

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950-51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20th February 1951.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10 a.m. today.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., T. O. BRYAN, M. E. COX, J. E. T. BRANCKER, F. L. WALCOTT, F. C. GODDARD, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., and L. E. R. GILL.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 6th February, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to enable the St. Michael's Vestry to raise a loan to pay retrospective pay to the employees of the said parish with amendments.

MESSRS. DOWDING, MILLER and MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay from His Excellency the Governor Messages as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 6/1951.

*His Excellency The Governor
To*

The Honourable The House Of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that His Majesty's Government through the Secretary of State for the Colonies has issued an invitation for two members of the Legislature to attend the Festival of Britain as their guests from July 9th to July 30th. His Majesty's Government have it in mind that a visit sponsored in this way would serve to associate

the Colonies with the Festival in a formal manner, and would also provide a convenient opportunity for the representatives to participate in informal meetings at which they could hear from Ministers concerned some account of United Kingdom policy in relation to the current world situation and could discuss the major problems common to the United Kingdom and the Colonies.

2. The Secretary of State for the Colonies states that the hospitality offered by His Majesty's Government cannot extend beyond the provision of board, lodging and necessary travelling expenses in the United Kingdom during the period July 9th to 30th. It will therefore be necessary for this Government to make provision for steamship passages and for subsistence allowances for its representatives outside the period stated above. It is also regretted that it is not practicable to extend the invitation to include wives of representatives.

3. The Honourable the House of Assembly are requested to indicate whether this invitation of His Majesty's Government should be accepted, and if so, to nominate one of their number as a representative from Barbados.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
19th February, 1951.

Message No. 7/1951 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House that he has assented in the name and on behalf of His Majesty the King to the Acts mentioned therein.

PAPER LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I have the honour to lay on the Table of the House the following Paper:—Statement of the sums of money paid to the Colonial Treasurer by the Commissioner of Police during the Quarter ended 31st December, 1950.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER:

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:

1. Whether it is a fact that at the present time there exists at the General Post Office a shortage of overcoats for use of Letter Carriers?

2. If the answer to the above query is yes, Will Government, particularly in view of present weather conditions; take the most urgent action in order to make immediate provision for raincoats for all Letter Carriers?

3. Will Government favourably consider provision of motor cycles for Letter Carriers in the hilly districts?

Mr. BRANCKER :—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:

1. Whether Government is aware of continued dissatisfaction at prices paid by factories for peasant canes, particularly in the Leeward districts of this Island?

2. Whether Government will give favourable consideration to the purchase of one of the sugar factories in this district, not only as the first step towards the nationalisation of sugar factories in this Island but with a view to offering a better price for peasant canes than has been paid, and is being paid, for peasant canes in this, as well as in other districts?

3. If action is taken by Government along the lines indicated by paragraph 2 above, will Government provide a fleet of lorries to transport at a reasonable figure, peasant canes from any part of the Island to the Government factory?

Mr. BRANCKER :—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:

1. Will Government, in order to pave the way to disendowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church, avoid taking any steps to fill such vacancies as may from time to time arise (either by resignations or otherwise) as regards the See or any other Office in the Anglican Church in this Colony?

Mr. BRANCKER :—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:

In view of the holding of a General Election for the Assembly this year with Adult Suffrage, will Government with as little delay as possible, initiate the necessary steps for the creation of Single-Member constituencies throughout this Island?

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Messrs. CRAWFORD, REECE and BETHELL entered the House and took their seats.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE re GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$10,334

at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1950-51, No. 43, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. As honourable members will see from the Schedule to the Resolution, it is proposed to supplement the Estimates under the first Head, "Governor", by providing increased pay for the domestic staff at Government House, by providing for an increased grant towards the lighting at Government House and to provide for the purchase of a motor-car to be placed at the disposal of the Officer administering the Government of Barbados. I will read the whole addendum so as to remind honourable members of what the position is.

The addendum states:—

"The Report of the Commissioner appointed in 1947 to review and make recommendations upon the structure of the Civil Service of Barbados and of remuneration and conditions of service of all Government servants contains the following recommendations (at paragraphs 222 and 223) in respect of the remuneration and conditions of service of the Governor.

(a) that the duty allowance of the Governor should be increased from £500 to £1,000 per annum;

(b) that transport for the use of the officer administering the Government should be purchased and maintained at the public expense;

(c) that some portion of the expenses of the domestic staff employed at Government House should be met from public funds.

2. The Governor's (Amendment) Act, 1949, gave effect to the first recommendation. But this increase does not provide sufficient relief from the heavy financial commitments involved in maintaining Government House and in acquiring the two motor cars necessary for use by the officer administering the Government of the Island. Rising costs particularly in so far as the wages of domestic staff are concerned constitute an unduly onerous charge against the Governor's emoluments and it is proposed to conform to the practice adopted in almost all Colonies.

3. The proposals are:—

(a) that a British make of car suitable to the dignity of a Governor should be purchased and maintained by the state;

(b) that the domestic staff at Government House should continue to be employed as the personal servants of the Governor but that their salaries and allowances should be borne by the State;

(c) that the expenses of light, heat and fuel for Government House should be met from general revenue;

(d) that the Governor should make a contribution of 10% of his salary of \$14,400 per annum to cover the proportion of expenditure under (b) and (c) which may reasonably be accepted as meeting the private and personal needs of the Governor and his family;

(e) that the proposals in (b), (c) and (d) should take retrospective effect from the 1st of October, 1950.

4. The wages and allowances of the domestic staff at present amount to \$84.69 per week and it is now proposed to increase this amount to \$100.79 with effect from the 1st January, 1951."

Mr. Chairman, having had to approach this House in my capacity as Leader of the Government a comparatively short time ago on the question of a vote for entertainment, and even apart from that,

being a Barbadian I am well aware that a Resolution of this sort is bound to provoke in the minds of many Barbadians in or out of the House, consternation, perhaps, and certainly opposition. I am prepared for it, and I think that to all persons who endeavour to look at this matter objectively and to look at a Governor of Barbados as just another Civil Servant, it is as reasonable to accept these proposals, perhaps with slight modifications, as it is to have accepted the proposals made by Commissioner Adams as regards the rest of the Civil Servants. It is no good our shutting our eyes to the fact that for 300 years the average Barbadian has been anti-Governor, anti-Colonial Office and anti-United Kingdom; that is a fact and that feeling has not yet died. It is a good thing that the early settlers in this colony, although they were doing it for selfish reasons and for their own interests, started the policy of watching carefully the actions of the Governor of this Island. Barbadians have made it crystal clear that they were prepared to have the ultimate voice in the running of their affairs in this colony. It is notorious, Sir, that for 300 years Barbadians have always told the Colonial Office: "Hands off; we are running our own affairs. Do not dictate to us." Such was the sturdy independence of Barbadians that they would curse the Colonial Office; they would go to the Colonial Office and say: "Give us a better price for sugar." All that is true and we can thank our predecessors for having established the fact that we are not to be dictated to, generally speaking, in internal matters; but it is possible to overdo the expression of that sentiment which is, in effect, concentrated in attacks on the occupant of Government House. We are always determined that the Secretary of State for the Colonies is not going to dictate to us, and that the Secretary of State's representative at Government House is not going to dictate to us; but is it not possible for us to overdo things and do an active injustice to the Chief Executive of the Colony? I have to say that, Mr. Chairman, because we all know that a Resolution of this sort is not likely to pass this House without opposition, and without, perhaps unfortunate acrimonious debate.

I had hoped that in a matter of this sort—discussion of which must, of necessity, be embarrassing to the Governor—the Leader of the Opposition and I would have had some measure of agreement by an informal conference outside this Assembly as to what all Parties would be prepared to vote for. In that case there would not be any necessity for making any speech apart from an ordinary, formal introduction of the Resolution and the seconding and support of it; but I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that that is not to be, and therefore, in introducing this Resolution, I think it necessary for me to state what I have just stated. Put shortly and briefly, this Resolution is nothing more than the final implementation of Commissioner Adams's Report. Let me remind honourable members that as far as the Governor is concerned, he has always been omitted, apart from what we did in 1949 by way of increasing the duty allowance which was in consideration of the revision of salaries. During the War the Governor was expressly omitted from the receipt of the Cost of Living Bonus which was given to other Civil Servants. After Commissioner Adams reported, we dealt with other members of the Civil Service; the argument used on the floor of this House was: "Attend to the poor and the lower branches of the Civil Service first," and we have attended to the lower branches of the Civil Service. There was a Re-organization Committee appointed and that Committee had on it representatives of the

Civil Service Association; recommendations were made which were eventually agreed to by this House and the Other Place finally passed the revised salaries. Again, the Governor was omitted. The suggestions made with regard to the Governor in Commissioner Adams's Report have now been brought before the House.

Honourable members have had, not as any part of the Resolution, of course, not even as any part of the addendum, the opportunity of looking at figures which led members of the Executive Committee to arrive at these figures. I have had a chance of seeing how we arrived at the figure of \$100 a week for the domestic staff; I have had a chance of seeing what it costs for the average lighting at Government House, and, as a result of that, members of the Executive Committee have reached these figures. We have had substantial help from the honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable senior member for the City in this matter. The honourable junior member for St. James has made suggestions to me as to what the members of his Party would be willing to accept, and, for my part, I feel that it would be commonsense to accept those suggestions. I am therefore moving the passing of this Resolution as it is, but the suggestions made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition seem to me to be suggestions which the Executive Committee should accept with this understanding; that the normal staff necessary for the running of Government House should be paid by the State, and the Governor should contribute from his salary towards what might be said to be the personal servants of himself and his family. In short, if the Governor as an individual were running Government House, it would cost him something to pay his servants. He has to employ many more servants, because he is Governor, for entertainment purposes and the State should pay for those servants over and above those which any man would normally employ in the running of his household; we accept that principle. We voted a sum of money to pay for lighting at Government House, but that money is confined to the cost of lighting certain rooms and the amount is small. If honourable members judge from their own electric bills, they will see that this proposed figure is not exorbitant. The proposal therefore is that we should pay for the lighting of Government House and the wages of the domestic staff over and above the personal servants of the occupant of Government House. Honourable members will know from the cyclo-styled breakdown which has been handed to them, that there is computed in this amount an allowance for additional servants and also an allowance for uniforms. It has been suggested by members of the Opposition, at least by the Party led by the honourable junior member for St. James, that certain figures be omitted, and I am perfectly prepared, if the honourable member makes that amendment, to accept it. If the honourable member moves as an amendment the deletion of these figures and a consequent reduction of the amount of the Resolution, I am prepared to accept that, the principle being that we will vote a certain sum of money today to pay for what may be called the official servants of Government House and for the lighting. When it comes to the question of the motor car, honourable members will see from the addendum that, as in the Adams' Report, it has been suggested that this car should be paid for by the State. If you go to Trinidad, you will find that there is at Government House, a car which is placed at your disposal. I do not think it is necessary for me to say much on that point; the State owns Government House and

we should not mind voting this sum of money to provide this car at Government House. I am told that some honourable members feel that this sum of \$7,200 is too much, but it has been considered that Government House should have a car worthy of the dignity of Barbados. It is felt that we should have a car magnificent in appearance but not too expensive and the figure which was put here was the price of a "Humber" car. It may be that we can find an "Austin" car; I hope that our American friends will not feel hurt if we say that in this colony there is no sense in buying an American car. At any rate, if a suggestion is made to reduce this sum, I am prepared to accept the principle of buying a car and I will come back to the House, after getting quotations as to all kinds of English cars that come to this colony, with the exact figure. If honourable members approve of the principle of having a car, we should be able to come back and ask for less than £1,500. If we get the figures, honourable members will be able to make a suggestion as to whether they prefer a "Vauxhall" or an "Austin"; it will be a matter of choice.

I do not think that I can add anything more; this is a matter which should appeal to honourable members' pride. However, I should just like to say that I am not saying that we should do this thing or that thing because other people do it; that is the worse argument to use before Barbadians. But I should say that the provision of this car and the payment of the things I have mentioned are usual in other colonies, and unless the principle was wrong in itself, there is no reason why we should not fall in line and do what other Colonies do. I am going to use one final argument which might appeal more to honourable members on my right than to those on my left; it is that an informal Committee discussed these matters and while they are not free to disclose anything they were told, they know, as a matter of fact that a Governor who has not got any private income, cannot, on the present salary and emoluments which he gets, be expected to run Government House in the way it should be run. It is easy to run Government House, I suppose, and entertain two or three people a month and no more; but today it must be remembered that we have people from the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization in this island, we have coming and going, people who expect to be entertained at Government House; and when I say entertained, I do not mean invited for tea or lunch or dinner, but staying at Government House. The Governor has to entertain people while they are in Barbados, but they never have the common decency when he is back in England to return the hospitality. The occupant of Government House is no ordinary man when it comes to entertaining: he has to entertain people from January to December. I am trying to appeal to honourable members to see that we are only doing common justice to the Governor of this colony just as we attempted to do to the other Civil Servants during the past few years; I appeal to honourable members to let this Resolution pass. The principle will be established and I give the assurance that before anything is put on the Estimates for the future, I will consult the members of the Opposition as to exactly what we should put on the Estimates. For the future we will have to put on the Estimates a sum to cover what we are passing today, and I give the assurance that honourable members will know beforehand what is going to be put on the Estimates. In fact, I should like an agreement beforehand as to the sum of money to be put in the Estimates as a result of our vote

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to move an amendment to this Resolution; I am going to move that this Resolution be reduced by \$1,934, that the following amendments be made to the Schedule:—

That Item "7 (a) (New) Domestic Staff, \$2,652" be amended to read "7 (a) Assistance for Domestic Staff and Lighting, \$2,400"; that Item II, "Lighting, heat and fuel, \$482" be deleted and that the figures "\$7,200" opposite Item 20. "(New) Purchase of motor car" be deleted and the figures "\$6,000" be inserted in place thereof. You will find, Mr. Chairman, that that is a total reduction of \$1,934.

As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, there has been great co-operation between the Parties in an endeavour—and I hope we will be successful—to keep this debate on the highest level and not bring in any personalities or make remarks which some of us might have to regret having made afterwards. I want to say that my Party in the Opposition realises now that the occupant of Government House in these times has to keep more servants than he would keep if he were living quietly with his wife and family, and we are prepared to accept the principle of paying some portion of the cost of the domestic staff. The figures I have given in asking for the reduction of the amount of the Resolution are based on the Government paying 75% of the cost of the domestic staff and the Governor paying 25%. We consider that that is an equitable arrangement; we also consider that we are responsible for the lighting of Government House and we accept the honourable member's assurance that, before the Estimates are laid, we shall be given the opportunity, as we have been given during the last week, of discussing with him what amount should be put on the Estimates, what amount should be contributed by the State and what amount should be contributed by the Governor. Sir, we accept that assurance fully.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as regards the provision of the car, we also agree with some reluctance, that it is the duty of the Government to supply the Governor with one car. This Resolution has been sent down to this House somewhat hurriedly, and the honourable member who introduced it has not had the opportunity of getting the actual price of a suitable car. I think that, perhaps a suitable car—a "Humber", or "Vauxhall" or "Austin" could be purchased free of duty. The sum of \$7,200 has been put down for the purchase of the car and I am suggesting in my amendment that that amount be reduced by \$1,200, leaving an amount of \$6,000. I am hoping, Sir, that in purchasing this car, the Government will bear in mind that they must purchase one which our mechanics in Barbados understand and for which spare parts are available; we cannot agree to buy a car the make of which has never been in this island before, and for which we cannot get spare parts. I think that an American car is more suitable for the State occasions on which this car will be used because American cars afford the necessary room, and the occupants of the car will not have to take off their hats.

I know that there are other honourable members who want to speak on this Resolution and therefore I am not saying anything more. The honourable senior member for the City has been associated with me on each occasion when we met both here and at

Government House, and there are one or two points which he will emphasize. I now beg to move that this Resolution be reduced by the sum of \$1,934, leaving the sum of \$8,400 for the domestic staff, the lighting and the car.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the honourable junior member for St. James for this reduction. This Resolution has been given very careful consideration by members of the Opposition. Like the honourable junior member for St. James, I feel that it is the duty of the State to assist in the provision of the servants for the running of Government House. If honourable members will peruse carefully the statements which have been put before them, they will see that there are 15 servants employed at Government House. I should like to say that at this time when the cost of living is going up and up for people in all walks of life in this colony, one cannot say that the cost of living has gone up for one type of person and not for the other type of person. The first item which must concern us in this Resolution is the amount of money to assist in the payment of the domestic staff at Government House. As the honourable Leader of the House has said, after a preliminary conference in connection with this matter, we were able to get certain facts. It must appear to honourable members, whether they are Socialists or not, that the Governor of this colony, by virtue of his office, is compelled to live in the State residence provided for him by the people of this colony; and surely no individual in this colony would agree that the Head of the Administration should be taken from the State residence provided for him and placed in a smaller house where, let us say, he would have to keep only four or five servants. We must look at this matter from every possible angle; to ask anybody to pay one-third of his salary for servants' wages is not what any honourable member of this Chamber, whether he is a Socialist or otherwise, would like to do. He would like to see other people doing it, but I am sure that there is no honest man who would tell you that he is going to pay 1/- out of 3/- for servants' wages. Imagine a man earning \$60 a month and paying \$20 a month for servants! It is a popular thing on Election Day to get up and say: "I have to pay this or that", but it is not honest, in my opinion. It is not a practical thing for an individual to pay one-third of his salary for servants and the question therefore remains: should we grant the necessary assistance to the Governor or not? Should we keep up Government House as it should be kept up or not? The Head of the Administration must live up to a certain standard, and whatever else you may think about people in this world, there are always standards to which everyone of us aspires, whatever they might be. If we accept that there are standards to which we must aspire, we cannot say after a traditional 300 years that we would like to relegate the Head of the Administration and make a comparison which probably will be made later in the day between him and an individual whose salary is \$120 a month. Let us be frank about the matter; when you worked for \$40 a month, you lived up to that standard; now you earn \$100 a month, it is your duty to live up to that standard. There are no two ways about it; if you live according to that standard, you must appreciate the fact that the Head of the Administration with a salary of £3,000 a year has to live up to a certain standard. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that we have been anti-Governor and anti-Colonial Office for generations in this colony; that is partly true, but we were always pro-British, so much so that we acquired the name of "Little

England" for this colony. While we have always been bold and would not allow the Colonial Office to dictate to us, we have always been pro-British. In many instances, one of which was during the 1914-18 War, we were considered to be more British than the British themselves.

As regards these items, we have agreed that a portion of the wages of the domestic staff at Government House should be borne by the State, and that the lighting up there should be the responsibility of the State. Honourable members will remember when their bills for lighting were in the vicinity of \$1 or \$2, but today those bills have gone up by 10% or 12%. We feel, I repeat, that the lighting of Government House should be the responsibility of the State; I should like to say that if the custom of the Head of the Administration in Barbados today was that of the past, when only certain people were invited up there, I would be the first to get up here and say: "Not one cent." But by force of circumstances, Governors have got to see that Government House is our Government House, that one or another is only there as the King's Representative and therefore he has to do what we want done. That is as clear as a pikestaff. We on this side of the House would like to make it clear to the Government that although we are supporting the principle of subscribing to the amount paid to the domestic staff at Government House, we want to make it quite clear that the staff will still be under the control of the Governor and his wife, and not under the control of the Legislature. The idea should not go around that money is being voted here to pay the salaries of the domestic staff at Government House; as has been pointed out by the honourable junior member for St. James, this money is being voted so as to assist the Head of the Administration in paying the wages of the domestic staff. In Sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 3 of the addendum to this Resolution it is stated that the Governor should make a contribution of 10% of his salary to cover a proportion of the expenses in respect of the domestic staff; I do not agree with that. I foresee an increase in the salaries of the staff in the not too distant future, and if we were to say that we are making this subscription to these expenses dependent upon the Governor paying only 10% of his salary, that will mean that for all time the Governor would be paying only 10% of his salary. I agree with the opinion of the honourable junior member for St. James that we pay 75% of these expenses and the Governor must pay 25%. The salaries of the domestic staff are not such as can be regarded as handsome salaries; it strikes me that they are going to be increased in the near future and if we were to bind ourselves to the Governor only paying 10% of these expenses we will find ourselves making a greater contribution towards these expenses than we expected to make. We do not want the Governor to have any misapprehension in this matter.

As to the provision of the car, after much debate in our Party, I should say that we are persuaded that it is correct to have a decent car — a State car — which will be the property of the people of Barbados. It must be obvious to honourable members that the Head of the Administration will have his own car and this State car will be used on certain occasions. The amount which has been put down here for this car is \$7,200; although I seconded the motion for the reduction of this amount by \$1,200, I think that we should put down a token vote of \$1 in respect of this car.

Mr. WILKINSON: If the honourable member will excuse me for one minute, I should like to say that I have spoken with the honourable senior mem-

ber for St. Joseph and he has suggested to me that I could further reduce this Resolution by \$5,999 and that a token vote of \$1 could be put down in respect of the car, which I am prepared to do. That will give the Government a chance to get quotations relative to the car.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am glad that the honourable member has decided to do that. We want to have a State car in which more than two persons can be carried and from figures I have seen we might have to pay more than \$7,200. I agree with the honourable junior member for St. James that we should get a car which mechanics in Barbados know and for which spare parts can be obtained. I agree with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that there will be much debate on this Resolution, and with the honourable junior member for St. James that the debate should be kept on the highest level. I am sure that every honourable member will try, because of the peculiar circumstances of the case, to keep this debate on the highest possible level, because, after all, it comes down to this; we are being asked to pay a portion of the expenses of the upkeep of Government House and we are being asked to do that because we see that 15 Barbadians are employed there as servants. As I said, the wages are not anything that you could really boast about. I am quite serious about this statement which I will make now: taking the salaries which I see are paid to these servants in consideration with those which are paid by middle-class people, who give accommodation, the salaries of the servants employed at Government House are not quite as good as those paid by middle-class people. I know that the honourable senior member for St. George will agree with me in this matter. I suggest most strongly that we should not give the Governor the impression that we, on this side of the Table, agree in principle with allowing him to contribute merely 10% of his salary towards the expenses of the domestic staff and we contribute the balance; because we would be binding ourselves to that principle when salaries are increased. I therefore think that the suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. James is the correct principle, namely that we subscribe 75% of these expenses and the Governor be asked to subscribe 25%. If my figuring is right, it is asking the Governor to do too much to pay £1,000 a year for servants out of a salary of £3,000. That is uneconomical, and if you find any man doing that, he is living above his means. What person with a salary of £3,000 a year would pay 15 servants £1,000 of that income? You cannot show me any person in this island with an income of £6,000 employing 15 servants. I think that honourable members should support this Resolution and I sit down by saying this: it would be quite easy when matters, which are so controversial as this one, are to be discussed, for the honourable Leader of the House to adopt the attitude of discussing them with members of the Opposition; because I am one member of the Opposition who is always willing to show reason and to use my influence with my Party to see what is reasonable and what is unreasonable. I therefore have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution as amended by the honourable junior member for St. James.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—I am moving a further amendment to this Resolution; namely, that the Resolution be further reduced by \$5,999 leaving the sum of \$2,400 for the domestic staff and the lighting, and \$1 as a token vote for the car. As I have said, that will give the members of the Government the opportunity of getting a price which

we think is a reasonable one to put before the House as the price of the car.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—The unanimity which I have noticed around this Table on matters of this sort reminds me of the saying that the rich man is always respected and assisted by his enemies, but the poor man is hated even by his neighbours. When concluding his remarks the honourable senior member for the City mentioned something about there being controversial arguments in connection with the passing of this Resolution, but, Sir, I certainly would like to hear more of them. Now I am not one per cent. in favour of increasing the salary of the Head of the Administration, because this Resolution only means an increase in his salary disguised in the term "low-paid servants." I say that whoever is responsible for the cruel wages which have been paid to the staff at Government House for a long period of years and even during the War years should be censured. It might be said that the present Head of the Administration is not responsible for the payment of these wages, but he has been here for over a year and that should have been sufficient time for him to consider that these wages were too small. I have a wage list here from Government House and it shows that the sum of \$84.69 per week was paid to 15 servants all during the War years, and that includes ration allowance which varies from 75 cents per week to the head butler to 25 cents a week to the assistant washer. That total amount gives you an average of \$5.60 per week for an individual, and it is now proposed to increase the total amount to \$100.79. Now the increase which is being asked for is still too small if you take into consideration the high cost of living today.

I must question the remarks which have been made here today by honourable members as to the difficulties which the Head of the Administration is expected to meet if his salary is not increased. I do not believe in treating any servant of the Government any different from another one; whether it is the Head of the Administration or the man who cleans the gardens, they both contribute to the proper running of the island, and each cook is expected to work in his respective place efficiently. Now in the addendum to this Resolution it is stated that the duty allowance of the Governor should be increased from £500 to £1,000; in 1949 we increased that allowance and the Governor now gets \$4,800 a year for entertaining people. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, if the Governor does not have any income he cannot be expected to entertain; but if the Governor does any entertaining at Government House, it does not mean that he embarks on his salary to pay for entertaining because he has a special allowance given by the taxpayers for that purpose. I do not therefore see why that point should have been made. It is said that the Governor should be given a car or cars befitting the dignity of his office; the question is: Are we acting in the interest of the classes or are we acting in the interest of the masses? It is already 300 years when there were in power people who felt that certain people should be thrown to the skies while others should be trampled. That should not be; this Resolution in which we are asked to increase the salary and emoluments of the Head of the Administration, is nothing more than going away from a democratic set-up and trying to do things which, in the end, must be perpetuated. It hurts me, Mr. Chairman, to find that last Tuesday we passed a Resolution to establish the post of caretaker of Government buildings, and the addendum to that Resolution stated —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but let him try and keep to this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I am trying to say that when we were asked to pay that watchman \$6.00 per week for doing a wholtime job, they were not thinking in terms of how that man would be able to meet his daily commitments and those of his family. I regret that I have to adopt this trend of argument, but I feel that fairness should be fairness regardless of whoever is involved. I notice in the Estimates that allocations were made under the Head "Governor" to this effect: Duty Allowance, \$4,800; Furniture, \$1,200; That item costs us \$1,200 every year. Stationery, \$360; Flags, \$120. Now as regards this provision for flags, I do not know if some occasion necessitated it and the money was voted and never reduced; but I can never imagine our having to spend \$120 a year on flags at Government House, because I take it that a supply is there for several years. I do not feel that these flags should cost us \$120 a year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member again; I asked him to stick to this Resolution, but he is now going up on the flagstaff.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I take it that we are considering the question of the maintenance of Government House and if a member argues about a particular item, I do not know if that can be considered as going up on a flagstaff. I do not know how you expect me to understand what you mean by that statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution does not ask for any flags.

Mr. ALLDER: I am discussing this Resolution and I take it that I have the privilege to discuss any part of the Resolution. I was saying that I do not feel that the flags at Government House should cost us \$120 a year. I have here the allocations in the Estimates including miscellaneous items and they amount to a total of \$11,314 per year. Inasmuch as labour gangs go daily from the Prison to Government House and keep the gardens and yards clean, I am suggesting that this \$2,416 which is voted for the upkeep of gardens should be reduced and the money re-allocated for some other necessities. I feel that if such things were done they would not have had to come here with a Resolution asking for more money to be spent on this Department. This Department will cost us \$30,545 during this financial year and I feel that if we are not careful, it will cost us very much more. I feel so because I have been influenced to that feeling by statements made here from the Government bench; but whenever suggestions are made for the improvement of certain social services for the people, you hear that the Government cannot afford to carry out those suggestions and so the suggestions were not considered. I feel, Sir, that if the Treasury cannot stand a certain expenditure for the people, it cannot stand any further burden when individuals want increased salaries and emoluments in their respective departments. We cannot continue, Mr. Chairman, as we have been doing during this session to vote large sums of money, which, when you arrive at the final analysis, it does not show that the money has been spent in the interest of the majority of the taxpayers in this colony and especially the unemployed who are deeply suffering today as a result of their limited opportunities to keep themselves and their families in a proper way of life. I have noticed that this practice has prevented us from embarking on schemes for the improvement of —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I have to interrupt the honourable member, and if he does not stick to

this Resolution I will have to call upon the Speaker. This Resolution does not ask for what the honourable member is speaking about.

Mr. ALLDER: I cannot help if you fail to observe what my rights and privileges are; we are discussing finance. This is a money Resolution and, as such, in considering the passing of it or otherwise, you have to think in terms of the financial stability of the island. That is what I feel every honourable member is asked to do when he is asked to support a money Resolution. In this Resolution we were asked, prior to the amendment moved by the honourable junior member for St. James, to vote the sum of \$7,200 for the purchase of a car or cars. Now I want to know why are we so mindful about supplying the Head of the Administration with cars? An honourable member has just said: "A car." If that honourable member says that they are going to purchase one car, I would like to know if they are buying a train, because I cannot see that they should be thinking of spending \$7,200 on a car. But that is beside the point; I have seen the Head of the Administration with two lovely cars and are we now going to ask him to sell those two cars which he already has or give them away or put them up in the garage to rust and use ours? What are we asking him to do? I feel that if you are going to add anything to an office when the present holder of that office resigns, before the new holder comes you should stipulate in your contract what prerequisites you are going to offer him. By doing that you will prevent what appears to be a duplication of amenities which this department seems to be getting now. Are you going to ask the Head of the Administration to throw away, give away or sell the two cars which he already has? Are you going to buy them from him?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: These two cars are the property of the Head of the Administration: they are not the property of the Government.

Mr. ALLDER: I know that they are his cars, but what are we going to ask him to do with them?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is his business. We may as well ask you what are you going to do with your stock in Roebuck Street?

Mr. ALLDER: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that you are inclined to be humorous, but I would like you to take me more seriously. I regret that, as far as this Resolution is concerned, I cannot be more serious on account of circumstances. I do not think that this is the appropriate time for us to offer the Head of the Administration this car. We have seen and heard from time to time, and we know too that the resources of the colony cannot permit us to spend money without being forced to do so and in channels where we do not expect to get any reasonable returns, Sir, in the days when other people occupied the place which we are now occupying, they did not think in terms of giving these concessions to the Head of the Administration, and I hardly see that we should make it our first duty to consider such things. The present holder of the office has just come here—it is a little over a year—and I take it that when he was offered the post—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I have to stop the honourable member.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—If I should be permitted on a point of order—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the honourable member. I want to draw to the attention of the honourable member that in your initial speech you mentioned that you are quite willing to accept the amendment to this Resolution, moved by the honourable junior member for St. James, relative to the car. I would be very glad if you would do that now.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I rise on a point of order. I take it that I was speaking and you interrupted me while I was speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot hear you unless you first take your seat.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I feel that I was interrupted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are out of order.

Mr. ALLDER took his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I accept the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. James. When we come to the Estimates we have to insert this new item "Assistance for Domestic Staff and Lighting", and I do accept the amendment that the item "Purchase of motor car" under the Head *Non-recurrent* should be a token vote of \$1. As the honourable junior member for St. James has suggested, the Government will investigate prices of cars for which we can get spare parts. Before I take my seat I am appealing to the honourable member's sense of decency; he was just about to say something confidentially told him by the Governor on an undertaking—

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of order—

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member was just about to repeat something confidentially told him by the Governor on an undertaking that nothing which was told him should be repeated outside. There is nothing in the world to prevent the honourable member from saying what he likes but it is a matter of common decency that none of us should repeat what the Governor told us.

Mr. ALLDER: I would like the honourable member to explain to the Committee the point I was about to make.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member began saying that when the Governor was appointed he must have been told so and so. That is what he was told. The honourable junior member for St. Philip, we know, would divulge anything; we were particularly told: "Understand, I told you so and so, but nothing I say should be repeated out of Government House."

Mr. ALLDER: That is a direct attempt to accuse me wrongfully; any normal human being who is following his politics would know that before any officer is accepted by this colony, he would have to be told what the conditions are going to be as far as his appointment is concerned. That is the point which I was trying to make, that His Excellency must have been told the conditions which he would expect to meet. The honourable member was unreasonable and indiscreet to suggest that I intended to betray some confidence that was reposed in me, but that is far from my mind. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this sort of thing will be stopped soon; the people should see to it that it is stopped. It is not fair, it is not honest, it is not discreet as far as the future of the island is concerned; you are doing nothing but practising politics which only suit the classes at the expense of the masses. You extend sympathy to people who are capable of taking care of themselves, at the expense of those who are helpless. That is all it is, and if it means my last day in the House, somebody has to stop this kind of thing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to stick to this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: This is wrong; no officer should be treated in a way different from other officers. As a representative in this House, I have brought forward as many suggestions as any other honourable member who was sent here at the last Election; and

I cannot honestly tell my people that I am attached to a Socialist set-up and therefore I have been able to do —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to stick to this Resolution, and if you refuse to do so I will have to call on the Speaker. I am not going to sit here and allow you to stray all over the place.

Mr. ALLDER: Time after time, Mr. Chairman, we have been asked to pass Resolutions, and we have been told that the bottom of the Treasury is dropping out. It means, therefore, that there will be a putting back of all those social reforms which we promised the people from the platforms and for which they sent us here. What is that but a breach of your responsibility towards the people? I think that in a colony like Barbados with its limited resources, its redundant population, the difficulty of the people in getting their conditions improved because of the irresponsibility of the Government — all these things go to prove that we should be more than careful as to our expenditure. What is more, I notice that there is a general practice by sojourners in this colony to get as much as possible out of it, so that when they go, they go with as much as they can carry. The needs of the people of this colony are being flouted; that is what is happening. But there are those who say: "We are your saviours; there is no one who can do for you what we are doing or intend to do. Therefore kick all the others into the sea." I believe in passing Resolutions which will remedy the suffering of the masses because it is they who need a helping hand being stretched out to them; the rich are well protected. Not only should such points as have been raised be considered, but it must also be considered that the Head of the Administration does not have to pay one cent of taxation or Customs Duties on his cloth or cigarettes or —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I ask the honourable member to stick to this Resolution. I cannot sit here as Chairman and allow you to stray all about. If you are not going to co-operate with me, I am not going to stand for this sort of thing any longer. I am asking you to stick to the Resolution or I will leave the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I want to make a suggestion if I am in order. While I stood here and supported this Resolution, I am appealing to you. It is no fault of mine if the honourable member does not see our point of view; but rather than let it appear that discussion is stifled because the Opposition has supported this Resolution, I think the honourable member should be allowed latitude to discuss this Resolution. He is old enough to know what is right and what is wrong. I say that, because I might find myself in his position some day. I suggest that the honourable member should be given every opportunity to put his point of view before the Committee. Personally, I do not think the honourable member should divulge anything which he was told privately because it would not be decent to do so. Because we on this side of the House are supporting the Resolution, there is no reason in the world why the honourable member should not oppose it if he wants to do so. The honourable member is entitled to his point of view; I would argue in the same way if I had his point of view. This is a money Resolution, and as such, the honourable member can speak on it from any angle.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn until 1.15 p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

LEAVE TO THE CLERK

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Before the business of the day is resumed, I am asking the House to grant leave to the Clerk for the remainder of to-day's session. The Clerk is not well and he is unable to resume this afternoon.

There being no objection, the Clerk was granted leave.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk, and that the Deputy Clerk act as Clerk for the rest of the day's session.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

REPLIES LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to lay on the Table the Replies to Questions No. 65, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, relative to the construction of the Panama Sea Level Canal.

Mr. COX: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 66, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. John, relative to vacancies occurring at Pumping Stations.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 1, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, relative to dissatisfaction among the peasant proprietors with regard to the funds allocated to them from the Sugar Industry Rehabilitation Fund.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE *re* GOVERNOR'S EXPENSES

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment, the honourable senior member for St. John was speaking on a Resolution to place the sum of \$10,334 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part 1, Current No. 43, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I do not want it to be felt that I am not mindful of the necessity of raising the present scale of wages of the servants at Government House. As a matter of fact, I deplore that that question was not considered before now. The servants can get what can be considered as adequate wages if these figures were gone into, without asking for one cent more from this House. Even now that these changes are being made I fear that the figures are not high enough, taking into consideration that a servant has to present himself or herself in a decent manner. The head butler would have to be a man of culture and refinement so as to be able to deport himself fittingly to those who visit Government House; and for him to be able to do so, economic inconvenience should be removed as far as possible. I do not feel that what is set out here as his wages would allow him to live up to the standard

which such an office requires. There are other employees lower down the list and I am surprised to know that they are getting what is set out here. My servant beats them by several chalks. (Hear, hear). I feel that what takes place at the seat of Government should be above board as far as the treatment of employees goes, and things should be done, which can be considered as a lead to other employers in the colony. These servants are being asked to steal, and it goes down to their credit that they have not been apprehended with anything which has been stolen from Government House. If a man has to work there for eight or twelve hours a day and he has to work for a longer period when dinners are given, he is prevented from having spare time to supplement his earnings by doing something else. The only thing which I feel causes the servants at Government House to keep their work is that they go in at Government House on mornings and come out on evenings. We have always taken for granted that things were going on all right at this Government Department, because such a Department is expected to be so good that we need not question what is going on; but what is happening shows that the place where you least expect that wrong things would go on, is the head place where they are going on. I know that I am only beating the air, because like a democratic set-up which this House is said to be, a majority has to decide the issues; and therefore the matter will end with the Resolution being passed. However large the amount for the purchase of the car might be, you leave a token vote of one dollar, but one can rest assured that the money is going to be spent eventually. I do not want honourable members to feel that because we are not voting the money now and are only giving a token vote, that we are only going to vote a dollar. It is as good as if it was said: "Have every cent now." In the end we are going to have recurrent expenditure for the upkeep of this car, and that expenditure is not going to be as nominal as if the Government or the taxpayers did not have to foot the bill. I can only say that I regret that this House has to deal with this Resolution to-day and for me to have to express myself as much as I have done. As regards the wages of the employees at Government House, I feel that the head butler should be given not less than \$16 a week because he has to be a man of culture and refinement and he has to work; the second butler should receive \$12 a week; the third butler, \$11; the pantry boy, \$7; the head maid, \$8; the second maid, \$7; the third maid, \$6.25; the fourth maid, \$6; the seamstress, \$6.25; the head cook, \$10; the assistant cook, \$7; the head washer, \$6; and the assistant washers, \$5 each. Although the suggested amounts contain an allowance for rations, they do not reach what I feel should be paid to these servants.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. As regards the figures which the honourable member has been reading out, are they before the Committee? Is the honourable member going to lay those figures on the Table or what? I would like to get some information as to that matter.

Mr. ALLDER: For the honourable member's information, I will say that those figures are my suggested amounts. It might be felt that my suggested amounts cannot be given; but if we are going to pass this Resolution, the Administration should know that this House expects that these amounts will be given to the staff up there. Besides what this Resolution calls for, there are some Heads which I feel get reasonable sums allocated to them; I do not want to suggest that the money is not to be spent, but it is my definite feeling that we should not add any further expenditure at Government House at this present time in preference to prior consideration being given to the im-

provements in the standard of living of the working-class people.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask honourable members to give way to me. We are not dealing with the servants at Government House in the sense that we are fixing salaries for them; such figures as the honourable member may have are to show how the Executive Committee were guided to the amount for which we have asked. All of us might probably agree that these servants should be better paid, but we were endeavouring, in bringing this Resolution before the House, to put up something which is reasonable. It is only fair to say that the present Head of the Administration has done what any stranger coming to the colony would have done; he asked what were the normal rates of pay for servants, and he was informed what the normal wages are and he has increased them, but we are asking for further increases. It is not for us to tell any Governor to pay his maid or his butler this wage or that wage; we have agreed that a lump sum should be given for servants and for lighting but do not let us attempt to dictate to the Governor how many servants he should employ and what they should be paid, or how many lamps he should have. We are voting this sum of money for assistance and it is up to the humanity of the Governor to say what he will pay his servants. If we feel like saying that these wages are low—I, personally, can tell everybody that we do not pay our servants enough, but it would be pretty rude for us to say what the Governor should pay his servants, and we could be met with the retort that the beam is in our own eyes.

Mr. MILLER: What I am going to say has been somewhat clarified by the Leader of the House although I am not altogether in agreement with what he has said. There is an understanding here that the Governor would pay 10% of this expenditure for servants and I am in agreement with the proposed increase for the Governor. I am satisfied that the Officer administering the Government has to pay salaries and allowances out of his salary and he has to provide for the time when he retires from service. I am also in agreement that there should be the provision of the best State car for the Governor; but what I am very much concerned about is the question of wages for the servants at Government House. I feel that these figures in respect of the servants happen to be indicators and they may be used by the rich in paying wages. Imagine a ration allowance of 18 cents a day! There is no reason why this Resolution must be finished to-day; I feel that when this Labour Government came into power freedom was brought to the people, and I am asking that the consideration of this Resolution be postponed so that an increase of 33 1/3% can be made on the wages of these servants.

Mr. ADAMS: In spite of what I have said, the honourable member is completely misinterpreting the whole object of this Resolution. We are not telling the Governor how much he must pay his servants; we are assisting him with these expenses. If the House feel that they are not going further than \$2,400, that is an end of the matter. If I were to ask the honourable member what he pays his servants, he could make some rude remark to me; I assume that he is as generous to his servants as he should be.

Mr. MILLER: I have nothing to say by way of retort to anything which the honourable member has said. I dislike the word "servant" and if I had the power to change that word, I would do so. The word "servant" came from serfdom and it is in order to remove that word from our dictionary. What I am saying is that we specifically arranged what increases should

be given and in the Resolution a specific amount is to be given.

Mr. ADAMS: That is definitely not true; the honourable member is saying that out of his imagination. No such arrangement has been made; so that what the honourable member has just said is untrue.

Mr. MILLER: I notice from the addendum to this Resolution that the proposals in respect of the Governor are to take retrospective effect from the 1st October, 1950, whereas the proposed increase in the amount paid in wages and allowances to the domestic staff is to take effect from the 1st January, 1951. I should like to have an explanation of that rather than my saying untrue things; I should like to know whether a mistake has been made in this addendum, whether the proposals in respect of the Head of the Administration are to have retrospective effect from the 1st January, 1951, also.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think that this is a matter which we should view as dispassionately as possible. We have to consider the facts and the arguments adduced by the honourable introducer of this Resolution, and we might even consider the significant silence of the honourable member who seconded the motion for the passing of the Resolution. I think that in this matter we have to keep before our minds' eye what the present cost of the higher officials in this colony is, whether the colony can afford to pay more, and, as we have been asked to do, view the matter as objectively as we can. In so far as I am concerned, I want to begin by saying that I have absolutely nothing against the present Head of the Administration. We are not permitted to refer to him in debate, but I certainly want to say in passing that so far as I know of him, he appears to be a very attractive personality, and as an individual, anything which we find it possible to do to make his stay here as happy as possible, we should do it; but that does not mean that we are going to saddle the taxpayers with any burden which we might consider to be unnecessary merely because we happen to like a particular Governor who may have endeared himself to all sections of the community. What I have in mind is this: the question of the remuneration for the Governor has to be viewed in the light of how much we spend on that particular post, and how much we spend in respect of the higher officials of the Government. Right now we have a Governor, a Colonial Secretary, three Assistant Colonial Secretaries, four Assistant Secretaries and an Office Superintendent. Those officials may be regarded as the senior officials in the Administration and what is important is not only the number of higher officials which we have, but also their cost to the colony. If we find that their present cost to the colony is not excessive, by all means increase them; if we find that some of them are underpaid, then we can see whether the number is not excessive. I, personally have never agreed that a small colony like this would need a Colonial Secretary, three Assistant Colonial Secretaries, four Assistant Secretaries and an Office Superintendent. One wonders what work can be found for them to do.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I must protest against what the honourable member has said; he knows that you cannot reflect on a previous vote of the House unless you are moving to rescind it. The Legislature has passed the re-organization Order establishing these posts which now exist and the honourable member is now criticizing what the Legislature has passed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am entitled to refer to the existence of these posts in order to make the point which I want to make. We have to bear in mind the total cost to the colony of all the higher officials in the colony, and we are entitled to keep before our

minds' eye how much we actually expend on these higher officials. I referred to the number of these officials purely in passing and purely for the sake of making that particular point. The Resolution before us does not state directly that we are increasing the emoluments of the Head of the Administration but, indirectly it means that. If he paid his servants out of his salary before, and now we are assuming the burden and he is only contributing a certain amount of his salary in this respect, I take it that we are increasing his salary. It is not enough merely to say that other colonies are doing certain things and therefore we should follow suit; we have to consider all things in the light of the special conditions which exist in this colony.

The honourable junior member for St. James began his remarks by saying that he realised now that Government House is not a private place and therefore certain expenses should be borne by the State. If honourable members on my left did not realize that before, they must have been sleeping because everybody knows that Government House is not a private place. When the honourable member's Party ran this colony for years, they refused to give the Governor of Barbados the emoluments which certain other colonies gave, because they did not think he should be given them. In my opinion, if the honourable member's Party were running the colony to-day, this Resolution would not have been before the House for the simple reason that they might feel that the people of the colony would regard it as a special effort by them to curry favour with the Head of the Administration for obvious reasons, and they would not have been so bold as to introduce it. When Sir Grattan Bushe was here, members on my left who were on the Executive were asked to give him a car, and the most they did was to give him a policeman to drive it; but today the honourable junior member for St. James claims that they now realise that Government House is public property. I believe that they are supporting this Resolution today because they feel they should support it and they do not want the Governor to think that they will be outdone by the particular Party in office, and they add their quota of support even although they may remain in their minds unconvinced of the necessity for placing these additional burdens on the State. We have been told that Trinidad provides a State car, and it is really surprising that we should follow Trinidad in this respect and not in so many others. Last year the Legislature of Trinidad made certain increases in the Governor's emoluments, but simultaneously that colony was embarking on a twenty-eight million dollar development programme and they were proposing to spend an additional three million dollars on the building of new schools and what not. The Trinidad Legislature must have come to the conclusion that they were taking steps to ameliorate the social conditions of the colony, and they did not mind spending a few thousand dollars more on the occupant of Government House. I am sure that the Trinidad Legislature were considering far-reaching plans to develop the country, they knew that the Governor was lending his weight and presence to such a programme and they felt inclined to give him a little more on his emoluments and make further contributions towards his personal welfare. Similarly, in Puerto Rico, the steps which are being taken there to transform the general economy of the country are of such a nature as to warrant the Legislature in making their high officials not only happy and comfortable but also to put them in affluent circumstances. In this colony, the position is just the reserve and therefore we have to view very seriously and with a certain

amount of consideration, any proposal designed, in the first instance, further to involve the taxpayers of the colony by increasing the emoluments of officials who are already well provided for. I say that, because one has to bear in mind that when an official comes to this colony as Governor, he is not a fool; he realizes that there are certain expenses involved the moment he accepts the position as Governor, and the salary and emoluments attached to the post are fixed bearing in mind the expenses involved in filling the particular post. We are now giving the Governor a salary of \$14,400 a year, an entertainment allowance of \$400 a month and certain other expenses involved in the running of Government House are borne out of the Public Treasury. We pay \$372 a year for the lighting of the Governor's Office, the Private Secretary's Office and the reception and Orderly rooms: We pay for what we may call the official lighting of Government House, and when, as is proposed in this Resolution, we increase the electricity vote by the amount suggested here, it will mean that we are also paying for the lighting of the rooms which the Governor and his family use as private rooms, so to speak. Every one of us in this colony has to light our houses; if we are already paying for the official lighting of Government House, why can't the Governor pay for the lighting of the private rooms in which he and his family live? The basis on which this matter was laid down before was quite reasonable and there can be no logical arguments adduced to support the claim that in addition to paying for the lighting of the official rooms at Government House, we must also pay for the lighting of the private rooms. I am therefore going to move that item II, "lighting, heat and fuel," be deleted.

As regards the wages of the domestic staff, I certainly could not agree that we should find the money, over \$5,300 a year, to pay the servants at Government House, and the Governor will only be paying 10% of that. That would represent an increase in his salary of almost £700 a year. I am inclined to the view that if the present wages of the domestic staff are low and they should be increased, the most we should be asked to do is to furnish the money to give the staff an increase. Paragraph 4 of the addendum to this Resolution says this: "The wages and allowances of the domestic staff at present amount to \$84.69 per week and it is now proposed to increase this amount to \$100.79 with effect from the 1st January, 1951." The increased cost of the servants at Government House will be \$16.10 per week; the Governor pays this \$84.69 which wages are considered to be too low, and I am prepared to vote for the difference between the old amount and the proposed one in order to allow the servants to get the increase. I am not prepared to agree that we should pay 90% of the total costs of the servants at Government House. (A Member: 75%). I stand corrected on this point; we are asked to pay 75% of the cost of the servants and the Governor will pay 25%. I see no reason for assuming that responsibility; it would be quite logical for this Committee to decide that in view of the increase in the cost of living both to the servants and the Governor we may not call upon him to pay the total amount of remuneration to his servants; but not because we want to pay the servants more money that we must saddle the Treasury with 75% of the cost of paying them and the Governor will only be paying 25%. That is absurd. It may be that in other colonies these things are done; but honourable members know that our Government House is small as compared with that of Trinidad or Jamaica, and the servants which are employed here would not be enough for Government House in those colonies. Only a year ago we increased the Governor's entertainment allowance from \$200 to \$400 a

month, and I see no reason today to increase his salary by assuming the responsibility for paying three quarters of the wages to be paid for servants. I therefore beg to move that the amount of \$2,652 in respect of item 7 (a) "(New) Domestic Staff", be reduced to \$960, which is more than enough to cover the proposed increase in wages of the staff at Government House; that item 20 "Purchase of motor car, \$7,200" be deleted as I am opposing that completely, because all down the years whenever the Legislature was asked to give a Governor of Barbados a State car, it has always said "No." I have not had the time to refer to any debates in this House on the matter, but there must have been very good reasons for this refusal in the past. I have not heard anything today to convince me that those reasons no longer exist. The island has not got any larger, the Governor is not called upon to do any more travelling and almost the only point which can be argued is that a car costs more money now than it would have cost 25 years ago. And the answer to that is that the car is the Governor's personal property and if he sells it he gets the corresponding value for it. I am therefore not prepared to subscribe my vote in favour of item 20 of this Resolution. There are other things which other colonies do for their Governors which we have not been asked to do as yet. We used to be told by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in support of his argument for more salary for the Governor that if we did not pay a proper salary we could not attract the right type of man; but the conditions no longer exist when it is necessary to have a man of special brilliance at Government House. Under the changed conditions from when the Governor was really the Head of the Executive, if it is not already a question of the Governor being a rubber stamp, the time is not far off when it will be so. Years ago we had a Governor who was both deaf and dumb, and the time is coming when we can have another Governor who is also deaf and dumb, because his position will be a purely nominal one, and in the scheme of things, all he needs to know is his alphabet; if he cannot sign his name, he can put his mark and that will be enough. The responsibility of the Governor is passing into the hands of the elected representatives of the people, which is as it should be. There can be no justification under these changed conditions for contending that if you do not pay fancy prices you cannot get an extraordinary brilliant man as Governor, because any sort of man can fill that post now. We have not heard that argument trotted out to-day. There are certain other perquisites which are attached to the office of Governor. So far as I am aware, Barbados is one of the few colonies which do not have a rest house for the Governor. In the old days the argument was adduced that if you did not provide the Governor with a rest house, when he took his annual holiday he would go to some private house or hotel, and the result might be that he might become prejudiced to the general interest and welfare of the community. That is why even rest houses were provided for the Governors in some of the smaller islands. Along the same line, the *London Times* suggested that Governors in the colonies should not be allowed to frequent clubs which had a colour bar; the feeling of the Colonial Office was that the Head of the Administration should, as far as humanly possible, refrain from identifying himself with any particular section of the community. In Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana nowadays it will be almost immaterial whether or not the Governor lives at the Yacht Club or Sam Lord's Castle or whether he frequents hotel Zanzibar because he will have little say in the formation of policy, and

no such strong check need be kept on his activities and associations. I mention that in passing in support of my claim that we may have followed with greater justification the steps taken by other colonies to provide certain perquisites for their Governors, than to follow in the steps which we are being asked to take today.

One hopes that the occupant of Government House will appreciate the fact that whether one supports or disagrees with proposals such as these, one's attitude is not that of personal implications, and one is more or less concerned with what one regards as his best for the colony according to one's likes. Therefore in recording a negative vote in respect of these suggestions today, I do so, not because I feel that the present incumbent at Government House is not a reasonably good Governor as Governors go, but merely because I feel that we should not be asked to saddle ourselves with the burden which these suggestions involve. I may find it impossible to be here for the voting because I have a rather pressing engagement to attend; but even although my negative vote will not be recorded when the vote is taken, I want to re-affirm my position as clearly as possible that I am opposed to the provision of the car, I am opposed to the provision as regards the light, heat and fuel and I am prepared to vote merely for the amount which is necessary to increase the wages of the servants from what they now are to the rates which are proposed in the addendum to the Resolution.

Mr. MAPP: A long debate has taken place on this Resolution and I propose to add a few comments. I feel that one of the unfortunate things in the presentation of this Resolution in respect of the Governor is that it has been brought down at a time when we are not considering the Estimates or the Civil Servants as a whole. I feel that the time has come when we should appreciate what the Leader of the House has told us, and that is that the Governor is simply another Civil Servant. Constitutionally, the Governor has the power of veto and he is ahead of other Civil Servants; but I feel that our attitude towards the Governor in the future must be that he is merely a Civil Servant. Barbadians are noted for their independent views and we feel that we can rule ourselves; that has been our attitude in the past and it will take some time to erase it from our minds. Governor Baldwin was a man of private means and he said that the responsibilities of Governors in the colonies were far in advance of their salaries and had a hard time financially unless they had private means of their own. When Governor Baldwin resigned, I do not think that he was trying to win any popularity at the Colonial Office; he was a man of independent views and he was not favoured by the Colonial Office in the way in which he did his job. I feel that we are getting very near to the position when the Governor must be considered in the light of being just another Civil Servant and for that reason I feel that we cannot consider the Governor's emoluments separate and distinct from the rest of the Administration. I feel that we have to consider all the Civil Servants. I believe that with the devaluation of the pound sterling the Governor's emoluments have been tremendously cut, and that is one reason why I am voting for this Resolution. Similarly, the emoluments of every Civil Servant and everybody else have been cut by devaluation. I am waiting with anxiety to see what the Government's policy towards other Civil Servants will be when the time comes. I am not guided by any claims that you cannot impose more taxation on certain classes in this colony; the claim has been made by the Conservatives

that if you go on taxing the rich, there will be nothing to tax, but since we raised taxation, millions of dollars have been contributed to the Treasury and the money has come from private enterprise. None of the main sources of revenue has been nationalised and if the argument that if you tax the rich you will tax them out of existence were real, then the money would not have been there. I feel that because of the increase in the price of sugar and because of devaluation, we should tax the rich more. There is no man or woman in the administrative service today, who is not deserving of an increase in his or her salary. There was the false argument adduced that when we were considering the people at the bottom, those above that level should not be considered; but everybody has his salary continually being cut into by the increase in the cost of living. Everybody knows what a dollar is worth today; a salary of \$200 a month meant something before, but it means nothing today. You can imagine what a salary of \$50 a month means. Our attitude should be to treat the Governor as another Civil Servant; he is not now representing what he used to represent because we have our destinies in our hands. Let the Governor be the Head of the Administration and when we are considering him, let us also consider other members of the Civil Service. The increased cost of living owing to the devaluation of the pound sterling, has bitten a big hole in the emoluments of the Governor; we only have to compare the wages of the servants with what they should get in order to realise that this Resolution is worthy of our support, even if we disagree with certain things in it.

I heard the argument of the honourable senior member for St. John, and his suggested increases for the servants at Government House amount to over \$1,000 a year more. It is fantastic to expect that these and other expenses should be paid by the Governor, and we agree that a proportion of the expenses should be borne by the State. I am hoping that the Government will arrange matters at Government House whereby a part of the staff which they are proposing to pay might become Civil Servants. I do not know if the Government thought of that in considering this Resolution, but I do not like the idea of voting this money and leaving it to the Head of the Administration to pay the wages which he likes. The personal staff which the Governor and his family may require might not be many and they should be paid by him; but all the other servants who are required to run Government House should be State paid. The suggestion was made here sometime ago that a housekeeper should be appointed for Government House, and that housekeeper would be in control of the staff maintained by the State. That will mean more money, but it will also mean that things will be run more smoothly at Government House, and honourable members will not be able to complain about this, that and the other thing disappearing. I hope that the Government will seriously consider the suggestion which I have made.

All Governors are not alike and when we get one who is sincere and want to help the people on, I feel that we should do all in our power to get him to remain with us, rather than attract some rich man who may be opposed to us. No matter what we do, the Colonial Office will accept what he recommends. If we have a Socialist Governor we may get whatever we want but that will not be the case if we have a reactionary Governor.

I have made the observations which I wanted to make on this Resolution. I repeat that with the rise in the cost of living, every single person in the Civil Service must be considered in the near future.

One of the reasons for the Conservative approval of this vote is because it has been stated by them in this House that the colony cannot bear any more taxation; and it is assumed that although we may pay the Head of the Administration more money, we cannot attend to the other public servants. We want to have the facts as to the national wealth of this colony; we want to find out how much is to be paid out in taxation, how much falls into the hands of the rich and how much falls into the hands of the other people, and I say that the Government will be well advised to ask the Colonial Office to get somebody to take Professor Beasley's place and hurry up with the fiscal survey of this colony. The Civil Service is seething with dissatisfaction in the lower ranks; they are complaining about the cost of living, and what is fair for one is fair for everybody else in the Administration. The British Government has given an increase in the price of sugar, and therefore the old argument that if you tax the rich people more they will go down to the bottom cannot hold water, because it has been proved that even with more taxation they have become richer than before. I hope that the Government will see that it is their duty to do justice to the entire Administration, to try and get a financial adviser to go into the facts and figures, and follow that up with proposals with respect to the entire Civil Service.

Mr. ADAMS: I have seldom heard a more deadly criticism of the Government and the Party to which the honourable member belongs, than that last speech. Let me say quite frankly that the honourable member could not have been more wrong than to give the impression that this Government is doing some people injury.

Mr. MAPP: On a point of order. I have not given any such impression; I cannot understand how the honourable member could have said that I have given that impression. I referred to the proposals in respect of the Head of the Administration and expressed the hope that other members of the Civil Service will also be considered.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member said that there is dissatisfaction in the lower ranks of the Civil Service; that we have selected the Governor for this increase and he hoped that the Government will also consider the people in the lower ranks. If the honourable member were not accustomed to speaking without first thinking, he would not have made that statement. I was very careful to remind honourable members that that argument cannot hold water: the reverse is the truth. The Government gave a cost of living bonus to Civil Servants and excluded the Governor; we appointed Commissioner Adams to go into the structure of the Civil Service, he made his Report and we dealt with every member of the Civil Service except the Governor. It was only after the people in the lower ranks were dealt with that we came down with proposals for increasing the entertainment allowance of the Governor. The Addendum to this Resolution shows that one part of Commissioner Adams's recommendations has been implemented and now we have come to deal with the Governor who has been left out; we have finished with everybody else and we have now come to the Governor. We have dealt with the Colonial Treasurer already. The honourable member is giving the Civil Servants the impression that the Government is doing them something wrong; he strayed from devaluation to taxation and all that nonsense. Devaluation or no devaluation, the Governor would have remained to be dealt with after we had dealt with the rest of the Civil Service. If we had dealt with the rest of the Civil Service earlier, we would have dealt with the Governor already. We did not deal

with the top first, and now that we have got to the top, we are told that we must start all over again. What we are doing now has nothing to do with the cost of living; we are merely dealing with the Governor who has been left out. The honourable member is damaging the Government in a way that the Opposition has never attempted, and he does not seem to have the intelligence to realise what he is doing. He is putting it into the hands of the Opposition to say; "One of your own Party is telling the Government that they are neglecting the Civil Servants." I say quite frankly to the Civil Servants that they are unreasonable if they use that argument. If it is a question of starting afresh, that is a horse of a different colour; but if we use this debate to say that the Civil Servants are hit by devaluation and we should deal with them, that is a fine speech for the Opposition.

I do not think it necessary for me to say very much more. I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. Philip has gone; he chose today to sneer at the members of the Electors' Association for supporting the Government, and he says, it may be that they want to curry favour with the Governor. The honourable member forgot that he was the only human being in this House who ever suggested that the Government should buy a seaside house for the Governor and he said that during a War when things were hard. He suggested that the seaside house should be bought and furnished. As a matter of fact, the honourable member knew that that would be quoted against him so he tried at the end of his remarks to get around the position by saying that other colonies have rest houses for their Governors. How can anybody pay any attention to arguments of that sort? I am glad to say — and it is only fair to say — that the members of the Opposition have approached this matter objectively, and although they may not be prepared to go the whole way with the sum which has been asked for, they have accepted the principle that some of the official expenses of maintaining the domestic staff at Government House should be paid in this colony, as is the case elsewhere, by the State, and that it is reasonable that the Governor should pay 25% of these expenses. It is only fair to thank the members of the Opposition for approaching the matter in this light and for eventually agreeing to a substantial part of this Resolution. As regards the provision of the car, I accept the honourable member's dollar token vote. The amount asked for in the Resolution is \$7,200; I have had figures sent to me and I understand that a particular firm is pushing up its prices. In any event, it is better to get a quotation and come back to the House with the actual figure.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:— Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and amend the Acts of the Island relating to the Colonial Treasurer.

Mr. ADAMS: This is a Bill which I think will

meet with the unanimous approval of the House because it is, in a way, the ending up of the re-organization of the Civil Service which makes the Service more efficient and make the working of Government Departments more up to date, and, in fact, more reasonable. I use the word "reasonable" because all of us are aware of what the earlier settlers and subsequent generations sought to achieve. In the early days they were determined to have the Colonial Treasurer appointed by this House for the purpose, as they felt, of keeping a check on, perhaps, rash and extravagant spending by the Government of the day. That has not served its purpose because the Colonial Treasurer is only a glorified cashier; he passes out whatever is presented to him for payment. It is the Auditor General who is really the watch-dog of expenditure in this colony, and it is idle to allow the present anomalous position to remain when we are re-organizing the services in the different Departments. It is with that object that this Bill has been brought down. The holder of the office will be called Accountant General and he will perform accounting functions which will include the proper checking of accounts to be made by that office. Clause 2 of the Bill says: "The Accountant General shall be the Chief Accounting Officer of the Government and shall have the general management and supervision of the cash transaction and accounting operations of the Government subject to the provisions of this Act and to such instructions as may be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

In short, the proper checking of accounts of this colony will be done in future by the Accountant General—the system which obtains in Great Britain and other large countries of the world and in many colonies in the British Empire. A MEMBER: Are you changing the pre-audit system? It is well to relieve honourable members' minds of any fears which they may have; it is not the intention of the Government, unless the expression of opinion is given by members of the House, to change the pre-audit system. While it is true that we are one of the few colonies with the pre-audit system, on the other hand, if the House insist on having that system, it is not the intention of the Government to change it. It will still be impossible for some Head of a Department to do rash spending and with a manipulation of accounts under the post-audit system, try to explain it away. The Head of a Department in some countries may over-spend his vote and with a post-audit system it may be put under "incidentals", or the Legislature might find itself passing supplementary estimates. Such a danger will not arise in Barbados. This is a simple Bill which follows on the recommendations of Commissioner Adams, and it follows the feeling which has been expressed in this House from time to time that the present system whereby the Colonial Treasurer is only a glorified cashier should be altered. Honourable members might remember Commissioner Adams's criticism; he recommended that the pre-audit system be abolished. He says in his Report: "The Colonial Treasurer remains the Government's Chief Accounting Officer and his duties are defined in Colonial Office Regulation 189 as follows:

(a) To see that the proper system of accounting is established in every department of the Colonial Government;

(b) To exercise supervision over the receipts of public revenue and as far as possible to secure its punctual collection;

(c) To bring promptly to account, under the proper heads and items, all money, whether revenue

or other receipts, paid into the Treasury or accounted for to him;

(d) To see that proper provision is made for the safe keeping of all public money and stamps;

(e) To exercise supervision over all the officers of his Department entrusted with the receipt or expenditure of public money, and over the sub-accountants, and to take precautions, by the maintenance of efficient checks, against the occurrence of fraud, embezzlement, or carelessness;

(f) To supervise the expenditure and other disbursements of the Government; to take care that no payment is made which is not covered by proper authority, expressed or referred to on the voucher relating to it; and, in case of any apparent extravagance or of any apparent defect in the provision for a charge owing to the exhaustion or absence of a vote, to call the attention of the Colonial Secretary in writing to the matter.

(g) Promptly to charge in his accounts under the proper heads and items all disbursements of the Government, whether expenditure or other payments:

(h) To render the accounts for audit and to prepare the Financial Statements and Returns."

The office of Auditor General is not to be abolished; the functions of accounting will be performed by the Accountant General. I do not think that there is anything, at this stage, which I can add to what I have said. The Bill is merely for the purpose of making the Treasury Department up to date, calling the Colonial Treasurer the Accountant General and giving him the duties of accounting. Clause 3 of the Bill provides that the Accountant General must deposit excess moneys in his name; Clause 4 deals with the withdrawal of public balances in his hands; Clause 5 provides that public moneys shall vest in his successor on the death, resignation, retirement or removal of the Accountant General; Clause 6 deals with the payment of salaries, services, pensions and allowances and Clause 7 deals with the monthly account of fees by public officers. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Bill seeks to make a change as is recommended by Commissioner Adams in his Report on the structure of the Civil Service. It is true that our system is a very old one, but it must be admitted that it has worked well however old it might be. What was worrying me was the question of keeping the pre-audit system, and the Leader of the House has assured us—and I want to remind him of it often and long—that unless it is the express wish of this House that the pre-audit system be changed, the Government will not be changing it. The honourable member says that in fact, the pre-audit system will not be changed. That is the one thing which would be worrying every honourable member of this Chamber when we are changing a system which has worked well in a community over a period of years, to one which we do not know. We must maintain our pre-audit system in whatever change is made. The feeling with officials of high-sounding titles is that when they have a block vote for the purpose of doing anything, as long as they are in the colony, it is their right to go to the Treasury and change the expenditure of money for purposes which were not known or even suggested when the Estimates were before this honourable Chamber. For that reason, I contend that an officer who is carrying out his duties under this Bill should have some check; it will leak out to members of this Chamber, or the Officer administering the Government will know that certain things cannot be done. I want to make this point; there are many people in this colony who view with suspicion the actions of the

Head of the Administration in connection with the recent appointments which have been made. This is nothing which is confined to the Civil Service; people view with suspicion the appointments of Deputy Comptroller of Customs, Deputy Harbour Master, Deputy Auditor General and Deputy Income Tax Commissioner which the Head of the Administration has seen fit to make. If you review the whole question of Government Service, you have got to be very careful that you are not creating posts with high salaries for displaced Englishmen who cannot find work in other countries. The fingers are pointing directly to what is going to happen; you may as well let the Governor know exactly the feeling of the people and do not let one or two people who can just get his ear in one corner tell him what is not true. I would say that there are certain specialised positions in which you must have Englishmen; but why do you take local men who we know have the experience and capabilities, who should be logical Heads of Departments, and make them deputies? There will be one big row in this colony if the members of the Government do not open their mouths and let the Governor know the feeling of the people. I am not so foolish as to think that any of the members of the Executive Committee can tell the Governor: "I want you to appoint 'X' or 'B' to this office." That would be stupid; but the feeling is that where you have local men with ability to fill posts at the top, we are not standing for those posts to be filled by any displaced personnel. In repeat that the recent appointments as deputies are being viewed with suspicion. Who in this colony would say that the men who have been appointed deputies have not got the integrity, ability and experience to become Heads of the Departments? Every man in this colony will say that within recent years you took men with experience and gave them appointments at the top; now you put them in the position of deputies with people in England waiting to be pitch-forked into these jobs at the top. That is not good enough: that might have been the position 40 or 50 years ago when it might have been argued that our boys were not up to standard, but now we have people in the Civil Service who can fill offices from that of the Colonial Secretary back down. Every now and then you read that a deputy this, that or the other has been appointed, and the next thing we will be told is that there is nobody in the Civil Service who can fill positions at the top. It is of no use waiting until a man becomes 52 or 54 years of age to appoint him as the Head of a Department; men can give their best service when they are in their prime. A man reaches a certain point with experience and after he gets there he goes back.

I hope that what I have said will not fall on deaf ears. I believe that if the members of the Government knew or felt that what I have mentioned is the policy which is being pursued, they would open their mouths and talk about it. I hope that what I have said will be written for the Colonial Office, the Governor or anybody else to read. I know that the members of my Party feel in the way I feel about this matter; I know that the members of the other Party feel so too. It is not fair to pay high salaries in order to attract the people whom you want to bring out here. I know what is taking place; (A MEMBER: I too) but you have not been sounding it aloud from the housetop. Mr. Speaker I thank you for the latitude which you have given me. I am not looking for any job, otherwise I would not be able to say what I am saying now. I am supporting this Bill and it may be argued that what I have said has nothing to do with the Bill; but what I have said has something to do with it. I support this Bill having the assurance which the Leader of the House has given this Chamber

that the pre-audit system will be maintained if the members of this Chamber express such a view, and that that system will, in fact, be maintained.

Mr. MILLER: I am prepared to support this Bill and I want to draw to the attention of the Government that in respect of the post of an Engineer to be attached to the Department of Highways and Transport to look after the tenantry roads, it has been claimed that the post has been advertised in an overseas newspaper. I ask the Government to consider that question.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member has given the assurance that the pre-audit system will not be changed; I am glad to have that assurance because I feel that not only this House but the Civil Servants as a whole would be opposed to any change in the pre-audit system. Commissioner Adams recommended a change to the post-audit system and I know that in carrying out the recommendations of Commissioner Adams that part of the recommendations will receive proper consideration by the Government. Commissioner Adams and those who are in favour of the post-audit system are familiar with that system in places which are very big as compared with Barbados, and where there are widely scattered branches of the Civil Service the post-audit system is very necessary. That system works well, but those who know about it say that they are not so sure that it will work so well in Barbados. The pre-audit system works well in Barbados because it is a good system and it is suitable to a small colony like ours where there are no branches of the Civil Service miles and miles away.

I do not know if there is any great significance behind the change in the title of Colonial Treasurer to Accountant General. The main thing is that this Officer will no longer be controlled by the House, and he will be in the same position as any other Civil Servant. However, we know that the office has been vacant for a long time, and I hope that when this Bill becomes law, the appointment will be made soon afterwards. I think it is wrong for a person to be called upon to act in an office for so long a period; some definite announcement should be made. The work of this office has considerably increased of late and, I repeat, it is unfair to have a person in an acting position for so long a period. Somebody says that that is the fault of the House, and that is why I say that when this Bill is passed into law, the Head of the Administration will have the making of the appointment in his hands and I think that the selection of a suitable person to fill the office should be made as soon as possible. I do not harbour any fears as regards the making of appointments especially as we have been assured that Barbadians will be considered first, then West Indians and it is only in the very last resort that personnel from outside will be brought in. I feel that only two offices should be filled by outside personnel — the office of Governor and that of Colonial Secretary. I think we have a definite change in the views of the Administration—a change which is desirable by the Civil Servants as a whole—but what is feared is that in making appointments locally the right people are not appointed because of certain recommendations outside, and people are appointed to posts over the heads of others. That is a fear which will arise unless you have the confidence of every member of the Civil Service; while the Civil Servants do not fear the continuation of making appointments from outside, they are not fully satisfied with the way in which appointments are made locally. In that connection I must say that if I were a member of the Civil Service, I would take exception to the type of examination which was set for members of the Service; it is an insult to them. A teacher from outside expressed astonishment at that

type of examination and if the Civil Servants had any kind of guts they would have protested against it; but they are a spineless group of people and probably these things will continue very far in the future. I agree to the change in the title from Colonial Treasurer to Accountant General and this officer will now be appointed by the Head of the Administration and not by the House as hitherto. I hope that appointments will be made in strict accordance with the assurance which has been given by the Leader of the House; where we can get local persons to fill offices, no attempt will be made to bring in outsiders.

Mr. GILL: What is worrying me about this Bill is the provisions of Clause 2 which I do not think is an improvement on the old Act. Under that Clause the Accountant General will be the chief accounting officer of the Government and he will have the general management and supervision of the cash transactions and accounting operations of the Government subject to the provisions of the Act, and to such instructions as may be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. It appears to me that the Accountant General will be in full charge of the cash and revenue of the Government and he will also be his own auditor. I would like to know who is going to check his accounts and who will make reports on him. In Trinidad the Accountant General's books are audited by an auditor appointed from the Colonial Office, but here it appears to me that the Accountant General will be boss of the whole show. That, I think, is a very faulty system; if we are carrying on business we have an auditor in the show, and that auditor is to be an independent person. Under Sub-clause (1) of Clause 3 of the Bill I see that the Accountant General is authorised and required to deposit public moneys in his name in such manner and at such rates of interest as the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall authorise, and that whether inadvertently or by design I do not know, the words "with the approval and consent of the General Assembly" have been omitted. Those words are in the old Act but they have been left out of this Bill and that is a very serious omission. The right to appoint the Colonial Treasurer as well as the right to say how the moneys should be deposited is being taken away from this Assembly, and we are now throwing everything into the lap of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That is all wrong. Under Sub-clause (2) of this Clause the Governor-in-Executive Committee can fix whatever amount of money they feel like fixing, but under the old Act the Colonial Treasurer has to retain in his hands for the uses of the island any sum over and above the sum of £8,500. I think that we have given up a lot of our power and I do not agree with the principle which has been enunciated today. I beg to move that the consideration of this Bill be postponed for one week.

Mr. REECE: The honourable member has made two very good points indeed. With regard to the pre-audit system, I would like to say that we agree with it for the good reason that no money should be paid out unless the person who is receiving it has given satisfaction that he is the person who is entitled to the payment. The pre-audit system is a good old system and I do not think that we should depart from it. I was very pleased to hear the honourable Leader of the House say that it was not the intention of the Government to depart from the pre-audit system. It has been the practice in this island to make a claim on the Treasury and satisfy the Colonial Treasurer as to the justice of the claim. It must be remembered that all manner of persons make claims for payment on the Treasury and it is right that they should show that

they are entitled to the payment. I hope that the pre-audit system will never be changed.

Subject to the points which have been made by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, the Bill is simply a re-writing of the old Act. In fact, certain clauses have been left out and certain others have been re-written. This Bill repeals the Colonial Treasurer's Acts but there are other Acts of the colony which are affected by the repeal of these Acts. Under some other Acts the Colonial Treasurer will have certain other functions to perform; if, for instance, a person wants to get a butcher's licence, he has to make application to the Colonial Treasurer. If we just repeal the Colonial Treasurer's Act and there are numerous other Acts under which the Colonial Treasurer has duties and functions to discharge, we are not going far enough; we must make provision in respect of those other duties and functions which the Colonial Treasurer is called upon to discharge under so many Acts. If we merely repeal the Colonial Treasurer's Acts and do nothing about the other Acts under which the Colonial Treasurer has duties and functions to perform, we will be in the air. I suggest that it would be wise to postpone the further consideration of this Bill until such time as another Bill can be brought down to deal with the duties and functions which are today being performed by the Colonial Treasurer. The Colonial Treasurer has been a very useful Officer; in the old days the Assembly guarded the taxpayers' money through him, but as time went on, he ceased to exercise that vigilance and it was the Auditor General who saw that the taxpayers were not unduly deprived of the money which they had put into the Treasury. The Colonial Treasurer became the paymaster but he still has the duty of seeing that the Auditor General has vouched for payments. It is now proposed that the title of the Colonial Treasurer should be changed, that he should not be nominated by the House at all, and that he should be completely free from any association with this Assembly. However that is nothing to worry about; but we cannot bring this Bill into operation creating this office of Accountant General unless certain other Acts which cast other duties and functions on the Colonial Treasurer have been amended and brought before the House, because persons who are making applications in respect of the payment of fees might be held up on account of the state of the law. I suggest that it would be well to postpone the consideration of this Bill in order that the Executive Committee might have the opportunity of considering what Acts should be amended, what the nature of the amendments should be and whether or not there should be brought before the House an omnibus Bill saying that any powers which are exercised by the Colonial Treasurer shall be exercised by the Accountant General. For that reason, I beg to second the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. WILKINSON: I know that a lot of people think that if we pass this Bill we shall be giving up some of our authority; it is often thrown at us that the House is giving up all its power. In my opinion, the Colonial Treasurer has been a glorified cashier, and it seems nonsense to me that we should have an Auditor General and a Chief Cashier to the Auditor General. However, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has suggested that there are certain clauses of this Bill which need some consideration, and I must confess to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that I did not have the opportunity of discussing this Bill with anyone. I am therefore supporting the motion for the postponement, not with any idea of shelving the Bill, but in order that

we may have a little more time to go into the Bill and propose some amendments to it. I think it would be wise for us to go slowly and carefully into this matter which, for this colony, is a big change. Let us do it in the right way.

Mr. ADAMS. Honourable members will be surprised to hear that this Bill was earmarked as being urgent as far back as November when the re-organization of the Civil Service was being carried out. For one reason or other, largely due to myself, the Bill has been kept back until today. This Bill only says that certain functions of accounting in the Auditor General's Office should be transferred to the Accountant General. The points made by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable junior member for Christ Church can be answered simply; are we going forward or marking time? What is the objection to the Governor-in-Executive Committee fixing the amount of money which the Accountant General should retain in his hands for the uses of the Island? If we are really going forward, the argument of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew falls to the ground. The principle that the Accountant General should be an ordinary Civil Servant, will, I feel sure, be approved by the Other Place and by the general public when it is explained to them that we have long outlived the usefulness of the principle aback of the House of Assembly appointing the Colonial Treasurer. It may be true that honourable members have not been able to go into the Bill; but there is nothing with which we cannot deal as we go along. I take it that the learned Acting Attorney General paid some attention to the fact that there are many things which the Colonial Treasurer has to do under other Acts, and he must have been satisfied that if you repeal an Act to the extent of abolishing the name of the Head of the Department, it is immaterial if in some other Acts you read the title "Colonial Treasurer", which has been abolished. There are one or two references to the title "Inspector General of Police" although an Act changes that title to "Commissioner of Police". If you have to get a hawker's licence or a butcher's licence from the Colonial Treasurer's Office you will still go there for it. There is no danger whatever in this matter. I have not specifically asked the Acting Attorney General about this matter, but I have no doubt that he is satisfied that although the title "Colonial Treasurer" has been changed to another title, yet the Officer will still perform the functions which he has to perform under the old title. I should like to make it clear that the accounting work has to be done by the Accountant General, and the auditing work has to be done by the Auditor General. I am sorry that I cannot accommodate honourable members on my left now especially as they have been so kind to the Government today. I repeat that this Bill has been held up and it is necessary to get through with the re-organization of the Civil Service; there is nothing in the Bill which cannot be explained to the satisfaction of the House as we go along.

Mr. DOWDING: What the hon. member has argued would be all well and good if members of the Executive Committee had ministerial responsibility; but they have not got that responsibility today. This House should not give up its power until members of the Government have been granted responsibility as Ministers. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has brought out the point that we are giving up all our power, and I further bring out the point that the argument of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is all well and good if honourable members of the Executive held ministerial status.

The question that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed for one week was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GILL, GODDARD, WILKINSON and REECE—6.

Noes: Messrs FOSTER, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, MILLER, MAPP, BRYAN, COX and ADAMS—8.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were read and passed.

Clause 3 was read.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GILL: Sub-clause (1) of this Clause says:

"The Accountant General is duly authorised and required to deposit in the name of the Accountant General, in such manner and at such rates of interest as the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall authorize, the whole of the public moneys which at the time of making such deposit shall be in his hands, or for which he shall be accountable as Accountant General as aforesaid, over and above such sum as the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall determine."

I beg to move as an amendment that the words "with the approval and consent of the General Assembly" be inserted after the word "Committee" appearing in line 4.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: It is difficult to understand why the honourable member has gone back on that point. We are getting away from the old ideas; one of the honourable member's colleagues spoke of putting more power into the hands of the members of the Executive Committee and giving them ministerial status, and this proposed amendment is the exact antithesis of what we are trying to do. The honourable member wants to put back the words which are in the old Act but I am hoping that he will not allow this amendment to go to the vote. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the negative, the CHAIRMAN declaring "I think the 'Noes' have it."

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was read as follows:—

4. Upon the death, resignation, retirement or removal of an Accountant General, all moneys deposited and also the balance of cash in the books of any bank to his credit as such Accountant General, and all public moneys in the office of the Treasury, shall vest in and be transferred to the account of such successor, and shall not in the case of death of any such individual constitute assets of the deceased, or be in any manner subject to the control of his personal representative, and in case any loss shall happen by reason of the depositing of the public moneys pursuant to the directions hereinafter contained the Accountant General shall not be liable to make good the same:

Provided always that nothing herein contained shall exonerate or be construed as exonerating such Accountant General from any responsibility incurred by his acts or defaults.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GILL: There are one or two errors in this Clause to be corrected. In line 6 the word "such" should be changed to the word "his", and the word "hereinafter" occurring in line 11 should be changed to the word "hereinbefore". I beg to move those amendments.

Mr. ADAMS: The word "hereinbefore" is in the old Act and it is now changed to "hereinafter".

Mr. GILL: This Clause deals with deposits which have been made. Clause 3 authorizes the making of deposits and if we are dealing with Clause 4 and speaking of those deposits, the word must be "hereinbefore". It does not make sense to use the word "hereinafter."

Mr. ADAMS: I accept those amendments.

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

Clause 5 was read as follows:—

5. The Accountant General shall make out and prepare a true and correct statement of all sums of money received and paid by him during the preceding month, and on what account showing the balance then remaining in his hands for or on account of the public, and such monthly statement shall be sent to the Clerk of the General Assembly before the fifteenth day of each month and laid before the General Assembly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GILL: I suggest that the word "sent" appearing in line 6 should be changed to the word "delivered". A thing may be sent but it may not be delivered; I think it is better to use the word "delivered."

Mr. ADAMS: One does not like to interfere with the draughtsmanship of the Government Draughtsman; he must have made this change for a reason, since the word "delivered" is in the old Act. It is the duty of the Head of the Department to see that Civil Servants do their work. I do not think that there is sufficient warrant for us to change this word.

Mr. GILL: I want to make sure that the delivery is made.

Mr. ADAMS: Copies of Statements are sent to members of the House and we do get them. I do not think it matters which word is used.

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

Clause 6 was read.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GILL: Sub-clause (2) of this Clause says:

"Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any Act for the time being in force, it shall be lawful for the Accountant General on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay all fixed claims on the Government of this Island in respect of salaries, services, pensions and allowances on such day after the eighteenth day of the month for which such fixed claims are due as the Governor shall authorize."

I think that instead of the word "due" occurring in the last line of this Sub-clause, the word "owing" or "payable" should be used. The claims are not due until the end of the month.

Mr. ADAMS: The word "due" is used in connection with the word "month" occurring in the previous line.

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

Clauses 7 and 8 were read and passed.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to recommit Clause 7. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy has pointed out that the word "the" occurring before the word "law" in line 2 should be deleted.

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

Mr. ADAMS: This Clause reads: "Public officers receiving fees to the public use shall account for the same according to the law at the end of every month, and until such accounting shall be had, such public officers shall not be paid their monthly claims." I ask leave to delete the word "the" appearing before the word "law" in line 2.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 7 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER POSTPONED

The next Order of the Day was called:—To move the consideration of the Report on Mr. Ralph Crowe.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not propose to proceed with this Order at this stage.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider and prepare a Draft Reply to Message No. 6/1951 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly relating to an invitation from His Majesty's Government for two members of the Legislature to attend the Festival of Britain from July 9th to July 30th. The Select Committee is to reply as to whether we are willing to send two members of the Legislature to the Festival and not to select the members.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Select Committee be appointed. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. Subject to the approval of the House, I appoint the following honourable members to serve on that Committee: The honourable junior member for St. James (Mr. WILKINSON), the honourable junior member for St. Philip (Mr. CRAWFORD), the honourable junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. BRANCKER) and the honourable senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Cox).

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I was hoping that we could have avoided meeting next Tuesday, but we shall have to meet next Tuesday when the Estimates will be laid. I understand that honourable members are willing to meet at 7 o'clock p.m., and I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn to Tuesday next, the 27th day of February, 1951, at 7 p.m.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.