying of the present situation is necessary. The next thing I would not like the Government to feel, if I vote for the postponement of this Resolution, is that I am asking it to set up any Committee or otherwise to deal with the appointment of persons receiving £600 and over

per annum. The information which I have is that the appointment of such persons is in the hands of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. If information has reached any member of this House to the effect that a particular appointment in those brackets has not been made because of some objection taken by local persons, I believe that that is a matter for specific debate by the House of Assembly and not that it should alter the principle already agreed upon. Let us act in concert with other places. It is a recognized fact that there are certain regulations which apply to all the colonies and I do not think we can go now and interfere with them. We have already approved of those salaries in the Estimates and these are supplementary amounts. The whole Civil Service, as far as I know, is based on the principle that appointment to certain offices is in the hands of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. As far as the case which has been cited by the senior member for St. Philip is concerned, I understand that the law of this island prevented that individual from being appointed because although he may have very high qualifications he does not have the qualification required by our law for the particular post. At any rate that would be a matter for specific debate. I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am not postponing this Resolution to cut anybody out of it. I am willing to spend any amount of time in going into these proposals on a Select Committee or any other Committee in order to get this matter straightened out with the persons who have already examined this question—the Expert, the Committee to whom the expert's report was referred, and the Whitley Council. I believe that if honourable members would spend a little more time on two or three evenings, we would be able to thresh this matter out. The senior member for St. Philip used the words "certain other amendments". The honourable member specified the increase of 4c. per hour for the unestablished staff and he specified the Teachers. But is that everything? Do you think when you are finished with them and the Resolution comes back here that it is going to be passed without debate? However, I feel that that is not the way we should send it back. It would be, to my mind, just as wrong to leave out those who receive £600 and over per annum as it would be to leave out the unestablished staff and I am not agreeing to the postponement on that ground. If the Government's spokesman can settle the points that have been raised I will not vote for the postponement but there are many outstanding points on which I would have to be satisfied.

Mr. CRAWFORD rises to speak.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I would like to remark that an honourable member who moves an amendment to a motion has not the right of reply. I do not wish to stifle debate but if the honourable member wishes to speak again he must first obtain the leave of the House to do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am going to ask the leave of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member may rise on a point of explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to explain, Sir, that I am not the honourable member who put forward the suggestion that we leave out of consideration salaries of £600 and over per annum and I am not going to allow any honourable member to suggest that I am urging something discriminatory.

Mr. LEWIS: And, on a point of order, I am at liberty to say how the honourable member's remarks strike me! I repeat, Sir, that the honourable member is not entitled to make another speech on this question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The senior member for St. Philip is entitled to speak on any point on which he has been misunderstood.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is exactly my position in this matter, Sir. The junior member for the City misinterpreted my remarks. What I meant to convey is that anybody receiving £600 and over is obviously able to tide over any difficulties during the Christmas Season, whether or not he receives back pay or an increase of salary; but the people who work for less than £600 per annum are not in the same position to cope with the cost of living. I made it clear that in spite of the fact that we were increasing salaries and also adding new posts, we should not deal with this Resolution in a hurry but postpone it and deal now only with employees who receive small salaries.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I see how this debate is going and I shall not say all I intended to say: it is not necessary at this stage. I simply want to answer a few criticisms which have been made. The first is the remark of the senior member for the City who said that this is an attempt by the Government to railroad the House into passing this Resolution. The position, Sir, is this: The Commissioner, Mr. Adams, as has been said, took five months to complete his work. His report was laid on the table of the House and the Governor-in-Executive Committee appointed a Committee to report on his report. Now that Committee did, the same thing the Commissioner did, that is, he consulted the Heads of Departments in this matter and how could it be expected that they would have done the same work in a shorter time, especially when it is remembered that most of them have to earn their livelihood? That Committee was in an unfortunate position in this respect: One or two of its members had to be up and down the West Indies for various reasons and even now two of them are out of the island. It is only recently that the junior member for St. John became a member of that Committee, when most of the work was completed. I just want to remind honourable members of that fact and also of the fact that the Committee could hardly have done its work in a shorter period. The Executive Committee realized that it would be difficult to get the Report, as sent to them, properly examined in a brief space of time but other honourable members, like myself must have been asked many times a day by Government servants "when are we going to get that money?" And the Whitley Council went so far as to write the Government asking it to take some urgent step in the matter as the Civil Servants were becoming restive. The sending down of this Resolution was no attempt to railroad anybody; it was only an answer to the uneasiness on the part of the Government's employees. As I have said, I shall reserve most of my remarks until the opportunity comes—if it comes—for me to further introduce this Resolution. But there is one thing I want to say before I sit down and it is this: "The Executive Committee has been pilloried this evening for this report. Now, we were invited one afternoon to meet the staff side and the Whitley Council in respect of certain matters on which they disagreed. They could not come to an agreement and the members of the Executive Committee were invited to meet them, not for an expression of opinion by us. We were distinctly told that we were not asked for an expression of opinion but were invited to hear the argument on each side so that we would be able to come to our own conclusion on the points on which they disagreed. And I was most surprised when I heard that afternoon that the decisions ar-

rived at by the Whitley Council are binding on the Governor-in-Executive Committee! Such decisions could probably be upset by the Legislature but we were distinctly told that they are binding on the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In the face of that, how can the Executive Committee be accused of these proposals? Now, Sir, much has been said about Heads of Departments. On that afternoon to which I referred, only one Head of Department was in dispute. Apparently, the Whitley Council had accepted the emoluments of all the other Heads and the emoluments of only one were disputed and he was the Director of Agriculture. The Whitley Council felt that the salary of the Director of Agriculture should be £1,300 a year but that in the case of the present holder of the office who has proved himself to be an able man, he should be given a personal allowance. That was the only Head of Department in dispute and the House is being told that the Government approved of these high salaries for Heads of Departments! But I want to make abundantly clear the point that we were told that the Governor-in-Executive Committee in the status of an employer and that any decisions made by the Whitley Council are binding on the Government unless they went to arbitration. On the face of that this House is being told that these are the proposals of the Governor-in-Executive Committee! There is only one further remark I should like to make and it is in connection with the unestablished staff. I heard for the first time last night that an increase of 4c. per hour was suggested for the unestablished staff. I happen to be a member of the Executive of the Barbados Workers Union and this point might have been discussed when I was absent but last night is the first time I heard about it. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the rates in this Resolution were agreed to by the Whitley Council, not by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I do not know the amount of representation the unestablished staff has on the Whitley Council but these rates were agreed to by the Whitley Council and last night we were told by the President of the Whitley Council that when the suggestion of an increase of 4c. per hour was put forward, it was considered too costly; that every additional cent per hour meant an additional cost of £10,000 per annum and an additional 4c. per hour would mean an additional cost of £40,000 for annum, and that the Financial Secretary considered it too costly. The suggestion of an increase of 4c. an hour for the unestablished staff was not raised in Executive Committee and last night is the first time I heard about it. The senior member for St. John said that he understood that most of the recommendations of the Whitley Council had been upset by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That is not true; somebody has given him wrong information. As a matter of fact the Executive Committee has decided that Teachers with Certificate "A" and 20 years' service should be given the maximum of £430 per annum, instead of £360 per annum which has been recommended.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The honourable member seems to forget that what happens at the Executive Committee is more or less secret.

Dr. CUMMINS: I wonder how long the honourable member found that out! (Cheers).

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let the honourable member name a single occasion on which I have discussed on the floor of this House anything that took place at the Executive Committee.

Dr. CUMMINS: Finally, Sir, the senior member for St. Philip suggested about coming back here with this Resolution on Thursday next. It is

impossible — and the honourable member ought to know it—for the Executive Committee to be summoned in such a short space of time to deal with this Resolution and to have any amendments to it printed and circulated in time for Thursday. I shall not go any further because honourable members are tired. The junior member for the City asked whether any particular Head in this Resolution can be postponed. The reply is “yes”. It has been done on previous occasions for further information. We have done it when considering the Estimates and I do not see why we cannot do it in considering this Resolution.

The question that the further consideration of the Resolution be postponed is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes:—Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, SYMMONDS, HUSBANDS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, LEWIS, MAPP, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD—14.

Noes:— Mr. BLACKMAN and Dr. CUMMINS—2.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

The Order Paper being fixed, the House is, on the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, adjourned to meet on Monday, 8th November, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.