

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th January, 1954.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present:

His Honour, Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. MAPP and Mr. VAUGHAN entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting which was held on the 17th November, 1953, having been printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 30th November, 1953;

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. John for the half-year ended 30th September, 1953;

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. John in connection with tenantry roads for the half-year ended 30th September, 1953.

PAPERS LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, I am commanded to lay Message No. 1/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House that after considering the Addresses passed by the branches of the Legislature, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies has given his general approval

to the proposals set out in His Excellency's Message No. 25/1953 and its enclosures, and that it is proposed to introduce the new system with effect from the 1st February, 1954.

Perhaps honourable members might be interested if I read the Message for them. It reads as follows:—

Message No. 1/1954

His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House Of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address by the Honourable House of Assembly dated the 18th November, 1953, on the subject of Ministerial Status, and to inform the Honourable House that, after consideration of the Addresses passed by both Chambers of the Legislature, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies has conveyed his general approval of the proposals set out in His Excellency's Message No. 25/53 and its enclosures, and his particular approval of the title of "Premier" for the Principal Minister under the new ministerial system.

2. Arrangements are accordingly proceeding with a view to introducing the new system with effect from the 1st February, 1954.

3. The additional staff requirements, as set out in Annexure A to His Excellency's Message No. 25/53 have again been carefully scrutinized with a view to reducing the cost of the proposals, and an economy has been effected by reducing the number of additional Assistant Secretaries required from four to three. It is considered that it would be imprudent to make any further reductions in the proposed establishment, although, during the initial period when the Central Secretariat still continues to serve all Ministries, it is not envisaged that it will be necessary to fill all the junior posts set out in Annexure A, and an assurance is given that these posts will only be filled as and when the development of the new system renders it essential.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House.

Bridgetown.

5th January, 1954.
(M.P. — S.260/S.1 Vol. IV.)

Also, on behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I beg to lay Statement showing gross Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1953;

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise Receipts for four months ended 31st July, 1953;

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise Receipts for five months ended 31st August, 1953.

Also, on behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, I beg to lay The Barbados Scholarship (Amendment) Regulations, 1953;

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1953; and

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Dr. CUMMINS : On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1953;

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1953.

Mr. M. E. COX: Resolution to approve the regulations entitled the Wireless Telegraphy (Amateur Transmitter) Regulations, 1953.

Dr. CUMMINS: Also on behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:

Resolution to place the sum of \$13,450 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953—54, No. 28, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953—54, No. 29, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Bill intituled an Act to amend the District Auctioneers Act 1904 to make better provision in respect of the place and notice of sales of goods distrained on or taken in execution.

Bill intituled an Act to repeal the Public Officers (Security) Act, 1910.

Bill intituled an Act to amend the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949

Bill intituled an Act to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

Bill intituled an Act to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,120 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54 Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953—54, No. 7, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House in Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. WILLIAMS: I beg to give notice of the following Address:—

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly considers that in view of recent waterworks and tenantry developments and better housing in the Island, that the time has come when Government should consider a scheme for the provisions of loans for the private installation of water services in homes.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. MILLER: Of the following Address:—

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly begs to draw to Your Excellency's attention the paucity of common cultural centres available to the public for the performance of art, such as concerts, drama and other cultural activities, especially since the Carnegie Hall has been utilised for other purposes.

2. The House would welcome any approach by Government to bridge this need, and would like to suggest to Government to convert and refurbish the top storey of the Queen's Park House as a little theatre as suggested to and mooted by the Civic Theatre organisation; inasmuch as Queen's Park House could be considered as a central common especially to those in the lower income brackets.

3. The House would also like to draw to Your Excellency's attention the budding interest in art amongst all sections of the community, and would humbly request that entertainment tax on theatricals by local artists and players be repealed so as to provide a filip and also bring these shows nearer to the pockets of the man in the street.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of the following Address:—

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that in order to assist in promoting British West Indian unity and solidarity, there should be an annual interchange of school children on holiday and respectfully requests that Your Excellency will endeavour to obtain the co-operation of the other West Indian colonies to make this proposal a reality.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And of the following:

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House is of the considered opinion that in order

- to put B.W.I. capital to the most effective use within the area;
- to permit economic responsibility to keep pace with political responsibility;
- to ensure that the profits derived from enterprises in the area remain, as far as possible, to assist in the agricultural and industrial development of the area, and that the proceeds of locally-produced commodities be used to promote credit for the area rather than to build up international credit for other countries,

We have a highly paid expert at the head of that department, therefore, you cannot say that you are lacking in experience to carry out your water supply programme. There must be some more justifiable excuse for failure to attend to this matter. Sir, if it were one parish that was not attended to, there might be some excuse but when it is generally stated that even the two standposts that each parish is accustomed to get annually are not supplied this year, that is highly unsatisfactory. Sir, we all realise the inconvenience which is suffered by the people who are without them. On my part, I would prefer to see a lot of things left undone so as to give priority to water extension. I think this is the feeling of many honourable members, therefore, we cannot but view with grave dissatisfaction any delay or refusal in the carrying out of our water supply programme to the various parishes, provision for which has been made by the Legislature in the Current Estimates and for which the supply of material is not hard to obtain.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering whether the Government is aware of certain provisions in the neighbouring colonies relative to the supply of water to householders. I think it is high time that the residents of this supposed modern City of Bridgetown have water installed on their premises by Government if they are unable to pay the initial cost for so doing. Sir, it is the practice of Governments—and I refer to the Government of Trinidad—to instal water on the premises of all householders in the City. In the City of Port-of-Spain, there is not a householder who has not water installed on the premises. Water has been installed by Government to the credit of the householder who has to pay for it in instalments to the local Government. I feel that a similar thing can be done here. If this Government intends to carry out its water programme to the fullest extent; if Government feels that it is an essential service, it should instal water on the premises of each householder in the City of Bridgetown under an easy payment plan which can be copied from Trinidad where the residents pay for it through the local tax. I feel this easy payment plan can be easily arranged through the Parochial Treasurer and in the same manner as Government now collects certain taxes through the various Vestries.

(A VOICE: There is an Address to that effect on the Order Paper).

Sir, that Address having not yet been passed by this Chamber, I can speak on this matter. I can bring to the notice of Government that in the extension of its water services, it can provide for the installation of water on the premises of each householder in the City of Bridgetown. I can propose a plan whereby residents can pay for it as I have just stated. In other colonies, water supply to the people is in the hands of the local government; it is not as it is here where it is in the hands of the Central Government. I am therefore asking this Government if it means anything in its water development, to do just as the Government of Trinidad has done in supplying water to every householder in the City of Port-of-Spain and that is to let the householders pay on easy payment terms the amount to the local authorities and then for the Government to collect from that source. If water is an essential service and is important from the point of view of health, it should be installed on the premises of every householder in this City.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I heartily agree with the principle of this Bill. On many occasions, a Vestry finds itself in the position where it would like to remove a standpost from one place to another but

owing to the amount of 'red tape' it has to go through in having to get a Bill drawn up to put the matter before the Legislature, it prevents Vestries from doing so. In my short time as a Vestryman, I can recount the many instances when Vestries of which I am a member refrained from removing standposts from one position to another on account of this amount of "red tape" and if the amendment to this Act will make this matter easier to deal with, by giving closer co-operation between the Waterworks Department and the various Vestries concerned, I heartily welcome this Bill.

Mr. COX: Sir, I think the honourable member is making reference to another matter which has been dealt with by this House already.

While on my feet, I should like to ask permission of the House to reply to a point made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip. The honourable member not long ago raised the question about the extension of the water services and in doing so, he quoted a point made by the honourable senior member for St. George some weeks ago with respect to the inability of the Department to grant the additional standposts to St. George's parish this year. I should like to say that I regret very much that the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department had taken that line of thought instead of, more or less, putting that plan to the Government as I think should have been done.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I never said anything of the Chief Engineer. If the honourable member is going to refer to any action or misdeed on the part of the Chief Engineer, I never made any such reference.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, I was merely going to say after hearing the statement by the honourable senior member for St. Philip, that I got in touch with the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department and he pointed out to me that of the \$200,000 which had been earmarked for the extension of mains and standposts over the Five Year Plan, he had spent something like \$150,000 in the first year which was up to the end of the financial year 1952-53 and the \$50,000 which was left had already been spent in this financial year, and as a result, he could not instal the two standposts which had been promised the parish of St. George. I got him to send a memorandum to the Financial Secretary and immediate action was taken in getting a sufficient amount of money under the Estimates to carry on, not only with the standposts to be erected, but with the laying down of mains, so that early in the next financial year, he can go ahead and make those installations. I just wanted to make that clear. Let me say that it is no fault of the Government that those standposts have not been erected, and I believe that it may have been overlooked by the Department in attempting to get ahead as quickly as possible with the laying of mains.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable senior member for St. Michael has referred to the programme of extension under the Five Year Plan. I was only referring to the two standposts to which each parish is entitled whether or not there was any Five Year Plan.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next 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 grants of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, but before Your Honour does that, I am asking leave to take Order No. 5 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone Item No. 1 and to take Item No. 2.

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

RESOLUTION FOR CAPITAL WORKS AT SEAWELL AIRPORT.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution reads as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of Two Thousand Eight Hundred and Twenty-Two Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1953-54, Part II—Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1953-54, No. 26, which form the Schedule to this Resolution, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

That sum of money is to be expended at Seawell Airport, but I want to make it clear that it is not to be expended on the runway. This money is a revote. There were certain unexpended balances to the extent of \$13,923 from last year's estimates of Capital Expenditure and the Government is asking that \$2,822 of that balance be revoted to be spent on certain projects at Seawell such as are set out in the Addendum of the Resolution. They are:—

(a) ROAD CONSTRUCTION:	
Section in front of Mechanical Workshop	\$ 275.00
(b) PAVED DRAIN	
Between Ramp and North Side of Workshop	26.40
(c) BOX DRAIN:	
East of "C" Barracks, and South of Workers' Canteen ..	\$1,620.00
(d) CONCRETE KERB AND SLIPPER DRAIN:	
North and South Road, West Side of the Administrative Building	175.00
(e) CONCRETE KERBS:	
(a) Lozange grass plot Car Park	180.80
(b) "D" Shape grass plot ..	208.00
(c) Back of Canteen and running East and West ..	66.40
(e) Car Park west of Canteen ..	83.20
(f) Around Met. Office Building ..	187.20
	\$2,822.00

I repeat that this is a revote from an unexpended balance that is detained towards work to be done at Seawell. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, sometime ago, I was informed in connection with the Airport that

the Government was hoping to wind up the office of Director of Civil Aviation owing to the general trend of aviation policy being to have one Director to serve the various West Indian Governments.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, On a point of order, this resolution is for certain works to be done at Seawell. It has nothing to do with officers at Seawell or with offices.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Sir, I am hoping that sooner or later, the matter to which I referred would be fixed. I have been made to understand that Jamaica would be coming into the framework of that policy and that would ease up matters. I see no reason why this colony should have so many aviation heads when only two or three airlines call at this Airport.

Now, the Addendum to this resolution reads as follows:—

"An amount of \$18,959 was provided in the 1952-53 Capital Estimates and Supplementary Estimates under Head VI—Miscellaneous, Item 6 and expenditure at the 31st March, 1953, was \$68,035.95.

A revote of \$2,822 from the unexpended balance of \$13,923 is required for the following works which it is now proposed to carry out at Seawell Airport."

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is a complete waste of time of having Estimates because all these Government Departments seem to be doing is wherever there are unexpected balances to come to this House and ask for them. I notice that in Trinidad, where we are too prone to criticise at all times and for everything, that the Financial Secretary has issued a warning to the Heads of the Government Departments that they must make out Estimates for expenditure on their departments carefully and also spend it in like manner, as they will be only getting money in the one instance. Sir, everytime you come into this House, you have Supplementary Estimates to deal with. I presume that this work is necessary, therefore, one should not object to it, but you certainly must object to how Government Departments carry out business in this respect.

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

RESOLUTION FOR SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISION AT MENTAL HOSPITAL

DR. CUMMINS: The next resolution is for the sum of two thousand and thirty-eight dollars to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I. Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54, No. 28, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Sir, this resolution has to do with the furnishing of certain quarters at the Mental Hospital. Honourable members will remember that just a few weeks ago, a similar resolution was brought to this House and after some long and trenchant criticism, it was withdrawn until certain information was obtained for the House. That information, Sir, would be found on pages 2 and 3 of the Addendum to this resolution. However, I want honourable members to bear in mind that the resolution itself has to do with the furnishing of quarters and the information on those pages has nothing to do with the resolution.

Honourable members may remember that as a result of the report by Sir Errol Dos Santos, it was set down that 10 per cent of a doctor's salary is deducted if his quarters are furnished by the Government, but if the officer furnishes the quarters

himself, he will get an allowance of 2½ per cent. Well, one object of this allowance is the making of provision for an allowance of 2½ per cent of salary of the serving Assistant Medical Superintendent at the Mental Hospital because he has furnished the quarters himself and that was also the object of the previous resolution. There is also another house unfurnished at the Mental Hospital for an officer of the medical staff and the Government is seizing this opportunity of furnishing it so that when the holder of the office arrives shortly, he will take up residence in furnished quarters and instead of he being paid an allowance in lieu of quarters, 10 per cent of his salary will be deducted for the furnishing of those quarters. As hon. members will see, provision for furnishing those quarters will amount to \$1,920 and the 2½% of the officer's salary which Government is called on to pay as allowance in lieu of quarters amounts to \$118. I am glad to see that the honourable senior member for St. John is in his place because it was he who was most vocal in his criticisms of that institution. He will see the information which was asked for on pages 2 and 3 of the Addendum to the resolution. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, it was expected that explanations, such as are given on the other side of the addendum of the resolution would have been what they are, but I would warn the Government that in dealing with matters such as this, it should not go too far in covering up what might really have happened.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I object to that remark. Certain information was asked for by members of this House, principally by the honourable member who has just sat and the Government investigated the complaints and as a result, has placed the information it received before this House. Government has not tried to cover up anybody. I know, perhaps, what I am going to say now may not be taken in good faith, but, be that as it may, I make this appeal. I am asking honourable members of this House, if they care anything about the proper running of that institution, to be most careful of any remarks they may make about the furniture question. I know some honourable members may say that they are within their rights to make comments on anything pertaining to the running of that institution, and if the officers there do not like what is said, they can go, but I will point out that officers to run that institution are not easy to find; they can go at any time; because those men are specialists. I may say further that the Superintendent of the Mental Hospital was very much perturbed by the criticisms of the House here a few weeks ago in connection with this thing and he is seeking another appointment in the Caribbean area. I do hope he will re-consider his decision because if he leaves, it will leave us with one such officer and I do know that you cannot get them every day. Sir, it is alright to get up in this House on one's hind legs and open one's mouth and criticise *ad lib*.

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I object to any honourable member in this House making any such remarks as "getting up on one's hind legs." None of us are animals.

Dr. CUMMINS: Well Sir, I will have to go back to college because one of the things I have been taught is that man is an animal. At any rate, the point is this: whether you get up on hind legs or forelegs, I am saying that honourable members should remember that they owe a responsibility to the community to have well-run institutions; there

fore, I am asking them to remember that. I think a lot was said on the last occasion and it need not be repeated. I would be the last man to stifle criticism, but at the same time, I am asking honourable members to remember that they owe a responsibility to the public to see that they have well-run institutions.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I think all honourable members appreciate the difficulty of getting efficient officers to run our institutions, and I think all honourable members also know that when this island gets efficient officers to run its institutions, the island gets the benefits, but because you desire that an efficient man should remain in his job, must you say nothing of what you may have heard or known to be going on detrimental to the good running of that institution so that that particular officer might not be offended? The reason why these questions were asked was because we wanted to see this particular institution run properly. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas says that as a result of the statements which were made in this House about the running of the Mental Hospital, the officer in charge of that institution feels very much perturbed. I would say that it would be a "weak-knee" policy of Government if it tries to stifle criticism on any officer or the running of his department, regardless of how efficient that officer might be. If anything seems to be contrary or anything goes wrong, and there is good cause for criticism, it should be criticised.

The honourable junior member for St. Thomas said that investigations were carried out by Government and the explanations are what are given here, but the explanations do not remove the fact that people who have something to do with the institution knew and said what really happened. I would like to ask the honourable junior member for St. Thomas if it is correct for an officer responsible to the Government and head of an institution to have relatives of his going around spending money belonging to the Government. On several occasions I have noticed that equipment was purchased for that institution by someone who was not directly connected with the Government and honourable members would agree that it is a dangerous practice.

What I am trying to point out is that when the person who is authorised by the Head of the institution to spend Government's money is not directly related to Government, that person cannot be responsible to Government; therefore, such a practice is definitely wrong and beyond reason. It is a very dangerous practice, however efficient the officer might be and the officer should be told so however much you might want him to remain in his position. If the honourable senior member for St. Thomas wants to say that is reasonable, let him say so, but honourable members are aware that it is not done in business circles.

I would like the honourable member to know that when statements are made on the floor of this House that the members who make those statements might not know when the actions which were the result of the statements were committed, but it is only when people who have something to do with the institution and the actual thing in question, go to members of this Chamber and make statements that such actions are brought to light. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas may say: "Do not say this or that of such a person," but he is only saying so because that person may be a head of a department or some "big shot."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the honourable member to tell me which department or officer is he speaking of.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, the only department which we are discussing is the Mental Asylum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Then, am I to understand that when you say the honourable junior member for St. Thomas is asking not to say this or that of such a person that you are referring to the Head of the Mental Asylum?

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the honourable member wants enlightenment, let me say, first of all, that this resolution has nothing to do with the general running of the institution. This resolution deals with furniture and allowance in lieu of quarters. Under (i) you have an officer whose house is already furnished by him and Government proposes to pay 2½ per cent. on the salary of the officer as an allowance on that. Under (ii) you are asking for furniture to furnish a house which is now vacant for a medical officer that is expected to take up his appointment soon. The honourable member is making certain accusations in connection with some person going and buying furniture and charging it to the Mental Hospital. I want to assure honourable members how empty is the honourable member's accusations. First of all, there was no vote to the Mental Hospital for the buying of furniture; secondly, enquiries were made at the Auditor General's Office and it was found that no voucher was presented to the Auditor General for money to purchase furniture at the Mental Hospital. The honourable member might well opine that the relative of the head of the Department went and bought furniture for herself for which the Government is now committed to pay an allowance of 2½% of the salary of the Head of the Department, but the honourable cannot say that the person bought the furniture for the Government.

Mr. ALLDER: Whatever the honourable member might say, I have seen things bought and I have been informed that the cost of what I have seen bought was put down to the account of the Mental Hospital. I daresay that if a lady who is not employed by Government were buying equipment for herself, she would not put down the name of the Mental Hospital as the party to whom the bill should be sent. I do not know how the Auditor General or the Accountant General handle things. I repeat that it was a wrong act and it should not have occurred because the lady is not responsible to Government. If she had squandered the Government's money, nobody could have asked her anything about it. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas knows that the Head of the Institution committed that institution to certain expenditure with the hope that the Executive would forward a resolution to cover it. I think it is wrong to concoct evidence to prove that members of this Chamber are liars. I hardly think that the Mental Hospital Board of which I presume the honourable junior member for St. Thomas is a member, pay any sort of interest in the running of the institution. I know that it is not the first time that evidence has been concocted so as to show that there was efficiency and nothing went wrong. I agree that honourable members can only go by what is put before them. It is not the first time that an official was called on the carpet to answer such questions. I happen to know of an official who has left the colony after he came in for much criticism over a similar thing. Once things like this get started, they will continue to go on unless they are checked.

Every official would feel that he can do the same thing especially when he is aware that the Government is possessed of a great dose of weakness. If honourable members are scared of officials, I see no reason why I should be scared. As the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has said, this resolution is for reimbursing some officer for furniture which has already been bought.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise again on a point of explanation. If the honourable member did not hear correctly, I will just repeat that I did not say "reimburse an officer for furniture he had already bought." I pointed out that the agreement is that if Government furnishes an officer's quarters, the Government deducts 10 per cent of the officer's salary for furnishing such quarters. On the other hand, if the officer furnishes his quarters, Government has to pay that officer an allowance of 2½ per cent. of his salary. This is a recent agreement. It is the result of the Dos Santos Report. When the Dos Santos Report was passed by this House, these officers had already furnished their houses. Again, the Government says that if you furnish your house out of your own money, it is paying you 2½ per cent of your salary as an allowance. This Government is not reimbursing anybody for money which they have spent.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, the last time a similar resolution was before the House, the honourable member gave the impression that the Government was reimbursing the Head of the institution for the furniture he had provided, and the question asked was why had that officer waited for over the two years that he was at the institution to claim compensation? That is what caused the postponement of the resolution more than anything else. Now, the honourable member is suggesting something else. If what the honourable member says now is correct, I would like to know if the Government is expected to provide furnished quarters for its employees, why didn't it have furnished quarters for that officer particularly as it seems to be more in favour of Government when it provides furnished quarters. If furnished quarters are provided, when one officer goes out, he will leave that furniture, and the officer who will be filling the vacancy will take up residence in furnished quarters. I do not agree that that is the policy because everytime an officer comes in quarters, he is provided with a new set of furniture and everytime he goes out the furniture goes out with him. As far as I am aware, every medical officer of that institution on taking leave of his appointment, disposes of the furniture and other equipment himself. I would therefore like to know how the agreements are drawn up between Government and these employees.

The honourable junior member for St. Thomas should also know this. The Mental Hospital costs this Government thousands of pounds annually to run it. It has a large population, something between seven and eight hundred souls. Can the honourable member say why the last matron at the institution left it? Is it because she was criticised for taking patient's food and feeding stock with it and when she sold that stock, she utilised the benefits to herself? If that were a properly run institution for which you have to purchase food worth thousands of pounds every year, the garbage and wastage from the kitchen would have been given to stock which in turn would be killed for the purpose of satisfying the needs of the patients and in such manner would be a saving in the cost of running that institution. No matron or any other employee would be permitted to use such garbage for personal benefit. Sir, we can only hope that some sense of responsibility would enter the hearts of those who are responsible for the run-

ning of the institutions in this island and the taking care of the sick and infirm, and that those who are responsible would do the things that are expected of them.

Mr. BARROW came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I must make some comment about this matter. I want to bring to the notice of the Government that while on visits to non-paying patients at the Mental Hospital, I happened to see the meals which were given them, and I enquired as to the amount of daily rations per patient. On observation of the conditions of the patients and with what I was told, I must say it is my opinion that they are very poorly fed and to the point where it is human cruelty. I therefore must censure Government for its omission to extend to the unfortunate mass of humanity down there the sympathy which they deserve. At least, Government is failing to give them adequate diet. They are starved out, if I may be permitted to use a bit of Barbadian phraseology for it. If you divide the amount of food which is given out daily down there with the number of inmates — I am referring to non-paying patients — you will realise that they are starved out. I am convinced in my mind that they are given starvation diets. I suppose the practice is carried out at other Government institutions. Other governments were supposed not to care about this matter but this Government should care, because some of their own families may be sent there and may have to enter as non-paying patients. I bring it to the notice of Government today so that when the coming Estimates are being prepared those responsible for the Mental Hospital should make provision for a substantial increase in the diet given to non-paying patients. Sir, I was deeply moved with what I saw on different occasions when I visited that institution with respect to the quality and the quantity of the food that those poor unfortunates had to exist on.

(VOICES: Shame! Shame! Very bad!)

Sir, I do know that honourable members may not want to hear that but I feel it is my duty to bring it to the notice of the public. It is cruelty to treat those people like that because they are helpless. I think that, at least, humanitarian feeling should be extended them by giving them sufficient to keep them from starving. Their affliction is enough pain without that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable member who has just spoken like myself is well qualified to speak on the plight of the inmates of the Mental Hospital. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because we both of us live on the lunatic fringe—I geographically, and he in the more nebulous sense of the term. I happen to live in Black Rock. I must say that none of the thunderings we have heard today from the honourable junior member for St. John have reached my ears even from my proximity to the source of those rumblings about the plight of the inmates. I was always of the opinion that the inmates of the Mental Hospital, when it came to things like diet etc. were better off than the people at the General Hospital. I am sorry to hear that we have a "snake pit" so close to the lunatic fringe where I reside.

But it was not that on which I got up to speak, Mr. Chairman. I really want to comment on Item 23, (New) Allowances in lieu of quarters. Under that item \$118.00 is to be voted. I notice in the note on Page 2 of this Resolution that the Government has taken heed of some of the strictures moved on the floor of the House when the Mental Hospital was being discussed on a previous occasion. But I

very much regret that the strictures which I made as regards allowance in lieu of quarters for the Superintendent of the Government Farm have not received the same consideration from the Government as some of the other strictures made in the House on that occasion.

The position is that the Superintendent of the Government Farm who is doing a useful job, which, especially in view of the extent to which we hear the poor inmates are pushed for calories, is most vital to the future welfare of the institution. That officer has been promised quarters. As a matter of fact I think that a certain amount has already been allocated for the building of quarters for him. The sad feature of this particular Resolution is that while \$118.00 is claimed as allowance for the imported officer, the local man, the Superintendent of the Farm, who to the best of my knowledge has been doing his job with a great deal of efficiency, and who has actually been cognisant of the fact that the Government have stated their liability to provide him with quarters is not being paid any allowance in lieu until the quarters are built. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs because you intimate to an individual that he is entitled to quarters; you are giving other people outdoor or indoor allowance — whichever you call it—and this other officer for whom you are to build quarters has to wait until the quarters are built, with no allowance in lieu.

Nearly all the employees at the Mental Hospital now are either accommodated in quarters or they get allowance in lieu; and some of them get both; because some of them still enjoy the old facilities and receive allowances too. I would like the honourable member who is responsible for this particular department to investigate this particular matter as soon as possible and make the necessary adjustment.

As regards the actual Government Farm there is a lot of undeveloped land at the back of the Hospital, unused except for the purpose of cricket. I hope that the Government will consider increasing the size of the farm at the Mental Hospital so that the inmates at least can enjoy some of the produce and have a more balanced diet than they get at present. In that respect I would entirely support the suggestion made by the honourable junior member for St. John except that I would like to warn him that increasing the size of the ration allowance is no guarantee that the food will find its way down the throats of the inmates. The mere fact that you make a larger allocation of the Public Revenue for the purpose need not necessarily result in an improvement as far as the inmates are concerned. I am not casting any reflections on anyone; but we all know that the volume of the commodities purchased is not always commensurate with the prices paid today.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I presume that there are under the Regulations certain duties laid down for the Medical Officers at Mental Hospitals. If it is not their duty to see that inmates get the proper food ration it should be made one of their duties.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. COX the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. COX in each case the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

TEA ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the House adjourned until 5.30 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

Dr. CUMMINS with leave laid the Replies to Question No. 37 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, to Question No. 41 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John and to Question No. 32 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas.

DEBATE ON MOTION FOR FIVE-MINUTE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, — I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss a matter of public importance. On the last occasion during the debate —

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker — I think that if the honourable member wants to move the adjournment of the House the House should know what he wants to adjourn on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member gave me an intimation of what he wants to adjourn the House to discuss. It is a matter of a newspaper report of what the honourable member said during a debate on Combermere School at the last meeting of the House.

Mr. VAUGHAN: To do justice to myself and not to give the public an erroneous view of what took place in the House I must draw to their attention that the following headline gives an entirely incorrect view of what actually took place. This is the headline which appeared in the "Torch" Newspaper: "V. B. Vaughan Made to Apologise for Lying References to Combermere School Head." As you may recall, sir, on that occasion the Chairman called you to the chair and reported to you that I had disobeyed his ruling. I was called on by Your Honour to apologise for having disobeyed the ruling of the Chair and I did so. There was no apology for what I had said, which was factual. But this newspaper has entirely distorted the facts and said that I was made to apologise for lying references to the Headmaster of Combermere School.

This is extremely damaging to my political character. I was referring to negligence on the part of the Headmaster of Combermere School, and saying that that negligence came through his absences from the school and would cause the school to suffer as an educational institution. I want to confirm today, sir, —

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I rise to a point of order, sir. You intimated that the honourable member was going to deal with a statement in a newspaper to which he drew your attention. I am saying now that if that is Your Honour's ruling the honourable member is not speaking within that ruling. He is making particular references to the headmaster. If he is dealing with the newspaper article let him deal with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot be out of order if he makes references to the Headmaster of Combermere School because the original Resolution for repairs to that School is not before the House. On the last occasion a Resolution dealing with Combermere School, but not with the Headmaster was before the House. In my view the honourable member will find difficulty in refuting

the distortion of which he complains without reminding the House of what he had been reprimanded about on the last occasion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to say that if that is so I think that the honourable member in his introductory remarks today has said all that he needs say. The allegation that the honourable member is bringing is one against the "Torch." The course that he wants to take is to take action against the "Torch."

Mr. SPEAKER: I repeat that it would be difficult for the honourable junior member for St. John to show the distortion of which he complains without referring to the headmaster on this occasion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As I see it the honourable member is merely trying to say on this occasion what he wanted to say on the last occasion when the chairman stopped him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not in the House on that occasion and I do not know what the honourable member said.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have to give the facts in order to refute the newspaper headline, the facts which I was stopped from giving on the last occasion.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, — Do I understand the honourable member to be saying that he is about to give the facts concerning what happened in Committee of this House on the last occasion and on which he said that he was misrepresented by the newspaper, or the facts concerning the headmaster on which he was ruled out of order on the last occasion?

Mr. SPEAKER: You should not pre-judge the honourable member.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, — This is not an inquiry instituted by the honourable member on my right. I hope that the honourable junior member for St. John is going to make the newspaper from which he read a document of the House, and secondly that he is going to make a motion that the Editor of the newspaper be brought before the Bar of the House. The disclosures made have been enough to merit a reprimand of the Editor of the newspaper which has accused the honourable member of lying. I am only reminding the honourable member that it is his duty to make that newspaper a document of this House and to ask Your Honour to summon the Editor before the Bar of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The summoning of the Editor is beyond my powers.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I cannot refute the damaging statement unless I give the facts. It has been brought to my notice —

Mr. SPEAKER: I will warn the honourable member that as far as he is able he should desist from bringing the headmaster into this.

Mr. VAUGHAN: But how can I defend myself?

Mr. SPEAKER: You can ask for the debates.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I will go on sir. The newspaper article states:

"For some unknown reason Mr. V. B. Vaughan, (junior representative of St. John) has developed a mania of attacking respectable individuals and firms in the colony by name, on the floor of the Assembly, and no other member paid him any attention, but at last Tuesday's meeting after Mr. Lloyd Smith (junior representative of St. Joseph and Chairman of Committees) in the Chair failed to stop Mr. Vaughan's ranting, the Speaker was called back in the House and compelled Vaughan to apologise . . ."

How can I refute that without establishing the facts of what the newspaper said was a lie? What happened was that I began to bring to the notice

of the committee that by frequent absences of the Headmaster of Combermere the school's educational set-up was suffering, and it was not fair to the parents who sent their children there to be educated.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you were ruled out of order.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I was speaking along those lines. I persisted in speaking under that Head after the Chairman ruled that I was out of order, and the Chairman called on Your Honour who said that I had disobeyed the ruling of the Chair and asked me to apologise, which I did. That is all that happened. The newspaper gives a damaging distortion of what happened. It makes it appear that I was called upon to apologise for what I said about the Headmaster of Combermere School. When the time comes I shall substantiate those allegations and bring to the notice of the public what I consider the unheard of neglect of the school by the present headmaster owing to his continuous absence on certain occasions helping with preparations for the Coronation celebrations etc. When he should be in school he is taking time off to attend to matters entirely outside of the school business. The Editor of this newspaper is an ignorant sycophant who week after week distorts certain public affairs and abuses responsible people. On this occasion I have been chosen as the special target owing to ignorant sycophancy. The Editor got a few printing jobs for the Marian Anderson show and made handsome profits.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a matter for this House.

Mr. VAUGHAN: For a long time, sir, the community has been suffering from the sycophancy of this little worm, and it is time that this verminous element in the journalistic community should be brought to his senses. If, sir, it lies within your power to summon this misguided sycophant before the Bar of this House you should do so and let him know that no distortion of what takes place in this House can go unpunished. Your Honour can verify if that lies within your power or not.

I am sure that no honourable member can accuse me of abusing responsible persons and firms by name on the floor of this House. I have never had that practice. Where the Editor of the Torch got that from I do not know. On any occasion that I have spoken in this House I defy him to bring one instance when I have spoken through spite or malice, and I defy him to bring evidence of this mania of mine for attacking individuals and firms by name. In speaking of the Headmaster of Combermere School it was my duty to bring to the notice of this House which votes \$100,000 a year to be spent on that school the gross neglect of the Headmaster through his frequent absences which I am prepared to establish. I do not see why I should be held up to abuse by a newspaper and referred to as having made lying references to that Headmaster when the latter was absent continuously during the Coronation preparations. Not only that, but the Headmaster took out with him members of the staff to help, and the Secretary of the Governing Body had to type things in connection with the Coronation. That is an established fact.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that as I understand the position what the honourable member wants to do today is to refute the newspaper article and headline; not to repeat today what he was prevented from saying on the last occasion. But so far as I can see, the honourable member is going to do what the Chairman of Committees called him up for on the last occasion. As I remember what happened then, he was called upon to apologise

to the Chair because he refused to withdraw remarks which the Chairman asked him to withdraw.

Mr. VAUGHAN: That is not so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am addressing the honourable junior member for St. John. The honourable member may not add to the alleged shortcomings of the headmaster. He may repeat what he has said already; but he should advance no new allegations.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The Chairman of Committees never asked me to withdraw anything that I had said. He told me that I could not refer to the headmaster in dealing with the Resolution that was before the House. When a newspaper which is read throughout the colony refers to me as having made lying references I must defend myself. My whole political career may depend on this. The people of St. John will ask what type of man have they sent to the House who has a mania for attacking respectable individuals and firms by name, and is now lying on the Headmaster of Combermere. I must establish the fact that I was not lying and defend myself from this newspaper attack.

Mr. SPEAKER: You do not have to establish that again.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Saying that I made lying references is a total distortion. I said that I was prepared to establish by evidence the headmaster's absence during the Coronation period and his absence during the Marian Anderson visit.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot do that at this stage. That is not a matter which is before this House.

Mr. VAUGHAN: May I not defend myself?

Mr. SPEAKER: Only on a substantive resolution.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am verifying that the references made by me, far from being a lie, were the entire truth, and I have in fact discovered more facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House of Assembly would never know whether or not the headmaster was guilty of the acts which you allege, and therefore you cannot justify your facts. You should bring the matter before the Governing Body. What this House must be concerned about is what happened on the former occasion between yourself and the Chairman of Committees and what happened after I took the Chair. We can never judge the honourable member's facts. We cannot judge anything without witnesses.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am prepared to bring facts to prove what I said. You may recall, Sir, what I said on the last occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not in the House. I only came in after the Chairman summoned me.

Mr. VAUGHAN: May I inform you of what I said? I said that it had been brought to my notice that the pupils of Combermere School were suffering from neglect as a consequence of the absences from school of the present headmaster. That was what I was saying when the Chairman of Committees ruled me out of order. I added that the absences of the headmaster occurred during the Coronation period and at the time of Marian Anderson's visit when—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member, so far as I know, made no mention of Marian Anderson's visit on a former occasion. He must mention no new thing. He must not introduce any new thing. If the honourable member wants to be well advised he may initiate a Resolution that in the opinion of this House such and such a thing happened and such and such a thing did not happen.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I will ask Your Honour to go thoroughly into my complaint as regards the distorted report appearing in the "*Torch*" newspaper, and as a protection of members of the House I would like Your Honour to take the most extreme measure which may lie in your power to deal with the writer of this distorted report. If it is necessary for him to be brought down Roebuck Street by a police constable to this House Your Honour should take that measure. Because of your powers in this House I am asking Your Honour to do so. We cannot let any newspaper make such distorted reports of debates in this House and such distorted references to any member of this House.

It is quite possible that any constituent of St. John taking up this particular issue of the newspaper would say to himself, "I thought that Mr. Vaughan was a different type of man. Why should he go to the House and lie on the Headmaster of Combermere?" If no action is taken on this, Mr. Speaker, it could cost me my seat. I have made no lying references to the headmaster. The references which I made can be established by facts; and the references which I will make on a future occasion will be quite relevant and true. Far from making lying references I will make further references in the interest of this entire colony. I will make references which will make every inhabitant of this island dissatisfied with Combermere School as a result of the actions of the Headmaster. I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—Before the motion is withdrawn I do not think it is fair to anyone in this island for an honourable member to use the privilege of the House to make so serious a charge against an individual and then to hide by withdrawal of his motion after he has said all that he wanted to say, without giving anyone an opportunity to say anything in defence of the individual. I would defend anyone who is misrepresented by a newspaper, no matter by whom the newspaper is owned. But, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. VAUGHAN: Is the honourable member seconding my motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would have to enquire of him.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You cannot put up a motion and then withdraw it like a bit of paper before it is debated by the House. When the honourable member rises here and moves the adjournment of the House for five minutes I take it that he wants the particular matter to be discussed by the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member put up a motion and has now asked that the motion be withdrawn. The honourable junior member for St. Peter cannot therefore begin his speech by saying "before the motion is withdrawn," because it has been withdrawn. The motion has been put and withdrawn. It has not been seconded and is therefore no motion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member rose—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order. There is absolutely nothing before the House. The motion made by the honourable junior member for St. John has not been seconded, and no other honourable members may speak on it, unless it is seconded, and it cannot now be seconded because it has been withdrawn.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, — I am asking leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the

Day. It stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection the honourable member may proceed.

Dr. CUMMINS: The Order is to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905. The purpose of the Bill, as honourable members will see, is to permit shops engaged in the sale of fresh fruit and fresh vegetables and handicrafts of B.W.I. origin or the products of cottage industry, to open for sale of those articles on public holidays, to the same extent as similar shops are now permitted to open on Sundays, Xmas Day or any other day set apart by proclamation for divine service.

To give effect thereto, it is necessary to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905 to exempt such shops from the provisions of that Act and, when so exempted the Governor-in-Executive Committee may make an order under the Shops Act, 1945 in respect of the hours during which such shops may be opened on bank holidays.

At present, shops selling meat, ice, and fresh fish may open on Sundays and other days set apart for divine service from 6 a.m., to 9 a.m., and it is obviously reasonable that such shops and shops selling fresh fruit and vegetables should be similarly treated in respect of public holidays; whilst in the case of shops selling local handicrafts or products of cottage industry, these should be allowed to open on a public holiday on the arrival of a tourist ship.

It is also desired to take advantage of this opportunity to make an amendment to the Act for the benefit of the Gulf Oil Company. They have represented that it is dangerous to have to stop drilling operations on Sundays and Bank Holidays, and that these operations should continue 24 hours a day, seven days a week. That contention has been supported by the Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas, and opportunity to amend the Act so that Gulf Oil Company can operate on Sundays and Bank Holidays is now being taken. I am sure that all the members of this House would be willing to grant Gulf Oil Company every facility to assist them in being successful in their drilling operations to bring to the surface the oil which Barbados needs so badly.

I beg to move, sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—What amazes me about this Bill is that as far as the Gulf Oil Company is concerned we are merely ratifying a breach of the law which is already being committed by that company. As regards the remuneration which the employees should get for working on Sundays and Bank Holidays several of them have approached me on what should be the trade union side of this matter. But as far as they are concerned nothing has been done by the trade union. It is known as an established practice that people working in the Post Office and Shipping etc., are paid something like time and a half when they have to work on Sundays and Bank Holidays. I am not looking at it from the point of view that these people working for the Gulf Oil Company are not organised. But they still form part of our society and you should pass laws for everyone. They say that they have approached various trade union bodies and nothing has been done. I thought that from the point of view of trade union representatives the matter should be mentioned.

As regards the shops being allowed to sell fresh fruit and vegetables on these days, a lot of them do so already. Most of them have already been breaking the law; but since most of them are owned by people who are owner-employee it does not mean that they are employing people and the question of remuneration does not arise.

I would like to point out to the honourable introducer of the Bill that I think the whole of Section 2 needs renumbering. It mentions "sub-paragraph v and vi," but there is no sub-paragraph v and vi in the principal Bill. In that Bill the sub-paragraphs are set out alphabetically and not by numerals.

In conclusion I would ask that action be taken to protect the interests of the employees of the Gulf Oil Company whether they belong to a trade union or not.

Dr. CUMMINS: I am sure that if representations are made to the Labour Commissioner he will see after the interests of the people who make those representations whether they belong to a union or not. That is what he is there for.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I have a few comments to make, and there is a point that I would like to draw to the Government's attention. This is the first time since this Act came into force in 1905 that any appreciable amendment is being made to it. Whenever you bring new legislation into operation you should always watch and see if any hardships are involved in it. I would be the first person to agree that you should enact legislation to ensure that all employees get proper time off, and that they do not work more than the hours which a human being should be required to work, normally, eight hours a day. I am going to bring to the Government's attention — although they should know it already — a point that has been brought forcibly to my attention by a labourer. Dealing with this Act he said to me that it is rather significant that on Saturday night or Monday night, or any other night you can buy rum at nine o'clock from any rum shop, but if you have a child ill or your wife ill you cannot get anything from a drugstore unless you go to a doctor. Every rum shop is allowed to open until nine and ten o'clock, but drugstores have to be closed by six o'clock. I am not saying that you should not be able to get rum, but we must face facts. I am sure you will agree that 99.9 per cent. of the people who want something as a result of illness at night go to a druggist and not to a doctor, and as I have said, while you can buy rum at nine and ten o'clock from any rum shop, the drugstores have to be closed by six o'clock.

As a matter of fact, I personally do not feel that it is a question of the time when they close. In a community where you have a population like that of Barbados a day is 24 hours. As far as I am concerned if one set of people work from 8 o'clock until 4 o'clock and another set work from 4 until 12 o'clock they work the same eight hours. You do not have to go to the U.S.A. to see that; you need only go as far as Trinidad.

Now, sir, I am going to sound a different note. I was glad to observe that the honourable introducer who should know more about unions than any of us in this Chamber did not reply to the criticism on the point about the workers of the Gulf Oil Company. I feel this: In a community like Barbados where you have seasonal employment and where you have a tremendous lot of people unemployed I think that the Union is rather wise not to jump in at the start and interfere by trying to make regulations etc.,

where a new company is just starting to develop. I think that the Union is wise not to interfere until the company has at least made a footing. I do not agree that because you should have 40, 50 or 60 people employed by Gulf Oil Company that any talk should be raised at this stage as to whether they work from 8 until 4 o'clock and as regards demands for overtime if they work after 4. As a matter of fact, instead of demanding overtime for those who have already put in a day's work I would prefer to see another 40, 50 or 60 go on and work from 4 until 12 and another set go on and work from 12 until 8 if it is necessary to have continuous work. That would be much better in a community where so many people are unemployed. The system which I have mentioned just now is the one that is used in big countries. People go to work in "shifts"—8 to 4, 4 to 12, 12 to 8. Each man works the same eight hours. In a community like this where as I have said, there is only seasonal employment and where there are so many hundreds leaving school and glad to work, that would be a better thing to do than to start off wrangling for overtime with a company that has just started to operate.

Mr. WILLIAMS: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker, the point that the honourable member is dealing with is not the point that I dealt with. I never suggested that the Union should jump in and interfere with a new industry. The honourable member is misrepresenting what I said.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have not referred to the honourable member. I am not referring to any suggestion which he made here today. I was making a few remarks and waiting to see if the honourable junior member for St. Peter was going to reply to me. I was pleasantly surprised that he did not take me on, because he was apparently thinking along the same lines that I was thinking along. At the risk of letting one or two warped-minded people—some of them in politics—think that I am defending the Gulf Oil Company, I repeat that in a community like this it would be a bad thing to jump in and make regulations before you allow the company to get a footing. Of course you should regularise hours; but allow the company to get a footing first.

I have heard criticisms levelled at the union for not jumping into the question. I said then what I am saying now; and I have gone further and said what is my attitude as regards this overtime business. I do not agree with it. What the Labour Department should do is get the unemployed people listed and encourage the company if they are working a 24-hour shift to employ 120 people instead of 40 or 60. You would be putting money into wider circulation. With the observations that I have made I support the Bill, and I hope that the Government will take stock of the suggestions that I have made.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I do not agree with the remarks made by the honourable senior member for the City. There must be something wrong when you get the honourable member agreeing with a trade union. What I want to comment on, sir, is the fact that if the company now exploring for oil in St. Andrew were exploring in Texas they would be paying American wages; but because they are in Barbados this same company which has wells all over the world is not paying the wages they would pay in America and the other countries where the standard of living of the worker is higher; they are paying plantation wages. That is where I accuse the Government, comprised as it is, of not protecting the interests of these workers.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What has an amendment to the Bank Holiday Act got to do with what wages are paid in Texas or in California?

Mr. ALLDER: The Bill brings in the Gulf Oil Company, and my statements apply to the Bill in the same way as the statements made by the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In this Bill the Gulf Oil Company is only seeking permission to operate on Sundays and Bank holidays like certain other businesses.

Mr. ALLDER: We should be careful that we do not legalise the exploitation which the Gulf Oil Company has been carrying out against its employees in Barbados, and that we do not permit it to do so by the action of the Executive, comprised as it is of officials of the Union. I am saying that it is wrong; because if this company were exploring for oil in New Mexico they would pay wages at New Mexican rates. But because they have come to Barbados they have dropped the rates at which they are accustomed to pay and are paying at the plantation scale. And the honourable junior member for St. Peter is a member of the Executive which signed the contract with the Gulf Oil Company, and did not stipulate in the contract that the workers whom they govern be protected. That is why the workers for this company are dissatisfied. They are dissatisfied that a big company which is accustomed to paying high wages in other countries can come to Barbados and pay people seven and eight shillings a day. In New Mexico they would be paid three and four dollars a day. I say it is wrong.

The mistake, sir, was made by the Executive comprised of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew and other trade union officials. A stipulation should have been put in the contract which would ensure that the labourers would not be exploited by this company. That is what the honourable junior member for St. Peter and his colleagues on the Executive failed to do.

When it comes to the honourable senior member for the City talking about running a big company like this from the island because you ask for overtime his statements do not hold water. This company is accustomed to paying out big money. I am not saying that if a small investor came to the island to open a shirt or boot factory you should run him out by making unreasonable demands. But imagine saying that because a few local people demand what their labour is worth you will run out a big oil company which is accustomed to paying high wages and salaries! You do not have to give a millionaire a chance to be careful; but even if he wants to be you should make sure that his carefulness does not hurt other people.

If my statements do not meet with the approval of the honourable senior member for the City we cannot take him seriously when it comes to representing labour because we know what he is expected to do. If they do not meet with the approval of the honourable junior member for St. Peter we know that it is not always possible for a trade union leader to do what he should.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—The honourable member has sat with a smiling face; I hope that he does not object to anything that I say. It is not always possible for a trade union leader to do what he should, says the honourable member. If he cannot be honest I must try to maintain the dignity of a member of the House of Assembly. The honourable member talks about a contract. What contract is there between the Government and the Gulf Oil Company as far as paying wages is concerned?

Mr. ALLDER: I did not say that there was a contract as far as the payment of wages is concerned. I said that stipulations should have been made in the contract between the Government and the company to ensure that the labourers were not exploited.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Again the honourable member is ignorance personified. When the Government was making a contract with the company the House had to pass legislation as to how they were to explore for oil. If the honourable member wanted an insertion to be made as regards wages he could have moved that such an insertion be made. He did nothing of the kind. But today he is trying to use a little political stunt. But when he is dealing with me he is dealing with one who is a politician too. He is not dealing with a Sunday School boy. It is well known that I represent a Trade Union. If the honourable member would like to incite people to commit arson and other offences —

Mr. ALLDER: Is the honourable member insinuating that I want to incite people to arson?

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that you do not.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I know that the honourable member will object further before I am finished. The honourable member also expressed the view that when the honourable senior member for the City and I agree about something you will know that the workers are not being protected. The honourable member would have to agree with the honourable senior member for the City outside of the House when he would not like it to be known what the agreement is; but the honourable senior member for the City and I can agree on anything in this Chamber because the public can read about it. When you wanted him to sell something and he did not give you everything —

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. ALLDER: I object to the honourable member's remarks.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What did I say?

Mr. ALLDER: I would like to ask that the Clerk read back the honourable member's statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have told the honourable junior member for St. Peter that he should have been addressing the Chair. The remarks that he made were not addressed to the Chair. I myself did not hear them, although I would have liked to.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—So far as the Union and the Gulf Oil Company are concerned I will say for the benefit of the House that the Union is not an organisation that jumps to the defence of people unless they are members of the Union. If an oil company is coming here it is not the Union's business to lay down rates before the company comes. When the workers organise then the Union makes representation on their behalf. It is not the Union's business to make representations on behalf of those who are not its members.

Mr. ALLDER: I did not blame the Union for not seeing that protection is given to the workers. I said that the Government, composed as it is of the honourable junior member for St. Peter and his colleagues, should have seen to it that a fair wages clause was inserted in the contract between the Government and the company. That was done in other instances — in the case of Seawell for example.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member does not even know the meaning of a fair wages clause. It means in effect that if you give a job to a company to be done by contract they shall not pay wages less than those existing in that particular in-

dustry or area, or in other words, what can be regarded as the general wage. To show that the honourable member does not know what he is talking about, if a fair wages clause had been put into the contract between the Government and the oil company the latter would have to pay wages at the plantation rates. The honourable member with his love of exaggeration says that the company pays seven and eight shillings a day. In my position I should not be trying to defend people like the Gulf Oil Company because it is easy to give the impression that you are trying to maintain the *status quo* or a certain wage level. But I must say in all fairness that the rates paid by the Gulf Oil Company are higher than those paid for similar work in this island; and it is not a rate of wage that was negotiated by the Union.

As far as the Executive and the Seawell business is concerned the honourable member does not understand that the Seawell people came to carry out a specific contract. But the Gulf Oil Company were given a licence to prospect for oil. They are not competing with local labour. They are not running a labour gang.

If the honourable member feels that he can run a trade union better than I, he has the freedom of the city. He is a representative for St. John and he can organise the workers in that parish and do something for them. But he knows it is hard work, and he will never attempt to enter that field. The Union has been dragged into this debate because of the remarks of the honourable member about union officials sitting on the Executive and not protecting the workers employed by the oil company. But it must be evident to honourable members that the honourable senior member for St. John does not know what he is talking about. He does not know the meaning of a fair wage clause. The honourable member is reading nowadays more than he can reasonably digest, and is catching on to high sounding words and phrases without getting down to the core of the matter.

I think the honourable member will do better if before he joins issue with me, he bears in mind that I know something of the job which I am doing. The Workers' Union has nothing to do with the drawing up of the agreement. The question of rate is not true. Members of the Gulf Oil Company came to the Union for registration and were protected. There will always be a few grumblers in any concern, but we leave that type of person to people like the honourable senior member for St. John to take care. The honourable member has nothing to do but to drive around and about to look for people with grievances. Those of us who have positive work to do have to devote our time to it; we have not the time to spare to do what the honourable member does.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

2. Subsection (1) of section 6 of the Bank Holidays Act, 1905 is hereby amended—

- (a) by the addition to paragraph (e) thereof of the following sub-paragraphs to be numbered (v) and (vi) respectively—

“(v) fresh fruit and fresh vegetables;
 (vi) handicrafts of British West Indian origin or the products of cottage industry;”

(b) by the addition after paragraph (p) thereof of the following paragraph to be numbered (q)—

“(q) the business of any person or company to whom a licence or lease to search for and get petroleum has been granted under the Petroleum Act, 1950.”

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: I would just like the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to say whether the amendments envisaged in Clause 2 of the Bill now before the Committee are applicable to all Sundays and Bank-holidays because I have some recollection that the honourable member in introducing the Bill made some reference to shops selling handicrafts opening only on the public holidays that a tourist ship is on visit to the island. I think I see in section 6 of the Bank-Holidays Act, the different trades and shops exempted under that section which may be open on any public holiday. It mentions nothing about public holidays on which a tourist ship may arrive.

Dr. CUMMINS: I am sorry, Sir, but I cannot answer the honourable member's question because I have not heard half of what the honourable member said.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, Since the honourable junior member for St. Thomas was unable to hear what I said, I rise to repeat for his benefit and the benefit of any other honourable member who is interested that in introducing the Bill, the honourable junior member for St. Thomas made reference to shops selling local handicrafts being allowed to open only on public holidays on which tourist ships are on visit to the island. I would like him to state clearly whether this amendment is only applicable to public holidays on which tourists arrive or whether it applies to opening on any public holiday.

Dr. CUMMINS: The amendment is general; it applies to any public holiday.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT POSTPONED AFTER DISCUSSION

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, The next Order of the Day stands under the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1901.

That Bill deals with the salaries of Registering Officers and as a result of the Dos Santos Report, it has been decided by the Government to increase the remuneration paid to those officers who have received the same salary from the time they were appointed in 1944. The scale of salaries as is set out in Section 2 of this Bill to amend Sub-section 3 of Section 12 of the Act, shows that the greatest amount is paid

to the Registering Officer for St. Michael and for the obvious reason that it is the parish that has the greatest population. It would then be seen that the Registering Officers for the City of Bridgetown and the parish of Christ Church are paid a salary slightly less than that of St. Michael and the Registering Officers of the other parishes will be paid a similar figure which is lower than that of the other three Registering Officers mentioned. These salaries are based on a population basis. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I must draw to the notice of the honourable introducer of this Bill that every measure that has passed this House for increase in salaries and wages of persons employed in the Public Service according to the recommendations of the Turner Committee and the Dos Santos Report was dated as from April, 1952. This Bill is not so. I feel that the cost of living is the same for Registering Officers as any other Government Officers and I would like to know whether this is an oversight or whether it was deliberately done. I happen to know that one of the Registering Officers made an enquiry about the matter and was told that it was incorrect. Whether it is intentional or an oversight, I think that the additional pay for these officers should take effect as from April 1952 just as was done with other employees in the Public Service. It is a question of common justice.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Lest the honourable member be thought to be singing a solo, I rise to support him. I am aware that the argument can be put forward that the work which Registering Officers are called upon to perform is part-time but I can reply to that by saying that other part-time officers were paid retrospectively. I am going to make another observation and it is this. While, according to the addendum, the Salaries Commissioner made no recommendations so far as Registering Officers were concerned, the Whitley Council giving thought to them has only recommended the parsimonious amount of \$5 or thereabouts per month more for those officers. This House has given instructions to the effect that with the implementation of the Maude Bill, which it is hoped would soon be on the Statute Book, that those officers would not have a five-year job, because they would be having work to do daily to keep the records up-to-date for local government use. I take it that they will be the persons appointed under the Act to make a register of the voters for Local Government. I wonder whether this Chamber realises that the increase to these Registering Officers is parsimonious. I think we can use the words of the honourable senior member for St. Michael when he said that it was not a question of paying a salary for what they did, but for the responsibility which they have and the integrity which is expected of them. The honourable member used those remarks when it was agreed to pay them \$50 a month. Now, they have only been raised to \$55 and have more responsibility than before. I feel that they should have been given a greater increase. It is not a question that they have to work once in every five years. I would like to make the suggestion that this matter be postponed so that the Whitley Council and the Executive can look over the matter again, particularly in view of the fact that the Local Government Bill would soon be put on the Statute Book and as a result, the Registering Officers would have to work every year.

(A VOICE: When the time comes).

Sir, I am suggesting that this Bill be postponed so that the salaries of these Registering Officers be increased to at least \$10 a month more. I am going to make that suggestion.

Dr. CUMMINS: Sir, I must thank the honourable junior member for St. John for bringing the matter of retrospective pay to my attention. I would like to assure honourable members that it was only an oversight because when last we dealt with the increases of salaries to Part-time Officers, it was retrospective in their case. It therefore can only be an oversight on this occasion.

I am asking leave to postpone this Bill so that it can go back to the Executive and be corrected. As regards to the point made by the honourable senior member for the City, I would like to tell him again that the salaries were worked out on a population basis and the figures were arrived at on that score. Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone this Bill.

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

BILL TO AMEND PEASANTS LOAN BANK ACT, 1936

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Peter: Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, This Bill to amend the Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936, is to give the Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank and staff an increase in salary in like manner as other members of the Service who were dealt with by the Salaries Commissioner. It is also making provision for the increase in staff by an additional clerk.

Sir, everyone who is aware of the working of the Peasants' Loan Bank knows that the work has increased in recent months by an amendment to the Act which liberalises the Bank. In addition to that, Mr. Haynes, the Manager, is also Manager of the Housing Loan Fund which also has stepped up the work of this officer. The Government has it in mind to amalgamate these two departments, one reason being that the businesses of these two branches of work deals with the same section of people in a broad way. Government is also making amendments to the Housing Loan Fund so that it would be dealt with by regulations. As is known, the Executive Committee controls that Fund and it is proposed to also increase the salary paid to Mr. Haynes for operating that Fund.

According to the increases in salaries under this Bill, it is proposed that the manager's salary which is at present \$3,456 per annum be increased to \$3,840 per annum. It also makes room, as I have said already, for an additional clerk at the same salary as is paid to Long Grade Clerks in the Civil Service. There is now uniformity in that respect and I do not think any honourable member would say that these salaries are not now in order. As far as Mr. Haynes is concerned, I think he is an admirable officer and has done good work for not only the Government but for his country. In both ventures, Mr. Haynes was a pioneer and it was due to his personality and drive that he made a success of them. He deserves the gratuity of his countrymen, therefore, anything that is done to make his financial status more buoyant, no one should begrudge.

With these few remarks, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, in view of the expressions of super efficiency on the part of the Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank as has been mentioned by the previous speaker, one is inclined to the view that the remuneration of that officer should be some-

thing more than that of a Senior Clerk in the Government Service. That officer is manager of two institutions. If comparison is made with his job and that of a Senior Clerk of a Department, there is no comparison at all, neither in that respect nor in the responsibility which is attached to his post. It may be argued that the Manager is in receipt of additional remuneration from the other post he holds but that should not be taken into account because it is only due to the fact that you have a man with this exceptional ability that you have been able to combine the two posts. In other words, if and when this officer retires, you will most likely have to look for two officers to put in those two jobs. They will have to be carried out by two separate managers. I recall, as the honourable junior member for St. Peter recalled, that in addition to Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank at one time, Mr. Haynes also supervised the entire distribution of funds sent back to this colony from the United States by Barbadian workers and at one time those funds paid out by him were in the vicinity of two million dollars. When that officer could no longer do both jobs, Government had to bring in somebody at twice as much salary as that which was given him.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is fair to the debate to bring in something outside of the Peasants Loan Bank Act. I do not think it is fair to bring in something that was done under another administration. I think it is well known that this Government has recognised all the services which Mr. Haynes has rendered in this colony in so much that it has brought in a Bill to give him pension when he retires on all his services and some of his services were rendered in places where he would normally not have been given a pension.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter was the first who made mention of services performed by that officer other than that of Peasants' Loan Bank Manager.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable introducer of this Bill said that not only was Mr. Haynes manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank but that he was also in charge of the Labour Welfare Fund. It was also said by the honourable introducer of the Bill that although it might not appear in this Bill, consideration must be given to the fact that the Peasants' Loan Bank Manager was also getting money from the Labour Welfare fund. Sir, it is well known that I am not in favour with these abnormally high levels of salaries which are attached to certain Government posts but if you look at this Bill, you will see that the rate of increase, in so far as this particular officer is concerned, is less than similar officers in the Government Service. If you look at it and work it out, you will see that the increase from \$3,456 to \$3,840 per annum is only a matter of \$36 per month more. The Turner Report and the Cuke Report, very conveniently, left the remuneration of this Officer to the Directors of the Bank. They did not treat him specifically as a Civil Servant. His job was counted as outside their terms of reference. I will finalise that point of my remarks by saying that it is not altogether fair merely because you have a good horse to ride him in more than one race without giving him the care and attention to which he is entitled for each race in which you are putting him into.

Now, Sir, reference was also made to the scope which the Bank extended its terms since there was a liberalisation in the Act. It was said that it had extended so much that the work warranted an in-

crease in the number of clerks from one to two. The liberalisation of the Bank includes the extension of credit facilities to non-owners of land, fertilisation and things of that nature. Under the Labour Welfare Fund, which reference has been made, the people who borrow the operation of the Peasants' Loan Bank are not entitled to borrow money to assist with the repair or construction of their homes.

(A VOICE: Who said so?)

So far as I know, the distribution of those funds is confined only to the people who work in the sugar industry. The honourable member knows very well that its business has only to do with peasants.

(A VOICE: But who are the peasants but those people who work in the sugar industry?)

Sir, I have never said that some peasants do not get loans from that fund. What I wanted to say was that the Manager should be given power to use his discretion to assist peasants here and there from that fund who are not deemed as workers in the industry. I am suggesting that facilities for borrowing from the Labour Welfare Fund should be given to peasants as peasants for making repairs to their houses. I am suggesting that if it be found contrary to general principle to grant peasants loan facilities from the Labour Welfare Fund we might borrow a certain amount of money either from the Stabilization Fund or the Rehabilitation Fund and put it in a certain fund so as to lend peasants who want to repair or construct homes.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I do not want to go in for criticisms of anybody but Mr. Haynes had that headache. However, he has given me the assurance that once a person is within the framework of the Act and is in some way contributing to the sugar industry, he would be granted a loan. I have seen some very good results from co-operatives.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise at a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member does not seem to understand what I said. I said that I know Mr. Haynes would use his discretion in the granting of loans, but I suggested that the principle should be laid down one way or the other and that it should be left to the discretion of Mr. Haynes or any manager.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I know that the particular officer is trying to administer the loans on the principles laid down by Government and yet trying to administer them as widely as possible to persons. I think he is doing that part of his job admirably. The honourable senior member for St. Philip probably would like these loans extended to people other than peasants, such as artisans. I would like to see that happen also and I believe all honourable members would not be in disagreement with that view.

Mr. COX: I am not replying on behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Peter, because I know that he can do so very ably, but surely, I must point out that the honourable senior member for St. Philip is really not right in his remarks relative to the funds being loaned to peasants. I have had talks with peasants myself and I know that peasants other than those who work in the sugar industry have been able to secure loans. In other words, any person who can grow canes and sell them to a factory is able to borrow from that fund to repair their houses.

(A VOICE: How long?)

It is true that there is a large number of sugar workers as compared with that sort of peasant who borrow from that fund as well as you will find that there are many houses belonging to people in a worse

condition than those owned by peasants. But you will find that money is loaned to peasants from time to time to repair their houses and even to those peasants who do not work in the sugar industry or on a plantation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I must say something in reply to the last remark of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. Until the honourable member had spoken, I was prepared to keep quiet but the minute he said that peasants other than persons who own a half acre of land or those who work in the sugar industry have received benefits under the Labour Welfare Fund, that is to say, were able to get loans to repair their houses, I am prepared to say that is a departure from the general principle. As I understand it—and I get it from people who interview me daily—that fund operates purely for people who work in the sugar industry. During election time, members of the party to which I belong actually argued that peasants, road workers, labourers who were sugar workers the day before,—if I may put it that way,—should be given opportunity to borrow from that Fund, but we were told that it was only for sugar workers. Now, I have heard from the honourable senior member for St. Michael that peasants other than agricultural workers have had the opportunity of borrowing from that Fund. I suggest strongly to the honourable member and more so to the honourable junior member for St. Peter that if that is so, it should be made a general principle. If one or two other than those who work in the sugar industry have got loans from that fund, then there is discrimination somewhere.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I do not think people fully realise how interwoven are the sugar workers in this country. It is a fact that 90 percent and even more of the peasants are sugar workers, so for all practical purposes, you will see that only a very small percentage of the workers of the colony would not be entitled to borrow from the Labour Welfare Fund. Nearly all of the peasants were agricultural workers before they obtained small holdings and most of them still have to work on a sugar estate to supplement their earnings. Those few peasants who do not have to work extra to make their living are those who would not need a loan from that fund.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a mistake in the wording of Clause 2 of the Objects and Reasons of this Bill. The clause reads as follows:—

This bill seeks to give effect to the above recommendations and the effective date of the new salaries will be 1st April, 1952, as was done in the case of the Civil Service. The salary of the Manager and Clerk was last fixed in 1949 by the Peasants' Loan Bank (Amendment) Act, 1949 (1949—36).

I presume that that is not strictly correct. It is true that the honourable junior member for St. Peter did mention that Government had in mind the reorganisation of the two Departments of which Mr. Haynes is head and that would mean that the two salaries combined would be equivalent to the salary of a Head of a department. I hope this scheme of Government, as was told by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, will soon be brought down to the House because the Board of the Peasants Loan Bank has discussed this matter long ago and forwarded its recommendations. It is now I think over six months that these recommendations have been forwarded to the Government. We visualised that the further extension of the Act, and the widening of the scope of the Bank would increase the duties of the Manager. The Board also foresaw that a normal human being could not efficiently perform the duties of Manager both of the Peasants Loan Bank and of the Labour Welfare Fund and therefore, the recom-

mendations are to that effect. Personally, I feel it is virtually impossible for the present Manager and his staff to perform efficiently the work of those two departments, however willing they might be to do so. And I have been supported in my view by complaints which I have received from many people of my constituency that applications which they have made for loans from the Labour Welfare Fund have been kept back for a very long time. On enquiring of the Manager the reason for the delay, he told me that his duties and that of his staff had increased so much recently that he finds it impossible to look after all the applications as quickly as he would like.

I hope that the Government would hurry up with the amalgamation scheme and bring it before the House in the very near future. I can assure the House that with the last extension of the Peasants Loan Bank Act, the number of applications for loans from that Bank has increased tremendously and as a result is putting a great amount of work on the Manager and his present staff. The work at this Department has increased to such an extent that applicants for loans under the Labour Welfare Fund must suffer as a result. The only thing which I see can ease the situation would be to increase the staff at the other department also. I throw out that hint because I think it is right to say from my knowledge of the situation that the staffs at both departments are working under pressure and their work is going to increase with the increase demands by the people.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, Today is one which I have heard many speeches that were far fetched from the matter which was before the House. I can quite appreciate that the giving of a certain amount of latitude is something which every tolerant Speaker would allow. However, you will realise that the Labour Welfare Fund and its operation has nothing to do with the Bill which is before the House, it being brought in merely because the Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank is also Manager of that Fund. As has been said, it is the opinion that the holder of the office of Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank should not be doing any job other than that. I too did mention something of the other job which that officer was doing when I made it clear to the House that this Bill does not give his total emoluments because it was known that the officer performed other work for Government. I think I went further and told the House that it will have to deal later with regulations and matters affecting the Labour Welfare Fund because the work of administration of that Fund had increased and therefore would affect the officer with which we are dealing. I however did stress that the main thing with which we were dealing was that of increasing the emoluments and staff of the Peasants' Loan Bank. This is the thing with which we are dealing and for the information of the honourable senior member for St. Philip, I would like him to bear in mind that this is the one thing with which this House is considering. However, I will tell the honourable member that no single man can hold two whole-time jobs. One can only hold a whole-time job, and probably do something else along with it. But this is not the case with Mr. Haynes who is Manager of both the Peasants' Loan Bank and the Labour Welfare Fund. If honourable members remember, the Salaries Commissioner in his report recommended a salary of \$5,760 per annum for this officer but that you should abolish the post of Manager of the Labour Welfare Fund and amalgamate the two departments in one with a single officer controlling both. At the present time, Mr. Haynes operates the two departments from the same building. The Government proposes to give that officer the same salary as was

recommended by the Salaries Commissioner, but because you are dealing with only the Peasants' Loan Bank, the proposal for increase is what you see—\$3,840 per annum. The operation of the Labour Welfare Fund, which is the other part of the work of the Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank, comes under a different administration, it being controlled by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

The honourable senior member for St. Thomas spoke about delays. Experience will show the honourable member that delays are necessary in any form of democratic process and only dictators can hurry up things. As I have said, the operation of the Labour Welfare Fund is being dealt with and it has been decided to increase the salary of Manager of that Fund who is also Manager of the Peasants Loan Bank to \$1,920 per annum. I will tell the honourable senior member for St. Philip this much more. Mr. Haynes' salary today is £900 per annum and these proposals will increase it to £1,200 per annum. I do not think the honourable member can say that this is not in keeping with the salary increases by the Turner Committee. In the process of time, it is proposed to amalgamate the two departments as I have said under one head and when that is done, there would be no difficulty in fixing the salary scale of this officer as it is fixed already.

The next point which I want to reply to, but which has nothing to do with this Bill is with regard to loans under the Labour Welfare Fund. There is no regulation at all which precludes a peasant as a peasant from getting a loan from that Fund, so long as he is engaged in the Sugar Industry. I should say that at this stage, especially for the honourable senior member for St. Philip, that there will be no need to borrow from the Rehabilitation Fund to swell the Labour Welfare Fund because the Labour Welfare Fund has enough money for the carrying out of housing loans. I may also say that anyone who has to do with administrative matters with regard to lending a person money to repair or build a house would know that before that can be done an inspector must go to the person wanting the loan and get a lot of information. There is also a limit to the amount of loans which can be made yearly from the fund. Therefore, if Government has a certain number of officers looking after the granting of loans, you would realise that Government cannot increase the distribution of the loans to a greater extent than the administrative machinery can allow them to do it. What I am drawing to honourable members' attention is that the amount of loans which can be handled in one year depend entirely on the Fund and the number of people who can handle it efficiently; if not, in later years the honourable senior member for St. Philip may come to the House and make the complaint that Government is lending out money without seeing that the necessary safeguards were made. That is one of the things for which an increase of staff will be made. I will say again that the Government is making every effort to deal with this other matter as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered the points that honourable members have raised.

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

On motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly:

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

RESOLUTION RE ABSENCE FROM DUTIES BY HEADMASTER, COMBERMERE SCHOOL

Mr. VAUGHAN: Before the House be adjourned Mr. Speaker, I beg for leave to give notice of a resolution.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to give notice of the following resolution:—

Resolved that in the opinion of this House, the Headmaster of Combermere School has been grossly neglecting his duties as headmaster of that institution by his repeated absence and in other directions and that a Commission of inquiry be appointed by his Excellency the Governor to go into the matter and make recommendations.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, I am raising objections to that resolution. My objection is based on the grounds that the Headmaster of that school cannot be absent from school without permission of the Governing Body; therefore it is a matter for the Governing Body.

OBJECTION TO ORDER NO. 19 PLACED NO. 1 OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg that Order No. 19 of Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to inform the honourable members that all Orders which deal with parochial matters are out of order at this stage.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to impeach any ruling made by you at this stage, but I would like to draw Your Honour's attention that I am inclined to view this matter in a different light from that expressed by Your Honour owing to the fact that I have made a diligent search on this matter and have found no authority to support that view. I would therefore ask Your Honour to reconsider your opinion which you have expressed on this matter. It is custom and usage of parliament that any Bills which are before the House are the prerogative of the House; they are not petitions of any set of persons. According to the view expressed by Your Honour, any money which is borrowed by one Vestry need not be deemed repayable by the in-coming Vestry as soon as the old Vestry goes out of office. Obviously, there is no authority which says that when one vestry raises a loan, another vestry cannot pay it back. I am inclined to the view that the Vestry which presented a petition to this House for the passing of the Bill, consulted the people on the matter and therefore any new Vestry coming into being while this Vestry's petition is before the House cannot affect the petition; only the passing of this House—not the passing of the Vestry—can put this petition out of order. I am not impeaching any ruling which Your Honour made on this matter, I am only putting to the House my view on the matter.

Mr. MAPP: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, The honourable member on my left is a lawyer and maybe that is the reason why he has argued both

ways on this matter. A similar case happened with a Bill under my name and the said honourable member rose and pointed out when I was about to move the motion for the second reading that the Bill had to be struck off the Order Paper and for the reason that the Vestry which presented the petition to that Bill had died. The honourable member seems to be contradicting himself by the argument he is putting forward now.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 12th January, 1954, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. COX: I beg to second the motion for the adjournment of this House.

The question that this House be now adjourned until next Tuesday, 12th January, 1954, at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th January, 1954.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present :

His Honour, Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mr. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES:

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I am commanded to lay the following Papers:—

Message No. 2/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable House of Assembly notifying the Honourable House that His Excellency proposes to address both Houses of the Legislature on the 1st of February, 1954, and of the appointment of Mr. Grantley Herbert Adams, C.M.G., Q.C., as Premier.

The Message reads as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 2/1954

*His Excellency The Governor
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly, with reference to paragraph 2 of his Message No. 1/1954, that he proposes to address both Chambers of the Legislature on Monday the 1st February, 1954, at 10.00 a.m. His Excellency will wear uniform.

2. In accordance with the procedure set out in paragraph 22 of the Acting Governor's despatch No.

303 of the 30th April, 1953, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which formed Enclosure I to His Excellency's Message No. 25/1953, His Excellency proposes to appoint Mr. Grantley Herbert Adams, C.M.G., Q.C., to be Premier with effect from the 1st February, 1954.

Government House,

Bridgetown.

12th January, 1954.

ROBERT ARUNDELL,

Governor.

(M.P. S.260/S.1 Vol. IV)

Mr. ADAMS: Also, Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended on the 30th September, 1953, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Mr. ADAMS: On behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I beg to lay—

Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th September, 1953.

Mr. MAPP entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$60,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 31 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Sir, This resolution has reference to Salaries Revision.

Mr. ADAMS: On behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$921 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I. Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 32 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: On behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Peter:

Bill intituled an act to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money resolutions of which I have just given notice.

QUESTIONS

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

Whether Government is aware of existence of dissatisfaction amongst casual workers employed by Departments, such as Highways and Transport, Waterworks and Public Works, because (unlike certain other Public and Private Employees) they are not allowed "time off" during working hours (on any days when private commercial houses are closed for cricket or races) without deduction from their day's pay?

(2) Will Government in view of the close proximity of the M.C.C. Cricket Tour, give sympathetic consideration to the granting of "time off", without deduction from pay, to such casual workers as are actually employed at the time on such days as the City stores are closed for cricket?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, was read a first time.

POSTPONEMENT OF ORDERS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1, 2 and 3 and to take Order No. 11 as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT and Mr. LEWIS entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph: Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: As honourable members will see this Bill as well as the two following, are merely carrying out the decisions of His Excellency the Governor that there should be a ministerial system and therefore, this Bill seeks to give assent to the increase of emoluments to members of the Executive Committee, some of whom would now become ministers, as well as some who are non-ministerial members. Honourable members will see from the wording of the proposals which appeared in the Message of His Excellency the Governor when he gave intimation of the proposed introduction of ministerial status, it sets out clearly what would be the salaries of the ministers. This Bill now presents all the salaries therein proposed.

I think it is quite clear as to the implications of this Bill, but anticipating possible questions, honourable members will see that instead of as before when members of the Executive Committee got paid as members of the House and then separately as members of the Executive Committee, they are now paid as ministers, the implication being that their emoluments would continue whether the House is dissolved or not. I am informed that members of the Executive Committee should have been paid—although no rule has been established—their full remuneration for any period which they acted as members of the Executive Committee even though the House is dissolved. It has been considered as only fair and right. I will refer in passing that the Speaker who

by law has to get around at all times as Speaker whether there is a dissolution of the House or not, until he ceases to be Speaker, should also be paid his remuneration during his period as Speaker. The Speaker and members of the Executive Committee have a duty on them to continue as members even though there be a dissolution of the House. The wording follows the English practice. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, so far as this Bill is concerned, I must say that it is a necessary Bill for ministerial status, but so far as members of the Executive who are official members and non-members of this House are concerned, I fail to see why they should have an increase in remuneration. I say that for the reason that it can be argued that those members are not Cabinet members at all and therefore they are unlike members of the House on the Executive who have to accept greater responsibility and are solely responsible for the running of the Government—at least to this House for decisions and the actual administrative work.

I think it is really advantageous to members of the Executive Committee who are non-members of this House to be there at all. They are in the fortunate position of knowing all secrets of the Government. Ordinary members of the House cannot share those secrets because they are not members of the Executive. Sir, these non-House members, who are non-official members of the Executive are merely appointed by the Governor. They are not elected by the people; yet they enjoy a privilege which is unique in the history of responsible government. I would not like anybody to think that I would like to vote myself an increased remuneration and do not want to consider any person on the Executive, but I do think that those non-House members on the Executive who non-officials are not responsible for any decisions taken; they enjoy a very high privilege, and one that very many members of the community would like to enjoy. I am not saying that they get any gain from it but many persons would be willing to sit in on that Committee and enjoy that privilege. Within recent years, this Honourable House has been stripped of many of the privileges which it once enjoyed and they have been transferred to the Executive Committee, so it can be seen that those privileges have been transferred to those people who have not faced the electors. Sir, the decisions which are arrived at on that body, those members can say that they had nothing to do with those decisions. Those members do not have to come out in the open, therefore, you do not know what opinion they hold on any question that comes to that body for decision. Sir, all they need do is to merely sit in on that body and exercise a great influence. I fail to see why they should be granted an increase in remuneration. Personally, I think it is carrying it too far. I think those members expected to be knocked off that body altogether. They did not expect to be still members of that body and to be getting this increase in remuneration as well. They are placed on that body usually to represent the particular interest in which they are interested themselves. As I have said, their privilege is one in which many people would forego a salary to get. It must be also remembered that it is unusual for people in such circumstances as theirs to need a legislative salary. I do think that some steps should be taken to delete them from superseding to a higher remuneration than the one which they are getting now.

There are one or two things which I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who is in charge of this Bill to consider before it reaches

the Committee stage. I would like to know whether the members of the Government here, are in a different position to members of the Cabinet in England and are not entitled to their salaries as I propose to say when the next Bill comes up for consideration, without having the Head of the Administration to exercise any authority over them by the signing of a warrant for them. I can quote Your Honour's case in dealing with that question. I think it is correct to say that the Speaker of the House of Commons is on a par with His Lordship the Chief Judge of Barbados with regard to the drawing of his salary under the authority of the Act. I think it is giving the Head of the Administration a little too much power over the Premier and his ministers when he cannot get his salary and theirs until they are signed by the Head of the Administration,—somebody whom the Premier may be at variance on important points.

Another thing which I would like the honourable senior member St. Joseph to tell me something about before this Bill goes into Committee is why should Clause 4 of this Bill be worded as it is: "This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of February, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four." It is true that we do not know when it would be passed, but bills are not usually worded that way. The Bills that come before us are usually worded, "This Act shall come into operation," they do not contain "be deemed" to have. Why this Bill should not read: "This Act shall come into operation on the first of February, etc."

If I may refer to non-official, non-House members on the Executive, I have not seen the usual organ for criticising the Members of the House and their getting free meals and things of that sort mentioned any thing of those non-official non-House members on the Executive getting a higher remuneration. That organ has mentioned nothing on that point at all and that is the reason why I feel it is necessary to bring it to the notice of members of this House. I do think that it is a mistake to grant those members on the Executive an increase in remuneration.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took their seats while Mr. LEWIS was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Since I am in agreement with the honourable member who has just spoken on that particular point, I think I should begin at the point where he has left off. On my first reading of the Bill, it amused me to discover that it was also proposed to increase the salaries of the other members of the Executive who are not members of the House of Assembly. There can be little justification for this suggestion. So far as we know, the only other member of the Executive to whom the new constitutional advance will place additional burdens of office is the Colonial Secretary or the Chief Secretary as he would be called, owing to the fact that he would have to be Government Spokesman in the Other Place. It can reasonably be assumed that the Chief Secretary will have additional work to perform in the Other Place, therefore, perhaps, there is some justification for attaching a specific salary to the post of the person who is the Government Spokesman in the Upper Chamber, and if for the time being that person happens to be the Chief Secretary, then you are giving him compensation for the duties he would have to perform there. In the Upper Parliament of England, the duties of spokesman for the Government are performed by a cabinet member. I think it is the Lord Chancellor's job as a cabinet member to be the Government spokesman in the House of Lords. As the honourable member pointed out, the other members of the

Executive Committee who are not members of the House, and who are by their calling representatives of special interest, would have no more duties placed on them, under the new set-up. They would have no more work, nor no more responsibility in formulating policy or otherwise. They just have to sit there more or less in an advisory capacity. Yet for all that, we still have this proposal to increase their remuneration by \$60 a month. It is an extravagant waste of public funds to increase their remuneration. As a matter of fact none of us can see the justification for keeping them in the Cabinet at all, for their advice is not needed on any matter that may come before the Government. Their advice may be taken below Cabinet level, that is to say, if the Cabinet has to discuss a matter of sugar interest or of any special interest to the mercantile community, there is no reason why at a special meeting held for that purpose, the Cabinet cannot get the advice of the representatives of that special interest. Bear in mind that the advice of those people may or may not be taken at Cabinet level. They are only wanted personally, so to speak to make up a number. Even in the Bushe Experiment their presence was purely in an advisory capacity. They were not needed in the formulation of Government policy unless members of the Executive from the House chose to be persuaded by the advice they give, therefore, there is no reason why this advice must be taken at Cabinet level, so that, added to the evil of keeping them there, you are now proceeding to increase their remuneration for no earthly reason whatsoever. I am going to concede that the Government spokesman in the second Chamber, whoever he might be, is entitled to increase remuneration under the proposed constitutional advance but as regards to the other members of the Executive, in my humble opinion, they are not entitled to one cent more and I sincerely hope honourable members would agree when the times comes to the deletion of the appropriate words in the section which will give them this increased salary. When it comes to the Government spokesman in the Upper Chamber who, as I have said earlier, is entitled to increased remuneration, that is also to me a debatable question. Why this position should remain in the hands of the Chief Secretary, especially now that we are having five full-time ministers, I do not know. I personally am of the opinion that with the introduction of Ministerial Status the post of Colonial Secretary could have been completely abolished with our particular constitution and with the division of Government departments into five separate and distinct ministries which if more or less independent, and properly organised so as to run on an efficient basis, would not want a Colonial Secretary and a Governor, unless the Governor will do nothing. As a matter of fact, Sir, if you read the proposals in the dispatches which came down with ministerial status, you will wonder what we have a Governor here for and a Colonial Secretary too. The important confidential work will be removed from the Colonial Secretariat to Government House and you are organising your Secretariat into five distinct ministries which would have their own Secretariat and what not. And you are doing that while retaining the post of Colonial Secretary.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member in order to criticise a vote of the House? This House has already accepted the proposals as were contained in His Excellency's Message. The honourable member is now saying they should not be so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made an observation that the

honourable senior member for St. Philip is out of order on the reference which he has just made. I do agree, to my mind that I gave the honourable senior member for St. Philip some latitude. The honourable member may not reflect on anything that this House has made a decision. The honourable member knows well enough that he cannot do that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: While I am in agreement that an honourable member should not reflect on a vote of this House, I think the honourable leader of this House is mixed up to some extent. Any measure of this House can be rescinded at a future occasion and if that be the case there is no reason why I cannot say that we cannot do away—

Mr. SPEAKER: But a measure will have to be brought down for the House to say whether the measure should be rescinded at a future occasion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well if that be the case, there is nothing else for me to do than to say that there should be one minister less than what is contained in this Bill on the ground that five are superfluous and I will give my reasons for so doing. If you have a Colonial Secretary, you do not need five ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip is again reflecting on a decision of this House. The honourable member must not do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am going to move a motion that we only need four ministers under our ministerial set up. If I may give my reasons for so doing—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I will be able to entertain that motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, This Bill seeks under Section II, to provide remuneration for members of the Cabinet and also for other members of the Executive Committee. It also fixes the rate of remuneration for those members. The salaries for the Premier and the other members of the Cabinet are fixed under Section III, Sub-section 2. It is proposed that the Premier should be remunerated at \$9,600 per annum and the other ministers, not exceeding four, at the rate of \$7,200 per annum. I propose when this House goes into Committee on this Bill and deals with Section 3 to ask for the deletion of 'four' and the insertion of 'three' in its place so that Mr. Premier, would have three other ministers. My reason for so doing—

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I must object to the remarks of the honourable member. He is again reflecting on something that has been passed by this Legislature. This Legislature has said what the number of ministers required under a ministerial system should be. That was done merely in order to prevent this House, now that the Bill is before it, from reducing that number. This Bill only seeks to carry out what has been agreed to by the Legislature. The honourable senior member for St. Philip is quite out of order to make such a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip is saying what he proposes to do if allowed to do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am saying that this Bill seeks to fix the salary for the Premier and four other ministers. The rate of remuneration which is proposed for the Premier is \$9,600 per annum and that for the other ministers is \$7,200. That salary has nothing to do with the other things which will come before us in another Bill such as travelling allowance and entertainment allowance. Well now, I am saying that there is no justification for paying these fantastic salaries to ministers in Barbados except on the decree that their duties would be whole-

time. One cannot see the need for five ministers. What would they have to do if they work wholtime? It can only mean one thing. If the salaries are to be so high—the only justification for whole-time work—then there must be the minimum number of ministers. That is how it appears to me. Sir, there was a time—not so long ago—when the work of Government in this Chamber was conducted by one man and that was the Attorney General.

(A VOICE: All that is ancient history.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is again reflecting on a previous vote of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am in no way attempting to do so. I am justifying the position which I wish to adopt later. I am not reflecting adversely on any previous vote. I am merely leading up to the matter of my argument. I will do everything to observe Your Honour's ruling.

Sir, there was a time when the work of this House was done by the Attorney General and the work of the Government Departments by Departments Heads. Now, you are to have your work done in the Legislature by five people with the addition of secretaries and perhaps under secretaries in the ministries. And you will be having all of that with your Department Heads. Admittedly, Sir, the volume and the complexity of Government Business have increased within the last few years, but one would never agree that it has increased to the point where these extraordinary increases are necessary. I personally do not see why the House should agree to provide these full-time salaries for five people in a small 21 x 14 colony and still retain Heads of Departments.

Sir, you cannot suggest \$9,600 per annum for a Premier for part-time work along with four other ministers at \$7,200 per annum. Unless and until a case has been made out for the implementation of these five ministers working part-time, we are not justified in agreeing to the proposals of this Bill. Since it has been made out in this Bill—I cannot agree with them *in toto*—and if this House in its considered opinion agrees to it that these salaries should be paid, there is no reason why this House should not say that it will give effect to that proposition provided that the start be made with four ministers and if it be found necessary later on to add the fifth minister to the staff.

With regard to the salary proposed here for the fifth minister, it is true to say that the Message sent to the House and to the other branch of the Legislature by His Excellency the Governor was quite contrary to what the Acting Governor, Mr. Turner, had recommended. The Message from the Acting Governor recommended that the fifth minister could be part-time.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I will have to interrupt the honourable member everytime he continues to break the Rules of this House. Sir, are we going to sit and have a debate against the Rules of this House? Are we going to sit and have a debate on something which we have already decided on? If the honourable member does not agree to the Bill, surely he has the right to register his vote against it, but the honourable member will still have to abide by the decision of the majority. Here now, the honourable member is now discussing the need for five ministers and whether or not they should work part-time or whole-time. It is against the Rules of this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate the contention of the honourable member, but if his arguments are to be taken seriously, why should this Bill be before us at all? We have to ratify by legislative action a

previous agreement of this House with regard to these proposals. If there can be no debate on it, there should have come down with it some dictatorial message. If it is sent back here, certainly, we must be able to make some discussion on it.

(A VOICE: You are entitled to say a minister should only get \$80 per month).

Certainly, if I can get up and say that, I can say why they should only get that amount. The honourable member who made that aside cannot be serious. Sir, since the principle has been already agreed on, to discuss the principle would be superfluous, but at the same time, how are we to say in our opinion—those of us who feel so—we do not want the proposals in this Bill? We should be able to give our reasons.

If the House feels that I must only say one Premier and three ministers without giving any reason for saying so, I would say that. I do however say that in our position as responsible elected members of this Chamber, we owe it a duty to ourselves and to the public to scrutinise carefully everything that comes before this House. Especially when it comes to the proposals in this Bill, in the interest of efficiency and economy of the island, we should not only scrutinise them very carefully but we should also make any recommendations which we think fit at any stage of our proceedings. Sir, the introduction of a ministerial system is costing this island a lot of money. Can you tell me what the honourable junior member for St. Thomas would do whole-time in a Government office without having to play with a pencil. Can you tell me what that honourable member would have to do every day in a week, every week in a month, and every month in a year? Sir, you cannot find sufficient work in Barbados for five ministers to do whole-time and when they start to operate, within a month they will come back to this House and say so. I am even taking into account that in the beginning of the system, the birth pang will be more. Sir, this Government is now run by officials and even if these ministers have to implement legislative policy, the official will still be there. You will also be having your permanent secretaries. What are all of them going to do whole-time? If in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, we were told that we are going to add St. Lucia or St. Vincent to Barbados, there might be some cause for all these ministries, but certainly there can be no cause with the work of Government as it is now.

Sir, I think honourable members are tied in principle to the previous decision of the Legislature in this matter, but I want to suggest that the proposals of the honourable junior member for the City with regard to the remuneration of the members of Executive Committee who are not members of this House, excluding the Government Spokesman in the Other Place, should be agreed to. Even if this House agreed to the number of ministers before, and on sober reflection afterwards, we find that number is an unnecessary burden on the people, we should not vote for this Bill as it is.

Sir, there would not be the slightest increase in the duties of the other members of the Executive. If the argument be that because members of this House will be getting an increase and because of that members of the Executive other than members of this House should also get an increase, I cannot think of anything more fantastic. Those people have no elections to face; they have no election expenses to pay, nor no additional financial burden. They only have to forego a little time from their office duties. The only expense they have to incur is that of getting gasoline to put in their cars to take them to Government House. Nothing more. I sincerely hope that this House will take some effective action against the proposals in

this Bill. I hope honourable members will agree to some reduction in the number of ministers as proposed under Section 3 of this Bill. I personally regret that the principle underlying this debate precludes me from saying what I would like to say as regards to the proposals contained in this Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats while Mr. CRAWFORD was speaking.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not got much to say but I think this House and the public of this island should have some assurance before we pass these salaries to become law that the proposed ministers will not hold other positions, if I may say, like any position in the Trade Union of this colony. Sir, we have already been made to understand that they will have to give up their professional duties, or if they are in commerce, they will have to give up such positions as they may hold in that field. I do feel that this House should have some assurance that the likely ministers would not be ministers and retain their positions as officials of the predominant Trade Union of this colony. I must be assured that this will not be carried on. I think the whole colony should have some assurance because the ministers will not be able to do justice to both positions at the same time. They cannot do justice as officials of the Trade Union and as ministers of the colony, putting aside the incompatibility and the injustice to members of the public to hold both positions. Sir, in no important community are active officials of a Trade Union, ministers of Government.

(A VOICE: What about Jamaica?)

Mr. Bustamante may be a normal Trade Union member. At any rate, Sir, we are not following Jamaica. We are following the United Kingdom. If that state of affairs takes place in a West Indian colony, it is not our duty to follow that colony. There is the possibility that the introduction of ministerial status in this colony will find the Trade Union entrenched in the same official position as it was before. We must have some assurance before we pass these salaries that that would not be so. I think honourable members have heard—we cannot prevent our ears from hearing—that there is great controversy amounting to almost a small riot in the ranks of members of the Government through one particular member who is an official of the Trade Union, insisting on being a minister and also a Trade Union official. We do not know if his insistence will prevail over the Premier.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I am sympathising with the honourable member because he may not have read the Message which came down from His Excellency the Governor which said that we will follow the United Kingdom conventions and it was on that premise that the House accepted the proposals. I think the honourable member is just wasting time with that silly speech.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I insist that this House should have some assurance.

(A VOICE: Would the honourable member say what assurance he wants?)

Sir, my views on ministerial status are well known to honourable members and members of the public. I have not much criticism to offer on this Bill. I reserve my criticisms until the time when salaries of the other members of this House will be discussed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Those of us who have made our contribution to this new departure need not say much to-day. As a matter of fact, there is not much to say but to express the view as to whether the salaries should be increased or reduced or whether we are satisfied that everything has been done to reduce

the overhead expenditure. We can only speak generally relative to the introduction of this new system of Government.

This Bill seeks to increase the salary of the two members of the Executive who are not members of this Chamber and in duty bound, I must record my vote against it. I shall do so when the time comes without any further ado because I think we on this side of the Table should be consistent. We cannot in one breath say that the expenditure of the island is soaring above level and that we do not think while developing a modern form of Government that the suggested expenditure is justified and then say that the increase in remuneration to these two members of the Executive who are not members of this House is justified. We are bound to oppose even this extra £150 per annum not only for fear that if we support it what House members on the Executive might think, that is, because of the two other members who this increase is for cannot be considered as members of the Socialist Party in power, but because we must be consistent.

The other part of the Bill seeks to make provision for remuneration of the ministers, who as I understand it, will sever their connections with commerce and any other interest of theirs so as to make this new venture a whole-time job. As we have expressed our views before on this question, we—the members of the Party to which I belong—do not think the remuneration is too much. What we said, and will say whenever the question arises, on the face of what is before us, do we need to go in for this stupendous expenditure? Do we need to pay all these salaries and other expenses? From the Message which was laid before us last week, it does appear that the Government has recognised in part our criticism. It should not surprise the public therefore, if in principle, having criticised the expenditure on this new system, we now do feel that the two members of the Executive who are not members of this House should not receive this extra \$60 per month. However, we are prepared to support the salaries offered to the ministers because we consider that they would be actually whole-time officers and would have to give up all other duties. We will have to be consistent, and anticipating that the Bill for further remuneration of honourable members of this House will be considered a little later on, I am going to let it be known now that it will be my pleasant duty to vote against it also. There is no point in saying: "Look at this extraordinary expenditure on this new system; look at how much money we are going on and on spending;" and then to say that it is quite right to give an increase to members of this House. You cannot blow hot and cold at the same time.

I was not in my place when my colleague spoke, nor did I hear all that the honourable senior member for St. Philip said, but I am partly in agreement with what I heard him say. If you look through the recommendations for the portfolios of ministers, you will see that it would seem impossible for the Minister who is taking on finance and education to do more than that portfolio, but when you take the portfolios of the other ministers altogether, you must say that they can hardly be enough to justify the appointment of the fifth minister unless the portfolios were allocated in a different way. Judging from the way the portfolios are allocated, it strikes me that a superhuman will have to take on the portfolio of finance and education as I feel that education and finance particularly is the most important portfolio, if it is going to be done properly. When a minister accepts the portfolio of education and finance, he must have creative ability; he has to do a lot of thinking and will have to study quite a lot where the finances of

this country are concerned; he has to study quite a lot so as to get this country run well and to prevent it from going down the hill. My observations on the other portfolios is that one of the ministers will only be responsible for two departments and I am wondering if there is to be a further allocation or reshuffling of the portfolios. If this is not so, I do not think it would be justifiable to have the fifth minister. Again, I will say that judging from what it appears to thinking people, judging from what is the situation in this colony to-day, it appears that every effort should be made to see whether it is possible to use four ministers instead of five. Sir, when the House goes into Committee on this Bill, I give notice that members of the party to which I belong are going to record their vote against the increase for the two members of the Executive who are not members of this Chamber.

Mr. BARROW entered the House and took his seat while Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY was speaking.

Mr. GODDARD: The honourable senior member for the City said, more or less, what members of my party have in mind, but there is one thing which I would like to add with respect to what was said about the two members on the Executive who are not members of this Chamber. In this party's memorandum to the Governor, we opposed their inclusion in the Cabinet and I have been asked since if we were serious, but we are very serious. If we are to go forward in true ministerial system, we feel that those members should be taken from the Cabinet. We meant every word we said on that point. However, they have been left in and now their salaries are being increased. Undoubtedly, it is a very small sum for their contribution at Executive level but for the same reason I have given, we are opposing the increase to their salaries. I will again say that we were very serious indeed when we said that they should not be included in a ministerial form of government.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, It seems to me as if the points made by the honourable junior member for St. John, the senior member for the City and the junior member for Christ Church and the senior member for St. Philip have not been given the serious consideration which they deserve by this House therefore, I must say that I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks made by the two honourable members who pointed out the possible dangers of having persons on the Executive who are not members of this Place and the absence of any responsibility on the part of those persons to the electorate, the public in general, and to members of this honourable Chamber. It has often been said that those persons are always nominated to protect sectional interest. However, I am hoping that when ministerial system has been in progress for a little time that some change will be made to remove those persons from the Executive Committee who are not members of this House. It is very important that ministerial system should work towards that end.

My arguments are going to be very limited on this occasion, but while I am on my feet I will remind the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that I am of the same feeling as regards the salary proposals as contained in this Bill as when we discussed the principle of the system.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, In reply to what was said, I will deal first with what the honourable member who has just sat down said. I agree with every word he says. There must come a time when it all depends on the goodwill of other members of this House and the collaboration and co-operation of the Civil Servants as to how soon would we have a

complete ministerial system in which those other persons do not sit down in Executive Committee and when the Governor would be no longer Chairman for that matter. Obviously, every colony that has emerged to full responsible government has been given this same road wherein to travel and it would be remarkable if of all people since God created this world, the Barbadians—no matter how much we are counted on for our sound commonsense by other people—were given a different road on which to travel towards full independence. The honourable senior member for St. John need not worry over that matter. I will assure him that if I can stop it in a month—not years—I will promise him to do so. However, it would be folly for us to develop the Bushe Experiment until we have reached this stage and then not show by our further deeds that there would be no justification for saying “no” to proposals which we would put forward for further development. If we show ability to govern ourselves and in the same manner as we have done to run the Bushe Experiment, then, of course, there can be no question of the Colonial Office or the United Kingdom saying “no”, you cannot have that privilege.

To go upward. The honourable junior member for Christ Church steered clear of the debate but did mention that members of his party were opposed to the increase in remuneration to the members of the Executive other than House members on the ground of the expressions of opinion which his party gave to the Acting Governor with respect to the implementation of ministerial status. We have to face realities and one reality which we have to face is this. It is true to say that there are diversities of constitutions and of political development in the British Empire and they are such that no system is entirely the same as another system—the Jamaica constitution is somewhat different from that of Trinidad and each of those colonies being different from ours, and that of Nigeria of necessity being a vast difference to the rest, and so on. Therefore, let us face realities. Can we hope to be the sole colony to reach such a stage where we would be granted basic ministerial status abolishing nominated members of the Executive, the Attorney General, Colonial Secretary and the Governor from the Cabinet? In this step from the Bushe Experiment we have got to this stage and we must reach a further stage, but it will be left to us sitting around here with the co-operation of the Civil Servants to bring that desire about as quickly as possible. However much that should have been brought about before, it is stupid to expect that stage would be given by Colonial Office on this occasion. (I am talking of the British Empire at present I am not talking of what may happen in any other country). I repeat that if we show ourselves worthy as I have no doubt we will show ourselves worthy of running ourselves in the same way as the Canadians, Australians and New Zealanders did when they took the same step as we are about to take, then the step between this constitution and the constitution when no official or non-party member, even including the Governor will sit in the Cabinet will follow soon. You do not get rid of the officials and keep the Governor; when you reach that stage the Governor and everybody goes from out of the Cabinet.

I repeat that we on this side of the Table are completely in accord with the wishes and the feelings of members on the other side that nobody but a party member should be on the Cabinet, but when you do so you must get rid of everybody from the Governor down.

(A VOICE: Oh no.)

That honourable member who said “Oh no” still has the Crown Colony mentality. I will however say again: let us face realities. Can you picture in 1953 the Colonial Office saying: “Let the Premier be Chairman of the Cabinet; let the Attorney General and the Colonial Secretary remain in their offices?”

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise at a point of explanation.

Mr. ADAMS: I have not misquoted anybody, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have just risen to point out that no member of this House has suggested that at this stage of our constitutional development there should be a simultaneous removal of both the officials and the nominated members from the Executive Committee. What was said was (1) that the nominated members should not be on the Cabinet; and (2) that there should be no increase in their salaries.

Mr. ADAMS: Certainly, Sir, that is no point of order. If the honourable member were listening carefully to what I was saying, he would not have insisted on interrupting me. I started off by telling about the diversity of constitutions in the different colonies, from the point where officials and nominated members outnumbered elected members to the point where elected members outnumbered non-elected members, in the Legislative Chamber, and then to the stage in which we have reached—the Bushe Experiment. We do hope that we will soon reach the stage where a member from the Other Place will not be on the Executive at all. But what I was saying was: Can anybody point to me a single system in the whole history of the British Empire, from the first Elizabeth to this time, when any colony merely got rid of its officials and kept the Governor on the Executive? They all went. When you have reached the stage where you have a party system and a majority number of elected members on the Executive, you usually do not want the non-elected, neither do you keep the officials; you let them all go. Therefore, when the honourable junior member for Christ Church said that his party's point of view was that non-members of the Government should not be on the Cabinet and you should get rid of them, but not meaning to get rid of the official members including the Governor, he is not quite correct.

Mr. GODDARD: I think I made myself quite clear when I said the two members of the Executive who are not members of this House.

Mr. ADAMS: I say again, if the honourable member only means to get rid of them, he still has the Crown Colony mentality.

(A VOICE): Do you think the honourable member for Christ Church and those of his party wish to do away with them?

Mr. ADAMS: The point I am making is that under no constitutional development in the British Empire in any period whatever, from the first Elizabeth, would you find a system in which you step from that jumble of elected members and nominated officials which include the Colonial Secretary, Attorney General and others into a Cabinet system without any of them. Can you point to me an occasion where you had the majority of elected members that you got rid of the nominated members and kept the officials? It never existed. That is what I am trying to tell honourable members. That is what I was trying to tell them when I told them to face realities. Of course, ultimately, the proper working of a proper constitution can only be attained either by running it from Whitehall or by running it yourself. All this half-way house leads to is but confusion and complication. A constitution can best be run

either by Colonial Office or by yourself out and out. That is all I am saying. In facing realities, let us face what the British has done. They allow you the constitution where the nominated officials must sit down with you but that is all of their job. I agree with the honourable junior member for Christ Church that they should not be there but when they go the others must go also. That is the only thing for which we can hope.

I have already replied to the honourable junior member for St. John. The honourable junior member for the City is opposed to the increase to be given to the Executive members other than those from this House. If I may completely answer the argument of the honourable junior member for St. John I will point him to His Excellency's Message on the introduction of ministerial status to which this House replied as follows:—

"The House appreciates and strongly approves of the principle that Ministerial Government should function in accordance with the constitutional conventions observed in the United Kingdom and pledges its support to following the traditions of Parliamentary Government which the Mother of Parliaments under a constitutional monarch has so long maintained."

We have directly said we will obey those conventions. Why does the honourable junior member for St. John continue to say that Trade Union officials must resign from Government when we have said 'yes' to that already. The honourable member knows that I made no secret of the fact that Ministerial Status is three years overdue because those who would have to run a Ministerial System of Government realise that their position which they were not willing to relinquish at that time as Trade Union officials might clash with that of running the Government and purely because of the fact that it was their wish to follow United Kingdom traditions Sir, otherwise than that, this debate would have taken place three years ago.

I have four notes on what the honourable senior member for St. Philip said during his speech. Although the honourable member was somewhat lengthy, he spent most of the time breaking the rules, reflecting on a vote of the House and I will say no more than that. On this talk about those officials the honourable member knows, or should know, that for over three hundred years those people have sat down at meetings of the Executive Committee. From the time we had Parliament that position existed until today and will continue to exist until they all go. For the last seven years all that they have been doing is to give advice. Why today because of this bill should we cavil on their listening?

(A VOICE: Why keep them?)

We keep them because we are not a Republic. Let me make it quite clear our constitutional set up as it would be worked would be in accordance with the way in which the British constitution functions, just as the Queen refers to Sir Winston Churchill and the rest of the Cabinet for the Government of her country so will be the relation between the Governor of this colony and the Premier and the other Ministers. The other members of the Executive Committee sitting there, whether nominated or official will only be there to give their advice.

Mr. ADAMS: I should not have to stress that the policy of the Government will be the policy of the majority party regardless of who are the unofficial members of the Executive. Under the working of the Bushe Experiment the Governor used to be advised by the Executive Committee, but needed not follow their advice. As from February 1, non-party mem-

bers of the Executive will continue to tender their advice; but that advice will be taken or not according to whether it agrees or does not agree with the policy of the Labour Party.

Imagine the absurdity of the honourable member for St. John talking about these people protecting their own interests. That is why the Labour Party has grown up, and because of that it has not been overthrown. The fact that the President of the Chamber of Commerce is a member of the Executive makes no more difference than if it were Malenkov there and not he.

When it comes to this increase in remuneration what argument has been adduced against it. The only argument that we have heard is that these people should not be on the Executive at all. If honourable members accept the premise that this system is a half way house which we have to live in before we reach the position of Canada or Australia, then these unofficial members will have to be on the Executive. Then, if you accept the principle, for whatever reason you allege, that the salaries of plumbers, long grade clerks, principal clerks, the Chief Justice, the Colonial Secretary and members of the House should be increased, and again if you have decided that the non-party members of the Executive should draw the same salary as that of an ordinary member of the House, and you say now that the salaries of the House members should go to \$160 a month, it is only fair and logical to do the same thing to the salaries of the non-party members of Executive so that you preserve the same relationship between the two as far as salary is concerned. That is the only fair and logical thing to do, assuming that it was right to remunerate them in the first place. It is not right to say that you should push up the salaries of the members of the House and not the salaries of the non-party members of Executive. When you are in power you should never do what you used to curse other people for doing—discriminating against people because they might happen to be of a different race, colour or political party.

Honourable members have got up and given excellent reasons for raising the salaries of members of the House of Assembly, and we approved of it in Executive Committee. I know that I am using a dangerous argument because in respect of the recommendations of Commissions like the Turner Commission and the Dos Santos Commission there has been a tendency to compare ourselves with some of the other West Indian Colonies, and you cannot follow blindly any other colony in that respect. You cannot even always follow logically in the sense of in what proportion so and so compares with their revenue and in what proportion it compares with ours; just like in the case of federation you cannot decide the number of seats a colony should have purely on the basis of the colony's population.

As far as the matter under consideration is concerned it was generally felt that if the salaries of Ministers in British Guiana were £1,500 a year, we should make Ministers' salaries in Barbados the same; if the salary of the British Guiana Legislative Council members was \$160.00 a month our House of Assembly Members should get \$160.00. To follow on logically, you must agree that the salary of a non-party member of Executive must be also \$160.00.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of explanation, Sir. The honourable Leader of the House has said that no honourable member has adduced an argument against this increase to non-party members of the Executive. I argued that in one case you were increasing salaries because of increased responsibilities;

in the other case you were decreasing the responsibility and still increasing the salary. I would like to hear the honourable member on that point.

Mr. ADAMS: The responsibilities and work of the non-party members of Executive will be increased to this extent: Each individual minister will be sending up minutes to Executive Committee that were formerly sent up by the Colonial Secretary. Non-party members will have more papers to peruse. It is not true that they will have any less responsibility. They will be in exactly the same position that they were in when the honourable member was there, except that it would be the same position that I was in at one time, a position in which you could talk your head off, and if the Governor did not want to accept your advice he was not obliged to do so. Of course if he wanted to try it out he would tell you to take it to the House and see what the House did. The non-party members can talk as much as they used to before. We will listen to their advice. But as regards following their advice it will depend on whether they can prove to us that in doing that we will be carrying out the policy of the Labour Party.

After all, it is stated clearly in the despatches. If we are following the United Kingdom Conventions the Governor must accept the advice of the Ministers. Advice other than that is advice which you need not accept. There will be no question of voting or of our being outnumbered on Executive Committee. It is true that all decisions will not be taken at Executive Committee level. At the present moment you have to come to Executive Committee and report that a police horse has broken a leg and ask could it be shot. We had to say, "yes; shoot it." Of course the poor animal would have been in its grave by the time we said yes. Today the Commissioner of Police will send in a minute to say that the horse broke a leg and the Minister will give permission for it to be shot.

As far as the duties of the non-party members of Executive are concerned the position will remain that they will tender their advice, and if we accept it we do. I do not want to be offensive to them, but as long as the system of having non-party members on the Executive exists—and I will do my best to abolish it—our reason, I say quite plainly for sending this down is that we should maintain the position of these members in respect of salaries as compared with the position of ordinary members of the House. We expect that honourable members will agree to put their own salaries up to \$160.00. If they are going to agree to that they must logically make the salaries of the non-party members of the Executive the same.

I have taken up a long time with this reply, perhaps because I did not state the position lucidly enough in the first place. I repeat that the moment you agree to increasing the salaries of ordinary members of the House you have to agree to this so as to maintain the scale between the two.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. I am doing that because I feel that it is difficult to amend this Act in the way I indicated. I would move amendments; and I take it that if I did that some honourable member would be raising the point of exempting part of these salaries from income tax. Members are afraid of that question; but I think that at least the feeling of the House should be taken on it. I say Sir, that there has been an expression of a desire for amendment; but when you come to do it in a commit-

tee of the whole House you may find that there is a difficulty in the way in which the Bill is worded.

Honourable members should not run away from a question because it is unpopular, or because it has been put forward by an influential newspaper or anything of the kind. I understand that in England some of the salary of members of the House of Parliament and some of the salary of Ministers is exempt from income tax. I do not know if there are reasons for that which are peculiar to England. Anyhow, Sir, in view of the fact that it is difficult in a committee of the whole House to amend this Bill so as to give effect to wishes expressed by honourable members I move that it be sent to a Select Committee. There are some points in this Bill which I would like threshed out. I feel it my duty to at least give the House an opportunity to have them threshed out. If honourable members do not want that opportunity it is a matter for the House.

TEA ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

2. Sub-section (1) of section two of the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949, (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) is hereby amended:—

- (a) by inserting after the words "members" of the Executive Committee" the words "other than the Premier and any member in receipt of remuneration as a minister.";
- (b) by deleting therefrom the words "one thousand two hundred" and substituting therefor the words "one thousand nine hundred and twenty."

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that sub-paragraph (b) be deleted.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—If that amendment is merely to delete the salary of the non-official members of the Executive Committee I am in honour bound to support it. I cannot for the life of me see why there should be an increase in the salary of those members who we have heard today from the lips of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph are there in a mere advisory capacity. We do not know if they were in that capacity before, but there is now a definite change in the situation. We have passed the stage of experiment, whether or not the experiment was ever tried. However, I feel that the House members of the Executive are now undertaking a greater responsibility for which they should be paid. To this responsibility must be added the necessity for the giving up of their private avocation. That alone would be a case for increased monetary compensation.

On the other hand the non-official members of Executive are now being relieved of their responsibility—and they must have had some sort of responsibility before. We are now relieving them

entirely, because no member of the House or of the public will be able to feel that any decision has even been influenced by the persuasion of these members. If Ministerial Status means anything, it means also that the ordinary rank and file member of the House will have his responsibility increased too. Politicians mainly from this House, and to a certain extent solely from this House, will now be responsible not only for policy, but for the administration and implementation of that policy; and to such an extent has that responsibility in the House been increased that there is a talk of a Leader of the Opposition being distinguished from other members of the House by receiving a higher salary than that paid to the ordinary members.

The responsibility of the rank and file member of the House has been increased, and that of the non-official members of the Executive has been reduced. It does not matter at what stage Ministerial Status is. The more you advance towards eliminating the non-official members from the Executive the less you make their responsibility, and this is a step in that new direction. Therefore I fail to see how any reasonable person could make a comparison and say that because the ordinary member of the House will get more salary the non-official members of the Executive should also get more. They might have had to meet more often, but they used to get their salaries when the House was prorogued and dissolved. That is a privilege, which the ordinary member of the House did not have. I am not saying that the ordinary member should have the privilege, because if we are following England we cannot grant that privilege. It is not done in England.

The Leader of the House laboured the point and asked if anyone could tell him what part of the Empire had a written constitution. I would like to ask him what part of the Empire does not have one. As soon as these places develop they have a written constitution. There is Ministerial Status in the Gold Coast and they have a written constitution. I am merely saying that you have done things in Barbados different from how they are done elsewhere; so it is not right to say when it suits you "give me a parallel and I will follow it." The experiment which we had in Barbados was unique. Having people in the Cabinet with politically opposite views to the party in power, and sitting in on decisions of the Executive and getting paid for hearing everything is also unique. Tell me if that is not so. If it is unique you can be unique by leaving the salaries where they are. In my humble opinion they should not get any salary at all. But since we have adopted the principle of paying them I cannot see the argument in decreasing their responsibility and increasing their salaries. It would be tantamount to saying that you should give both the Governor and the Colonial Secretary an increase because of Ministerial Status. Because it is true that the Colonial Secretary is virtually a Minister. I do not care what anyone else says. He is a Minister in the Other Place and he has certain portfolios that are not given to the ordinary elected member of this House who becomes a Minister.

I repeat, sir, that even if originally you put these non-official members of the Executive on the same footing as the ordinary member of the House, now that you have reduced their responsibility you should not increase their salary. You pay the people in the Civil Service for accepting responsibility. They may not accept it when the time comes, but you pay them because you can blame them if things for which they are responsible go wrong.

I cannot accept the argument of the Leader of the House. As far as I can understand he is saying that he realises that it is wrong for these people to be on the Executive at all; he will do what he can to eliminate them as soon as possible; but in the meantime, since you used to pay them the same salary as was paid to the rank and file member of the House you must increase their salary because you have increased the salary of the rank and file member of the House. It would be a different argument to say that since you have already started to pay them you will not take it away now; or to say that some of them may have been appointed since you started to pay and it might be wrong to take it away until you get rid of them. But leave the salary where it is. Leave the wrong where it is.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman — In order to prevent this argument from being repeated, let me say again. It all depends on what you mean by responsibility. In one respect the non-official members of the Executive never had any responsibility except to give their honest advice and opinion to the Government; and that was the responsibility of all members of the Executive, including our own, until the day of the Bushe Experiment. There is no constitution in any colony in which that was not the case. What is the Crown Colony System? It is either having in the single legislative chamber, or in an upper chamber or sometimes in both the representatives of big business, the planters etc. Now take the Executive Council of Trinidad, British Guiana or Nigeria. Is there any constitution in which you do not get people of different views on the same Executive let alone the same Legislative Council until you reach the stage of absolute party government in which the parliament, except in the case of a coalition, are predominantly of the same views?

I must repeat that the position in Barbados is that there is no change in the duties of the non-official members of the Executive. They still have to advise the Government as they have done all along. I can at least understand the attitude of the two honourable members of the Opposition at the extreme end of the table. That attitude is that no one at all deserves an increase. But to argue that you should increase the ordinary House member to \$160.00 a month and leave the unofficial members of Executive where they are is unjust.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, — I am not prepared to challenge the statement that the position does not exist of having a constitution in which you retain the elected members of the Executive along with officials, including the nominated members. The honourable member said that the position is that when you exclude your nominated members your officials go at the same time. In other words, you progress from the existing system to full cabinet government in which only elected members of Parliament are in the Cabinet. Presumably the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has refreshed his memory on that point, and has full knowledge of what he is saying.

There are two points in connection with this matter. We are supposed to be in the vanguard, constitutionally speaking. But this step that we are taking today—Ministerial Status—does not put us much further ahead than Trinidad, British Guiana or Jamaica except in the almost nominal question of the Governor's powers—nominal in the sense that they are seldom ever used. Trinidad had Ministerial Status three years ago, and British Guiana had it since then. They were therefore advancing ahead of the other Crown Colonies in the Caribbean area. The step that we in Barbados are taking today should be something nearer to cabinet

status than what is proposed. It seems to me that we were ahead of the other colonies all the time, but now we are three years behind them. (A MEMBER: In time; not in position.)

I for one am not sure in my mind that the argument advanced is constitutionally tenable. If you refer to Para. 19 of the Acting Governor's despatch in connection with Ministerial Status you will see that it reads as follows:—

It has been represented that the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General should cease to be members of the Legislative Council, that Government business should be conducted in that Chamber by one of the members of the Government Party who would be appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Principal Minister, and further, that the members of Executive Council should no longer be included in Executive Committee as such, but that Executive Committee should consist of the Chief Secretary, the Attorney General, the House of Assembly members and the member selected to be the Government spokesman in the Legislative Council. This, however, does not represent the majority view, which is that changes on these lines should not be made as part of the present proposals. I share the majority view.

That proposal was put up to the Acting Governor by more than one member of the House. It was that we should eliminate the nominated members completely from the Executive. Mr. Turner did not suggest, as the honourable Leader of the House has suggested, that that would be constitutionally incorrect. He merely said that it was not the majority view; and presumably he may have used the words "majority view" in the sense of what was the view of the Government. However, as I have said, Mr. Turner did not suggest that it would be constitutionally wrong as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph suggested.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member must not misquote me. All I ask is that you show me, judging from history, that the Colonial Office would be likely to agree to the system suggested in para. 19 which the honourable member quoted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member asked us to show him any place where it had been done. He said that the nominated members and the officials always went at one sweep. Mr. Turner never suggested that the alternative proposal mentioned in para. 19 was constitutionally incorrect and should not be adopted.

Mr. ADAMS: What is the honourable member talking about when he describes a thing as being constitutionally correct? If the Legislature were to agree tomorrow to abolish itself and let the Governor alone rule that would be constitutionally correct. It would be the law. To be constitutionally incorrect is when you have a constitution and you go against it. You can propose any set up that you want to. What I said was to look at what has been the practice and see whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies would have been willing to accept that proposal.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Apparently all that the honourable member means is that we cannot quote a precedent for it. But the position is: If we felt in our considered opinion that that should have been the set up we should have put it to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and let him tell us that we could not quote any precedent or that it was constitutionally incorrect, or that he would not agree to it. It was submitted to Mr. Turner, and he did not turn it down on principle. He said that it was not the majority view, and that therefore he did not put it up. If in the considered opinion of Mr. Turner, an imported official, having to deal with people of the mentality of that of

the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, he does not feel that the time is ripe to extend the set-up it does not necessarily mean that we do not think that the time is ripe. If it is the considered opinion of this House that we should have only the elected members of the House and the Officials on the Executive let us say so, and let the Secretary of State for the Colonies turn it down. There is no justification constitutionally, legally or morally for retaining at this stage of our existence these people on the Executive merely to give advice, which, as I said earlier, may be taken at a lower level. If you want to discuss sugar matters let them meet you in the lobby and brief you on matters which are in their special interest or on which you want special advice. In the same way that that you accept or refuse to accept their advice in the Executive now, you can accept or refuse to accept it at these lower level meetings.

I am prepared to support the amendment moved by the honourable junior member for Christ Church, because I do not see any need for retaining the services of the non-official members of the Executive, and by agreeing to this amendment I see a way to curb the unnecessary expense which these proposals will cost the colony.

Mr. LEWIS: I understand from what I have heard now that either this question of excluding the non-official nominated members from the Executive was put to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and he turned it down, or that it was not put to him because of the fear that he would turn it down. We are supposed to have a different and a better constitution than that of any other colony on earth. As I have said sir, it appears that the question was either put up and turned down, or it was not put up because it was known before hand that it would be turned down.

Now take the position of the other members of the Executive. If the Government falls two months after the 1st of February the Prime Minister and his ministers will lose their salary; but these nominated, unofficial members will go on drawing theirs. There is nothing we know of that can affect them. It is not a case of doing a job. If you bring it to the level of doing a job you will have to pay the members of the Other Place. If you agree that these members on the Executive Committee are doing a job, a job in which there is no responsibility, then the members of the Legislative Council are even more deserving of a salary; because they can turn down anything sent to them by this Chamber and they have to discuss it in public. But these unofficial members of the Executive are removed from the spotlight of public opinion; and they will continue to draw their salaries whatever government comes or goes. What are their hazards?

If you say that they have a spot of work to do, look how many others there are in their position who would be glad to do that spot of work. As I said when we were discussing the Maude Bill, the late Mr. Morgan-Jones told vestrymen that they had the privilege of seeing their competitors' trade returns. These members of the Executive have the great privilege of knowing before hand what the Government is going to do. They know before the members of the House. They are not affected by any change of government; while the government might fall as a result of accepting their expert advice because it appeared reasonable.

I do not see that there is any justification for paying them except that they were paid before; and I am willing to let it stay where it is now. There are some of them who had an opportunity

of speaking on the Ministerial set up, and the way they spoke on it, and would then come back to take part in it makes one wonder.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—What worries me is that there are so many things needed to be done in Barbados, and when you ask the Government about doing them you hear that there is no money. When however, these resolutions come down for increases you can find the money. There is going to be a serious situation in this country. Certain people are getting what they want and nothing is being done to improve the conditions of people in the various walks of life. I will have to support the amendment.

Question that sub-paragraph (b) of clause 2 be deleted was put and decided in the negative on a division as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT and Mr. GODDARD.—(7).

Noes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, and Mr. COX.—(11)

Question that Clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Clause 3 was called. It read as follows:—

3. (1) Section two of the principal Act is hereby amended by adding the following sub-section immediately after sub-section (1) thereof—

“(2) Subject to the provisions of section three of this Act, the Premier shall be entitled to receive salary at the rate of nine thousand six hundred dollars per annum and other ministers, not exceeding four in number, at the rate of seven thousand two hundred dollars per annum.”

(2) Sub-section (2) of section two of the principal Act is hereby consequentially re-numbered “(3)”.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, — I am moving that the word “four” occurring in sub-clause (2) of clause 3 be deleted and the word “three” substituted, so that you will get the Premier and three ministers instead of the Premier and four ministers.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking Your Honour to rule that out of order. The Message that came to this House made it clear, and the vote that was taken was taken on the clear understanding that there would be five ministers. The House did not signify in its Address in reply to the Governor's Message that it disapproved of that. I am suggesting that discussion of whether there should be four or five ministers is out of order on the ground that it would be a reflection on a previous vote of the House, which is only allowed if you intend to move a repeal.

Now passing by all that, and putting it merely as a matter of procedure, I will say now that when honourable members remember that the date for initiating Ministerial Status is the 1st of February, I hope that honourable members on this side of the House will see — I am going to choose my language carefully; not because I have any hope to be able to influence those on the other side of the table — but I am asking honourable members on this side to remember that very often when your political opponents fail to carry conviction on a particular matter they try to emasculate the measure to such an extent as to establish by that manner what they failed to establish by vote. There are some people in this island, not unconnected with politics, who pretend to agree with a lot of things with which they do not really agree. When they fail in ordinary voting to get their principle established they try

ways and means to knock the bottom completely out of the principle which their opponents might have happened to get established. I know that some people who are both directly and indirectly connected with the subject we are discussing tonight have no more use for Ministerial Status than for Hitler dead or alive. They would do anything to sabotage it.

I am asking honourable members of the Labour Party not to fall into the trap. This attempt to reduce the proposed number of ministers is no concern for the Treasury; it is another subtle way of trying, even at the eleventh hour, to prevent the Ministerial System from working smoothly and efficiently. We have not reached this stage overnight, nor have we reached it by copying everyone else. Unfortunately Mr. Turner often used the phrase “Jamaica has it” or “Trinidad has it.” Let us say he made a slip. But I was discussing this matter for Barbados verbally with the Secretary of State for the Colonies before Sir Hugh Foot was discussing it for Jamaica. There is no question of copying Jamaica or anyone else. We in this party have thought this out and thought that out. We have considered how most efficiently we could run this, that and the other. After mature consideration and reconsideration and going back and forth between the views of this party and the views of the Executive and the Administration and the Secretary of State for the Colonies we have seriously come to the conclusion that the best and most efficient way of running Ministerial Status is to have these five active members of the Party made Ministers, and given the portfolios that have been given.

I am sorry that I too am breaking the rules, the whole point being whether it is in order to make the motion that has been made. I am pointing out that the motion is untenable because of the Reply that was passed by a majority of this House to His Excellency the Governor. I am also pointing out that it is going back on what after careful consideration this Government has persuaded the Secretary of State for the Colonies to accept, and what the Secretary of State for the Colonies has accepted; what has been sent down to this House by the Governor and what the House has accepted by a majority. Now at the 11th hour you are getting subtle comments, because some honourable members feel that they should go against the Government at all costs, and because other honourable members may not be wise enough to discover what is behind this pretended anxiety for the economy of the island.

I am warning honourable members on this side of the House and I am warning the island that we are taking a big gamble that everyone has warned us against. We are attempting to run Ministerial Status on the cheap. We have decided that we do not want to be semi-slaves. We want self government; but we will have to pay for the latter, and we will have to pay more as time goes on. Members of the House will have to work; and ministers will have to work; and they will deserve even more than is set out in this Bill because of the work that they will have to do through starting as we have started.

When the proposal went to the Jamaica House for having five ministers they said it could not work; that there should be eight ministers. Take the portfolios in our proposals. We have done all the rearranging that could possibly be done. I do not know any other country which has Ministerial Status and in which the Premier is Minister of Education. I believe that in Turkey the Premier is Minister of Finance, Defence etc. No where else. It has been done here because of economical considerations. I am not saying that it is incongruous; but I am saying that it cannot be done on less than this. Of course you can take any portfolio and add on more to it by mak-

ing a Minister work unreasonably hard. Some of these portfolios have been taken from one Ministry and put under another. It was after seeing what was most fitted for a particular Ministry, revising our views and getting the advice of people in administrations not only in this country but elsewhere that we have, as I have put it, perhaps on a desperate gamble cut down this that and the other.

There is only one argument for having four ministers and not five — the economic argument. And we have already overdone the cutting. We have cut off an assistant secretary. That means that someone will be overworked. Do not think that there is anything in these proposals that we have not given careful consideration to, including economy.

I will say that only intelligent people can sabotage anything really. The others do it without knowing, being led by those who are clever. I do my paramount duty to the island by warning people that when you preach that Ministerial Status is too expensive and should be cut down the alternative is to go back to the Crown Colony system. You cannot have Ministerial Status without proper staffing, and that costs money. If you want Ministerial Status you must pay for it. If it is too dear do not have it at all.

Let me say that for three years I have breathed, gone to sleep with and awaken with this question of Ministerial Status. It is on careful consideration and the reactions of the House that these proposals have come down in this way. Our sober judgment tells us that we have come down too much on the cheap. Of course the Government will be as economical as possible. Of course we will see that Civil Servants do not go to work at 10.30 although it may suit other people to go to their work later and still make money. But that is not all there is to it. It is the function of the Ministers that will matter. I say again that we can mark time and be content with mere Crown Colony status, or we can say that we want real self government. But when you say the latter look around for the money. You can be content with a couple of sheds and cots; but if you want a first class hospital you must look for the money. Of course you can refuse to spend this money; but you will not be anywhere near Ministerial Status or self government. You will be marking time with the Bushe Experiment until oil gushes from Turner Hall or until the money falls from heaven.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let us concede that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is personally convinced that five ministers are necessary. Is there any reason for his suggesting that the attempt to reduce the number to four, because someone else has moved it, is an attempt to sabotage the entire Ministerial Status? That is not even drawing a red herring across the trail. Only a mind trained along the lines on which the honourable member's mind has developed could suggest that an attempt to reduce the number of ministers to four is a subtle, or other attempt to wreck the whole constitutional advance of the colony. This House stressed the necessity for economy. (A MEMBER: Not true! The Opposition's motion was defeated.) Paragraph 4 of the Address reads as follows—

Mr. ADAMS: When I said what I did about sabotaging, I was not accusing any individual member of intentionally trying to sabotage Ministerial Status.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Para. 4 of the Address reads as follows:—

The House appreciates the difficulties inherent in financing a new system such as has been proposed. It notes with interest the experience of other Caribbean Colonies and is conscious of the attempt which

has been made in these proposals to cut down expenditure to a minimum. Because of this the House assures Your Excellency of its willingness to agree to a money Resolution designed to provide for the carrying out of these proposals.

The underlying theme was the necessity for economy. The Opposition moved an Address stressing the need for further economy; and it was not passed because of the extravagance of the majority party. The Government, sir, has demonstrated to-day that they appreciate the need for economy by reducing the number of assistant secretaries and agreeing to start off with three instead of four.

Mr. ADAMS: In deference to criticism and to see if it would work.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Government repudiated its own proposals by deciding to divide three assistant secretaries among five ministries. On the face of it that is more than a gamble. The Assistant Secretaries will be in an important position to guarantee continuity of the work in the ministries. If the Government itself recognises the need for economy and brings down a proposal for three Assistant Secretaries instead of the original four, why cannot the House on more mature consideration reduce the number of Ministries to four on the grounds of economy without being accused of attempted sabotage? Was the Government attempting sabotage when it sent down proposals for three Assistant Secretaries? Was the Colonial Secretary trying to sabotage Ministerial Status when he suggested three Ministries and one working part time? The Colonial Secretary is at the head of affairs and is in a position to know from both sides the work that there is to be done. He said that three Ministers would do with one to act as a substitute if one of the full time Ministers was ill or out of the island.

Now at the moment there are only four members of the House on the Executive. Four part time men. They go there when it is convenient or when they have to go. Are you going to say that in the same island four men devoting full time will not be able to cope with the work that is being dealt with by four part time men now, bearing in mind that you are increasing your Secretariat staff and extending it and giving the Ministers private secretaries and what not? In addition to that the Heads of Departments will still be there. The Colonial Secretary and the Governor will still be there. If we are desirous of being economical I think that we can start off with four Ministries and see what transpires.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph speaks of compromise in politics but he only speaks of it, he does not believe in sharing it himself. It is for that reason that I am going to warn the honourable member that his policy and his business of government cannot succeed easily unless he decides to compromise with the few but strong voices on this side of the table. What the honourable member must realise is this; we might have had various differences on matters but we have always been united by compromise when we see the necessity to compromise, but at no time does the honourable member show a willingness to meet members on this side of the table half-way. We certainly deserve that respect from the Government Bench. Why I say that is this. This House agreed to the appointment of four Secretaries and the Executive after our consideration of the matter reduced the number to three. This House was made to feel that four permanent Ministers would be appointed and that the fifth Minister would be Minister with-

out portfolio, I heard the honourable member saying that whenever any of the other Ministers are absent that this Minister without portfolio will hold the papers of the Minister that is absent.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I must correct the honourable member. That is utterly untrue. The only question as to four Ministers and a Minister without portfolio is contained in the dispatch of Mr. Turner. That was his personal views to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. In reply to the Secretary of State, we say we are not guided by what Mr. Turner has said. Our proposal is according to what has been sent down in His Excellency's Message and the Secretary of State in his reply said, if that is your view, I accept it.

Mr. ALLDER: Can the honourable member see the fallacy of three Secretaries to serve five Ministers? Even the admission by the honourable member shows that he has not sufficient work to serve five Ministers. Unless the honourable member wants to create sinecures, is the only way as I see it, that he would agree to having five ministers because if he expects every minister to work wholetime, obviously he would not have reduced the secretaries to three. If the five ministers are to do work as is expected of them, obviously, the least number of secretaries the honourable member would give assent to would be four; but he reduces that number to three; therefore, he feels that three secretaries can suffice ministers, and therefore the fifth minister would have little or nothing to do.

Mr. ADAMS: I must again correct the honourable member. Sir, the number of permanent secretaries has not been reduced; it is the assistant secretaries that have been reduced in number.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member seems to have things wrongly. Our aims and objects, from the time the first Message on ministerial status from His Excellency the Governor reached this Chamber, were to see that the new system was run as cheaply as possible; therefore, we made our suggestions with the hope that the honourable member would be capable of realising that although we on this side of the Table are not within the Government Party, yet we are part and parcel of the Legislature—and we speak for a large section of the populace.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph boasts that you cannot run ministerial system on the cheap. That is effrontery because one would expect that everybody with the interest and well being of the colony at heart would try to see how cheaply and efficiently any system can be run. The honourable member's arguments also give the impression that the other members of the Executive Committee who are not members of this House have no real powers over members of this Chamber on the Executive for the simple reason that the Executive members from this Chamber can change anything or any decision at the Executive Committee; yet, after this House has agreed on a principle, the Executive Committee can change it. I refer to the reduction of assistant secretaries as is contained in His Excellency's Message of last week on that subject. The Executive Committee can change that after this House has agreed to it, but this House cannot change the number of ministers although we feel that the new system can be run efficiently by four ministers. Sir, I am in duty bound to support the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, In supporting the amendment, I am not expressing any new view.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the question is whether that motion is in order.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In supporting the motion for the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I am not expressing any new view. I am supporting it whether I be thought of as one who would like to sabotage the matter or not. It is a matter of indifference to me. It is said that "As you grow older, you grow wiser, and as you grow wiser, you become more interested in the life of your country; you give serious thought to all the changes." Sir, only a fool would try to resist progress; only a very stupid person would try to say that a ministerial system can work in neighbouring colonies but it cannot work in Barbados. On the question, I have always applied what I thought was the right measure, the right weight, and the right argument. The question which I ask myself more than any other is: How much can Barbados afford to spend on a form of Ministerial Government? Let us not look at the question from the point of view of what British Guiana, Trinidad, or some other neighbouring colony whose revenue is five or six times greater than ours can spend. Must we say that our system of ministerial status must be similar to theirs? Therefore, when these proposals first came before this Chamber, I said then that I was more in favour with the suggestions of Mr. Turner, who was Acting Governor at the time. His suggestions met more with my approval than the later suggestions which were put up for five ministers. I feel that although it is only a question of saving £750 by the suggestion of having four ministers and one without portfolio who would act in place of either of the ministers, it would, however small, mean a saving on the expenditure. Therefore, when I support the deletion of "four" to "three" in this clause, it is no new departure with me. I have always been convinced of that view and I have made it known before. I have made it known that I considered the salaries for ministers were not too high but that I thought four ministers were sufficient to start our ministerial system with despite the argument of the Leader of the House that we should not run it on the cheap. I am supported in my view by the fact that the four members of the Executive from this House have done a good job in running the Government up to to-day. Surely, if they have done so well giving part-time service, they can do better when they devote their whole-time attention to the running of the Government. If that suggestion were given a trial and it was then represented to this Chamber that it was impossible under the new system of Government to carry on efficiently with four ministers, then I think it would be rather unreasonable for this House to say "Oh no, carry on with the four; come what may, you must carry on with the four." I say: try four; you are doing a good job at the present with four.

Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that it would be a wicked waste of money to start with five ministers. I say so although I am fully cognisant that the Government has taken some consideration of the arguments in this Chamber on the proposals and have showed us its willingness to economise by using three assistant secretaries instead of four as were at first proposed. I am going to stress what I believe is a popular view inside and out of this Chamber. When the Five-Year Plan was considered by this House, the honourable Leader of this House made me the promise that he would look into the working of the entire Service after I pointed out that it wanted re-organising so that some Civil Servants should not be made to get to work at 8 o'clock in the morning and some at 10 o'clock. Sometime has passed since that promise was made. I see no reason why some should go to work at 8 o'clock and some at hours different from that.

Mr. ADAMS: We agree with that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member says he agrees with that. My point in saying this is that if Civil Servants can go at 10 o'clock, it will be no wonder if the Ministers go at 1 o'clock p.m. It is my considered opinion that if the promise made me was carried into fulfilment and some attempt was made to reorganize or unify the time when Civil Servants should get to work, we would be able to know now if greater efficiency had resulted from it. Bear in mind that this is not a question merely of efficient assistant secretaries to the Ministers. The real success of your ministerial status will be having a competent and satisfied Civil Service working with it efficiently. As far as I am concerned, there is no question of sabotaging.

Sir, we know of nothing that went on behind closed doors. We can only speak on the recommendations which are before us. I will ask the honourable Leader of this House one straight question. Is it the Colonial Secretary that is sabotaging? I do not know; I am asking that question. If the honourable member has a spark of courage and he knows the person who is sabotaging this thing, he will name the person.

Sir, I am not at all supporting the motion for the deletion of "four" and the insertion of "three" in this section as I understand has been moved by the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I do not agree with the honourable member's motion as it is worded. The section reads:—

"Subject to the provisions of section three
"of this Act, the Premier shall be entitled to
"receive salary at the rate of nine thousand six
"hundred dollars per annum and other minis-
"ters, not exceeding four in number, at the rate
"of seven thousand two hundred dollars per
"annum".

This is no court fine that you should have the words "not exceeding". If I were one of the members of the Government, I would have kicked against those words ever since. All that phrase means is that there need not to be four ministers with the Premier; there could be three. When that is inserted, it means that if there be four ministers and one of them has the guts to say what he means at any time, if a minister has the courage and temerity to disagree, the Premier can walk in with three ministers instead of four in his Government. I feel that it should not be phrased like that. Sir, everyone of us knows the great loyalty of the honourable senior member for St. Michael to his Party and the Premier. The day might come when that honourable member, should he be a minister, might feel that he being in charge of a ministry should run it as he thinks fit; he might not want to be dictated to and, if something happens, to take the blame. I therefore strongly suggest to honourable members who may be of a different view from me not to vote for that clause as it is but to vote for four ministers. Do not vote for "not exceeding four." Do become wise and vote for four in number. Personally, I am saying three ministers and the Premier. I am counselling honourable members not to vote for "not exceeding four." Of course, the honourable Leader of the House may answer me by saying that if the situation merits it, he will take only three ministers along with himself, but I will remind him that he has told us quite clearly already to be prepared, he might need six in all. When I rose, I said I would have supported the amendment moved by the honourable senior member for St. Philip but on reflection I will not do so owing to the way in which the clause is phrased. If the honourable member prevails with his motion, I counsel him to delete the phrase "not exceeding."

Finally, I say there should be no sabotage. Anyone who is interested in the welfare of the community will be interested in seeing that the Government follows that system which would give Barbadians a greater share in the administration of the affairs of this colony. I support the introduction of ministerial status wholeheartedly. The only thing that worries me is the cost. Of course, I am not referring to the remuneration for the Premier and the Ministers. Bear in mind that no member from the Party to which I belong has ever made the suggestion that the remuneration for ministers is too much. When members of the Regional Economic Committee were here a few weeks ago, I took the opportunity of discussing the question with those who are ministers in the two colonies that have been granted ministerial status and they too suggested to me that you must start it on the right foot if you want to make a success of it. I may say that while they said so and that it could not be run too cheaply, they also said that they read the speech by the honourable senior member for St. George and suggested very strongly that much in what that honourable member had said could be implemented. They suggested that before starting off with the ministries and making selections of the diverse secretaries and assistant secretaries that would be needed for them, pruning should be gone into most carefully in the various Departments of Government and taking persons from them where possible and seconding them to the ministries. They agreed with the suggestions of the honourable senior member for St. George and felt that his suggestions were worthy of consideration. In that manner, they felt that Barbados could bring down the further expenses for running a ministerial system. I therefore throw that out because I too believe that you can get ideas from those who have experience.

Again I say, do not let there be any more dissatisfaction in some Civil Servants having to get to work at 8 o'clock while some others are allowed to come at 10 o'clock. If all are made to go to work at the same time, you are bound to effect a saving. With the greatest respect for the Premier, I say that if the ministries would not be open before 10 o'clock when the public generally line up for business at 8 o'clock, I feel there would be a tremendous overlapping in the business of the ministries.

Finally I would say that seeing the date line of this Bill shows that the system would be brought into force as from the 1st February next, I thought I would have been told more by the honourable Leader of this House on his introduction of the Bill. I have seen notices advertising for officers for the ministries. I have had information that you can go through the various Departments of Government and get those officers. In that way a saving can be effected unless there is the idea of making jobs for one or two people. Rumour has it that way. Sir, my motion therefore is to delete the words "not exceeding four in number" and to insert in its place "three in number."

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, This is the first time in my life that I have heard anybody suggesting that there should only be four ministers. The suggestion was always five, but there was the suggestion of four ministers and another without portfolio. When it came to that suggestion, I said it was humanly impossible to carry on efficiently under that setup if two of the ministers happened to be out of the island at the same time. I was absolutely unable to raise a smile when honourable members with this most stupendous and serious matter before them took leave to adopt the attitude of saying such rash things and making such

motions when they know well enough to what such actions lead. Let me repeat that when these recommendations were discussed some honourable members did say that they agreed with the suggestion of five ministers and some did say there should be four ministers and one without portfolio. There was never the suggestion of four ministers.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member said he never heard the suggestion of four ministers. It is not correct to say so. The suggestion of four ministers was made here. I suggested four in my speech. What I did say was that I somewhat agreed with the suggestions of Mr. Turner who suggested that there should be four ministers and one without portfolio, but I actually said that there should be only four. It is there in black and white.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I have never known any honourable member to say so. I would however say that the honourable member by making that admission has put himself below the standard of intelligence of any honourable members of this House. If any honourable member can suggest that, then he is fit for incarceration in a home for delinquents. Let me say again that Mr. Turner in his despatch says five ministers—four and a minister without portfolio. At present the suggestion is three ministers and the Premier, but the suggestion until now has always been five ministers. There was the suggestion that there should be only four active ministers and one without portfolio in case that a minister was absent from his duties. We said that was not good enough. Can you think of the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour, functioning efficiently if he has also to hold the portfolio of the Minister for Agriculture? Let us say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is being bombarded about importing rice; and if he is holding the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture, and is at the same time working hard on the growing of more food crops; cannot you see that it would be impossible for him to run those two things together? That is one reason why we did not agree with Mr. Turner's recommendation that the Minister for Trade Industry and Labour could hold the portfolio of agriculture. That is why we suggested five active ministers. Again, I wish honourable members to visualise the position of a minister of agriculture who is fighting for the planting of more canes and the digging up of potatoes and a minister for food production saying to leave the potatoes and plant less canes on account of the mealy bug would be the better proposition, what conflict there would be in the running of the two departments. If honourable members thought about that, they never would have got up and made that amendment. Honourable members have not taken into consideration when they were making the amendment for reducing the number of ministers that during some months of the year some ministers are bound to be out of the colony attending some conference or such thing. It is possible for two to be out of the colony at one time. If honourable members thought of that, they never would have made that absurd amendment. I am not accusing any honourable member of sabotaging anything. I believe every honourable member will assist this Government in making ministerial Government work efficiently. Honourable members have said so and I see no reason to disbelieve them. I say again that the suggestion of five ministers is no new idea. As far back as 1942, this party—the Labour Party—saw that it would be necessary to increase the members from this House on the Executive. We repeated that view every time we put our views before the electorate. In

our last manifesto, we repeated it. We said that in the coming Parliament, one of the Labour Party's first major acts would be to initiate full responsible government for the Island with Ministers in charge of the Departments of Government. If found necessary, the number of members of the Executive Committee who are to become Ministers will be increased. We said that we would do that or change the Executive Committee Act. What we are doing is the first thing. We have stuck to the English convention.

It has been suggested that there should be four ministers and one without portfolio. If it is a question of a minimum, what are you saving? Bear in mind that the minister without portfolio would have to be paid also. Even if you do not have an active minister, you will have to pay the minister without portfolio and a remuneration of \$3,600 per annum has been recommended. The proposal was that he should get half of what a minister is getting. This would mean a saving of only \$3,600. Mr. Chairman I am appealing to honourable members to see what the amendment means. This is a serious matter and I am wondering if honourable members do not see the implications through the stupidity into which they are leading themselves. Can any honourable member really suggest that this island can be efficiently run with three ministers and the Premier?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I do not know if the title of the Chief Minister has confused the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. I do not know if because it has been proposed to call him "Premier" has caused him to think of Barbados as if it were Canada or Australia. Barbados is only a small colony of 166 square miles. I just want to ask the honourable member if he seriously wants to say that four full time ministers are insufficient to run efficiently a small island like this and if one is absent from the colony for a few weeks, another of his fellow ministers cannot hold the portfolios of the absent minister temporarily. The honourable member talks of the duties of Minister of Agriculture conflicting with that of the Minister for Trade and Commerce. Sir, what on earth can the Minister of Agriculture, in this 2 x 4 island so exclusively concern himself with, that for two months or so, he cannot hold the portfolios of Minister of Communications and Works. At some time before, we have had three members of the Executive from this House out of the island at one time and the other member conducted the business of Government. In Trinidad, three Ministers have been out of the island at one time and the other Ministers shared their portfolios between them. It has often happened that two Ministers in Trinidad were out of that island simultaneously and the other Ministers shared their portfolios.

(A VOICE: Shame! Shame!)

It is true, Sir, from the point of view of certain honourable members in this House, the more Ministers the merrier: the better their own personal triumphs. You well might make it sixteen in order to give general satisfaction. (Laughter).

Sir, in this small colony, are we saying to operate with the five Ministers that they can find work to do for every day in a week, every week in a month and every month in a year. I remember very well that in Trinidad there was a discussion because the Attorney General suggested that the Ministries should be open at eight o'clock and that the Ministers should be present. One Minister, the Hon. Mr. Roy Joseph lambasted him. He let the Attorney General know that Ministers could come in office whenever they felt like doing so. A Minister in Trinidad at certain times in the year, like at Budget times or any such important occasion, has to be in office everyday, but normally in Trinidad you cannot find any of them

in office. What would they have to do in office except to look at the ceiling? Trinidad is a far bigger colony than Barbados and there is not sufficient work to keep the Ministers in office. How much so will it be in Barbados. If you have in this island half a dozen well-run municipalities, you can take care of the whole island efficiently. Sir, all I see that you are doing is adding to the cost of your ministerial set-up, your Legislature, your top-heavy Government department by having five Ministers. You are saying that the Minister for Agriculture cannot act for anybody else. Sir, again what would your Minister of Education have to do to occupy his time in an office every day. It seems to me, that all he would have to do is while the Estimates are in course of preparation he would have to go through half-a-dozen files with the Director of Education. Occasionally the Director may have cause to see him a few times over a week. The permanent Secretaries would have to write the speeches of the Ministers. It is a mistake for us to allow the nomenclature we are attaching to these posts to confuse our minds with the importance or the size or the complexities of the problems. Barbados is a small colony; it is not like British Guiana, Trinidad or Jamaica.

Sir, is the recommendation for five Ministers because we want one for Pelican and one for Culpepper? If to-morrow morning, St. Lucia, or Dominica, or St. Kitts decides to embark on ministerial system of Government, do you mean to say that they must embark on it with five Ministers? In those countries where the people are very interested over their money they would accept nothing like that at all. It is significant that in all of this discussion about the necessity for the fifth Minister you have not heard a word about the detailed duties of the Ministers to show the reason why it would be necessary to have the fifth. I am willing to give the honourable senior member for St. Joseph my entire Parliamentary salary if he finds himself and each of his Ministers in office from ten o'clock in the morning until four o'clock in the evening with the exception of when they are attending Cabinet meetings or visiting public works. Again I ask what would the Premier or his Ministers have to do in an office all day?

The honourable Leader of this House knows as well as we know that four Ministers will amply do for running this ministerial system even if one happens to be absent. The four members of the Executive from this House are now carrying on this Government and they would be the last to say that they are not carrying on efficiently. There were a few occasions when two were out of the island and the others carried on. Sir, this Bill makes provision for the remuneration of the Premier and four Ministers. Honourable members should weigh this in their minds and be satisfied before they vote for it that in this small island there is need for a Premier and four full-time Ministers to conduct the affairs of this colony efficiently, even at the beginning of this set-up when they would have to put in more work and even when one of them is absent and the others would have additional burdens placed on them.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I must say that from the time I heard about ministerial status my own opinion was that you should have not less than six Ministers. I have always felt that they should be four Ministers in this House and two in the other Place. There are virtually the Premier and three Ministers in this House and another Minister in the Other Place but I feel there should be two Ministers in the

Other Place. I will like to remind honourable members that there was a time when this House had six members on the Executive Committee. Of course it had four for a long time. If as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph says that this ministerial set-up had been cut to the bone in deference of what was said in this Chamber, the last Message from His Excellency the Governor shows that the Executive Committee since then must have been influenced by what was said in the Other Place because this House never agreed to a further cut down by one Assistant Secretary as was contained in the Message. The whole idea of further economy had been opposed in my opinion in the reply from this House to His Excellency's Message, but the proposals from the Other Place may have indicated that. I would like my colleague to know that the words "not exceeding" could not have been placed in the Bill by members of the Executive from this House. Those words could not be placed there by those members because the honourable Leader of this House said that the expenditure was cut to the bone and it would be impossible to run the new system with less than a Premier and four ministers. Therefore, the words "not exceeding" could not have found their way in the Bill as has been sent down by persons who formed that opinion. I do feel that those words "not exceeding" are entirely wrong to be placed in that section because they give the impression that you are entitled to cut down the number of ministers although you say that they should not be cut down. I must remind honourable members that a ministerial system of Government is a very expensive set-up and I cannot see even if it were possible to run our system with one minister less that the system would be much cheaper in the long run. I do not think the job could be done as efficiently. What I think has happened is that the introduction of ministerial status has been delayed and its delay has given certain people the opportunity to get a top-heavy Civil Service to impose it on. I am fully aware that we are super-imposing a ministerial status on a really top-heavy Civil Service. The way to have a cheap ministerial set-up is for the ministers to be efficient enough so that some of the Heads of Departments or Assistant Heads could be dispensed with. That is a job for the ministers themselves. I would advise the would-be ministers not to go into the Service and get accustomed to the number of Civil Servants they have around them. Let them go into the Service with the view that the cost of administering this colony must be reduced. It must be reduced by amalgamation of offices that are related one with the other and the cutting down of some of the heads of departments and sub-heads. I believe that certain people are afraid to say that at this time. Perhaps, it may be better to grease the wheel now that you are going into a new set-up and do not let people know your real views until you have fully settled down. There is a lot of diplomacy in holding that view.

Sir, I am not voting for the reduction of the number of ministers. I would counsel hon. members not to make the mistake of cutting down on the number of ministers. I feel it would be a most serious mistake, especially coming as it is from the honourables senior member for St. Philip and the senior member for St. John. It would be a most serious mistake for those honourable members because if things go wrong, and those honourable members start to criticise, it can be said that you wanted the job run cheaply and not efficiently. Since it is said that under a ministerial set-up, you must have a healthy opposition and so

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: There is only one point that I wish to make. Is a Message which is sent to the Legislature at anytime equivalent to legislative action which cannot be changed? If it is so, and any action is taken to vary any part of the Message it is a certain sign that that Message cannot bind us. There is a principle that when you send a Message to the Governor requiring him to send down legislation for money—I remember the John R. Bovell Grant—and he sent down that legislation you yourself could vote against it. If we were bound by any Message sent by the Governor it would mean that neither of us could vary the terms. I appeal to the honourable member not to mislead the Chairman. It is not that his loyal henchmen are not going to support him in the crisis. We know that the Bill will pass.

Now, Sir, if you read that Message you will see that it was drafted with some skill. It said how the necessary Legislation would be sent down and how all the money that could be saved would be saved etc. You will remember that during the debate I said that four Ministers would do. All that I am trying to say is that the Message did not bind us and it could never bind us. It was not legislative action. It is merely that a Message was sent to us by the Governor and we sent back one in reply. In fairness to this committee, whatever amendment is put up, so long as it is germane to the issue, that amendment should be decided by vote. I do not doubt that the honourable member's Party will carry the day; but let it be carried in this way now that legislative action is to be taken.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—I think that the Opposition has made a tactical blunder in trying to force an issue on this matter. As I have said before the Bill does read “not exceeding” etc. which is good from the point of view of the Opposition. But by forcing it to the public's attention and to the attention of the Leader of the House and the attention of those honourable members on this side of the table who would like to see it firmly established that the number of ministers should be five, the Opposition are doing themselves an injustice. If the Leader gives the assurance—it will not bind Government in perpetuity—but if the Leader gives the assurance that he will carry on the Government with no less than five Ministers including himself, and the Opposition are sure that they can put a certain amount of pressure to urge their own point of view at a later date, I am suggesting that we leave the matter as it is; because the Leader has given us the assurance that it will be all right. It would be better than for the Opposition to force this and be defeated. I think we are just wasting time. The Leader was well aware that the Bill was brought down in such a way that it could accommodate both sides.

Mr. ADAMS: I am accepting the amendment of the honourable junior member for the City that the words “not exceeding” should come out. That will make it clear that there can be no ambiguity. As it will be a bit cumbersome to say “other ministers four in number,” I suggest that we say, “four other ministers.”

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—Before the amendment is accepted I will say that now that the House seems to be in a calmer mood, and the Leader has actually accepted part of the amendment—“not exceeding four” being taken out—I am wondering if he will accept the full amendment. This is nothing to do with questioning your ruling, Sir, but what we were worried about, and what we are still worried about is that when we were debating

the reply to the Governor's Message we said we were in favour of four ministers, including the Premier, although the Leader has said today that he did not hear that. We said we were in favour of four and not five. In view of the fact that the Leader has just accepted an amendment I am wondering if the Chair will entertain our motion now. I have no doubt, as the honourable junior member for St. James said, that we will be defeated; but as he has pointed out, when we were replying to the Message we were not enacting laws. Now, however, that we are enacting law, we would like to have it recorded that we were never in favour of five ministers. This is the only time that the Opposition can do that.

I have always argued, Sir, that you have always got the better of me because you are in the Chair. I am sure, Sir, that if you had seen the Reply, or rather refreshed your memory on it before you made your ruling, your ruling would have been different. So I am wondering, Sir, if you will allow us to put our motion now. It is true that some honourable members will leave the House rather than vote and let it appear that your ruling is being questioned. When the honourable Leader replied to the honourable junior member for St. James I wondered if he realised that example is better than precept. I have sat in the gallery on several occasions and heard him challenge, not only the ruling of the Chairman but the ruling of the Speaker. He may not have pressed his challenge; but he did challenge rulings. It is fortunate for him that he usually gets the better of the Chairman.

This matter is of great importance, and we should have it recorded that we are not in favour of five Ministers because of the financial implications, and bearing in mind the economy of this island. I would like to assure you that in asking that that be done I do it with no discourtesy to you as a member of this House and least of all as Chairman of Committees. The motion could have been put a long time ago if the Leader of the House had allowed it to be put. Nothing moves me when I am on my feet and when I want to talk. If honourable members are hungry they should have taken dinner before. I can stand up for a long time.

My motion was that the words “not exceeding four in number be deleted and the words “three other ministers inserted in place thereof. The honourable Leader has accepted part of my motion, and therefore it is the honourable senior member for St. Philip's motion that should be put now. The Leader having accepted part of my motion the rest of it would not read. I therefore ask leave to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection leave was granted.

The question that the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip be now entertained was put and resolved in the negative the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD. (7)

Noes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mr. MILLER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MAPP, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. COX, Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BRANCKER. (13).

Clause 4 as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, with an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the House adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

Mr. ADAMS asked for and was granted leave to take Order 12 as the next Order of the Day.

BILL TO AMEND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) ACT, 1949.

On the order being called for Mr. ADAMS to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— After the long debate on the previous Order I beg to move, without further ado, that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,— I shall not be long; but for the very reasons which we gave in opposing the increase in the salary of the non-House members of the Executive I am opposing the increase in the salaries of members of the House.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— Perhaps I did not make it clear, but the Bill with which we are now dealing is the one dealing with the Leader of the Opposition alone. I want to make this clear because even on the precincts of the House we have been asked about this proposal that there should be a Leader of the Opposition and that this salary should be paid to him. Honourable members will remember that Sir Grattan Bushe said in 1946 after the elections of that year that he would send for the person who seemed best able to command a majority in the House and ask him to nominate members for the Executive Committee etc. That follows the convention relating to the Premier. The convention relating to the appointment of the Leader of the Opposition is set out in the phrase "the person who, in the opinion of the Governor, appears to be performing, and from the state of the political parties, to be capable of performing the functions of that position."

When that is read side by side with the comments of the Secretary of State for the Colonies that he regarded the salaries to be paid to Ministers as a matter primarily of domestic concern, and that the feasibility of such a provision would depend on whether such a person could be readily identified, it is obvious that this is nothing complicated. What I am going to say now is not the Government's view but my personal view. It should be patent to the blindest person that, with the present composition of the House, it would be difficult to appoint a Leader of the Opposition. But that is nothing to do with the Government.

As far as this convention is concerned I have not checked up to see how it is applied in Great Britain and what would happen there if a case like our own occurred; although it is almost inconceivable that such a case would occur there to-day. There was a time when there were a fairish number of Independents in the House of Commons; but in the present day there are hardly more than half dozen.

But in an island like this which still makes it possible to have persons calling themselves independent and being returned to the House without any attachment, or at least any obvious attachment to any political party the position is somewhat different. In Great Britain they have practically eliminated any chance of the Liberal Party ever coming anywhere near to be a Government Party; so in that country the choice of a Leader of the Opposition is child's play. That is not the case in Barbados, and that is why, as I understand it, the Secretary of State commented on the matter as he did.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, it is nothing to do with the present Government. As far as I know, it is not one of those matters on which the Governor would have to ask the advice of the Premier or the other Ministers. I have not checked up on it; but I fancy that if any reference is made to anyone in England on this matter it would be to the Speaker of the House of Commons and not to the King or Queen. Again I wish to make it clear that there is no suggestion that the Ministers or the Government, as distinct from the Governor himself, will have anything to do with the choice of the Leader of the Opposition. I express no opinion, because if it is the Governor's choice it would seem impertinent to say that I am suggesting to him from the floor of the House what he should do. I am not giving him any advice because the only practice that could be followed is the English practice.

I should imagine that we may find it difficult here to follow the present English practice because it is so easy in England to choose a Leader of the Opposition. Suppose at the next Elections in England the Conservative Party got an overwhelming majority over the Labour Party; the Labour Party would still have an overwhelming majority over the Liberal Party. It would not be a case like ours with a few members of the Electors' Association, non-descript Conservatives, so-called Independents and the Congressites. It is due to the growing up of the English system that there is no room for third parties.

I have made this long explanation, Sir, because I have had requests for an explanation from certain members of the House. I will promise to check up on how the convention will work.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,— The honourable senior member for St. Joseph need not worry himself, because it is likely that one of his battalion will lead the Opposition. It is purely an academic question, and I am not suggesting that it should be more than that. I merely wanted to inquire why it was deemed necessary to change the terms of Mr. Turner's despatch as regards the salary to be paid to the Leader of the Opposition. What I want to point out is that as far as Mr. Turner's recommendations are concerned, the Government has seen fit to revise the salaries of Ministers upwards, and the salary of the Leader of the Opposition downwards. That does appear strange. There must be some justifiable reason, and perhaps the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would like to inform the House as to that reason. I personally feel that \$200 a month is reasonable for the Leader of the Opposition; but at the same time I am of the opinion that \$600 a month is too much for a Minister. But since one has been revised upwards there must be some reason for that and also for the revision downwards of the salary proposed for the Leader of the Opposition.

According to this Bill the Leader of the Opposition will get \$200 a month — \$40.00 a month more than the ordinary member of the House. The Turner

or over conscientious as to say that the post should be honorary or with that salary it is better not to have any Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition does deserve something extra to that of an ordinary member. Let me repeat, there is no similarity in the office of Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the House. We are recognising the Office and are giving £100 over and above that of an ordinary member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I do not know what difference there is between Mr. Turner and the honourable member who has just sat down, but I would say, that as far as I can see, Mr. Turner has some thought and reason and his motives are actuated on some proper basis. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has often said that there would be no difference between the Prime Minister of Great Britain in regard to his position with the Queen and the Government, as it is with his position with the Governor and this Government, and if there is no difference with his counterpart in Great Britain and himself, then there is none between a minister here and a minister in Great Britain. This question is not one of imparting a view on paths of information to the Leader of the Opposition; the honourable member knows that by virtue of the position of the Leader of the Opposition, he has to be in attendance in this Chamber at all times and his position is other than that of an ordinary back-bencher.

(A VOICE): The honourable member forgets that there is a rule that every honourable member has to be in attendance whenever there is a meeting of this House, so long as he is in the island, whether he is Leader of the Opposition or any other member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is nonsense. The Leader of the Opposition in Great Britain gets a salary twice as much as the ordinary member but the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has acted true to form. Sir, none of the salaries here for ordinary members of the House, the Leader of the Opposition, the Speaker, Deputy Speaker or Chairman of Committees, bears any proper relation to the remuneration proposed for Ministers. If the Leader of the Opposition has nothing to do, correspondingly, the Ministers have nothing to do. If the Leader of the Opposition is not here to keep in touch with what is going on, he is not fulfilling his duties. Where else in this world under a British constitution do you give a Minister ten or eleven times as much as an ordinary member? The only reason I can see for the present level of the salaries of the Ministers is that, perhaps while the Government Party promised the electorate to soak the rich, they are in process of doing what they say, but at the same time seeing to it that by their doing so, they themselves may also become rich.

This is purely an academic matter to me. If we are approaching this new system on a proper basis, we must bear in mind the fact that we are not legislating for the present setup alone but that we are legislating for the entire duration of the political life of this colony. I am not very much concerned with the argument as to the swing of the political pendulum. I do feel that the proposal for Leader of the Opposition should bear some relation to what is fair and what is just. It is impossible to suggest that this particular Bill does that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am thoroughly convinced from the argument which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph put up just now and from his demeanour when he was putting up such an argument that he is not convinced himself that he is right. If you looked at his attitude and everything else when he was putting up such an argument, you would have noticed what I said. The Leader of the Opposi-

tion in Jamaica gets half of what the Leader of the House gets.

(A VOICE; That is not true).

When Mr. Bustamante as Leader of the House of Representatives, Jamaica, was getting £2,000 per annum, Mr. Manley, as Leader of the Opposition was getting £1,000.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. COX and Mr. BRANCKER—9.

Noes: Mr. TALMA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, and Mr. GODDARD—7.

Clause 2 was then passed.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) ACT, 1949

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph: Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I know honourable members of this House would expect me to give some long exhortation on the principle of legislative salaries, but they would not hear me tonight as I have informed the public quite fearlessly already of my views with regard to that matter. The *Advocate* newspaper gave to my views on this matter almost a whole page so it can be said that my views have been given the greatest publicity. At any rate, I have a few things to make comment on in this Bill. First of all, I understand that these salaries have been more or less decided on after comparison with those of Civil Servants. If that is so, there can be nothing more erroneous. Let me point out that the status of members of this elected Chamber is entirely different from the status of Civil Servants. The affairs of the Legislature are paramount in any community and bear no relation to either the manner in which Civil Servants are appointed or dismissed. The community by their vote put us here, so no one person can dismiss us, not even the Governor. The Head of the Administration has no power to say which of us should not be elected to this House or re-elected, so if these salaries for members of this House are based on the principle of that of Civil Servants, that should not be so.

I also understand that the salaries paid to members of the British Guiana Legislative Chamber were taken as a precedent. Sir, why of all colonies, should British Guiana be taken as a precedent? Why British Guiana should be a copy for members of the Legislature of Barbados for remuneration is a mystery to me. If we take Jamaica as an instance—not British Guiana at all—we would see that there is not such a vast difference existing between ordinary members' salaries and ministers' salaries as it is with our own. Approximately, the Chief Minister

in Jamaica gets three times that of ordinary members and the Ministers two and one-third times as much as ordinary members. Mr. Bustamante gets \$12,000 per annum and ordinary members \$340 per month. Here, Sir, the Premier is going to draw five times that of ordinary members, and Ministers are going to draw nearly four times as much. In Trinidad, the Ministers draw \$800 per month and ordinary members \$320. The comparison of ordinary members here with ordinary members in those two colonies is ridiculous. Our status as elected members is just the same as the Ministers. We have equal status before the people and there is absolutely no reason why this great difference should be made in the remuneration. There is absolutely no justification for it. Ministers are also to draw other Cabinet allowances. Do ordinary members have to travel in their constituencies? Oh yes! When ordinary members take their motor cars and put gasoline in them, do they get it free? Oh No? When I rent a car to visit my constituency does it cost me money or do I get it free? Why should ordinary members not get a travelling allowance? Surely honourable members have to travel also in the interest of their constituency. As I have said, in the other two leading colonies—Jamaica and Trinidad—no such comparison exists. Ordinary members of the Legislature of those colonies are considered important people and as having similar duties to perform as far as the electorate is concerned, as Ministers. In Jamaica, they are given travelling allowance and subsistence allowance. Why should this Government still conform to the absurd opinion of the *Advocate* that ordinary members of this House should be paid a great difference in salary to that of Ministers? As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I cannot appreciate it. I do not see on what principle the Government should decide that such a vast difference should exist between the salaries of ordinary members and Ministers in the same Legislature. As I have said in my statement on ministerial system, it amounts to the creation of class structures in the Legislature itself—something which should never happen.

It has always been said that Barbados is a law unto itself; we do not have to follow anywhere. I would say that if we follow somewhere, we should follow the people with the higher principles. As far as following British Guiana is concerned, this Government could not have picked out a worse colony than that, because as far as I am concerned, an ordinary member in the British Guiana House of Assembly—I am referring to the former Legislature—used to draw remuneration not only from the Treasury but from party funds. It is for that reason that an ordinary member could draw such a small sum of \$160 per month from the Legislature.

Sir, the honourable Leader of this House boasts of our superior constitution. If our constitution is so superior to others, why is he so small in mind and so insulting to our constitutional concept as to compare its ordinary members in this House with those of British Guiana? It is not fair to us. Sir, it is absurd under adult franchise to be parsimonious in our remuneration of the legislators. I must recall this from the letter which I wrote to the Press. Nobody challenged that letter not even Mr. George Hunte, our severest critic. I pointed out in that letter that the principle of establishing legislators' salaries was along this line. Since you have adult franchise: since anybody who can gain the confidence of the electorate may be elected to the General Assembly, the income paid by that Legislature should be calculated on the principle that it is the only income of the legislator. You have to rule out any concept of a member getting income from any-

where else but from the Legislature. If a legislator must have the confidence of the Legislative Chamber, you must not embarrass him by a parsimonious salary. You must abide by the principle that it is the only income of the legislator and it is only on that principle that salaries for legislators actually exist. When they pay a legislator in Jamaica \$340 per month plus travelling and subsistence allowances it is on that principle that they are paid. So, too, when you pay an ordinary member in the Trinidad Legislature \$320 per month plus \$50 for travelling allowance. I have come to the conclusion that the poorest man in the community, so long as he has the ability and can gain the confidence of the electorate, when he is elevated to the status of a legislator, should not be embarrassed whatsoever from a financial point of view, as it may tend to prevent him from discharging his duties efficiently. If he does not discharge his duties efficiently, it should not be because of financial embarrassment through the State's parsimonious actions, it should be some other fault. When you pay a legislator a parsimonious salary, certainly it can be embarrassing to him. I have stated those points already.

It is neither my duty nor my right to say to increase the salaries of ordinary members of this House of Assembly. If I say so, it would be against the laws of the country, but I have stated my view of what those salaries should be in a letter to the Press and everybody could have read it, even my constituents. Let me say that I am not afraid to express my views on this matter to my constituents, because when it comes to principles, I am convinced that I can address any crowd in my constituency. I am convinced that 98% of my constituents are convinced that I represent their interests conscientiously. Of course, it is your duty to represent them conscientiously. I am going to say this also. From the moment one becomes a legislator, regardless of who he is, his expenses inevitably increase by virtue of his being a legislator. If a legislator is to pay the necessary time to his duties as a legislator and to do justice as a representative, he deserves a requisite remuneration for that purpose. I certainly do not think that \$160 per month is a requisite remuneration for members of this Barbados House of Assembly.

Sir, many a man has had to give up his own life's purpose or has lost out through his political convictions. Many a man has lost financially by affiliation with some particular party. Do you mean to tell me that a legislator should have a further penalty when he is elected by the people to serve them? Must a legislator be given parsimonious remuneration? I think it is unfair to treat him in such manner. It is totally unfair to him. And I think it is more so in Colonial societies than in metropolitan areas. I do know that I have suffered from the political attitude I have taken. A former employer has told me: "Vaughan, you will be surprised to know the big business men that have phoned me and asked me to dismiss you so that you can be politically embarrassed at the elections." He told me further that because he was a man he refused to do it and that he had replied to one of them telling them that so long as I did his work efficiently, he was totally indifferent to my politics. Now with that fact in mind, now that I have been elected to this Chamber, should the State further add to my embarrassment? I do not think so.

Sir, I cannot appreciate this great difference in salaries of ordinary members and Ministers in this Chamber. If this Government had copied Jamaica, the Premier would only be drawing \$480 per month and the other Ministers \$277 in relation

to our salary. If this Government had copied Jamaica ordinary members of this House would be getting \$255 per month in relation to what the Premier is going to get. There is absolutely no justification for this vast difference between the remuneration of ordinary members and Ministers. Sir, not one single measure which may be brought down to this House by the Ministers can be passed unless the majority of this House sanction it. They are dependent on our sanctioning of the measures which they bring down. Ours is as great a responsibility as theirs—perhaps greater. They do have other office work to perform but they alone cannot vote on measures. Those measures have to be passed by the majority of all of us. Sir, members of this House may be regarded as directors of the community purse. We collect a revenue of approximately thirteen million dollars; then we have to say how this thirteen million should be spent on the community. Surely any director in Bridgetown who is responsible for the expenditure of such a vast sum would not receive \$160 per month. All of us in here are directors so far as revenue of this colony is concerned. Sir, I only want to draw to the Honourable House how unfair is the difference between the salaries of ordinary members and ministers. I feel you will appreciate that there is no justification for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable junior member for St. John has made one mistake and that is criticising the Government for following British Guiana. The Government has not followed British Guiana; it has followed British Guiana only in so far as amendments of salaries are concerned. British Guiana had proposed to give its ordinary members in its House of Assembly something like \$400 per month, and the remuneration for its ministers was still less than that in this colony.

(A VOICE: Is that so?)

Certainly, if this Government had followed British Guiana, it would be doing what is right, but that is not so.

However, what I feel honourable members should agree to is the establishment of a Parliamentary Superannuation Fund to be contributed to solely by honourable members. This fund should be subscribed entirely from the salaries of honourable members themselves and paid into the Public Treasury. Let me make my position clear. I am not suggesting that one cent should be taken from the Public Treasury. Honourable members should agree to the contribution monthly or annually of a certain amount of money from our own remuneration to be paid into this Fund from which we could benefit when we retire from legislative activities or when we are retired compulsorily by the electorate. A member should, if he contributes a certain amount over a number of years benefit accordingly. In one parliament, which I happen to know something of, makes contributions to such a fund. This contribution is something like £20 a year and the individual member's benefit over a seven-year period is something like four times as much as that put in by the individual member. In the case of a fourteen-year contribution, the individual member's benefit would be about five or six times as much. If the individual member loses his seat in the Assembly before he is entitled to any benefits, the money which he contributed is refunded. I am not going as far as to suggest a Pension Fund as is the case in the United Kingdom, nor am I saying that the State should contribute towards this fund, but I will strongly suggest to honourable members to consider the advantage of making a sacrifice monthly or annually towards the establishment of a Super-

annuation Fund because in the long run, honourable members have everything to gain from it and nothing to lose.

Mr. COX: Sir, I am not prepared to tire the House but I think I should say a few words after listening to the speech made by the honourable junior member for St. John. I am sure every honourable member would agree with me when I say that the only time the honourable member makes a good speech in this House is when he is pleading a case for a bigger salary for himself.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I object to such an implication of being dishonest and I am asking that the honourable member withdraw those remarks. Whenever I make remarks in this House, they must not be construed as being of a personal nature. I was talking on a principle and I strongly object to the implication that I make a good speech when I am pleading a case for more money for myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable senior member for St. Michael to withdraw those remarks, because they do reflect on the honourable junior member for St. John.

Mr. COX: I do so quite willingly, Sir. I am always willing to obey the Chair. I withdraw them. The honourable member has said that his remarks must not be construed as being of a personal nature. I quite agree to that statement but what else must I conclude than that he makes a good speech only when he is advising this House on what should be the guiding principle of giving honourable members good salaries and the idea of giving such good advice is largely because of the fact that the honourable member would get more money.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, it will be remembered that some time ago, I gave notice of an Address with respect to the remuneration of honourable members of this House. I never moved its passing but the honourable senior member for the City has agitated me on many occasions to deal with it.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, allow me to say that the first time I knew that the honourable member wanted more money for members of this House was when I heard it in the Address.

Sir, the honourable junior member for St. John has said just now that we have followed British Guiana in making out our salary scale and wondered why we do not follow them in other things. I think I am correct in saying that in 1952 when we were dealing with salaries for the professional, executive and technical officers of Government Departments, this Government did bring in a scale based on the rates paid by British Guiana and the very honourable member got up on the floor of this House and criticised Government severely. The honourable member said at that time that the revenue of British Guiana was many times more than that of Barbados and we could not afford to pay our Heads of Departments as much as British Guiana was paying theirs. Now I hear to-night the same honourable member advocating that the salaries which are to be paid to members of this House of Assembly are based on remuneration which exists in British Guiana, a colony in which proposals for paying its legislators are ridiculously low and which should not be followed. As I understand the honourable member, he is saying that you need not follow British Guiana in paying members of this House, but you went too far when you paid technical, administrative and professional officers of this Government who do real useful work to the island on a scale comparable with that of British Guiana. The Government went too far on that occasion but on this occasion, it has not gone far enough. Sir, I can only conclude, as I

have said already, that the honourable member can always make a good speech whenever he has to plead a case for increase of salaries for members of this House. I appreciate the fact that if honourable members get an increase, the honourable member would also get the same. Sir, all that I wanted to say is that this Government feels that in following the British Guiana proposals that it is about as far as this colony can go.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I do not think that we should increase salaries of honourable members now. I must be consistent. I have listened to the speeches and I am not satisfied that we should increase these salaries now, therefore, I must record my vote against this Bill if I stand alone. I may say that all these comparisons with British Guiana started with a speech from the Throne, when the then Governor, Sir Alfred Savage compared salaries of everybody with British Guiana without comparing the national revenue of each colony. Because of that, I do not agree with those honourable members who make comparisons of Barbados with British Guiana and like colonies.

There is only one point on which I will touch at this moment. I believe in parliamentary traditions. Although we differ occasionally in our politics, I have a real sense of pride for Barbadians of my hue and type, and when I see the position which Your Honour occupies, and with the knowledge of the position from whence you came and that you are not one of a rich family, I think if there is one person who should be adequately remunerated, it should be Your Honour. While I will not decry what has been set out in this Bill towards Your Honour's remuneration, I give notice that when this House deals with the resolution for an amount of money for entertainment allowance to Ministers, I shall ask that Your Honour be included in that vote. I feel that at times, Your Honour by your position is somewhat embarrassed when you cannot entertain others of your distinguished position as they can entertain you when you are their guest. I think if there is one person who should have some kind of Entertainment Allowance, it is Your Honour. Because of your position, the occasion must arise when Your Honour as Speaker of this House of Assembly would have to entertain as much as the Leader of this House of Assembly. It must be remembered that former members of the House of Assembly who occupied Your Honour's distinguished position were men in good financial positions and could afford out of their own expense to get together privately or publicly. There are people in Your Honour's position who come here from sister colonies very often. It is well known that travelling by plane has made this world rather small. When or if such persons come here, Your Honour is not in such a really good financial position as to reciprocate the hospitality which you receive when you leave this colony. I am addressing these remarks to the members of the Executive who are responsible for formulating policy. Your Honour is offered in this new setup \$240 per month. I am sure no honourable member would say that is a big salary. I am sure honourable members would agree to a resolution of something in the vicinity of £100 as an Entertainment Allowance for Your Honour. I feel it should not be set aside but paid as salary whether or not the occasion arises, so that Your Honour would be able to act freely. I am throwing out that suggestion as I see nothing here for it. I am hoping that what I have said will in the not distant future come true. I do hope that the opportunity will be taken to offer a sort of token allowance to Your Honour because the people who occupied that coveted position for generations were always in a position

to reciprocate the hospitality they received when they went abroad and Your Honour should be placed in such a position. I do feel that if there is one person in this House who should have an Entertainment Allowance, it should be the Speaker.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am rather surprised that honourable members who have spoken on this Bill overlooked certain aspects of it in regard to the remuneration of the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. I heard very much during the discussion on the previous measure about the inadequacy of the \$40 over that of honourable members which was provided for the Leader of the Opposition. Some honourable members felt that the remuneration for the Leader of the Opposition was so inadequate that they asked that the post be honorary. To my mind, what is more glaring in this Bill and more than in the previous measure is that Mr. Deputy Speaker and Mr. Chairman of Committees are getting only \$20 per month more than what is being provided for honourable members. As a matter of fact, I feel that Mr. Chairman of Committees should be compensated to a greater extent than Mr. Deputy Speaker. Even if it is argued that in the past, the two offices were compensated in like manner, it is no reason for this House to perpetuate what to me is an obvious injustice. Any person who accepts the office of Chairman of Committees accepts to sit long hours in this House of Assembly. He has to carry on indefinitely and to be remunerated to the extent of only \$20 more than an ordinary member is inadequate and one must question why a more reasonable figure was not arrived at. If the amount of \$40 per month more for the Leader of the Opposition is inadequate, how much more inadequate is this \$20 more for the Chairman of Committees. That sum does not in any way take into account the strenuous and lengthy service which the Chairman of Committees has to render in this House. I do feel that Government should reconsider this matter. I do feel that sparse and inadequate provision has been made for these two offices more especially that of Chairman of Committees.

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

On 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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. ADAMS: I think honourable members may agree that on the last point which the honourable senior member for St. Lucy made, it would be very invidious to keep those salaries at the same level. I personally think that the exercise of knowledge of Rules of this House and things of the like make the position of Chairman of Committees more onerous than any position of the House save that of His Honour the Speaker. If honourable members feel that there should be a difference between that of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, then this House may consider the question at some future Session. I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to take as the next Order of the Day, Item No. 4 and that the instruction of the House when it goes into Committee be to deal with No. IV. Resolution.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next 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 grants of sums of money for the service of the Colony. The instruction is that the Committee deal with No. 4 Resolution.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone Nos. (i), (ii) and (iii), and to deal with No. (iv).

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

RESOLUTION FOR TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE FOR MINISTERS AND GOVERNMENT HOSPITALITY VOTE

Mr. ADAMS: This resolution is for the sum of \$1,000 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I, for the purpose of making provision for travelling allowance for Ministers and a Government Hospitality vote. I do not think it is necessary to state it in here, but because of certain stupid remarks which may have arisen elsewhere, I would state that if you have a Government Hospitality Vote, some Department of Government will have to see after it. As set out in His Excellency's Message, paragraph ii (5), this Government Hospitality Vote is to be controlled by the Premier subject to reference to Executive Committee, but it only says "controlled by the Premier" because he is the Minister for Finance. When one goes on a deputation to the United Kingdom, entertainment is provided out of a vote similar to this, and the Treasury controls it. When Sir Winston Churchill came out to the West Indies a few months ago, what he may have paid out for entertainment would undoubtedly have come out of a vote similar to this. I mention that to show the reason why there should be this Government Hospitality Vote. It is only controlled by the Premier because he is in the position of Minister of Finance.

I am going to suggest to honourable members that if members of the Government keep an accurate check, they may have to come and show to the House that they are not travelling unduly but that they are spending more than what is given them for travelling allowance. But again, it is because of the desire to economise that we have only asked for that amount for travelling. I do know that in the first year of the running of this ministerial system, ministers will have to do a lot of travelling and if you agree with the principle that travelling purely on official duties a minister should not be out of pocket, I feel sure in keeping accurate records, the Ministers have nothing like enough for travelling. I just throw out that warning. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, This is a very important resolution that we are handling, and the agreement to this resolution should be based on the view that the Government take the overall allowance that is paid out in travelling and entertainment and

other matters. We have the Head of the Administration receiving a duty allowance of \$4,800 per annum. In these proposals the Ministers will be getting an allowance of \$50 per month for travelling besides the Government Hospitality Vote of \$3,000. Besides all that, you have \$10,000 voted in a lump sum for conferences and things of that sort. Well, when all those things are added up, the total amount for allowances under these Heads comes to over \$27,000. Right from the beginning of the operation of this new system, Ministers would be given travelling and entertainment allowance. I feel that some reduction should take place somewhere and I cannot promise to support this resolution as it stands unless the Government Bench explains whether Government intends to reduce the entertainment allowance of the Head of the Administration. Sir, the principle is wrong. You should not have a Government in a small colony like this where unemployment is so rife and where taxation has reached its zenith coming and indiscreetly increasing the amount under these Heads and for things which are not particularly necessary. Entertainment allowance is of no necessity whatsoever because one is not obligated to entertain. If you are saying that the Head of the Administration should get \$1,000 for that purpose and then you are saying that the Ministers should get \$3,000 between them for that purpose, I am saying that that is too much, because when a Minister entertains, I take it that the Government entertains, and when the Head of the Administration entertains, the Government also entertains. If that is the case, entertainment allowance should be reduced somewhere, somehow or other.

Sir, we are not going to see any lapses as regards to the spending of these allowances unless all the Ministers are sick. The question of the principle is wrong. Government entertainment allowances are too great already so far as the revenue of the Colony is concerned. When this House discussed this new system, I pointed out that under entertainment allowance, the Government must consider that the Head of the Administration was already getting \$4,800 therefore, if the Ministers must get an entertainment allowance, that which the Head of the Administration gets, should be reduced. If that could not be done, then the Ministers should accept a reduced amount for entertainment. It is only natural that that should be so. I say it is wrong. This expenditure is going to be more than what is here on this paper because the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has hinted that the amount set down for travelling is less than what it is expected to be. Sir, I would like to know how much entertainment Ministers would be doing in their offices. I would like to know what entertainment they would embark upon in so short a time. To my mind, no Minister deserves travelling and entertainment allowance. I am saying, Mr. Chairman if the Ministers are entitled to entertainment allowance to this tune, obviously I must say that His Honour the Speaker should be given entertainment allowance also. I can see more justification for the head of this Honourable Chamber having entertainment allowance than all the Ministers, because his position merits his entertaining more than the others. Speaking personally, if I were a Minister, I would not want to do all this entertaining. I suggest that sufficient money is being proposed to be spent already under this new ministerial system, and to increase it by these little stupidities is taking advantage of the situation. At present, the public is crying out very loud and strong against the cost of this new system, so some consideration must be given to the public feelings and if hon-

ourable members as servants of the public — we are elected by them — are here to protect their interest and to plan things for them, I feel some respect should be given to the views of the public as have been expressed over the past few weeks, since it was known that this new system would have been brought into operation.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows that this entertainment allowance is something which Ministers could forego because the salaries which are proposed for them are high. As is known the Bill for their remuneration has been passed tonight with a measure of strong criticism and that clearly shows that honourable members realise that the expenditure is high. Although on some of the measures that have been passed tonight nothing much has been said, it does not mean that Government is correct in everything. Members of the Government must bear in mind that for the most part they are passing measures to benefit themselves, therefore, one has to be very careful that one's action does not appear to be indiscreet. Of course, there can be no denying of the fact that with ministerial system coming into being, of those officials who used to visit the Head of the Administration at Government House, part of them would have to meet the Premier or some other Minister and therefore the cost of entertaining those officials who would be meeting the Ministers should of necessity be provided for the Ministers, but it must be remembered that it would be taken off from the Head of the Administration, therefore, the grant which the Head of the Administration now gets should be reduced. I think that is quite simple to understand. I daresay that if the suggestion were made that the entertainment allowance of the Head of the Administration should be reduced by X pounds and be given to the new Ministers for the reasons I have given, I hardly think the Head of the Administration would fail to agree to the suggestion.

I am sure that no honourable member of this Place who sits on the Executive has raised that point. It should have been raised. If the question were raised at a meeting of the Executive and the Head of the Administration disregarded the suggestion, I would consider it as indiscreet. Sir, this Government Hospitality Vote can reach anything like \$30,000. This colony cannot afford to spend so much on that purpose. Newspapers and the public are apprehensive over the cost of ministerial system and more so, when one does not see any means by which you can increase the wealth of the colony. With all the fancy hopes of what this new system would mean to this colony, one does not see one iota in the suggestions whereby an extra dollar would be added to the revenue of the colony. I am going to say this now. We are paying very dearly for this fandangle political term, "Ministerial Status."

If the change in the system means anything by all means pay reasonably for it; but if it is going to cost too much leave it out. Members on the other side can behave in whatever manner they like. They feel that they are strong, not realising that they are only strong because of the weakness of their opponents. Members on the Government side do not even have that reasonableness of character to realise that when a suggestion counter to theirs is made—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When the honourable member says "reasonableness of character" what does he really mean? Does he mean character or was that a slip of the tongue?

Mr. ALLDER: We all know that the honourable member is disgruntled. I am still glad that I have been able to bring him to his feet.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would still like to know what the honourable member meant.

Mr. ALLDER: Is the honourable member speaking to a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member had better explain what he meant.

Mr. ALLDER: If I thought that honourable members were so dumb I would have explained it already. I am saying that the members of the Government Party, by their obstinate attitude towards any criticism against them give the impression that they are really unreasonable in their behaviour. Therefore I made the statement that they do not have any reasonableness of character.

What is more, sir, when objections are raised on matters like this the honourable senior member for St. Joseph does not even hold out the promise that the Government will go into it and probably do what it is expected they should do. When the Estimates come down for the next financial year it will be seen that the statements which I am making now are correct, because under each head you will see increases, and the explanatory notes are going to say—and they are always generous with these statements—that the increases are due to increased cost of this and that, increased charges by the Crown Agents or some other agents. Then we will find, Mr. Chairman, that before the next financial year is out Government will have to be raising taxation to put back the money which they have unreasonably squandered.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I would not like to detain the Committee much longer, but I would say that the honourable senior member for St. John is usually confused when it comes to dealing with financial matters. When you are dealing with money in dollars and cents it seems that the last digits always confuse him. Three thousand dollars divided by five comes to twelve dollars a week per minister. Can any reasonable person say that the amount provided for entertainment by ministers can be regarded as excessive? No one is in a position to say in the first month how anything will work, nor can you take the first month as an indication of what 12 months will be. The sum of \$50.00 a month for travelling is too small, but the Government sent it down.

As regards the Entertainment Allowance the suggestion that the honourable member made that there will be such dishonest ministers that they will spend out the vote because it is there shows the condition of the honourable member's mind. That sort of thing is very dangerous in a community. We have supposedly responsible people who never seem to think that other people can do anything honestly. Such people are dangerous. They never try to build up anything; their only desire is to show that other people are dishonest. I have always found that the people who make these suggestions need a little introspection.

Mr. ALLDER: I notice that the honourable member seems to be setting up himself as a purist nowadays. Whenever he gets up to speak he tries to put himself as high as the stars, but his behaviour always pulls him down into the gutter, and shows where he really is. If the honourable member feels that the figure I have criticised is justified in his getting the amount—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am asking the honourable member to withdraw the word "his". There is nothing in this that I am getting. The honourable member is crazy.

Mr. ALLDER: Is the word "his" unparliamentary? I am going to say now that the honourable member is a member of the Government. It has been suggested, and there has been no indica-

tion given that the honourable member will not be one of the ministers for whom this Resolution is going to provide Travelling Allowance and Entertainment Allowance. There is nothing in what I have said to withdraw. If I had made an unnecessary statement I would withdraw it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What I am objecting to is his using the pronoun "his". He cannot make a reference to any member of this Chamber as drawing something from a vote. The honourable member does not understand simple English.

Mr. ALLDER: If I cannot understand simple English I cannot withdraw a word that I cannot understand.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the honourable member is so ignorant not to understand, I am asking the Chair to make him withdraw the word "his". If he is pleading ignorance it is no fault of mine.

Mr. ALLDER: If I implied that the honourable member is going to be a minister, and he is not going to be one, all that he had to do was to tell me that I am wrong. All that the honourable member is objecting to is that I implied that he will be a minister.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The implication was that I was drawing a salary.

Mr. ALLDER: I have never claimed to know everything. The honourable member can sell some, or give away some of his great education. The honourable member is bigotedly stupid.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to continue on the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I am saying, sir, that suppose the honourable member was going to be a minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not worry about that.

Mr. ALLDER: Suppose for instance that the honourable member was going to be a minister. The honourable member said just now that the amount might not be sufficient. This is the point that I want to make. In the position which the honourable member now holds he meets strangers, and I suppose that inasmuch as he is entertained by some, that he entertains some too. I would like to ask how much, if any, he spends out of his own pocket to entertain his friends. If he does not do that now by virtue of his position why should he expect more than is necessary because the taxpayers are providing it? I raised that point because the honourable member was the only one to get up and challenge my statements. We all know, Mr. Chairman, that an individual is likely to be very cautious when he is spending his own money. But when he is spending someone else's money he can be very, very liberal.

I am bold enough to say that a thing of this sort should not pass this Chamber at all. My objections are reasonable, and my reasons are honest. (A MEMBER: Sit down.) I am asked to sit down. The honourable member who asked me to sit has a weakness in that when he is attacked by someone who means the attack he cannot say a word. When he is called things like "monkey nuts" he does not reply.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member is finished with the Resolution, I would ask him to take his seat. He is not speaking on the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: To say, Sir, that it does not hurt me that this Resolution will be passed is wrong. It certainly does. Of course I cannot stop it from being passed. But what I would like to know from the Government Bench is if there is any possibility of getting the total entertainment grants reduced during the next financial year. That is, if there is any intention when dealing with the Estimates for the next financial year to make these amounts less than they are. Because this Resolution might get passed by this Committee tonight it does not mean that this is the last time that this matter will be

raised. And while I might be the only person to raise it tonight there may be more voices in protest against it the next time that it is raised. I say that because on many occasions when we handle something for the first time we have a tendency to oversight some item, and if an objection is raised at a later date the Government members always say that you have agreed to it already and therefore you should not say anything. That is why I have spoken on the Resolution as I have; because my protest against it would be known if I have to move a deletion at some future time.

It can hardly be said, sir, although we hear talks about unexpended funds lapsing in the Treasury, it can hardly be said that any entertainment in this or any other community has not been spent, and has therefore lapsed. And it is only because of my failure to see any lapse of such funds that I am suggesting, and rightly so, that if the Resolution called for \$50,000 it might all be spent. It is not unknown that when the end of a financial year approached Heads of Departments just used up extra energy to make sure that the end of the financial year did not find them with unexpended money. Whether or not other honourable members agree with me it does not alter the fact that such things have happened, and that scrutiny is necessary to see that they do not happen. That is the purpose for which we were sent here, and although in the opinion of some it may be unpopular to raise a protest that does not alter the fact that a protest should be made. It is very peculiar, Mr. Chairman, that in a matter like this the Government should show such liberality when there have been deserving cases —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Am I to sit here all morning listening to you just talking and talking?

Mr. ALLDER: I am saying, sir, that there have been many deserving cases in the past in respect of which the Government did not show the liberal attitude that they are displaying over this matter. There have been cases of employees whom we felt should have been better treated —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Keep to the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: If the Government continues in this strain it will have to look around to see where it can collect more taxation from; and inasmuch as in the Five Year Plan —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Five Year Plan is nothing to do with this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Indirectly it has much to do with it, sir. This Resolution calls for the spending of money, money collected by taxation. The Government, therefore, has to think not only in terms of spending money, but also in terms of collecting it.

It is not clear to me, sir, how much travelling a minister will have to do, and therefore my arguments in that respect are somewhat limited. I would like to know if the ministerial offices are going to be situated within a mile of the ministers' residences —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see nothing about ministerial offices in the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: We are dealing with travelling, sir. We have to think in terms of the points to and from. The ministers' offices will be situated within the heart of the city, and most of the other Government Departments will be only a couple blocks away; and inasmuch as —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Everyone knows where they will be situated. Must we listen to the honourable member telling us all over again?

Mr. ALLDER: I must mention these things.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mention them to yourself.

Mr. ALLDER: If we are dealing with travelling we have to think of distances. It cannot be otherwise when you are computing the cost of travelling. I am very apprehensive over the cost of these two heads, and I am more apprehensive be-

cause the Government is already spending a tremendous amount on the administration of a colony such as this, while on the other hand we are not travelling as fast as we should in bringing our social services up to the required standard.

I would like to be in a position to make the Government Bench realise that the privileges of this Chamber are not limited to members of the dominant party. These are privileges which have been guarded jealously by those who have gone before us. I would say too, and I cannot say it too often, that compromise is very necessary in politics.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr Chairman, — Before the question is put I would like the honourable member who has just spoken to know that we will not be always as quiet as we have been tonight when he makes these unnecessary remarks about the Government. The honourable member is one of the

most sensitive human beings that I have ever come across in public life; and he may be made to feel that he is sensitive.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House until Tuesday, 19th January, 1954, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I also beg to give notice of dealing with this resolution later in the same manner as the honourable senior member for St. Michael has given notice just now.

Mr. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$20,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54 Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54 No. 36 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the regulations entitled the Wireless Telegraph (Ship Station) Regulations, 1954.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill intituled an Act to amend the Volunteer Act 1909 and the Volunteer (Amendment) Act, 1946.

Bill intituled an Act to amend the Police Act, 1908.

Mr. G. H. ADAMS: Bili intituled an Act to continue various expiring laws.

REPLIES LAID

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay replies to Question No. 40 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for the City.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Bill intituled an act to amend the Volunteer Act, 1909 and the Volunteer (Amendment) Act, 1946 was read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Police Act, 1908, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill intituled an Act to continue various expiring laws was read a first time.

RULES 88 AND 89 SUSPENDED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Dr. CUMMINS, seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1, 2 and 3, and that Order No 4: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony, be the first of the Day and that the instructions of the Committee be to deal first with the resolution for \$600 of which notice has just been given. At the same time that the Committee is in Session, it should deal with the other two resolutions of which notice was given earlier.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, before you give your ruling on that, I would just like to say that I heard the honourable senior member for St. Michael and the honourable member who has just spoken give notice of resolutions which were actually inaudible to me and they are asking that consideration be given to them now.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member would give way to me for a moment, I would tell him that the first resolution for \$600 is for the purpose of meeting the expenses to entertain two parliamentar-

ians who would be here on the 29th instant, and if this resolution is not dealt with to-day, it will be difficult to see how we could get the money in time. the (\$8,800-resolution) is for flood damage — repair to roads in St. Andrew and St. Joseph which is very pressing. The (\$7,000-resolution) is for the purpose of continuing the work at the Oistin Town Sub Post Office. The Public Works Department is working faster than was at first anticipated on this Post Office and it is impossible to go on further with the work until this money is granted. They have reached the stage where they had expected to reach before the time.

Mr. ALLDER: However expeditious the measures may be, I feel the time has come when the Government Bench should pay greater respect to honourable members who are not members of the Government Party. Here it is, these resolutions were read out only just now. You could scarcely hear what the honourable members were reading and they are asking you now to give immediate consideration to the passing of those resolutions. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has been without any previous knowledge of what are the contents of those resolutions and how they apply to one's field of politics or how they would affect the Colony. You have not the time to consider what side you should support or oppose as far as these resolutions are concerned. I think this constant action of Government is carrying things too far. It is making a mockery of Party Government. Because the honourable member can successfully get the support for such things in this Chamber, he should not come and throw them on this House haphazardly without caring whether honourable members like it or not. I am speaking not only for myself but also for those other honourable members who do not belong to the Government Party and who do not know anything about these things until the Government brings them here to get our blessing. I am appealing to honourable members of the Government to discontinue doing such things. I have not even received a cyclo-styled copy of these resolutions; at least the Government Bench could hand around a cyclo-styled copy to each honourable member as soon as notices were given. What I do mean is that Government should not wait until it is about to deal with the particular resolution to hand around a copy. I feel it would be an easy thing for the Government Bench to get Civil Servants or the Clerk of the House to send honourable members who do not belong to the Government Party a cyclo-styled copy of such resolutions as soon as it has decided to deal with the matter so that honourable members would have as much time as possible to study the matter. When honourable members outside of the Government Party get resolutions, they have to go around and investigate things in them so that they can decide whether they should support them or not.

Mr. COX: I must apologise to the honourable member. In the first place, it has been customary on some occasions to have cyclo-styled copies of these haphazard things sent to honourable members or distributed to them before hand with the permission of His Honour the Speaker and for that reason I must apologise. However I do hope honourable members would lend us their assistance in dealing with these resolutions because they are for urgent matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has moved a motion that this House go into Committee of Supply and that the instructions to the Committee be to deal first with the resolution of which notice has just been given

followed by two other resolutions of which notice has also been given. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No".

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. MAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. COX, Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. HAYNES.—12.

Noes: Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, and Mr. ALLDER.—3.

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

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR VISIT OF LORD RUFFSIDE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this resolution is for the sum of \$600 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1953-54, Part I—Current.

As honourable members will see, the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has been informed by the Secretary of the United Kingdom Branch that the late Speaker of the House of Commons, Colonel the Right Honourable Douglas Clifton Browne (now Lord Ruffside), will be visiting this Colony from the 29th to the 31st of this month accompanied by Lady Ruffside. As a result, the Branch has asked Government to sent down a resolution for the sum of \$600 to cover the cost of entertainment.

Since then, the Local Branch of the Association has learnt that Lord Scarsdale is on the same ship and will also be coming ashore to pay a visit to the Branch. The expenses would be no more. However, I mention that for honourable members to know that we would be entertaining two members of the United Kingdom Parliamentary Branch for the two days that they would be here.

I may anticipate a question by saying that the proposals include the usual form of entertainment and in addition, as I understand it, the co-Chairmen of the Local Branch will take the visitors out to see certain important portions of the island. As I have said there would be the usual form of entertainment. I do not think it would be necessary to say that there would be a cocktail party at which members of both branches of the Legislature and their wives would be invited.

I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate our entertaining a former Speaker of the House of Commons and I think that we as associates of that ancient Chamber in London, the House of Commons, should pride ourselves in so doing. But, Sir, what is remarkable is that only eight days ago, suggestions were made by members of this Chamber, which, if they had been accepted by Government, we would not have had to be handling this resolution today.

I feel, Sir, that a fund for this purpose should already have been established as the dignity of His Honour the Speaker is no less than the dignity of the Speaker of the House of Commons, which was held by those gentlemen whom we are about to entertain. I feel that a matter of this sort should have been handled by the Speaker of this Chamber. His Honour the Speaker should have had an entertainment fund. Instead of our having to rush through a resolution of this sort, a fund for this purpose should have been set down to His Honour the Speak-

er. When those suggestions were made last Tuesday the Government did not show any appreciation for them. I must stress that the dignity of the Speaker of this Honourable House is a high honour regardless by whom the Chair is held and there should not be any discrimination because of the personalities who might be involved. I must make it known that of all expenditure which we have had to give our blessing to in this Chamber this is one which should not have come down as it is, but should have been included in a larger amount for the setting up of a fund from which His Honour the Speaker of this Chamber would be able to draw for the entertainment of those who are related to this Chamber. I hope, Sir, that although the suggestions were turned down last Tuesday by the Government, that consideration will be given later to the necessity of instituting such a Fund. Probably, we can have the Debates Committee, of which His Honour the Speaker is Chairman, to administrate the fund.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that there is something in what the honourable senior member for St. John said but it appears to me, that in a matter of this sort, some amount should be set aside in the Estimates every year for the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I think that there is a fund already set aside in the Estimates, but that is for the Head Office. I do think that the Local Branch should have a fund from which it can draw for matters of this sort because every now and then, we have to come to this House with these rush resolutions for this purpose. I do not think the Local Branch of this Association should come cap in hand to Government the time to get money for this purpose.

I too agree that the Speaker of this House should have an entertainment allowance and if such a fund is provided, I would welcome it and give it my support. However, I think that this particular vote more concerns the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association than His Honour the Speaker, and I do not think that there should be some provision made for it in the Annual Estimates. There are hundreds of these things under Subsidies and Grants and I do think that the Local Branch of that Association should have something to spend without having to rush the Executive and the Legislature everytime an invitation is received or a visit is being made to the colony by one of the Association members.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the suggestions made by the honourable senior member for St. John and the junior member for the City in that it is rather undignified for us to come cap in hand to the Government — if I may borrow a phrase from the honourable member on my right — everytime a visiting parliamentarian has to be entertained by the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, how many members of the public are aware of the constitution and conventions of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. It is constituted of all the members of both Houses of the Legislature in the British territories which have a two-Chamber Legislature just as in this colony, and in those colonies in which there is only one Chamber, it is constituted of all the members of that Chamber. It is a voluntary and free alliance of all the parliaments within the British Commonwealth of nations. Some of us may feel that it is an instrument of Imperial policy. However, I do feel that it is an instrument for the creating of better understanding among members of the Commonwealth Association.

Certainly, if members of the public would want to know if honourable members can question the expenditure of \$250 to provide furniture for one of the Government offices when that furniture would stay there until perpetuity, or as long as it lasts, they would want to know if we can frivolously vote for the expenditure of \$600 on one cocktail party. It is for this reason that I advocated to support a definite fixed allowance to be given to the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to cover costs of the contribution to the Mother Country and the cost of every entertainment which the Local Branch may be called upon from time to time to undergo.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the suggestion that there should be an entertainment allowance to the Speaker of this Honourable Chamber is not out of place in this debate. At the same time, we must not overlook the fact that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and the dignity of the office of Speaker are not synonymous terms or symbolic of one and the same thing, therefore, there is nothing to prevent the Government from deciding to allocate, as I proposed, a fixed amount for that worthy cause because of the solidarity of the parliamentary institutions of the British Commonwealth and at the same time also to allocate a suitable amount for entertainment allowance for the Speaker. It would be rather unbecoming of this Chamber as one of the three oldest parliaments in the British Empire to be parsimonious about making a contribution of this kind to the entertainment of the former Speaker of the House of Commons.

Mr. Chairman, I will pass on to another aspect of this question. I hope that entertainment provided by Government officials for these members of the British Parliament is not included in this amount of \$600 because there are other entertainment allowances which we voted for earlier in the financial year. Certain people have been given entertainment allowance to entertain visitors to the colony. I therefore hope that the wording of the resolution seeks to do what it purports to do and that is to provide for the entertainment of Lord and Lady Ruffside and the additional visitors Lord and Lady Scarsdale. I hope it is not for entertainment which would be given by other Government officials. I am not saying that it is going to happen but it is only a query of mine. We all know that these resolutions frequently are not worded to express fully their purpose and I hope that this sum is not confused with sums which may be voted to specific Government officials for the carrying out of their liabilities to entertain visitors of importance to this colony.

Mr. ADAMS: What does the honourable member who has just sat down really want to know? Does he want to know if the entertainment which would be given by the Head of the Administration would be charged to this \$600? Of course, I do not know if he suggested the Head of the Administration or an employee of Government or a man in the street. But why say so? I rose particularly to answer that and to point out that the people who would be showing around these visitors would most likely to be His Honour the Speaker and the President of the Other Place who are the two co-Chairmen of our Branch of the Association. Of course, there may be some others in the party. It is quite possible, particularly in view of the fact that the dates coincide with some other legislative function. It is estimated that the Cocktail Party will be attended by about 100 persons. I, personally, was not at the meeting which was held to go into the matter but I do know that the caterer for this place who catered

for a similar function previously — about a year ago—put an average of \$3.50 per person for a Cocktail Party. The drive is estimated to cost \$100 and the luncheon another \$100. I understand that is the breakdown.

As regards the other point made by honourable members for the subscription to the Local Branch of the Association of such a fund, I would only say that we should pull our pockets first before going and asking the general taxpayers to pay for entertainment of parliamentarians. If there is need for such a subscription, by all means, let us make one out of our own pockets so that we may have something in the pool. We must remember that members of the public are not going to be in that entertainment. That entertainment would be mainly for members and on some occasions their wives. May be, of course, on an occasion of a special delegation from a parliament, that delegation can be entertained out of the Government Hospitality Vote as is done in England. May be, other people besides members could attend on such occasions. Let me again say that this is an informal visit by Lord Ruffside and his party. It is only by accident of the ship passing through here and staying here for two days that the visit has been made possible.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member who has just sat down made reference to members pulling their pockets first before asking the taxpayers to pay for entertainment of parliamentarians. I hope the honourable member would apply that same statement to the Head of the Administration.

(A VOICE): That is against the Rules. The honourable member knows that he has no right to bring that in.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. John must withdraw those remarks.

Mr. ALLDER: I bow to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I would just like to say that I hope the organizers of this party or those who are responsible for the Cocktail Party would try to make it a stag party because of my experience of what happened at a similar function previously. I feel that the invitations should be extended to the wives of honourable members. I remember very well that at the party given in honour of the British Industrialists who visited this colony some time last year, it was an extremely dull affair and half of the refreshments was not consumed. I also remember that one honourable member brought his wife, and curiously enough, it seemed as if the other honourable members' wives were not invited.

As regards the point made by the honourable senior member for St. John and the junior member for the City, I would say that members of this Chamber should think twice when advocating their want of keeping His Honour the Speaker to the dignity to which his office relates. I am always suspicious when you are dealing with Barbadians and because of Barbados being what it is. I am sure if the late Sir Harold Austin were in that Chair, certain instructions would be applied because of the personality of the man. I am pulling no punches because of the man's personality, but I think as regards to the present holder of the office, the same sort of principle that would be applied if the late Sir Harold Austin were in the Chair should also apply now. At any rate, I think the least said about this issue and of keeping His Honour the Speaker to the dignity of the Chair is the better at this stage of our history.

Mr. ADAMS: I need not plead guilty of what the honourable member who has just sat down is

referring. All I can say is that as far as I know, three honourable members of this House and three honourable members of the Other Place attended a meeting which was held to consider matters relating to the visit of these parliamentarians and made recommendations to which the Government said O.K. and brought down this resolution to provide for them. As far as members of the Executive could see, the amount requisitioned covers normal entertainment or what appears to be normal entertainment.

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

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE EQUIPMENT FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution which Government proposes to deal with is the Resolution for \$3,120 for the purpose of purchasing a 10/7 Winget Type of concrete mixer for the Department of Highways and Transport. I think the addendum explains this resolution quite fully. As honourable members know, quite recently, we had a lot of trouble with the mealy bug at various plantations and as a result, the Agricultural Department is trying its best to exterminate that pest. In consequence, the Director of Agriculture got in touch with the Director of Highways and Transport for the loan of a concrete mixer to use in countering that pest and the Director of Highways and Transport has agreed to the loan of one of his outsize mixing plants, provided that one be given of the size I have mentioned at the earliest opportunity in place of the one he would be loaning. This resolution, therefore, seeks to provide the necessary funds to purchase the 10/7 concrete mixing plant. I hardly think it is necessary for me to say anything more, but if honourable members want further information, so far as what I have on me, I should be only too willing to give it. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the honourable member who introduced the resolution read the addendum to it carefully; if so, he certainly should have explained how came it that the Director of Highways and Transport could state that the concrete mixer, he purports to lend out is too large for his purpose. As it appears to me, this House has been asked to vote for a concrete mixer that was too large for the purpose for which it was required and if we did not have this pest at present, it would have been of no use to us and we would still have had to purchase another. It also looks to me as if the loaning of the large concrete mixer to the Director of Agriculture is being taken as a good excuse for getting one of the right size.

Sir, a concrete mixer is a very essential thing to the Department of Highways and Transport. You cannot allow it to be removed or loaned unless you get another. That is how it appears to me. As I see it, the whole of this thing is really fit for a joke column. This how the addendum puts it: "The Director of Science and Agriculture is anxious to obtain the use of stone dust in the scheme to encounter the Mealy Bug Pest."

"The Director of Highways and Transport is willing to release one of his two outsize 14/10 concrete mixing plants, which is too large for his purposes, provided that he can have a replacement of a 10/7 Winget Type."

"It is estimated that the cost of this replacement will be \$3,120."

As I see it, this is a very urgent matter, but it also looks as if the Department of Highways and Transport cannot do possibly without it; yet it is of no use to the Department. The Department therefore is willing to lend out the one which is of no use to it so as to get the correct one. I do think that it is the duty of the honourable senior member for St. Michael to explain this situation. I have said on many occasions that the Department of Highways and Transport puts in a colossal sum of money in the Annual Estimates every year for plant, tools, spares and equipment for which it must have. In some cases, it asks for an increase to the vote by a Supplementary resolution which money is sometimes more than what was first put in the Annual Estimates. It has been brought to my knowledge that there are many plants, and so forth, in every size, at that department that the employees there do not use or do not know how to use. Sometime ago, we heard in this House that there was a spraying machine which was imported by that Department and which was never used or was broken before the employees there knew how to use it. That is a very serious matter and we must bear in mind that only some of these things reaches our ears. If the person who orders these goods is still working at that Department, I think the time has come when this House should check up on his ability about ordering goods.

I wonder if this next thing which I am about to enquire is in the portfolio of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. This House has been repeatedly hearing that this Mealy Bug Pest is mixed up with the ant which causes ratoon stunting disease. The two things have become very mixed up in here, and not only in here but also in the newspapers, so that whenever we talk about them in here, we talk about them together as if they were one and the same thing. I understand that it is not so at all. I do not know if it is ignorance or intention on somebody's part. I do know that there are people in this country who have a reputation for being the best planters in the world and looking into the matter of how they can cut down labour costs even if it be by robbing labour of proper wages, they have been ratooning and ratooning until they have left stumps in the ground and I wonder if by doing so, it is not worse than the Mealy Bug Pest. I do think that is what is causing this trouble. Sir, they say that the mealy bug pest is causing so much trouble now that we have been forced to give up the land that was put aside for the planting of food crops for the planting of more canes. I consider this to be a very serious matter and one which is yet to be discussed in this House.

I know the honourable senior member for St. John has not departed from his policy on land utilization and the planting of more food. We are told by every visitor to the colony that we should try and diversify our agriculture. We have also been told that the planters made a mistake of too heavily ratooning to cut down their cost and because of that, they could have left a permanent house for the mealy bug pest and the ant which causes ratoon stunting. Sir, it is always advantageous to any country to plant and produce as much food as possible. It is known that no export crop can make up for that; therefore, in my humble opinion, the Government was very wrong about willing away more land for the planting of canes. The decision must cause us to import more food. Sir, one good has come out of this resolution and that is, we know that the Department of Highways and Transport has imported a concrete mixer which it could not use.

Mr. GODDARD and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. LEWIS was speaking.

Mr. MILLER: I would like to get some more information from the honourable introducer of this resolution about the mealy bug pest. I do not think that this Committee has been given all the details. What I would like to hear something more on is the use of stone dust in countering this pest, because as far as I know, stone dust is an excellent fertiliser. Sir, it is unfortunate that the Government should be called upon at this time to spend so as to bring this mealy bug pest under control, when, probably, if it were discovered earlier, it would not have presented the hazard that it is now. However, we should not hesitate to spend all that is required. For many years this Government has had a very efficient entomologist in the person of Mr. Tucker and I think I am correct in saying that for all the years that he has been here, he has not discovered the presence of the mealy bug pest as a ratoon stunting disease. Making some friendly experiments myself, I have discovered that what causes ratoon stunting disease is the ant that moves about the mealy bug. I have discovered that the attack on the first crop canes is not particularly noticeable and the same thing can be said of second crop canes but thereafter you get the trouble. What I have found out is that the ant moves about the mealy bug which feeds on the roots of cane plants. I feel that had it not been for the ant, the cane plant would not fall an easy victim to that bug. However, I am very anxious to have further information from the honourable senior member for St. Michael about it if he has it in his possession. I would really like to know what is the policy of the Agricultural Department in its fight against the mealy bug pest and the use of stone dust in the campaign against it.

The honourable junior member for the City has questioned about the concrete mixer at the Department of Highways and Transport and said that there must have been some mistake in the ordering of it. I think he is correct in his statement about the affairs of that department. For instance, I know that that Department has ordered a brake-testing machine which cost this Government a lot of money and it is a white elephant today. There is also in that department a balance scale which was never used. As far as I know that scale is in dust and ruin. I do hope however, that honourable members would not take such things as a reflection against the new Director of that department. I think it is only fair and correct to say that this engineer is doing a good job. Probably, the Director feels the need for a new concrete mixer of a smaller size than what he has at that Department and it is for that reason that I would ask this Committee to pass this resolution, as as not to deny the department the opportunity of getting a smaller mixer and one which the Director may be able to use better. If as the addendum states the outmoded concrete mixer will be held by the Department of Highways and Transport until the Director is satisfied that this House will give him a smaller one, I do not think that we will be doing any good to withhold it by not agreeing to this resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to ask the honourable junior member for St. George a question, Mr. Chairman. Can the honourable member tell me whether the mealy bug is responsible for ratoon stunting disease?

(A VOICE): How would he know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that honourable members are concentrating more on the mealy bug pest than what is the real purpose of the resolution. I think I have given sufficient latitude so

far as the mealy bug pest is concerned. I do not wish to hear anything more about the mealy bug.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not think Mr. Chairman is aware that it is contained in this resolution. I am going to read the first paragraph of the addendum to let him know that it is so. It reads: "The Director of Science and Agriculture is anxious to obtain the use of stone dust in the scheme to counter the Mealy Bug Pest."

Mr. MILLER: I think it is but fair that I should be given the opportunity of replying to the request of the hon. junior member for the City. The honourable member asked if the mealy bug is regarded as a parasite of ratoon canes like other parasites. It is true to say that the bug in itself is not a parasite of ratoons but is supported by the ant who moves it into position for destroying the ratoons. The two work in conjunction. Any parasite that feeds on roots of any plant must stunt the growth of the plant; therefore, that can only be regarded as a disease.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, however microscopic this addendum may be, it does appear to me that the only corollary is to give the large concrete mixer to the Department of Science and Agriculture and get the smaller one for the Department of Highways and Transport, otherwise the Department of Science and Agriculture would be coming here in another resolution for a concrete mixer. What I would like to know from the honourable member who is looking after this matter is this. Since one of the ingredients which the Department of Science and Agriculture will be using in the concrete mixer is stone dust and this material is obtained at the Department of Highways and Transport, would it not be better to have this material produced or pulverised by the staff of the Department of Highways and Transport? I feel that that department would be better able to take care of the whole matter. From my knowledge of the working of the Department of Science and Agriculture, I do not think it is equipped either to maintain, to repair, or to operate a concrete mixing machine and it seems to me that we will have to be duplicating maintenance and operating staff as well as ordering duplicates and spares and matters of that sort as a result of sending the concrete mixer over to the Department of Science and Agriculture.

However, I do think that we should be indebted to the present Director of Highways and Transport for pointing out the economy of having a smaller concrete mixer. From my interpretation of the reduction in the size of the concrete mixing machine, it can be taken to mean that the department envisages the abandoning of those projects which were thought to be sadly needed in this country at that time like the construction of the East Coast Road in which the full capacity of the large concrete mixer would be necessary. I do not intend to go into any research as to the eradication of the mealy bug. I will only concern myself with the purchasing of the new machine by the Department of Highways and Transport in substitution for the one to be handed over to the Department of Science and Agriculture. I am wondering if at this stage it is too late for the Government to consider the economy of pulverising the stone dust over at the Department of Highways and Transport and sending it over to the Department of Science and Agriculture.

(A VOICE: That has been considered.)

I have heard the remark that that has been considered. If that is so, I presume that other factors concerning the matter have been taken into consideration; therefore, I think there is nothing more to do than to carry out the suggestion.

Mr. Crawford came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. COX: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to a point made by the honourable junior member for the City. The honourable member said that it appears to him as if the concrete mixer which the Highways Department purports to hand over to the Agricultural Department was not used. I want to tell him that that mixer is used by the department. The department has two large mixers and prior to this resolution, the Director of that department was asking to include in the coming Annual Estimates money for the purchase of the 10/7 Winget-type mixer such as has been asked in this resolution. The Director feels this type of concrete mixer would be more economical to run and better to handle. He also declares that the output by that machine is much better than that of the other mixers which he describes as obsolete items. As honourable members knew, the Director is a new Director of that Department and it is a fact that you will have one expert recommending one particular type of machine or equipment which another would say is outdated. That is what the new director has done in this case. Let me again point out that whether or not the question of the Department of Science and Agriculture requiring a concrete mixer in its scheme to counter the mealy bug pest came up, the Director of Department of Highways and Transport was prepared to ask Government to give him two new plants similar to the one which we have before us today.

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

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISION FOR DISTRICT POST OFFICE AT OISTIN

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next resolution I propose to deal with is the one for \$7,000 to supplement the cost of the erection of the Post Office and Library at Oistin.

As honourable members would see from the addendum to the resolution, the amount of \$7,000 is required to supplement the expenditure on that Post Office. The amount of \$18,000 was provided in the 1953-54 Capital Estimates to meet the cost, but that estimate was made in 1950, so to that amount must be added provision for cost of living allowances and for increases in building costs. It was also necessary to revise the original plan so as to make provision for extra storage accommodation as it is considered that the Post Office will be come a fairly large distributing centre. The revised estimate of the cost of this work is \$25,000, which is an increase of \$7,000 over the original estimate. This resolution is providing for that increase.

Sir, the reason why this resolution is brought at this time is because the Colonial Engineer has gone ahead with this work much quicker than was at first anticipated. The Government was prepared to put this amount in the Annual Estimates for 1954-55, but after the Colonial Engineer got ahead with the work so quickly, he asked that the balance of money be given him so that he could finish the work without having to stop. He pointed out that if he did not get this vote immediately, he would have to close down work until he gets the money. I am sure, honourable members will be glad to know that the workers on that building have gone ahead with that work ahead of time and would not be laid off before it is finished. I therefore beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate that now the work on that building has started, it should not be delayed. However, Sir, the Five-Year Plan was only passed a little over a year ago in which it was proposed to make this erection. I must say that if the estimate for this building was made as far back as 1950, certainly it should be revised before being put into that plan, particularly in view of the fact that since then, Government has revised its salary scales. Consider that the 1953-54 Estimates have been based on figures in the Estimates of 1950-51. Something is wrong. I remember when work on this building was started. It was started not long ago. I wonder if any of this \$7,000 is spent already. I also wonder if even though we pass this supplementary estimate today, at the end of March, the work will not be completed and we will be called upon to revoke the money. I notice that in these days, this House of Assembly is not supplied with plans. A great deal of the money voted for Capital Works is voted without this House knowing the size of things to be built. I think if increased accommodation for storage in the Post Office had become necessary, this House should have approved of it. At any rate, it would be stupid to withhold this money because you did not approve of the increased accommodation. Sir, you have decided to build something to a certain size and then you decide to increase it. To my way of thinking, that is all well and good for things done by private enterprise; but I think that any adjustment in the size of that building should only be done if approved by this House. When you put up a proposition and then alter it for something larger, you may find that you will not have the money to complete it, or will have to cut down the size. I think it is slackness when these things happen; I do not mind how good or how quickly you are building that post office, it shows that you are not taking all the factors into consideration. I do think that it is rather a slipshod way for Government to go about these things. The question of the building of these district post offices has been raised for years and years ago, therefore, Government should have had sufficient experience of what it wanted in that direction long before 1953 when the vote for this Post Office was put in the Estimates.

Sir, I cannot believe that the parish of Christ Church has been developed in the last two or three months to such an extent that you should revise the plan for that Post Office. I do not think it is a good thing to do. I do not think that now that this Government is accepting more responsibility that it should come to this House and say that it has changed its plans on the building of the district post office at Oistins where the building has been half way finished and that it wants more money to complete it. I think it is a wrong idea. It can be said that you have not been entirely fair to the legislators.

Mr. BRANCKER came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would like the honourable junior member for the City to know that he is not alone in the criticism which he has just voiced because when I received my paper with that resolution, I immediately put it down and said that the whole affair was a real howler. It seems to me as if the Government approached this matter in a state of *laissez faire* because no one would start to build a sub-post office or to put up a building without knowing the traffic it has to carry or supply. It would be like starting a railway service without knowing the number of passengers that were likely to travel by it at the various terminals. Government

has acknowledged in the addendum to the resolution that the estimate of \$18,000 for the erection of that building was made in 1950 and to that must be added cost of living allowances which I presume is cost of living allowances for the workmen employed on it. Government has also acknowledged that there would be an increase in the building cost. This is, of course, quite a howler when the note goes on to say: "It has also been necessary to revise the original plan to make provision for extra storage accommodation and it is considered that this Post Office will become a fairly large distributing centre." Surely, you do not start a building in such a manner. You must have realised in your mind before you start to build a Post Office at Oistin that Oistin is a built-up area and because of that you will have to do so and so or this and that. That is the way in which you should have gone about a matter such as that. The way in which this building was started and then altered to make additions does not speak well for the type of people who are doing things like that. It should be criticised because it is known that on some occasions, you can flog a good horse until it dies.

In connection with this new Post Office at Oistin, I would like to point out to the honourable introducer of this resolution that it is time that something be done to the Post Office in St. Lucy. It is a wooden building and it is getting older and older. It is rather broken down and looks like a decrepit log cabin. It has no water supply. It has also been put before this House already that the people in that parish would like it removed to a more central part of the parish. It is situated at Benthams and that location is not considered central. The people feel that it would be more centrally located if it be put at a place like Nestfield. I sincerely hope that the honourable senior member for St. Michael would give me some assurance that in the next Annual Estimates there would be provision for something to be done with that Post Office. You should not give the impression that you go about these matters in a sort of slipshod manner.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, the action of Government in this matter is to be commended. It is clearly stated that in the first place the work has been accelerated and the work has got past the position where they had expected to reach at the time; therefore, there is no point holding up the completion of the building now by waiting for the new financial year to begin to get the balance of the money to spend on it. The old estimate of the cost of that building was based on figures of 1950 and the result is that the amount of \$18,000 does not apply to it today. I think all hon. members would agree to that. I repeat that it is no point in delaying the completion of the building until the next financial estimates are made out in the next three months. More than that, you would be keeping people out of work. What is wiser and more advantageous is the suggestion to come and ask at this stage for the \$7,000 to complete it. I am quite in favour of granting it at this stage.

I do not think there is much more that I can add to the debate. The point mentioned by the honourable junior member for the City that it was planned one way and then built another is something which could be explained with full satisfaction. It is not that the building was enlarged to make provision for more storage accommodation but it is anticipated that the people who are going to use it would be more and more in time to come. The place where the Post Office is erected is a very residential district and more and more buildings are being erected in the vicinity monthly. I think that its erection is

something for which this Labour Government would be held in good regards for posterity.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I read here that the original plan has been revised and that is what I said. The honourable member stated that it was built according to the original plan but that is not so. The question of storage was not in the original plan. I would like the honourable member to realise that this building is not built according to the original plan.

Mr. GODDARD: More than three years ago, I saw the plan of that building in the Public Works Department when the late Mr. T. Went, was the then director. It was drawn to specifications made in collaboration with Mr. R. Clarke, our new Postmaster. I knew about it because I was instrumental in getting the piece of land for the purpose. I can say that the delay in the building of it has been the result of negotiations which went on from time to time between the Christ Church Vestry and the Governor-in-Executive Committee and I am glad to see that that is past history. With regard to the enlargement of the original plan, if that has been so, I do not know. I would say that the present building compares with the plan which I saw three years ago. It does not look in any way different to what I saw by the original plan. I would say that \$7,000 is a large increase but it must be remembered that the original estimate was made over three years ago.

I am very glad that Government is going ahead with its erection in the manner stated and is trying to finish it in this financial year and not waiting until the end of March to get this money to recommence work on it. I think Government should adopt this principle wherever it is needed and more suitable. The only thing which I would like to recommend to Government today is that in its scheme of sub-Post Offices, there is need for one at the other end of Christ Church by Hastings Rocks. I understand that a site has been recommended by the Postmaster General in that vicinity. It must be borne in mind that Hastings is a hotel area and besides that it is a very large residential area and day by day a more extended residential area is being built up around it. I do know that the Postmaster General thinks that a district Post Office is really needed in that district. I feel that it would relieve pressure on the General Post Office, therefore, I do hope that in Government's scheme of district post offices, that one around that area would be strongly considered. It has already been recommended and it would only be a matter of which would be considered as more important to erect first and the question of economics.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—The sum of seven thousand dollars does represent an appreciable increase, and perhaps the claim that the lapse of three years before construction was put in hand will account for this increase needs a little more substantiating. Also, sir, I do not think that the Government has so far satisfied this committee with regard to this drastic revision in the original plan without first informing the Legislature. Be that as it may, I must say that the building has been erected very fast. It has been an extraordinary piece of work for the Public Works Department of Barbados, and the time in which the building has been constructed has been remarkable. Apart from that, I have been told by experienced people that efficiency in construction has not been sacrificed for speed. Some experienced constructors have said that the building is one of the best public buildings constructed in this colony for many a year. The type of construction, the materials used and the workmanship are said to be of a class not usually offered by the Public Works Department of Barbados. I am told by peo-

ple who know about these things that much of the credit is due to the new Foreman employed by the Public Works Department. He is from St. Lucia, or British Guiana or somewhere else. I understand that he supervised the work at every stage, and he saw that the men gave a proper day's work; and although much of the work has been done by job work he has seen to it that it was done satisfactorily. The result has been a building of which the workmen can be proud, and of which the island itself in the course of time will be also proud. One hopes that the example set in the construction of this building will be followed by the Public Works Department in other construction work.

Now on this question of additional post offices I want to say that as honourable members are aware, St. Philip is the largest parish in the island in area. I am therefore suggesting that it should be considered a necessity for a sub-post office to be put at another point in the parish. The present Post Office serves the western part of the parish. People who have to come from the eastern part have to walk seven and eight miles to get to the post office. I am suggesting to-day that due attention be paid by the Government to the advisability of erecting as soon as possible an additional post office to serve the parish of St. Philip.

There is a further point that I would like to make. Somewhere in the Addendum it is stated that the Government might have waited until the Estimates for the ensuing year were prepared, but that they decided to go ahead now and get the additional money needed to put the work in hand. That, I think is a wise thing to have done, because many of the artisans employed by the Public Works Department are now idle. The Housing Board is doing almost nothing, and the Public Works Department, apart from this job, are marking time. It is still some time before the submission to the Legislature of the Budget for the coming financial year, and during that time these people would be out of work. The work has to be done, and the money may as well be voted this year. Even although we are opposed in principle to the introduction from time to time of these supplementary resolutions for appreciable amounts, still, in the interest of providing work for people who depend on the Government for their livelihood from this source, I submit that the Government should be willing to consider the introduction of other supplementary resolutions in order to see to it that even a greater number of artisans and labourers are not kept idle during the next two and a half months; because work would be put in hand only after the budget is voted, and you, sir, must appreciate from the experience of your own constituency, that an appreciable number of people are not working to-day. They have been laid off, and are waiting for the new financial year to start. Even if that is the usual practice there is no reason why we should continue it. Since we are going to find the money eventually there is no reason why it should not be found earlier rather than later.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—There is one further point. I would like to know whether the introducer could give a break down of the various costs. If that was done we might be able to see whether the Resolution for \$7,000 is unreasonable or not.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—These estimates were drawn up in 1950, and the work has been carried on in 1953. The original estimate called for \$18,000 and this supplementary Resolution calls for \$7,000—a little over one third of the original estimate. Now in 1950 when the original Estimates were drawn up the cost of materials was

considerably higher than is the case to-day. Nails, galvanise, cement, lumber, stone etc., all cost less to-day than they did in 1950. While we might be glad that Government has embarked on the erection of this district post office we should not permit that joy to prevent us from seeing that all anomalies are removed. I do feel that if the building is going to cost a third more than the original estimate certainly a full explanation should be given before we give our sanction to this Resolution. It is a large amount of money, and regardless of how fast the work has been carried out I would still like to see a clear statement as regards this expenditure.

I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy that the break down of the costs should have been given. I do not want to join in the trend of parochialism, sir, but for some time now public monies and other public property have been permitted to be housed in a small wooden building in the parish of St. John; and it has been reported to me that such a building has been broken and entered on several occasions. If the Government realises that its various departments are responsible for the people's properties I think that the Government should see to it that proper places to be used as sub-post offices be established in all the parishes and not only in the metropolitan areas like St. Michael and Christ Church. I do feel, sir, that instead of duplicating the same service in adjoining districts Government should take a look around and see that some of the same services are erected in the various parishes. For some time now there has been talk about the erection of a savings bank, library and post office in St. John, and even the idea of a modern school building was mooted about four or five years ago. But with all the provision that there was in the Five Year Plan, sir, no consideration has been given to keeping the promises which the Government made some four or five years ago.

I am hoping sir, that the time will come when more business will be done through the post office and that there would therefore be need for a greater measure of security in protecting the property of the inhabitants of this island. While I do appreciate seeing the attempt which has been made to establish this post office at Oistins I am hoping that the day is not far distant when the Government will realise its obligations, not to one parish, but to all parishes of the island—because its revenue is drawn from all sources. While other honourable members have started to press Government for the erection of post offices in their particular constituencies, yet I am hoping that Government will give consideration to those parishes which continue to house their post offices in the back premises of some private houses. That cannot give sufficient protection to the possessions of the public which have to pass through the post offices. The householder who might also be the postmaster or postmistress cannot be held absolutely responsible for the public's property because the amount lost through burglary or otherwise might be greater than the postmaster or postmistress concerned might be able to repay.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I rise to support this Resolution. I also want to support the remarks of my colleague that there should be a sub-post office in another part of St. Philip. I think that this question of post offices needs going into a little more. The big complaint that I have is that these country postmasters and postmistresses are supposed to administer the old age pensions too; and this is the cause of great dissatisfaction in the parish of St. Philip. When the Old Age Pensions Scheme was first instituted it was all right. But the scheme is getting too big now for that sort of administration.

I think, too, Mr. Chairman, that it is high time for Government to consider seriously the new increased costs that are continually coming before us. I think that the Government should find ways and means of increasing the capital assets of this island so as to meet this new increased expenditure, or we will have a financial crisis sooner or later. These increases are creating a great burden on the taxpayers of this island. I support this Resolution to-day, but with a seven thousand dollar increase over the original estimate I think that something is going wrong. I think that where these new schemes of development are concerned the Government should take the members of this Chamber more into its confidence and let us know in good time what development and what new scheme they contemplate and ask for our co-operation in order to prevent any misunderstanding.

The suggestion has been made before now that these Old Age Pension Offices be separated from the post offices in the country districts. The payment of Old Age Pensions should be a part time job for some man or woman other than the postmaster or postmistress. I think that the one in St. Philip gets \$1,600 a year plus her salary as postmistress. Some consideration should be given to those young people just out of school with certificates and no means of finding a livelihood. It is preposterous to see one man or woman with two or three jobs when there is so much unemployment in the island. I think that something should be done about that. I hope that the honourable Leader of the House will bear it in mind and act accordingly.

I support the erection of this post office at Oistins. I saw the building as I was passing in the bus and it looks like a good job. Without any further ado I repeat that I support the passing of this Resolution and I hope that the comments I have made have reached the ears of the Leader of the House and that something will be done towards improving the situation as I have described it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—Comments have been made on this Resolution and one expected that the Government would have replied to those comments. I have not risen to criticise the extra expenditure; I have risen to criticise the absence of a reply which seems to be due to a lack of knowledge of the facts on the part of the member responsible for putting this Resolution before us. I would not have risen had the honourable introducer made a proper explanation to honourable members.

I say that, sir, because if in 1950 the Government came down with a Resolution for \$18,000 to do this work, and to day you come back for \$7,000 more, and in your addendum you say that the cost of living allowances have increased—which is true, and that the building costs have increased—which is absolutely incorrect honourable members must take up the Government on that.

This is what I want to explain: I am not objecting to the amount. But the Government should not put in the addendum to a Resolution things by which they think they can fool people. The Opposition is wise enough to scrutinise these things. I am going to put it this way: Any honourable member who has taken the trouble to compare this plan with the original plan will see that the last plan is dated as all plans should be. That is not by way of criticism. Government should always insist on having dated plans. If a plan is not dated you do not know where you are.

Now, sir, as far as building costs are concerned I can prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the statement that buildings costs have increased is in-

correct. I hope that statement was not made to bolster up this Resolution. The fact is this: The new plan is one for a superior building. If you take this plan up you will see the difference between it and the original one. It presents a much better appearance, and I am commending the Government on the change. But I must insist that building costs to-day are lower than they were in 1950. Cement has gone down, so have nails, so has lumber. I could quote the prices.

We are asked to vote an additional \$7,000. The building is a good job. I must join the honourable member for Christ Church and say that it looks as if you will, in the not distant future, need another sub post office down by Hastings Rocks. If you look at the plan, Sir, you will see that it is not merely a revision of the original plan, but you are now making provision for extra storage which is an absolute change. The Minister who usually advises without portfolio has just joined the ranks over here, sir, and he has not spoken yet; but he will be able to tell you of the absolute difference between the present plan and the original plan.

In the future when addenda to Resolutions are being prepared the Government should ask the persons responsible for preparing them to be careful, as the observations from the Opposition will be very critical. The Government cannot get away with merely saying that building costs have gone up. I want to assure the Government that speaking for myself, I am prepared to vote the money because since the new Public Works Engineer has been here I have been carefully watching the work that he has been doing. But we must not be expected to vote money without getting a proper explanation. The change in plan does merit having the honourable member in charge knowing more about it. It is a substantial alteration for the better, and the member in charge should have been acquainted with the facts. He should have been able to tell us why the Addendum says so and so; that it became necessary to do so and so; that the facts are so and so. But on the face of it one can clearly see that having passed the plan around, the honourable member was not in position—the Minister in charge of Public Works was not in position, or that he had got the facts so recently that he had not been able to go through them, and become acquainted with them.

That is my feeling in the matter, and I will vote for the Resolution because the change in plan is a change for the better; but do not allow those who prepare these addenda to put in statements that are not statements of fact.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—I have risen because of the serious charge accusing the Government of putting into a Resolution something which is false. The addendum states that the reason for this additional cost is increased building costs, and honourable members have pointed out that building costs have not gone up; they have come down. I am warning the prospective Minister that that is a most serious thing, and it must not be allowed to happen again. He is talking to responsible members of the Legislature, and he should get his facts very clearly and present them with an accuracy which cannot be challenged. He cannot come to this Legislature and declare that the Government wants more money because of an increase in the cost of building materials when it is not so. The hon. member has not yet been declared a Minister, but he is going to get it badly in the neck when he is a Minister and comes here with inaccuracies like this. He will be held very much more responsible than he is now. Up to now he can still say that he has accepted what

has been presented to him by the Head of the Department. But it will be his duty as a responsible Minister to see that what he presents here is beyond challenge from a moral point of view.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I think that the honourable junior member for St. John has answered the question for me, in that in the first place we have to trust someone. The Colonial Engineer is a technical officer and he has more or less put up this Addendum. I am not a builder and I do not know the costs of these items. I presumed, as the honourable junior member for St. John has said, that the officer did go into the costs of the materials carefully before making the statement that appears in the Addendum. If he did not, he could have submitted any figure. He could have said \$11,000 or \$2,000. But he has said \$7,000. I have to take it for granted that he went into the matter carefully.

The Addendum, sir, not only mentions increased cost of building; it also mentions increased cost of living allowance. As hon. members know that does not include any increase in salaries. Since this plan was drawn up salaries have been increased. I am not in a position to say whether the cost of this building includes overhead costs; the cost of running the department. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy asked for a break down of the cost. As you know, sir, we do not usually have these break downs but if honourable members insist I will assure them that I will ask for the break down and submit it to the House at a subsequent meeting. This Resolution was hurriedly prepared so that it could reach the Other Place by the 26th inst.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable member is attempting to answer statements made by the honourable senior member for the City and the honourable junior member for St. John. But there is nothing in the Addendum that suggests an increase in the cost of building materials. It says increased cost of living and building costs. The honourable member has promised to furnish a break down. What break down do you require? In the new plan entirely different details and principles are involved. You may have a 50 per cent reduction in the price of building materials and still have greater building costs. We are only wasting time. Honourable members do not seem to have studied the Addendum. The building is an entirely different one from the building proposed in the original plan. It must involve an increase in building costs.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I cannot sit and let what the last honourable member has said go unchallenged. He tells us that we are wasting time. It is our duty when a Resolution comes here to check on the facts in the Addendum. The honourable junior member for St. George has not helped the honourable senior member for St. Michael. The prospective Minister for Public Works has been shrewd enough not to admit that it was a new plan. He went all around the question. If honourable junior member for St. George is trying to help the Government by saying that increased building costs do not necessarily mean an increase in the cost of materials, and he believes that, that is a matter for him. The Opposition said that when the honourable member takes over his portfolio as Minister of Public Works he must not come here with plans so substantially changed that the change can be spotted, and be not in a position to tell us all about it.

When the honourable junior member for St. George tells us we are wasting time I would like to tell him that it is our duty to check on these things. We do not come here to make sport. One honourable member asked for a breakdown. It seems to me that it would be impossible to give a break

down at this stage. I have some experience of these things. In any building project you must make certain allowances. Recognised builders today estimate costs by saying that it takes so much per foot to put up a wall so many feet high etc. etc. That is the way the cost of this building was arrived at.

I repeat that I am voting for the Resolution but I maintain that the prospective Minister in charge of it should be in a position to tell us, instead of trusting to what is written in the Addendum, that there is a substantial change in the plan.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The honourable junior member for St. George has given his customary display of ignorance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the honourable member is referring to the honourable junior member for St. George as being ignorant.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Ignorance is an absence of certain knowledge of facts; it is not an insulting term. What could building costs mean? It means an increase in the cost of material and nothing else. The honourable junior member for St. George seems to interpret building costs to mean labour only. That is absurd, but it is the only way to interpret his argument. How is it possible to increase building costs if the price of building materials is not increased? It includes the cost of materials plus labour. The honourable member cannot say that we are inaccurate, because we have not been told by the Government that it is a bigger building. I will ask the honourable member—if he is capable of thinking—to exercise his capability before he gets up to condemn people for making statements that are perfectly correct.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am sorry to have to delay the passing of the Resolution. If the Addendum merely stated an increase in building costs I must admit that it would mean that the cost of material had gone up. But it also mentions increased cost of living allowances. Those are two things. Then it also mentions increased accommodation for storage, which means an enlarged building. Therefore, three reasons are given for the increase in the estimate. It seems to me that the new Director of Public Works saw such a large estimate for the erection of the building that he decided that you might as well spend \$7,000 more and erect an entirely new building.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again; Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

TEA ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the House adjourned for half an hour.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:

REPLY LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to lay the Reply to Question No. 36 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE

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 in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE No. 33

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is as follows:—

Resolution that the sum of \$8,800 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953—54, No. 33, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

As honourable members will see the sum of \$30,000 was provided in the current Estimates for flood damage. That has already been spent by reason of the heavy flood damages we had during the financial year. Members will also see that the Government had to ask for a supplementary vote, and the sum of \$2,800 was recently voted to carry out further work. This Resolution now asks for another \$8,800 for carrying out the following work:—

(a) temporary diverting of watercourse, re-building culvert and retaining wall and road reinstatement in St. Elizabeth Village on Highway 3 near Bathsheba	\$5,000
(b) temporary repairs to culvert and road reinstatement on Cherry Tree Hill, St. Andrew	800
(c) road reinstatement over two landslip areas on Morgan Lewis Hill, St. Andrew and minor repairs to surface water drainage channels and culverts	3,000
Total	\$8,800

I think, Sir, that the Addendum explains the object of the Resolution quite thoroughly. Honourable members will also see how urgently the money is needed; because the St. Elizabeth Road is at present closed to traffic, and we hope to have the Cherry Tree Hill Road and the Morgan Lewis Hill Road reconstructed very soon.

I move, sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—What I would like to ask is, whether these areas are parts that have been washed away for the first time or whether this is a regular occurrence in these areas.

Mr. COX: As far as St. Elizabeth Village is concerned this is the first time that this has happened for some years. I cannot say off hand whether work has been done at Cherry Tree Hill and Morgan Lewis and has been washed away.

Mr. LEWIS: If this work is to be done in time for the crop season we will have to vote for this Resolution. I am wondering whether any member of the Government would be willing to make a statement as to when we will be able to get the soil expert for the Scotland District. I am referring to Dr. Bennett. New areas are being subjected to this loosening up as a result of the rain fall that we have been having, and if we can hear when Dr. Bennett will be coming I would be glad.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—This is an appropriate time to mention the road by Newcastle where you have to divert to come from Foster Hall. Those who are lucky get through free; those who are unlucky have to pay a shilling. It would be an appropriate time for the Government to state their intention as regards the reconstruction or otherwise of this road. It is now three years since the road has been in that condition, and the public would like

to know whether it is possible for it to be repaired.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to comment on what so far has been the Government's policy on road repair and construction. Every now and again it is brought to my notice that road workers are laid off for three, four or five weeks periodically because the money voted for road repair and construction has been spent. From the point of view of our employment policy, if we have roads which are being continually repaired, I think that the Highways and Transport Department should be able to estimate properly the amount of money that will be needed so as to prevent periodical recurrences of unemployment. Most of these people who are laid off are people with families and it works a great hardship on them. With a little more imagination and social thought concerning the livelihood of these people I do not think that this constant laying off would be absolutely necessary. You should have that vision where employment policy is concerned so as to avoid these recurrences of hardship. I hope that as soon as Ministerial Status is officially brought into operation as we expect it will be on the 1st of February the Minister who will be in charge of this department will use such thought and social vision that the road workers will really see a change in practice as a result of the new ministry.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I must emphasise what the honourable junior member for St. John has said. Apparently the problem confronting those who are responsible for the laying out of road work is whether they should get the work done as quickly as possible by putting on a certain number of people, thereby getting the work done and keeping the people in the particular area satisfied or whether they should spread out the work over a longer period by keeping fewer people employed down to the end of the financial year. It happens every year, and this year has been as bad as the worst. People have been laid off as much as two weeks ago with the circumstances attendant on people being turned out of work.

I really feel, sir, that in planning the road programme for the forthcoming year it would be better to estimate an amount of money adequate to ensure that these persons regarded as permanent employees of the department are kept employed until the end of the financial year, rather than having these people out of work for four or five months. Even if it happens as it has happened this year that the vote has been exceeded almost throughout the island one wonders why a supplementary Resolution was not produced so that these people might be re-employed. The Resolution before us is just a drop in the bucket. I would like to see in the next week or two another supplementary Resolution.

St. Elizabeth Village is, I think, in the parish of St. Joseph, Mr. Chairman. I notice that of the \$8,800 asked for in this Resolution no less than \$5,000 is for work in St. Elizabeth Village. At least this is one instance, Mr. Chairman, in which you could not complain before going into the Chair that the parish of St. Joseph has been forgotten. I hope that this establishes a good precedent and that we will have the assurance of the members of the Executive that they will send down similar Resolutions for similar work in other parts of the island where the need for emergency jobs is almost as great as in the areas provided for by this Resolution.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman,—I am always interested in road work programmes, especially when it comes to St. Andrew, because, Mr. Chairman we in St. Andrew suffer more from difficulties in getting out owing to landslides etc. than any other

parish. I am always pleased to see Government sending down Resolutions to remedy roads like the Morgan Lewis Road; and I am sure that the parishioners of St. Andrew, and the people of the island as a whole will be pleased if the Morgan Lewis Road is fixed. Cherry Tree Hill is a famous excursion spot, and most excursions pass through the Morgan Lewis district. Much money is spent on that spot, but it seems to be uncontrollable. Only yesterday I passed through there and I think it is a very wise thing which the Director of Highways and Transport has done in asking that this Resolution be sent down, because the area has not yet reached the worst stage.

We had a meeting in St. Andrew last Friday night, and the residents of the Hillaby District told me that I only seemed to know about the roads in Belleplaine, but that the roads in their district wanted fixing too. I hope that we will soon see a Resolution to fix the Hillaby roads.

As far as unemployment is concerned I can say a word of praise of the present Director. He is interested in his work. Since he has been in the island, I am sure that the road workers, in St. Andrew realise that although they have been laid off it is only because the money is expended. When they go to him and he explains the position they are willing to wait until work is available to them. Most of the people who are employed in this kind of work get employment in the sugar industry during the crop season, and then during the dry season they seek employment with the Department of Highways and Transport, and the Director has been very good to them.

The Morgan Lewis Road is practically connected with the Boscobel Road. If it is fixed it will help the Morgan Lewis plantation to get out their crop and you will have the people in the Boscobel area sending their canes to Haggatt's Factory. They (Haggatt's Factory) will also be able to get out their canes. The Director sent up a bulldozer to Boscobel and they have been able to move away some of the mud that was washed down as a result of landslides. Although it is only a temporary remedy, it shows that he is interested in alleviating the sufferings of the people in these areas.

We also have tenantry roads which are in bad condition. There is one called Franklin Road. I think that the prospective Minister who will be in charge of this Department will have to come and save me when the crop season starts. I think I will put him on the spot. He made big promises, and perhaps through no fault of his own he has not been able to keep those promises. I am going to make it a point of duty to ask the Director to send a bulldozer and help them get out their crops. I am satisfied that the Director is doing his best, and when I say that, I think that I speak for the parishioners of St. Andrew. They are satisfied that he has done well since he came to the island, and I hope that he will continue.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,— I do not know how recently these landslides have taken place. If it had been recently there would be no cause for complaint in getting the work done after the crop season. I would not like it to be taken that you are coming for money to get this work done in the crop season. Work of this kind should be carried out before the crop season starts so that you will get the most benefit from the roads and prevent a lot of unnecessary inconvenience.

The next aspect of this Resolution that I would like to deal with is the question of employment in the Highways and Transport Department and the Public Works Department. It usually depends on

the amount of money that you can put in the Estimates for the particular financial year to do such work; and the amount you put in will be based on the amount of work you intend to do that year. Those two aspects are related to each other, and it would be difficult to work out a scheme which would ensure all the year round employment. I have had several complaints from people in the Public Works Department and the Highways and Transport Department—people like carpenters and masons who have been laid off. To my knowledge there are only three schemes of building operations which the Government is carrying at present—The Pine Technical School, Richmond School and the Oistin Post Office. I think they are also carrying a few road schemes.

I think, sir, that in the country parishes at least it is always advisable to carry out the major amount of road work during the non crop season so that you will get a seasonal fluctuation of employment. Where the Public Works Programme is concerned I think the Government should try as far as possible to keep it going throughout the year because it helps to take care of the employment of artisans. I know it is a rather difficult thing, but the point has been raised by my colleague and to my mind it is worth study and consideration.

I hope that in the estimates for the next financial year we will see new building schemes. One which should be brought down is the new fire brigade station. Government should always remember that a building is a capital asset; and it is always a valuable asset to put money into circulation and make people happy.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to say a word for the people of St. Joseph and for the whole travelling public of the island. It is a shame and a disgrace, sir, that Foster Hall Road in the parish of St. Joseph has been permitted to remain in a state of disrepair for four years. (A MEMBER: That road is private property.) It is not private property. I am talking about Foster Hall Road which leads from Bathsheba and connects it with the Newcastle Road. I am speaking about the road which brings you up from Bathsheba across to Newcastle Road. (A MEMBER: You are wrong.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: How long has it been in a state of disrepair?

Mr. ALLDER: About four years. Every year, sir, at this time, just before the crop season you see a few Resolutions coming down for temporarily repairing some road or the other.

I am saying Sir, that it was about three or four years ago that I had to draw to the attention of Government the disrepair of that same road.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was repaired since.

Mr. ALLDER: I know that the part of it which is in St. John was repaired.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the part that is in St. Joseph was repaired since that time.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, what I do think is that it is a disgrace for the people of St. Joseph and the general travelling public to be compelled to experience great difficulty in getting from St. Joseph to St. John. Everybody knows that much of the year's cane crop is to be brought from that part of St. Joseph and farther across by way of Foster Hall to Three Houses, Upland Limited and Guinea factories. During the last crop season, many people had to pay an extra charge to get their canes to those factories from that part of St. Joseph by having to pass through a private road. I may say that not only owners of these vehicles have to pay a fee for passing through this private road to the owner but motorists

also. Why should these people be compelled to embarrass themselves and to pay this extra fee to pass over that private road? Why should these people be forced to pay this shilling? The roads in the Foster Hall-Newcastle-Bathsheba area are not so bad from the point of view of maintenance as the roads in the St. Andrew districts. How is it that you find it difficult to maintain the roads in a district where repairs are not as difficult as roads which you now have under repair? Sir, it is unkind and very hard to the travelling public to continue year after year to keep this road out of commission. It is very annoying to the travelling public to drive up a steep slope and then to find at the top of it a sign "Road Closed", and you either have to go back or go by way of a detour through a road belonging to the adjoining property for which you will have to pay a fee of a shilling. We have been told that the Department of Highways and Transport bought a lot of equipment to help in repairing this road, yet nothing has been done. The staff of that department, so far as I have been told, has been laid off for three months in this year without any employment. The saying is that this department has no funds to carry out any more road repairs. Why should that be so when around the island there are important roadways over which peasants have to carry their canes lying in a state of disrepair and cannot be used? We are talking of improving the tourist industry and in a booklet it has been suggested that the Bathsheba area, the Codrington College area, and the St. John's Church area, are important areas for the tourist to visit. How embarrassing would it be to a garage caterer if on his taking out a number of sightseers to that part of the country and on reaching Bathsheba, he wants to take them to St. John's Church and Codrington College and in his doing so, he finds that after travelling some distance, the road is closed. If that road has been closed for a short time and it was known that the Government was trying to expedite repairs to it, I do not think anybody would have anything to say about it. Certainly, you should not allow a road to remain closed for over a year. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was capable of expressing gratitude, certainly, he would have gone to the rescue of those unfortunate people who are situated on the hills behind Bathsheba. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you will agree with me on this point. Sir, I do not know how often you go down that way, but I presume that you go sometimes and that you are interested in seeing that the people who live that way get what has been promised them a long time. But with all those promises over all those months, there is still that important road in the same state of disrepair. Sir, I can only do what I think the travelling public would like me to do and that is to draw the attention of the Government to it. I presume that with your relationship to the parish and your stronger relationship to the Government, you would like something done to this road at once, and not only for that reason but because you know that that road is an important one. Sir, no one wants to be rushing into the yard of some private owner and then to be stopped and asked to pay a fee because if the person does not have it, he has to turn back or suffer embarrassment. Why should the travelling public be subjected to such embarrassment especially when they know that there was the possibility of Government remedying the situation long before this time. Sir, not only should this state of affairs be considered as being unkind to the people in the area, but the Government should realise that it is its duty to see that wherever evils are in existence and notice has been drawn to them to do something about it and to do so immediately. Espe-

cially should this be so in a case like this where it is causing great inconvenience to hundreds of small peasant owners in the reaping of their crops.

What the Government should also know is that these small peasants do not own lorries nor trucks for the purpose of removing their crops and as a result, they have to go around and get freighters who during the past years have been carrying up their freight rates. That state of affairs has taken up a large percentage of the price which peasants get for their canes. Freighters for these peasants realising that this road is blocked make a detour when freighting these peasants' canes and demand a further increase in their charges to these peasants. Sir, we should not allow the peasants in that area to be left at such a disadvantage when we can do something to ameliorate their conditions.

Mr. COX: I shall be very brief in my reply to the remarks made. First of all, I am in sympathy with the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, the honourable junior member for St. John as well as the last honourable member who spoke relative to the question of laying off people at various periods. Of course, as the honourable junior member for St. Lucy pointed out, it is a difficult thing to plan. In the first place, you have to make up your mind as to whether you should employ 150 or 250 and employ them part of the year. As honourable members know, every year we vote certain amounts of money to be spent in the various departments of Government and in many cases when supplementary resolutions are required, we generally vote for them. We have also to try as far as possible to keep within the limits of what we agreed to spend in the Five Year Plan. I will, however, promise the honourable members who made points relative to this matter to take it up, firstly with the Director and then with the Government in order to see what can be done so that in the future we would not have so many people laid off. I somewhat agree with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy that the situation is worse on this occasion than before but I may point out that that is largely due to greater efficiency. As a matter of fact, the output by workers is a long way better under the new direction of Mr. Barron than it ever was before. If honourable members will refer to the Annual Estimates, they will see that in 1952-53 approximately \$20,000 was passed for the construction of highways, but on this occasion that sum has been increased to \$70,000. Although this amount is greater, it has been spent. Government has also provided this year under Capital Estimates, the sum of \$901,349 as against \$826,618 in the 1952-53 Annual Estimates and that amount has also been spent. In addition to all that, the amount of \$60,000 which was voted for the reconstruction of the Seawell Airport and \$128,000 which was voted for the repair of tenantry roads has also been spent.

While I am on this point, honourable members will agree that when it was agreed to vote money for the repair of roads, and more so for the repair of tenantry roads, that it was agreed to vote the money for two reasons. Firstly, the money was voted to give the many people who live in those almost impassable roads better roads and secondly, to provide work for people during what we call the hard time season. It will therefore be seen that under those circumstances, however Government arranges this work, at some time or the other, you will find that there will be more people employed than usual and at another time they will be laid off.

The honourable senior member for St. John has stressed the point of the out of repair of the Newcastle Road and he feels that Government is more

or less indifferent to the wishes, hopes and aspirations of the people in that area, but as Your Honour has drawn to our attention, that road has been repaired on many occasions. I am sure if the honourable member would take a look at that part of Barbados, he would see that the land in that vicinity is pushing towards the sea all the time. He will see that the concrete braces to keep the Waterworks pipeline in place is almost pulled out at the present. He will also realise that although the pipeline is above the surface of the land that it is pulled away from the land and if he asks the people who live in that area about the water supply, they will tell him that their sufferings for water are largely due to the type of soil in that area. Of course, I think the honourable member knows that the Government for some months now has been trying to engage the services of an expert in Soil Conservation but unfortunately, up to now, that expert in the person of Dr. Bennett has not arrived yet. Until such time as this expert arrives, we can do nothing much. I am sure that the honourable member as well as all honourable members would agree that if you are to put up roads at such heavy cost as they are today and then to find out that they are washed into land, or the sea, or a river, the next day, they will say that it would be better to wait a while and be advised on the matter by someone who knows how to handle such areas before spending and continuing to waste large sums of money on those roads. However, I want to assure honourable members that the Government is sympathetic to their views and is considering all those things. There are other roads such as Turner Hall Road, which have been repaired on many occasions at a very high cost, only to find that after getting a heavy rainfall that the road has given away. Sir, it is unfortunate that those people have to be so greatly inconvenienced, but when one looks at the area, one must agree that it would not be wise spending if Government merely put back the road whenever a heavy rainfall washes it aside.

While I am on roads, I would like to take up the honourable senior member for the City on a matter pertaining to them. I noticed in a speech which has been recorded of what he said on the floor of this House a few months ago on tenantry roads that the honourable member said he knew of a tenantry road which was not on the list but which had been repaired because it led to a particular person's property. I was not in the House when the honourable member made that statement and though belated, I am appealing to the honourable member to tell me what road it was so that the Government may investigate it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, On a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Is the honourable member in order discussing something?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What have I said, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member would give way, I would just like to say—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Must the honourable member speak first because he is Leader of this House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can allow him.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Is that a request? If you order me I will do it. I got up to say—

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Surely the honourable member should be called upon to sit down. The honourable member does not know what I am about to say.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Neither do you know what I am going to say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable senior member for the City allow the honourable Leader of the House to speak?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, If you rule, I will sit down. I was on my feet first.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The honourable member was beginning to say—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Beginning to say what, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member challenged me before I said anything.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask through the dignity of the Chair that the honourable member sit down.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Leader of this House knows that he should sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to sit.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No Sir, not that way; Your Honour must rule that I sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well I rule that you sit.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I bow to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I am not going to make it worse. I am only suggesting that certain matters should be aired at the appropriate time—not at any time. All that we have before us are the roads in St. Joseph and St. Andrew. It is not relevant to discuss some tenantry road which was discussed somewhere else now. If I may be permitted to say something further; it is that the honourable senior member for St. Michael should never have raised the question.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, As far as I am concerned, I only got up to say that the honourable senior member for St. Michael challenged me for not giving the particular name of a tenantry road in a speech which I made some time before. If Your Honour say that I am out of order, I will refrain from saying anything further.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to give the honourable member the opportunity to reply to the question by the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I did not intend to say anything on this resolution, but in answer to the honourable member's question, on some occasion previously when replying to some honourable member's criticism about whether the Vestry or the Commissioners of Highways of St. Michael had sent in a list of all tenantry roads to be repaired to the Department of Highways and Transport and that the roads on that list were repaired by priority, I recall saying that I knew that there were roads that were sent in to be repaired under the tenantry road scheme that were not yet repaired but that roads which were not on the list were given priority for repairs. In other words, what I actually said was that whenever a road was taken over and repaired it was not taken over by reason of density of population in the particular area or by length of time that the tenantry road existed. The reply which I got from the other side was that those tenantry roads were given priority for repairs according to the list sent in by the Commissioners of Highways. I knew quite well, having much to do with the preparation of that list, that was not so because there were roads which were repaired that were not on that list then. I did not say that any minister selected any particular road to be repaired first.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I think you will forgive me for rising again. The point has not been made clear as to the point I made. I gather that the Newcastle Road would not be repaired until and unless that expert comes and gives his

opinion. If that is so, I do not think that decision is a correct one. I agree that the land in that area slides and disrupts the roads and the water system, yet we also know—and I think Your Honour knows better than any of us—that those roads have been maintained in the past and lasted for many years. Inasmuch as the roads in that area are important, I do not think the Government should decide to do nothing with those roads, even although the honourable senior member for St. Michael has said that the land slides and removes those roads regularly. The land slides in St. Andrew just as much but the Department of Highways and Transport is always trying to rectify roads there. I am suggesting that inasmuch as the Newcastle road was a highway before any of us in this Chamber was born that the same methods applied to keep the St. Andrew roads in proper repair be applied to keep that road in such a condition that it can be used by the travelling public.

An alternative to that suggestion would be that the private road through Foster Hall which appears to me as fairly level and even safer, should be requisitioned by the Government, if not for all time, temporarily. As honourable members know, it is a private road and parts of it are covered with grass. If Government really wants to relieve the sufferings of the travelling public and the people in that area with the carting of their crops, I presume that negotiations could be or should be carried between the Government and the owner of that road whom I feel would be willing to co-operate with Government. The only unfortunate thing about these matters is that the Government Bench does not give the impression that it wants to discuss things in an amicable manner either with members on this side of the Table or anybody else. The Government does seem to disregard any suggestion however valuable it may be.

Sir, if it is the intention of the Government not to do anything with that road until that expert arrives, that decision is a wrong one. Even if you had to repair that road every other month, the decision to do nothing more until the expert arrives and gives his opinion would be wrong. As I have said the alternative would be to negotiate with the owner of the private road and put it in proper repair. I presume the owner would not even talk about selling it to you, but would be willing to co-operate with you. The mere fact that excursionists are permitted to pass through his yard is an indication that if Government approaches him, he would be willing to negotiate with its members. I do hope that the honourable senior member for St. Michael who is responsible for roads would take my few remarks to heart and in good faith.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The only thing which I would like to say is that the honourable senior member for St. Michael implies by his reply that the money spent on those roads that are affected by landslides has been wasted and that if you continue to spend money on them before getting expert advice that you will be wasting more money. What I want to suggest to him is that the important thing to be done is to begin construction of the proposed East Coast Road which would provide a proper highway around that entire coastal area. If the terrain itself is bad and does not lend itself to road construction, even the biggest expert in the world cannot do much with it. Rather than waste time and money, it is better, once for all, to embark on the construction of the East Coast Road. It has to be done and if it is not done by this Government, it will be done by another Government. I do

think that it would be far better to start and spend the money on that road.

Mr. Chairman, you are in a position to know that the Highway Commissioners of the Vestry to which you belong have on more than one occasion offered the Government to construct the entire portion of the East Coast Road that traverses St. Joseph. The Commissioners of that parish have stated that they would provide the labour, supervision, material and what not for Government in the construction of the East Coast Road and if the Government wants to supervise the project at an engineering level, well then, it could do so. I suggest sincerely that the Government take up the St. Joseph Highways Commissioners on that matter again; go into the matter of finance; make the money available to them; and start the construction of that road. It would give that part of the island a proper and permanent highway easily traversible from one way or the other for the residents there and for the benefit of tourists.

Sir, I do not think that the Government expects that an expert would come here and make that terrain which slides more suitable for the construction of a road that would be permanent. We have experienced engineers at Department of Highways and Transport. They are qualified men and if with their accumulated experience they can do nothing to make that road stay permanently, what can anybody else do but to merely mark time and waste time fooling the public that they can do something worthwhile. That is merely an excuse for further delay and for further postponement when no useful purpose can be served and when the important thing which should be done is to start immediately to construct a road in the area which you know would be practicable, and something which you know that should have been done long ago.

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

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR VARIOUS ALLOWANCES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next resolution is for the sum of \$13,450 for the purpose of meeting the expenditure relating to Clerical Assistance, Cost of Living Allowances and Acting Allowances. As can be seen from the schedule to the resolution, the sum of \$2,500 is needed for Clerical Assistance; \$10,000 for acting allowances and payment of substitutes and \$950 for Cost of Living Allowances. The addendum sets out very clearly the need for this supplementary provision. I therefore beg to move that the resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

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

RESOLUTION FOR \$60,000 TO SUPPLEMENT SALARY REVISION

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the next resolution is for the sum of \$60,000 to provide for salary revision, which arises out of the Dos Santos recommendations. In paragraph 13 of the Memorandum on the draft Estimates, it was stated that this figure for revision of salaries was subject to alteration when the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner had been received. The legislation to give effect to the Government's proposals arising out of the recommendations of the Salaries Commis-

sioner has been passed as all honourable members know, and, in consequence, the emoluments of Government employees have been revised with retrospective effect from the 1st April, 1952.

As the proposals for the revision of salaries and wages were not adopted until after 31st March, 1953, it was not possible to provide the additional amount required in respect of 1952-53 in a supplementary estimate in that financial year. The increases in salaries and wages in respect of the financial year 1952-53 have been charged against the amount of \$415,000 which was provided in the 1953-54 Estimates, and the increases in the present financial year have so far been met from the respective departmental votes in the 1953-54 Estimates.

If any further information is required on any particular point, or any honourable member wants anything cleared up, you may request it. I have checked the statement sent to the Executive Committee and I can assure honourable members that the \$60,000 is now needed to give effect to the retrospective pay. I beg to move that the resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, I do not know if this information can be given. I really should have given notice of it beforehand to the honourable member. What I would like to tell him is that there is a great contention now by the employees of the Cassava Factory about back-pay for themselves.

What I would also like to know is if this resolution includes such persons as scrubbers and sweepers at the various Police Stations. They are the people who are generally overlooked. If it does not include them I hope these few words of mine would cause the matter to be satisfactorily settled.

Mr. ADAMS: I have had a talk with some of those scrubbers and my impression is that they were included.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that honourable members of this House pay attention to what they should because the whole idea of this resolution is to provide this money which has been bungled by the Financial Department of this Government. It definitely has been bungled. We have been told that the sum of \$415,000 for allowances was provided for the requirements for one year. I still remember that members of this House, particularly the honourable junior member for Christ Church pinning down the honourable Leader of this House to answer the question whether the increases would start from the 1st April 1952, and it was very difficult to get the Leader of this House to state that that would be so; so much was that so, that the Head of the Administration had to say in a speech that it would be done.

Sir, when the \$415,000 was put in this year's annual estimate it was intended for one year. What has happened is that we have made no financial provision for some of these salaries, for more than one year hence we get in the last paragraph of this addendum the following statement "As the increased emoluments of established staff are paid on the authority of Civil Establishment Orders and not charged against the vote "Salaries Revision" it is estimated that an amount of \$180,670 will be available from the Salaries Revision vote for allocation to the various departmental votes for 1953-54. This balance will however be in sufficient to meet the increases to the end of the current financial year, and it is estimated that an additional sum of \$60,000 will be required."

I would like to challenge the honourable member of the Government to explain that. Since you

bungled it by not putting \$830,000 in the Estimates, you say that this is no charge because there are legislative instruments. If you take the 1952-53 Estimates, you will see that there is provision for \$100,000. Now if you are going to pay it by Civil Establishment Orders against which there is no financial provision, why was the \$100,000 put in the 1952-53 Estimates? They have hidden behind the fact that they have the authority of the law and the other things. That means that it can be done on the authority of Orders and Bills. That is how they have shifted out of what has happened. Therefore, if you did not charge it against the Salaries Revision vote, why did you not do it so in 1953? This is just a matter of covering up something that has been done wrongly.

What I would also like to know is if any member of the Government can say if all the employees in the employ of the Government on the 1st of April 1952 will be getting an increase in salary according to what this House agreed for the various posts they held at that time. Once again I would say that many people have left the Service since the 1st April 1952 for one reason or the other and some who have worked for eight or ten months since that date will not be getting one brass cent from the Salaries Revision, and that is not what this House of Assembly passed. We revised salaries from the 1st April 1952, and all those employees working on and after that day should have got those increases. I have already drawn the attention of this House to a policeman who was allowed to retire from the Force many months after April 1952, and a letter has been written him telling him that there is nothing there for him. Sir, we passed the increases to be effective from the 1st April 1952 and it is not fair to that policeman if he was allowed to resign not to receive the increases that were his from that date. There must have been some reason for it. He should never have been allowed to resign from the Force if the law was against it. There are other people who were so affected to whom I have already drawn the attention of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. One of them was a nurse at the General Hospital who was on a two year probationary period and after being there until February 1953, was sent away. Incidentally that was the end of her two-year probationary period. Bear in mind, that she had already qualified as a nurse at the General Hospital. Well, when the other people were paid their retrospective pay, this nurse inquired and was told that the increases were paid only to people who were in the employ in April 1953. That is not fair and just, and I would like to know if any provision is made in this resolution for any of those persons. I think it is their due; not only is it their due but this branch of the Legislature has been emphasizing that from 1st April 1952, salary revisions were to take place and we have never attached any other conditions to the money coming out of the Treasury for that purpose. We did not write a memorandum on the Salary Revisions to the Financial Secretary to say that persons not in the employ of Government in April 1953 would get nothing for their work after April 1952 and that only those in the employ of Government on April 1953 would get back-pay. We never passed legislation to say that. Here there are Civil Servants who are attaching conditions to money coming out of the Treasury and altering conditions which the people's representatives say should stand. I am at a loss to understand it. Honourable members do not seem to get these complaints. Sir, we did not attach any special conditions to the money coming out of the

Treasury but the Financial Secretary can write a memorandum on our resolutions and say do not mind what the resolutions say, these are the terms. Can you believe it? People who have been working for the Government and had been working all the time at a salary which the Government deemed to be less than what they should be paid will not be getting what should be theirs because of a condition which this House did not impose. How the Government as at present constituted, allowed that, I do not know. I wish the assurance that that memorandum has been changed, so that you can pay those people their just dues, otherwise I feel it is definite highway robbery. I understand that memorandum was revised afterwards and that the Unestablished Staff and labourers would get back pay for every day they worked since April 1952, I feel other persons who were employed every day since that date until before 1st April 1953, should also get theirs. I do not think it would amount to a lot of money because there cannot be many cases. I think it would be a good gesture on the part of Government to revise that memorandum.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I do not think what the honourable member said as regards to the interpretation which the Financial Secretary has placed on the persons who have been in the Government Service and who have been unfortunately retired or left after giving useful service prior to April 1953, is alone in his view. I know of a particular person who happened to be a trainee policeman who joined the Police Force after April 1953, and who put in about six months service. He thought he would have been entitled to a few dollars backpay but from the ruling which was identical to what the honourable junior member for the City said, he was told that owing to the date when he left the Service he could not get that increase, because it only applied to the people who were employed on the date when the resolution was passed. I consider that ruling as utter nonsense. Once you were a Government employee and was in the Service after April 1952, from which time this House promised salary increases, you should be paid. If you were a trainee policeman from that time and you left the Service, any increases that may have accrued to you should be given you. I think this particular complaint has been brought to the attention of this House already. Of course I do not know if because that chap was a trainee policeman he was not entitled to the pay of a policeman. He got a job as a Customs Clerk after he left the Force. He brought the case to me and I told him that the interpretation was a wrong one and promised him that I would go into it. If that is the case I think it is unfair. I think the interpretation should be that once you were in the Service on the qualifying day you should get any benefits in the form of backpay even although you may have left before April 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, that principle has been attacked and defended in this House more than once. It is easy to look at it from one angle just as it is easy to look at it from the other angle. In ordinary business when a firm offers to give its members an increase, but during the negotiations, the men do not strike but go on working, they get that increase. But since when in ordinary business, an increase is promised to the workers, and negotiations are going on, and while those negotiations are going on, some worker who gets fed up and clears out, would hope to go back and say: "You know, you have promised me back pay from the date when the conference between the firm and my Trade Union first took place; give me mine now

that you have given the others who are still working. If you were the manager of the concern, would you give that worker backpay? You would not do it. If that worker had kept on with your firm and was satisfied with your conditions, certainly you would give him back pay; but certainly you would not do so when that worker got dissatisfied and left and probably went and got a better job. Which of us under those circumstances would offer to pay that worker backpay? You would not do it. That is how the Government approached the matter.

Sir, there were some Civil Servants who were content to remain and to work until that resolution was passed to give them an increase. Do you think that those who got disgusted and left should be treated in the same way as those who remained? There are some cases of persons who left the Government and got better salaries during the interval between this Government passing the Resolutions for salaries revisions. Who do you think should get the backpay? You must say, give it to the man who has been content to remain. Certainly if you give it to the man who has left and got better wages, you will create a grouse, because the man who was content to remain would say: "Here it is, I have been content to sit down until whatever time Government gave the increase, but I am no better off than the man who left the Government in disgust and got better wages." "He has come back and has been given backpay." I hope the two honourable members would see that there are two sides to the question and that you can argue strongly on both sides. This is one question which is entirely unquestionable standing by itself. As you look at it from the other angle, you can also see the other side of it. This is the position. The Government decided as a matter of principle that it would pay these salaries increases as from 1st April, 1952. You have decided that if any person retired after the time that the resolution was passed, that they would still get it. If that person retired between April 1952 and the time when the resolution was passed, then they would not get it. I ask honourable members to see that the arguments are not on one side.

Mr. WILLIAMS: We are not dealing with a case where a man has left the Service or was sacked. The case I put forward is of a youngster who joined up as a policeman and was sent to training school for a probationary period, the period which one undergoes before becoming a full-fledged policeman. He was deemed after serving that period not to have the requisite intelligence to be a policeman or something to that effect and was not allowed to continue. This is not a case of a Long Grade Clerk who suddenly says: "This is not for me; I can get a better living in commerce," and leaves the Service. The case which I have sighted is on all-fours with that which the honourable junior member for the City sighted where a girl after serving as a trainee nurse is taken on at the General Hospital for two years on probation. After serving for the two years she is told that she is not qualified and has to leave through no fault of hers. If you give a salary of say \$36 a month to this nurse with the understanding that when the Salaries Commissioner comes along and recommends anything more she would get it and the Salaries Commissioner recommends \$40 which this House passes, why should she not be qualified to receive the retrospective pay? It should not be the further question that she was a probationer or left some little time before the increase was passed by this House. Once you are satisfied that she was there during the qualifying period, then she should get that increase.

Mr. LEWIS: I suppose you can say that two sides apply to the question, but it can only have one side for me, and the side which it has for me is the side which this House has passed. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to know that what he has mentioned is not what has happened. On the previous occasion, these salaries increases were passed without the condition which the honourable member mentioned, but that condition "if you are in the Service when the resolution was passed" was applied afterwards. With these last salaries increases that were passed, the Financial Secretary introduced an entirely new condition. He said that irrespective of what the case may be, you must be in the Service on the 1st April, 1953 or you get nothing. And bear in mind, that is not the date when the resolutions were passed for these salaries increases. The two cases which were brought to my attention are (1) that of a policeman who applied under some regulation for retirement from the Force. The accommodation was there for him and he retired from the Force. He did so under the direction of the Commissioner of Police. He had worked for six or eight months in 1952. The other case is worse because it is one in which you have a nurse at the General Hospital who has spent four years in training. After passing her examination, she was taken on two years' probation and the hospital authorities waited until the very last month of her probation period—if you must call it so—to say that she was of no use. My opinion is that if she was of no use then, she was of no use before. The whole thing about it is that it did not suit them to say so. They had two years fixed in their minds. She was not trained abroad, so they could treat her like a boy in the yard. The senior member for St. Joseph is entirely wrong in what he says. It is not in April 1953 when the Resolution was passed.

Mr. ADAMS: I would correct the honourable member. The directive was there that anybody who retired before would still get backpay, and only the people who were in the Service until April 1953. If a man was 65 between April 1, 1952 and April 1, 1953, obviously it would be unfair not to pay him, but if he cleared out, if he retired before he was 65, should he get it?

Mr. LEWIS: That is not in dispute. I want the honourable member to check up on the dates when these resolutions were passed. They were not passed in April, 1953. If you say from April 1952 that is the condition which you have put for the money to come out of the Treasury. Let me say that the previous principle was not invoked this time. Every time you get a salaries revision, you have a new principle set by the Financial Secretary. I think the nurse's case need some attention. I do not feel that a Labour Government should countenance a thing like that. You will be accused of doing injustice.

Mr. ADAMS: Apparently, what the honourable member is talking about that nurse has nothing to do with the question of backpay. It seems as if that is a question to bring to the notice of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. If the honourable member would give me an instance in which possibly the rule has been broken, if he will give me an instance of a person who retired because he was 65—not a case in which the person was not bound to retire or one which the Government felt because of his record, he should leave the Service,—I will certainly look into the matter. I give my absolute assurance to any honourable member who knows and tells me of a single case in which the person who was in the employ of the Government Service was still

in the Service when the salaries revisions resolutions were passed or left the Government Service between the beginning of April 1952 and the ending of March 1953 and did not get the increase, I would only be too glad to examine it, and not only examine it, but come back to this House and say what was the position and if they were badly treated, I would see that the injustice is corrected.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am bound to support my colleague on the fact of the nurse at the General Hospital. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said it may be a case to bring to the attention of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. I would like the honourable member to know that we are not accusing him or either one of his ministers for anything that went wrong, but if grievances of the people reach us on this side of the Table, it is our duty to bring them to the notice of Government. I would like the honourable Leader of this House to put himself in the other fellow's position. I would like the honourable member to look into the matter as if he were a father of children who are not in the fortunate position as those of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. All my colleague is saying is that a girl is taken from school and sent to the General Hospital where she qualifies as a nurse.

Mr. ADAMS: I am saying nothing against that. All that may be gospel truth, but that is a matter of conditions, a matter which would naturally go to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to seek into. We are concerned, as far as this resolution is concerned, with this position: Tell me any single instance that you know that backpay was withheld wrongfully; bring it to my notice.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We accept what you are saying but we are saying that there must be existing grievances with nurses at the General Hospital. What my colleague is saying actually existed already. There it is, you had a nurse on the staff for a probationary period after she was qualified. Without any warning, when the time came for backpay, she was told her services were not required any longer. We are saying that you should go and hear something about the matter from the Director of Medical Services. We are asking you to hear it in a real honest way from both sides. There are existing grievances at the General Hospital but we are not saying that you are to be blamed for it. We are saying that something is happening that you would not like to happen to a child of yours if you had one working up there.

I may say that in all complaints that I have received relative to that institution, the junior member for St. Thomas has always given attention to them when I put them before him. In some cases they were real, in others, they were imaginary. In this case, all I am saying to you is it seems to me as if the statement is correct, therefore you should investigate it. We are not saying that the Government is wrong. Never come to the conclusion that it is not true because you have not heard it. Again I would warn you not to hear one side of the matter. There is a tendency of only hearing the official side of the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not saying that anybody who has reached 65 years or whatever is the retiring age has not been paid retrospectively. What I am making as the main issue is something which I regard as an injustice and that is taking on as a probationer somebody whom you have trained previously and who has qualified. You are treating that person in the same manner as somebody you did not know at all. I feel that one year's probation should be the most in a case like that—not two. I brought that up not as

a side issue. You have taken that person on for two years' probation which ended February 1953, and at the end of that time you tell that person that you are not putting them on the staff. If that person were incompetent, well may you think that they were so before that time and if that is so, were you not taking money out of the Treasury and paying them for slack work?

However, I am saying that the principle applied this time to salaries increases is a changed one to the last. I am saying that my case would not be worse with this principle because the resolutions for these salaries increases were passed after April, 1953. When this House passed those resolutions, we made it clear that the increases were to be paid as from April 1952.

Mr. ADAMS: Are you going over that again? This House has said that we are going to pay these increases as from April 1952 but if you get a man putting in his resignation before we gave consideration to it, probably because he might be dissatisfied, are you going to pay him too? That is all the Government did. If the person worked up to the end of the last financial year, we say, you will go back to April 1952 for your salary increase. Although it was passed after that date, we will be contented to pay if you came up to the end of March, 1953.

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

On motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

On the re-assembling:—

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

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

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — The next Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of \$921.00 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953—54, No. 32, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The object of this Resolution is to send two unionists to the University College of the West Indies in Jamaica to attend a Trades Union Training Course. Now, sir, we have had such courses held here in Barbados in 1948 and 1952. They were attended by Barbadians. The grant in those days was put by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation. On this occasion the course is being held in Jamaica and C.D. & W. will put up a portion of the money, while the West Indian Governments who send unionists to take this Course are being asked to pay the return passages of the unionists, and also the cost of dependents' allowance to the people who are taking this course if they happen to have dependents.

In the case of Barbados, sir, two members of the Barbados Workers' Union have been selected. The course starts on the 1st of February. In one case there is no dependents' allowance because one of the selectees is a bachelor. In the other case the selectee

has a wife and one child, and the Government is asked to put up dependents' allowance for him; and as I said before the Government is being asked to pay air return passages for the two men. The Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation is putting up the cost of the students' board and lodging, weekly allowances, transport within Jamaica during the course, equipment for sports etc.

As I have said, sir, we have had unionists attending such courses in Barbados in 1948 and 1952 and the students profited considerably. I believe, sir, that it is true to say that the strong position of the Barbados Workers' Union is due to some extent to the training provided by those courses. I also think we should do everything to safeguard the present position and working of the Union. The Resolution, sir, is fairly clear and straightforward, and I move that it do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, — I do not know if it has been the practice in the Caribbean—perhaps it has been—for governments to find money for the training of Union officers. But at any rate, this Government should have been more impartial in its selection. Besides the Barbados Workers' Union we also have the Clerks' Union in Barbados. Certainly one delegate from each union should have been selected rather than selecting all two from the Barbados Workers' Union.

Personally I do not look very favourably on unionists being trained by Government Officials. (A MEMBER: By Government Officials?) This is a Government-sponsored business by Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation. On the last occasion it was done by Mr. Catchpole and others. He was the Dean of the course. In the U.K. there is the Ruskin College for the training of unionists. I was very closely connected with the last course and I was not very impressed by the nature of the training given. It tended to have an imperial bias, if I may use such a term. In these Government-sponsored courses the training always seems to take the bias of making peace at any cost. I do not think that that is the best way to advance the independence or the usefulness of trade unionists.

I am not well acquainted with trade unionism internationally, but I suspect that it is not the usual course of action taken internationally to have such training courses sponsored by governmental organisations. I feel pretty confident that that statement is correct. If it was the usual practice internationally then the strikes which these international unions sometimes call against governments would hardly take place. Strikes are the main weapon of trade unionists, and whenever it is the consistent policy of a union not to strike you can suspect that it is a company union so to speak. Whenever you get a union in which the strike is not the last weapon, but no weapon at all, you can legitimately suspect that it is a company union. In any area, especially a low wages area, where there is a consistent absence of strikes one can begin to be suspicious. I am not saying that strikes must be the first weapon of a union; but where there is a definite policy against strikes it must lead to suspicion.

I do not for a moment endorse all that Dr. Jagan has done; but in his strike policy he seems to have brought British Guiana a great deal of benefit, because I read only today that they will be granted 66 million dollars for development. I have read something written by an official, an Englishman, denying that Jagan is a communist.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to hear anything about Jagan. Leave Jagan out.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Dr. Jagan is a trade unionist, sir. I cannot lend my support to this Resolution, sir, because I am not convinced that these courses, sponsored by Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation and financed by local governments are in the best interests of officers running workers' unions. It has been brought to my notice that the psychology of workers in this colony seems to be that they are the servants of officers instead of being their employers. That is the very opposite of what a collective body of workers should feel. The workers of this colony, I understand, are rather afraid of nominating annually any officer of their own liking, and the policy as I understand it is that they are pretty well cowed into accepting the position that they are not to direct the working of the union, but are to be directed by the union officials. I believe that that is the result of this policy of government-sponsored training courses. The worker loses independence in his organisation. There could scarcely be a graver charge against such a policy.

We have in this colony, I believe, a reputation of having one of the best if not the best union in the Caribbean. We have got that reputation through the docility of the workers themselves, and their reluctance to challenge policy which is controlled by officers of the union. They have got to believe that a President must be permanent. I have been told that the Secretary's office is a permanent one. That must be a very peculiar form of trade unionism. From what I know about it internationally such a policy does not exist. But we Barbadians are so unique in many things that we may put some of that uniqueness into the development of workers' organisations. But it is not the best policy by any means.

When we have that psychology of obedience under any circumstances, it is, Mr. Chairman, a retardation of the progress which the workers should maintain. I know cases of workers who have independent spirits and who would challenge any officer and who have done so, and have been unhesitatingly expelled from the organisation for an expression of their rights and the rights of their fellows. They have been summarily expelled, disgraced and pointed out as trouble makers, communists etc. as a result of their independence of mind, and their democratic way of saying how the union should be run.

I myself some time ago belonged to a new union formed in this colony, and happily now defunct. I will say why, I say happily. I was appointed secretary. I said I must be elected as secretary or I would not accept the position. I insisted on that and because of that I had to break off relationships with the first appointed officers. That is my outlook. I do not want to be the Secretary of a Union appointed by anyone. I insisted upon election.

Now sir we have a population of 220,000. It is regrettable that there is only a single union in this community. No matter how much we may boast of the higher wages prevailing in the colony to-day it is my strong suspicion that there are other unions in this area by whose activities the wages of workers are even higher than ours. In other colonies the policy of unions is not as ours. Wages in this island are by no means uniquely high for the Caribbean. In Trinidad and Jamaica there are wage scales for workers which are far higher than the scales of those workers' counterparts in Barbados. Take engineers' wages, for instance. And despite the existing union in this colony there is still a serious exploitation of labour as regards time, over time, and conditions of work. Such conditions exist even among the workers that belong to the organisation. Many of them have got disgusted and left the union. Several thousands have left within recent years. If the trade union organisation were exercising any re-

sponsibility towards the workers whom they are supposed to represent this dissatisfaction, these backslidings would scarcely take place. But as soon as you challenge an official of the union you are termed a renegade.

I cannot see myself voting government funds for the support of that type of organisation. I think it is the duty of the union to review constantly all grievances of workers, and if nothing more, to bring to the notice of the Labour Party certain suggested legislation which should be on the Statute Book, for the protection of workers and the improvement of their working conditions. I am shocked many times to discover certain conditions that exist. The first thing that I ask the worker affected is if he belongs to the union. On many occasions the answer is yes. I ask the person if he has brought his grievance to the notice of the union. "Yes", he says, but we do not get any satisfaction." I am speaking from experience, Mr. Chairman.

But, sir, right now as far as I know, the organisation known as the Barbados Workers' Union is still in arrears in presenting their annual report to the proper authority in this country, the Auditor General. That is something disgraceful. If they were administering the union efficiently that would be impossible. The administration of the union is rotten.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member can attack the union as much as he likes. It has been often attacked in the past and is still the best in the West Indies. But when he begins to introduce things which reflect on the personal integrity of members of this House it is a different matter. Both the General Secretary of the Union and the President of the Union happen to be members of this House, and the honourable member cannot reflect on their characters.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have not by word attacked the personal integrity of anyone. I did not accuse anyone. What am I to think about the administration of the union when the Auditor General has not received within recent years the financial accounts of the organisation? Whatever is the cause of the mal-administration is a matter for the union. I will not presume to say. With those statements, sir, it would be hypocritical for me to support this Resolution. There have been grave charges. I have not made them. There have been grave charges made in the Press of this island about the same mal-administration, and those charges have not been answered officially or otherwise. I am exercising my right as a citizen and a public representative when I deprecate the introduction into the House of a Resolution for funds for the support of such a badly run organisation. It is not fair to the public or to the union.

Were it not for the psychology of obedience to which I have referred the officers of the union would have been sacked long ago by the personnel of the union. But the workers are told that you cannot change the Secretary and you cannot move the President from office because their office is for life.

Whenever I hear about the flights of the local union officials to places like Sweden, Belgium, Berlin, etc. I often wonder if these international organisations are aware that the Barbados Workers' Union have not submitted a financial report on the running of their organisation for several years. If they did know, I wonder if the Barbados Workers' Union would enjoy the international prestige which it does.

Be that as it may, we in this colony happen to know these things. But we as a people have a grave fault. We hate to challenge authority in any form.

That is a psychology that came right down from our ancestors — the psychology of bowing to authority; and this generation, although not quite so subservient as past generations, still evinces that subservience to some extent, the psychology of the boss. The psychology of the boss reigns in the minds of the officers and the psychology of docility and submission in the minds of those whom they govern. That is responsible for the unsatisfactory state of affairs which obtains in the present workers' union of this colony. As soon as you challenge authority you are called a trouble maker and a communist. No matter how wrong the authority is you must submit to it. That is the psychology that obtains in Fairchild Street. If the various international bodies knew of the state of affairs that existed in the Barbados Workers' Union I doubt whether there would be so many invitations to the numerous conferences to which we have become accustomed.

For those reasons I cannot vote for a Resolution to take money from the Public Treasury to spend on the training of two officers of the Barbados Workers' Union. I would not be surprised if in their selection of the delegates the latter were not tested and judged on the grounds of their docility and ready submission to authority. And I will go further, Mr. Chairman, and state that in my opinion the present workers' union is an obstacle to the real progress and independence of workers which should obtain in this colony. Go and look at their buildings and office. A trade unionist from St. Kitts was shocked and expressed his surprise to me at the dilapidated condition of the offices of the Barbados Workers' Union. In little St. Kitts, he told me, the union offices are vastly different. There are typewriters, the filing cabinet system and all the things that should properly be found in an office. The Barbados Workers' Union has been established for the last seven years and has not got a proper office yet. Only recently they put a rum shop underneath. I do not believe that you will find a rum shop under a trade union headquarters in any part of the world except Barbados. What an encouragement to the sobriety of workers! What an encouragement to their stability! What an example to set to workers — a rum shop underneath their headquarters! That is the last straw.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—With all due respect to the honourable junior member for St. John and his ability both educationally and otherwise, I fail to agree with some of the statements that he made in relation to this Resolution. If those statements are correct we need to send out more than these two men, so that they can learn the working of the trade union movement and put others on the right track. I do not see why we should not vote for this Resolution, and considering the trend in the trade union movement the world over, I do not see that a better person should train trade unionists than government officials. To say that the British Government is not competent to train trade unionists is wrong.

We are a people who have suffered physically, materially and otherwise for many a year. We have learned to benefit from those sufferings. I would not substitute British teaching for Russian teaching for anything in the world. I consider communism to be the most devilish thing on earth.

Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN: Did I imply that I preferred Russian teaching?

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I want to make it perfectly clear that I am whole heartedly in favour of this Resolution to send these two Negro men to Jamaica to learn the rudiments of trade unionism and to come back and teach my people what they do

not know. I know that the Workers' Union is not all that it should be. There is room for improvement. That does not destroy the fact that this Resolution is for a useful purpose. I want my position to be made clear in this House. We were sent here by the working men and women of this island; and if those people did not feel that we were competent to deal with their problems they would not have sent us here. Without further ado I repeat that I will support this Resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—Reference had been made to the fact that a Trade Union Course was held in 1948. I suppose that that was a time when trade unionism was in its infancy. I would like to warn the Government that this matter will pose two problems. In the first place there is now supposed to be a rival union. How strong that union is I do not know. How strong it will become will have to be determined. I do not cite British Guiana. I do not want a Red herring to be drawn across the trail. That does not get anyone anywhere. The position is this: There is a rival union. Since this is supposed to be a government subsidy should they send two officials of the Workers' Union on this course or two non trade unionists from outside? And should there be a position in which the Government is approached for a subsidy to send unionists from another union on a course what attitude will the Government take in the matter? We may get the snags that we now get in Jamaica with these rival unions.

The other point is this: I do not know whether the two gentlemen are already trade union officials or whether they are workers whom it is hoped to make officials. I think that is an important aspect because it may be felt in union circles that you are bringing in people from outside to run the union when you should make the trade union people themselves aspire to their own leadership. I think that the Government could well bear those two points in mind for a future occasion.

I would also like to say that there should be no disagreement in principle with sending these two men because there seems to be some precedent for it. Even if there were, we would have to approach it from the basis of whether it would be a good thing and whether people would benefit from it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—There are one or two observations which I would like to make. I suppose there will be a long debate on this. The Resolution sets out clearly that of the \$921.00 the sum of \$810.80 is to pay the return passages of the two men, and \$110.00 is for dependents' allowance for one of them. Now, sir, I think we should always face facts. Before this Resolution came here, I saw in one section of the Press that two gentlemen had been selected to go on this course. I have actually taken the opportunity to congratulate one of these gentlemen who I know has been associated with the union for some time, although I do not know anything about his trade union ability. On the other hand I am also told that the other gentleman selected is also from the union.

Now, sir, I think that there is in existence another union known as the Barbados Clerks' Union. One wonders whether or not—This is criticism which is constructive—one wonders whether or not an opportunity was given to the Clerks' Union to send a member to this course.

Dr. CUMMINS: I do not know if the honourable member would accept a little information. He was not in his seat, nor was the honourable junior member for St. Lucy in his seat when I introduced the Resolution. But it was originally intended to have three selectees from Barbados — one from the

Clerks' Union and two from the Barbados Workers' Union. I have on the file a minute by the Labour Commissioner. It says: "The Clerks' Union has at last gone out of business, and there is no point training anyone etc. When the question of this course was first raised it was intended that at least one person from the Clerks' Union should attend. The Labour Commissioner commenting on that said that the point to be considered with representatives of the Clerks' Union was the possibility that that union might not last very long since, he understood, the membership had fallen off considerably. The Labour Commissioner continued: "Incidentally I did propose to Mr. Thomas, the President, that he himself attend the course, only to be told that he could not honestly accept the offer since he was hoping to resign at any moment. It was sometime after that that the Labour Commissioner wrote the minute to the effect that at last the Clerks Union had gone out of business and there was no point in training anyone from that union."

I just wanted to give that information, Mr. Chairman. It does not say here how the selection was made. I believe the two gentlemen mentioned in the Resolution were selected from a panel. I believe that the selection was done by the Executive Committee of the Barbados Workers' Union, although it does not say so here. All that is said here is that Mr. Walcott recommended these two men.

I do not want to reply to the honourable junior member for St. John. He was amply answered by the honourable junior member for St. Philip. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy referred to Government sponsoring such a course before. That is not correct. Such courses were held in Barbados in 1948 and 1952. Having been held in the island this Government was not called upon to contribute anything. But the course is now to be held in Jamaica. It is not being carried on, as the honourable junior member for St. John said, by Government officials.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I never said anything about the course being carried on by Government officials in Jamaica.

Dr. CUMMINS: There is ample evidence to prove that the honourable member said that these men would be trained by Government officials in Jamaica. The truth of the matter is that they will be trained at the University College of the West Indies. That is one point I wanted to correct. This is the first time, I repeat, that the Government of Barbados has been called upon to contribute to such a course.

Mr. VAUGHAN: This is not the first time that the Government of Barbados has been called upon to spend money for the training of trade union officials because sometime ago the present Secretary was sent to Ruskin College. (A MEMBER: That is not true. He was on a scholarship).

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable junior member for St. Thomas has given an explanation. I still cannot quite understand the situation, although it may be my fault. The honourable member read a minute by the Labour Commissioner, which minute seemed to be more the utterances of a politician than of a Government official. He says that "at long last the Clerks' Union has gone out of business."

Dr. CUMMINS: He did not say at long last.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: He said at last. "At last the Clerks' Union has gone out of business." And this is what I do not understand: Further on he says that it might not last very long, and then he goes on to say that he offered an opportunity to Mr. Thomas who said he could not take it be-

cause he would soon resign. Something in this business seems to be wrong to me.

Dr. CUMMINS: If the honourable member will give way again I will say that there is a minute dated the 8th day of May to the effect that it was first proposed that Mr. Barnes of the Clerks' Union should go. The Labour Commissioner approached the two unions.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member said previously that the Secretary of the Workers' Union recommended that these two gentlemen referred to in this Resolution should go. How could the Labour Commissioner say that someone was going? Tell me who proposed whom. Someone is doing something wrong. I am not saying that the honourable member is wrong. I am saying that something is wrong.

Dr. CUMMINS: The minute of the 8th of May says: "I have seen Mr. Barnes of the Clerk's union who appears to be a reasonably intelligent and keen person and able to benefit by the course. The point to be borne in mind by the representatives of this union is the possibility that the union might not last very long, since I understand that the membership has fallen off considerably. Incidentally I had proposed to Mr. Thomas that he himself should attend the course only to be told that he could not accept the offer because he was hoping to resign at any moment." Then there is a minute dated the 16th of October which says: "The Clerks' Union has at last gone out of business etc."

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am going to say categorically that this is a wicked mis-statement put down there for the honourable member to mislead this House. What I am saying is this: The Barbados Workers' Union comprises ten thousand members in this colony in which there is another union. Although the other union is not so strong numerically, it is also composed of members of this community. Why should we be asked to support a Resolution to take money from the Treasury contributed by all sections of the community merely to send on a course two members of one union? What I am saying merits a postponement of this Resolution. On the 8th of May the Labour Commissioner said he offered Mr. Barnes. The Labour Commissioner was not the person to offer anyone anything. Then on the 16th of September he comes back and says that at last the Clerks' Union has gone out of business.

Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable member should not take that statement out of its full context. The Labour Commissioner had said before that he did not know how long the union would last.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Saying that he did not know how long it would last was an admission by the Labour Commissioner that it might last for a longer time than he anticipated, or possibly for a shorter time. Having admitted that, he would realise that like the Barbados Workers' Union a time comes in the year when the average membership goes down. It was not fair of the Labour Commissioner to come to the conclusion because the membership had fallen that the Clerks' Union might not last very long; and because he did not know how long it would last no opportunity for attending this course is given to that union. But the Labour Commissioner goes further and makes an offer to Mr. Barnes and although in September he said that he did not know how long the union would last, he then skipped from Mr. Barnes to Mr. Thomas who says he could not go because he was soon going to resign. If in September someone is going to resign as president it shows that there must be something to resign from.

I am not suggesting anything bad on the part of members of the Government. But I am going to suggest that it savours of something indecent. That minute which the honourable member read from and which speaks of the way in which the offer was made cannot satisfy any member of this House. The Labour Commissioner says that Mr. Barnes seemed to be able to make use of the course. But he does not tell us—and I hope the Deputy Leader has this information—he does not tell us why he deserted Mr. Barnes skipped over to Mr. Thomas and in the interim he tries to impress us that the Clerks' Union is dead; and how he came to offer the opportunity to two members of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable member seems to think that the Labour Commissioner was prejudiced against Mr. Barnes.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have not said anything like that.

Dr. CUMMINS: The Labour Commissioner went on to say that shop assistants and clerks required some information. Mr. Barnes seemed to be able to go to the top in an organisation organising that class of worker.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I want the honourable member to tell us is why Mr. Barnes having refused and Mr. Thomas having refused there is no one else in the Clerks' Union to whom one of these scholarships could be offered. If there is a minute paper which says that Mr. Barnes refused and Mr. Thomas refused can the honourable member tell us if there was no other member of the Clerks' Union to whom an offer could be made? It is a fact that the Clerks' Union is still in existence.

Dr. CUMMINS: There is nothing to show that anyone else was approached.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I thank the honourable member. In the absence of any evidence that anyone else was approached I think that this Chamber should know more about it. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas said that the original idea was that there would be three places — one to the Clerks' Union and two to the Barbados Workers' Union. I must confess that I am not satisfied from the evidence that I have received that every opportunity has been taken to get someone from the Clerks' Union to go. The two members asked are not the only members of the Clerks' Union. I am sorry that my colleague is not here. I am hoping that my point of view will be thoroughly investigated.

If this money was coming from outside of the island—say from Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation — it would be no concern of ours. But when the Government comes for funds from the general revenue we cannot vote money solely for the benefit of members of the Barbados Workers' Union because union members are members of the Executive Committee, and as such would have the right to bring such legislation down. You will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Government will agree with me that unless the public is informed that every opportunity was given to members of all the existing registered unions to make use of this course we could not honestly vote this money from the Public Treasury. The Clerks' Union is not dead. Because two of its members were offered an opportunity and refused there is no reason why someone else from that Union could not have been allowed to make use of this course and come back to Barbados and do useful work in this connection.

Before I sit I must say that may be that minute was seen for the first time by the honourable member to-day. When taken in its entirety one must come to the conclusion that it was felt that because two members of the Clerks' Union were asked and refused that was the end of the matter. But you must satisfy this Chamber beyond the shadow of a doubt and you must satisfy the general public that every opportunity was taken to let someone else benefit from this course. I would counsel officials in this island not to use language which can be interpreted as prejudice. The honourable member in charge of this Resolution should see to it that he gets further information from the Labour Commissioner. If the honourable member can come back and prove to me that the Clerks' Union is dead I will admit that I am wrong. If it is not dead the honourable member is morally bound, especially in view of the position that he occupies, to see that this matter is rectified.

Mr. WILLIAMS: There is only one point I would make on this stage. I agree with what the honourable senior member for the City has said. I did not use the same words when I spoke first, but the innuendo was there.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—Relative to the political propensities of some government officials to which the honourable senior member for the City referred, I think that what honourable members deplore is the fact that there are some other honourable members who feel that the Administration must be sheltered at all times—a view which I do not share. But the honourable senior member for the City should be the last person to be surprised at the political prejudices of imported officials. It was the same member who drew to the attention of the House that a former Attorney General had made a reference which could only be described as being grossly derogatory to members of the Government. Baiting of honourable members of the Assembly is the favourite pastime of officials who come to this colony. It is not surprising to me that in order to ingratiate himself with the regime in power that he should make innuendoes which would tend to throw a certain amount of suspicion and disdain on organisations which are rival to the Barbados Workers' Union. I can only think that the honourable senior member for the City was suffering from a lapse of memory when he expressed surprise.

Since the Labour Commissioner is the person who made this comment about a union for which I have no use at all, I think I should take the opportunity of telling the House that this same Labour Commissioner is in the habit of making some rather uncomplimentary statements about the political affiliations of members of this House; and therefore it does not surprise me if, in trying to ingratiate himself with the ruling regime, he should exercise his normal propensities.

I hope the Head of the Administration will take what I have said seriously because if he wants to substantiate my statement, I can supply him with witnesses. I am very glad that this resolution afforded me the opportunity of speaking on it because I do not believe in moving the adjournment of the House to discuss the behaviour of an imported official, my chief reason being that their days are numbered in one particular place, and as a result, I do not consider them worthy of notice. I am sincerely indebted to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas for the display of his usual candour and making it possible to say what I did, by his giving the information of the facts that are germane to this Bill.

I will pass on to this matter of the Labour Party. Sir, I happen to be a member of the Barbados Labour

Party and as far as I can see there is popular misconception in the minds of the citizens of this ancient and loyal colony of Barbados that members of the Labour Party are synonymous with members of the Barbados Workers Union which is an organisation to look after wages, and better living conditions for workers, and things of that sort. I would like to disabuse that view from anybody's mind. I am loyal to Trade Unionism and I will go as far as to say that the very idea and term "Trade Unionism" holds an enthusiasm to the majority of members sitting around this Chamber. I have said so because I do not want anybody to think that any of the remarks which I shall make are levelled against the spirit of Trade Unionism or because I nurture antipathy for Trade Unionism. I will go further and say that when I was a student I had to make a decision as to what things I was going to specialize in and realizing the deficiency here in Barbados of persons to lead workers along proper Trade Union lines and the fact that those who were in the vanguard needed assistance, I took the decision to study Trade Union law at London University and during the three years of my study at that University I used to go out in the docks and visit workers and working conditions. As a matter of fact, I got as far as to be walking about Trafalgar Square with and meeting workers in canteens. I therefore can say that I know something of Trade Unionism.

I, therefore, can hold myself to be in support of Trade Unionism, but with the background of my training as a guide, I cannot see any good which a three-months course can serve or benefit anybody in Trade Unionism whether the course be given at the University College in Jamaica or anywhere else. It cannot do any good unless the person has Trade Unionism embedded in his soul. Therefore, to take two people and send them to the University College of Jamaica on a Trade Union course for three months probably as a gesture of reward for services rendered in the past whether those services were in a Trade Union or elsewhere, I do not think it is a necessary and wise expenditure of the taxpayers money. This is one of the ramble reflections which I was making in my mind while other honourable members were speaking.

Sir, for some years past, the very term "Trade Unionism" meant enthusiasm to many members of this Chamber, and I think it holds the same charm to us today. But while this is so—I believe so—I wonder if this House will be doing the right thing, just because the majority of us are members of the Labour Party and because it is a Labour Government, to pick up the taxpayers money and spend it on a Trade Union Course for two persons when we have not given the people who put us here the opportunity of saying whether we should do it or not. The mere fact that it is done in the other West Indian colonies is not sufficient recommendation speaking personally, that we should do it. I am not saying so because I am opposed to the idea. Far from it. As a matter of fact, it is something, I would like for the good of the movement in Barbados, and I will go as far as to say that as others are doing in Jamaica at the University College, I myself, would like to give my assistance in that direction. I am sure if I had the time to spare and offered my services to be attached to some establishment of Trade Union for teaching purposes, I do not think my services would be turned down—not from the recommendation I have had. With all that, I believe more in "down to the earth" Trade Unionism instead of going in for these higher specialised things. It may be that these Courses are merely given by C.D. & W. just because a tussle is going on between the W.F.T.U. and the I.C.F.T.U. and it may

be a question of trying to outdo each other. Let me say at once that I have no sympathy for the W.F.T.U. (World Federation of Trade Unions) and as it appears to me the I.C.F.T.U. (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) seems more intent on propaganda than to getting down to the little problems of Trade Unionism and increasing the standard of the workers in the world. I do wish that the spirit of Hardy and people like him and the spirit of the Workers Educational Group to which I was affiliated for a short time along with the children of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas and other people from the West Indies would be implanted in the people attached to the University College of the West Indies that is sponsoring these courses on Trade Unionism through Colonial Development and Welfare. Even if that be so, I do know that Trade Unionism is not something which you can pick up on a three-months course of lectures, especially if they are given by people who for the most part had been most remotely connected with Trade Unionism as is most likely to be the case with the lecturers who are attached to C.D. & W. We do not get "down to the earth" Trade Unionism by those lecturers. Those lectures should be given by people like Mr. Ernest Bevan, like Mr. Creech Jones, the former Secretary of State for the Colonies, who was one of the greatest exponents of Trade Unionism along with the people whom I have mentioned earlier.

I am going to return to what I consider is the problem of the issue before us. Are we sure that the taxpayers approve of their money spent in this way? Do you consider that it is the best thing for Trade Unionism to be asking for public funds in this manner to educate its members or that the best thing would be for the Trade Union to educate its members within the movement. I do think that it would be the better thing if the Trade Union educate its members within the movement. I do feel that the Union should have some fund or education organization to educate its members.

Sir, I am not voting against this resolution although I have said what I did, and my decision has not been determined through any fear of reprisals. I am voting for this resolution because I do not want anyone to feel that I want to deny a number of other people who are my comrades from getting what I have been able to get and actually in the same manner as they are going to get it. That is, I have been able to study Trade Unionism mainly at the expense of the British taxpayer while these candidates for the course will be getting it through C.D. & W. funds and at the expense of taxpayers of this colony. As I have said, I was not a Trade Unionist at the time I took my course. I had absolute freedom in the choice of the subject which I undertook, but I undertook to study Trade Unionism because I felt that by doing so, I would be better able to serve the people who I wanted to serve. Alas! I should say that there are people in the colony whom I personally know, did the same thing as myself but their services in that direction have not been utilised.

However, Sir, I do not believe in something sponsored. I do not believe that educational facilities in Trade Unionism should be given by way of dispensation from above. I am against its being given from that source. The solidarity of the English Trade Union Movement is accounted for by the efforts and the sacrifices made by people of the calibre whom I have mentioned before and whom it will be invidious to me to draw to the attention of honourable members again. I do not think any self-respecting Trade Unionist would accept from a Socialist Government a scholarship in Trade Unionism of this nature, especially when many members of the public in Bar-

bados are not aware or may not care to subscribe to such a thing.

This brings me to another point. I wonder if the honourable junior member for St. Thomas knows whether the Sugar Producers Association of this colony was offered one of the places. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph can back me up when I say that the Barbados Sugar Producers Association is as much a Trade Union as the Barbados Workers Union. If honourable members doubt me, they only have to look at the legal definition of a Trade Union. The legal definition is: "Any organisation substantially representative of either workers or employers is a Trade Union within the meaning of the Act and must be registered as such." Therefore, the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association should be registered as a Trade Union. It probably has been registered in such manner. It is remarkable to see the metamorphosis in our social outlook. Around the middle of the nineteenth century, people from the Mother Country were sent to the Colonies because they dared to join Trade Union movements. Only sixty years ago the British were hanging trade unionists, now today, they are sponsoring the movement. I do think that the Mother Country is only sponsoring it because of the pressure from the headquarters of Soviet unionism and the United States on the other hand. But to get back to my point. Surely, the Barbados Producers' Association, would be entitled, by its being a Trade Union within the legal definition of the Act, to a place for anyone whom the Association would like to send to Jamaica on that Course. I am sure all honourable members of this House would rise up in indignation to any proposal to send a candidate from that Union. At the last meeting, we passed a Bill giving salary increases to nominated members of the Executive and many members raised a howl over it. If we adopt that as an argument, we can say that we have given one of the richest men in this island who has been nominated to the Executive Committee by the Governor, but who owes no duty to the electorate, an increase in remuneration to the tune of \$60 per month. And let us say for further argument that the same gentleman to whom has been given this increase and who is a member of the Sugar Producers' Association of this colony was selected by that Trade Union as a candidate for this Course, could we say that it would be ridiculous to grant that gentleman the same facility as we are granting the two selectees by this resolution? We could not say that if we wanted to give this facility to a selectee of the Barbados Workers' Union. This is the situation with which we are confronted.

Sir, it is one of the paradoxes of Colonial development today that we should have these anomalies existing in the system. However, I do not think that this is the time to go into legal quibbles in this matter. My only regret is that officers of the workers Trade Unions such as do exist, do not think that it is much more easily to retain self-respect by having a regular fund out of which they can educate the more promising members of their unions. If they thought so, it would not be necessary to have an *ad hoc* measure such as this one which is sponsored by the Government. I do hope that my speech would be taken as an exhortation to Trade Unionists to get down to the job of educating the more promising of their Union by their own efforts and sacrifices to fulfil executive positions and for such things as is necessary to their Union. They should not be waiting until some small Course such as this, that is sponsored by the Government comes along to enable them to do so.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir,—I am not going to usurp the honourable junior member for St. Thomas by making a reply but it would be impossible for me to sit in silence and not make a contribution to this

debate, especially as it probably may be the last speech I may make as the official head of the Barbados Workers Union. I am indeed very glad to hear the honourable senior member for St. George, who has just sat down after making what I may call a rather academic speech, has intimated that he is going to vote for the resolution. Let me say that I appreciate all that he said. Briefly, he said, he realised that whatever criticisms he may be able to make—and anybody would be able to make criticisms on any organisation—the resolution was nevertheless a necessity.

Sir, let us completely purge our minds of anything that has been thrown at us by our bitterest enemies. Just as approaching the British Guiana question, you always have to ask yourself: "Should I as a British democrat, or a believer in democratic socialism as we are,—I believe every honourable member in this House at present is a believer—support anything which looks like tyranny or going over the lines and you answer yourself by saying 'no'; then that is the justification for the attitude which some of us, although that person may be left wing or even extreme left wing, take as regards approaching this situation. It is not just politics; it is because of what may go wrong if you do otherwise. With Trade Unionism as it is in the West Indies or in undeveloped, independent, non-self-governing territories like Barbados, if you wish to retain that organisation which over a period of time—more than a century in some countries, but much less than that in some others—has shown to be a useful and in some cases a most useful organisation for obtaining better conditions for working-class people, then surely you must have some principle to guide yourself or allow yourself to be guided by. As long as you, or the members want to make the organisation a success, then things which may appear on the surface to be regrettable, must be somewhat overlooked. You must look at the matter in its proper perspective and must look at it not as a matter of reproach or even a matter of regret but as an unavoidable matter.

Let me remind honourable members that the question that Trade Union matters are now being sponsored by a Conservative Government is accidental. This training of future officials of Trade Unions started when the Labour Party in Great Britain was in power. It started in 1948, when that Government put by money to C. D. and W. for Trade Union courses in the Caribbean area. We were clamouring that we were neglected colonies, that the workers had no voice and therefore wanted representation. What was the good of our clamouring that we were being neglected, that the Colonial Office took no notice of us and our voices were not heard and in order to be noticed we had to chuck bricks through windows and make comments that no help had been given us? All the riots and the disturbances in these parts were said to arise, and obviously arose fundamentally out of the fact that there was much poverty, misery and degradation in the West Indies, and the fact that workers were getting very poor wages and that no method was paid to bringing their plight to the notice of their employers, let alone to the notice of their Government which very often was one and the same thing. Bear in mind you ask for Trade Union help; you ask the British Government to come to your rescue you ask to provide money to help you and out of that asking the C. D. and W. fund and organisation started. It was history repeating itself. Honourable members will remember that the Mother Country through the British Trade Union Congress joined with other

Western Governments, which might have been unduly under the influence of the United States, to support the creation of an international organization for workers distinct from the international organization of which they were all members because they felt, rightly or wrongly, that the organization to which they belonged was of Russian domination. Owing to that tension they decided to support this new International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will bear with me. I am just saying all of this to show honourable members the stages which led up to this resolution. This House, not even as a representative of the working class as it was then, contributed money to send a delegate to London for that initial conference. I well remember that the honourable senior member for the City was one of the strongest in favour of the public contribution for that purpose. The honourable member pointed out that although he was not a Socialist; yet he felt it was a good thing for this island to do and that was to join with other Governments in financial contribution to the new federation. That is how the I. C. F. T. U., was formed and how we became affiliated with that Federation.

I hope the honourable senior member for St. George will forgive me for constantly making reference to his speech but I cannot help doing so. In his academic definition of a Trade Union the honourable member rightly pointed out that a Trade Union could either be comprised of workers or employers, therefore, the Sugar Producers Association of Barbados is a Trade Union and recognised as a Trade Union, there was no reason why that association should not have been asked to submit the name of a candidate for this course. That is beside the point. You were not asking employers Trade Unions; you were asking working class Trade Unions.

Let me go back to the I.C.F.T.U. Although every government of the West Indian colonies which sent representatives to that conference gave money for so doing, some of the strongest things that were said about employers there were said by West Indian Trade Union Leaders. Almost every West Indian Trade Union representative pointed out what was happening in the West Indies and why there were so many people who were dissatisfied with colonialism and the rest of it. I say Sir, do not suggest that because you have Government money and because this course will be run from money contributed by the British Government that the persons selected to attend that course will not have proper training. I must point out again that with Government money West Indian Trade Unionists at that conference attacked the system which existed in these colonies. They said that the United Kingdom Government was not really doing anything substantial to get rid of the miserable conditions in the West Indies and the British Trade Union Congress admitted that both sides were to blame. Its members said they did not keep in touch with us and we did not keep in touch with them and after that they promised financial assistance.

The honourable junior member for St. John made some reference to St. Kitts and what the Trade Union in that colony was doing. At the conference of the I.C.F.T.U., the St. Kitts delegate pointed out that the Trade Union in that colony could do nothing without money. He said that in some cases they had only a couple of hundreds of members and that there was not the prospect of getting more because they did not have enough money to pay transport to go out into the country and make members of the

sugar workers. I make this digression only to show that no person in the West Indies could say that they are ashamed at the appearance of the head quarters of the Barbados Workers Union. I do not think any Workers Union building in any part of the West Indies can surpass our building except perhaps that of Jamaica.

(A VOICE: I was making reference to the office).

In short, Sir, from 1948 it was decided to train people in Trade Union methods. The decision was taken after the first Conference of the I.C.F.T.U. and I think the first training course here began around July that year and lasted for about four months. At the conference, it was felt that there should be more trained people coming from the ranks of Trade Unions to take their place as officials and that type of person should be the one selected to go to Ruskin. It was felt that those people selected for training to become officials some day should not be people like myself, or the honourable senior member for St. George, or Mr. "Sleepy" Smith, but that they should be full-fledged Trade Unionists; people who intended to remain permanent in the Union. The despatches that came out always made that point.

Sir, the only difference between the Course this time for Trade Unionists in the Caribbean and the courses in 1952 and 1948 is the fact that the University College of the West Indies is sponsoring it and it is not taking place here. The University College of the West Indies is saying here it is, we have the lecturers, we have the people who know something about Trade Union history, and we have the people apart from the lecturers who can be of great assistance in running the course. It is only because of that, that this Course is taking place at the University College of the West Indies and not in Barbados. There is no point about its being conducted with Government money; that point is as old as the hills. There are people in Great Britain who are of a different political conviction than ours who gives scholarships to Trade Unionists and it is because those people have sufficient commonsense to know that it is better for them to have organized trade unions run by people who understand how to run them, than to have hotch-potch agitators starting unions and coming to them asking for increased pay without knowing whether it is deserving or how to get about it. If honourable members look at this matter carefully, they will see that this Government is only asking for money to send these Trade Unionists to Jamaica only because the school is not in Barbados this time.

I ask the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to forgive me if I seem to tread a little on what he probably would be saying by way of a reply. Sir, far from the Clerks Union having any sense of grievance in the selection of the candidates for the Course, honourable members will be surprised to hear, as I was surprised to see, that on one occasion when the Clerks' Union could afford to send somebody to attend a conference of Trade Unionists, they contributed to the expenses of the Barbados Workers Union delegates. The Clerks Union subscribed something like £20 or £30 to help defray the expenses of the Barbados Workers Union. Sir, that Union was so satisfied that what the delegates to that conference would do would prove something good for all Trade Unionists in Barbados that what I would call a rival union to ours put funds in our pockets. It would be completely untrue to say that no other Union was given a chance to send anybody on this Course. Let me remind honourable members that Mr. Christie Smith of the Clerks Union, on one

to me because every statement I made can be established as a statement of fact.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has gone over what he has already said again. Is the honourable member going to express the same views again?

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I am not satisfied over the situation of this Government on the eve of ministerial status and will not be satisfied until the honourable member resigns publicly the post which he holds in the Barbados Workers Union, or Premier of this colony. I will only be satisfied when I see either of those things accomplished. The honourable member must resign from the Barbados Workers' Union before he takes up his position as Premier.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, would I be in order if I move a motion that the question be now put? If I am, I will move such a motion. When I do so, it is not because I am trying to stifle debate, but honourable members would agree with me when I say that we have fully followed all the arguments of the honourable junior member for St. John.

Mr. MAPP: I second the motion.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The honourable members who have just spoken are trying to stifle debate. As I was saying, I am not at all satisfied with the untenable positions which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph now holds and I want the public to know. I am prepared to say so at a public meeting if the honourable member does not resign one of the two positions immediately. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas with his usual poverty of information on the introduction of Government measures, did not even know the contents of the minute before him. That would show what is the honourable member's capability of handling Government's business.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, Is that dealing with the resolution? Is that what we shall have to sit here and listen to all the time? Honourable members have sat here and heard all those arguments trotted out already by the honourable member. I believe all honourable members are fully apprised of what the honourable member has said. We have heard all those things, either by persons outside of this Chamber or by the innuendoes of the honourable member. The honourable member seems only to be exercising the prerogative that has been given him by continually repeating himself.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I have to defend my position. I would not be satisfied with honourable members trying to stop me from speaking.

(A VOICE): Let the honourable member continue his verbiage.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, One thing I would like to say. I would like to know if you are allowing the honourable senior member for St. Thomas to sit back and just snipe at other honourable members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should not refer to other honourable members as snipes I am appealing to the honourable member to deal with the resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I am saying that the honourable members who made that motion just now did so with the object of stifling debate on this question. I would excuse the honourable senior member for St. George, but—

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I took honourable members of this House into confidence over that motion. The most I have done, as I take it, was to ask for your ruling whether it would be in order to move that the question be now put due to the lateness of the hour.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, the attempt of the two honourable members was to prevent honourable mem-

bers who have been sent here by the people from discussing problems of the community. I was surprised when the honourable senior member for St. George saw fit to suggest such a motion. I want the honourable member to realise that a former member of this House attempted the same thing during the last session and he has paid dearly for doing so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member to deal with the resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, I am dealing with the resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It appears to me that you are dealing more with honourable members than the resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think the honourable member has misunderstood me. I would like the honourable member to believe that I was listening with a great deal of interest to what was said on all sides in this debate, but after hearing so much repetition by the honourable junior member for St. John that seemed to me not to add any authenticity to the statements which the honourable member made, I was trying to enjoin the honourable member to rest his soul in peace that we had fully understood all his criticisms.

As regards my trying to stifle debate, far from my doing so, I feel I would be the last person to do so, especially when it comes to a debate on a democratic matter such as this, I do think that democratic institutions such as Trade Unions can only flourish on criticism. The honourable junior member for St. John made some points in his debate, some of which are good; but mere repetition does not enhance their validity. Let me again assure the honourable member that I never made any motion. I only got up and asked the Chair for a ruling.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, The reply which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph made to my colleague—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member to deal with the resolution. Let us get on with this measure. If the honourable member goes on and on like that and does not deal with the resolution, we will be here until daybreak. We have gone far into the night already. I would like the honourable member to understand that I have a bed in which I would like to rest for at least an hour.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, I did not intend to speak on this resolution, even although when I read it, I did not agree with the principle involved in it. I was hoping that I would have heard from the Government Bench some explanation which would have caused me to feel that I was wrong in my apprehensions as far as the principle was concerned. However, the more I listened to the explanation from the Government Bench, the more dissatisfied and confused I have become over the matter and I am glad that the opportunity has presented itself for most of us to be able to see where Trade Unionism in Barbados and in the West Indies is heading. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas who introduced this resolution said it was a precedent. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph who supported the arguments for the passing of the resolution said that it is not the first time.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the difficulty which the hon. senior member for St. John labours under in trying to understand what is said in this Chamber. What I did say was that it is the first time that Barbados is asking for money because although it was not the first time that there have been such courses,—they taking place in Barbados before—it was the first time that we are called

upon to send any person outside of Barbados to attend such courses.

Mr. ALLDER: However well may be the honourable member's explanation, I am saying, Sir, that there is no moral in the principle of this resolution. As a matter of fact, the very first thing which is against this measure is that the people who had something to do with the granting of the scholarships started out wrongly to deal with them. If those scholarships were offered to Barbados from whatever source they were provided, either through the Labour Department, the Colonial Secretary or the Executive Committee, the principle in selecting the delegates was wrong because they were not provided to benefit one private organisation. Even if it were so, as soon as it comes to the question of asking for Government funds the picture becomes different. It implicates not only the Trade Unionists in the colony but non-Trade Unionists as well. Now I am on this point, allow me to say that there are a couple of officials in this colony, Heads of Government Departments including imported officials and even members of the Civil Service lower down the line, who seem to feel that all they have to do is to please the Leader of the Government and the Government in power. I would like to tell them that they are entirely mistaken. They are short-sighted in thinking so and they should discontinue practising such stupidity. It is by that mistaken idea that you get the Labour Commissioner recommending that the delegates for that Course should only be drawn from the Barbados Workers' Union. As far as one can see, the name of the Clerks' Union only came into the picture by accident. From the Minute read by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, one can see that the Labour Commissioner, whoever he is, could not give that impartiality that is expected of him.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I must rise to refute that statement of the honourable member. There is nothing in the Minute which I read which would give anybody the impression that the Labour Officer was partial to the Barbados Workers' Union. I said definitely, that the Labour Officer approached officials of the Clerks' Union as well as of the Barbados Workers' Union. The officials of the Clerks' Union said they could not send anybody because the person, who should go, could not get leave from their work. Of course, the Labour Commissioner did say that the Clerks' Union was losing members and probably would soon be dead, but the fact remains that the gentleman from that Union who was asked to go, said he could not go because he could not get the necessary leave. What the honourable senior member for St. John says about impartiality is quite wrong.

Mr. ALLDER: I would say that when the honourable member read that Minute and got to the part which signified that the Clerks' Union had lost members, that statement gave me a feeling of some semblance of partiality in the matter; however, I would not say that there was victimization of the Clerks' Union on the other hand. The words "at last" which are mentioned in that Minute show that something is expected to happen. When one uses those words, he expects something to happen. Why should a Labour Officer be able to write minutes which could signify his partiality. I say it is wrong and the officer who wrote that Minute should be heavily censured. Of course, the Government is not going to censure him because he is pleasing those whom he believes he is to serve. That officer believes that the members of the Government are the only people he has to serve, but he is mistaken. He may find that they may only be in power for a very short period.

(A VOICE: The honourable member is now mistaken.)

A member of the Government has said that I am now mistaken which is taken to mean that the Government in power will be there for a very long period. His remarks can only cause those officials to become greater fools. The reason why the political pendulum swung to the left as far as it has done was only because the people who were in power held it too strongly to the right. Sir, I am saying that the method of selection was wrong. What an impartial Labour Officer would have done would have been to put a notice in the newspaper calling for applicants for those scholarships. He would not have taken it upon himself to say that the Barbados Workers' Union was the only democratic Trade Union existing in the colony and that the Clerks' Union "at last" is dying. I am sure that there are more Trade Unions than the Barbados Workers' Union in Barbados.

(A VOICE: Are they registered?)

I do not care what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph says. The method adopted in selecting these delegates, the relationship of the delegates to the members of the Government and the discrimination which appears to have been practised have forced me to the conclusion that this is nothing but a misuse of privilege based on corruption.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member should be made to withdraw that statement. I object to those words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must ask the honourable member to withdraw those words.

Mr. ALLDER: If the honourable member wants me to withdraw those words I withdraw them. I would also like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to be able to influence me to voluntarily remove the thought. I have no desire to harbour malicious thoughts for the sake of so doing. I am saying, sir, that this is the first time since I have been a member of this House that I have seen government funds spent on things such as this. It is a precedent which is being created, and a dangerous one too. I can say boldly that if another Government was in power, and that government had a trade union, and the executives of the trade union were also members of the Executive, and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and his supporters were in the Opposition a Resolution like this would not pass this Chamber without a strong fight. The honourable member would not have sat silently and allowed it to pass easily. It is discrimination.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that other trade unions exist in the island and the members of such unions should have been acquainted with the possibility of acquiring some of these scholarships. The whole thing has been done underneath the table. That is why the Labour Officer should be severely censured for the method that he has adopted in distributing these awards. What makes me feel doubly bad is when I realise that no real worker has been selected. I feel that we have reached a stage where the real worker should be qualified to take over his own business. If you go several miles beyond the reach of the real worker and select other people and then come for the taxpayers' money it is wrong. Bank robbers usually feel that they are right and that the rest of the community is wrong. I have taught myself to see both sides of the picture. It seems that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas wants to get up; let him do so. He is one who has enjoyed similar benefits to the one to which this Resolution refers.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, — I would like the honourable member to explain what he means when he says that I have enjoyed a similar thing.

Mr. ALLDER: I thought the honourable member would have appreciated my having honoured him by mentioning him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has asked that you explain what you mean. Explain it or withdraw it.

Mr. ALLDER: I mean that the honourable member enjoyed a similar measure of ignorance as those whom I had in mind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable senior member for St. Thomas ever have a Trade Union course?

Mr. ALLDER: Did he, Mr. Chairman? I was saying, sir, that the whole thing is wrong. In the first place the Labour Officer was at fault in not advertising this course in the newspapers and giving other unions in the island an opportunity to make applications. In the second place this is the first time that a Resolution of this kind has been brought to this Chamber for this purpose. In the third place the Resolution not only asks for payment of the passages of the two delegates, but also for a living allowance for the dependents of one of the delegates. I feel, sir, that all that is wrong. We have seen cases where employees have been selected and sent on courses, and they have asked their employers to continue to pay their salaries. If they are employed by the Government the Government continues to pay their salaries. Private firms do the same. But in this case it is not so.

I have read in the newspapers the names of the selectees. I also know that both of them are employed by the present Government, though not as a government. The selectees are employed as servants of the members of the Executive, and this committee has to decide whether hands should be put in the Public Treasury to send these delegates on this course. The mere fact that the delegates are so closely connected to the Government shows that there is something wrong with the whole scheme. Speaking from an impartial point of view I am saying that it does not appear right. I may be wrong. But if you carried this matter before a tribunal of unbiassed persons they must feel as I feel. The mere fact that the delegates are related to members of the Government — not because they are members of the Union, but also because they are employed by the members of the Executive—gives me the feeling—

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member who introduced this Resolution has pointed out that the unions had been asked to select officials for this course because officials would be more likely to make permanent use of what they would learn.

Mr. ALLDER: I hope that the honourable member realises that trade union officials have not been selected. If the honourable member were to say that especially one of the delegates selected is an official of the union it would be untrue.

Mr. ADAMS: The "Beacon" Newspaper is owned by the trade union and run by the trade union, and one of the selectees is an employee of the "Beacon", while the other is a cashier and clerk of the union. It would be difficult to see how anyone could be more an official. I cannot allow the honourable member to get away with these statements. When he says these things we just laugh; but some people may feel that what he is saying is true.

Mr. ALLDER: If the honourable member is saying that because one of the delegates works at the "Beacon" he is an official of the union then the boy who sells the papers in the streets can also be considered as a trade union official; and so can the young girl who sets up the type. I think that

everyone in this colony whether he is directly related to the union or not has to be interested in the policy of the union and in its activities. We all have to be interested in how it is run. That is one thing.

The next thing is, Mr. Chairman, that we have never seen a group calling itself a Labour Government which is more willing to squander other people's money than the present Government in power. What it all boils down to is that just because they do not want to do what certain private employers would do, or that the Government would do—to continue the salaries of any of their permanent staff who were going abroad—they have put this Resolution before us now. Because they are bosses of the union and bosses of the Government they decide that they will not carry this burden on their shoulders but drop it on the shoulders of the masses of Barbados.

Mr. ADAMS: The trade union is still paying those people's salaries.

Mr. ALLDER: What I am saying is this: The trade union should have decided to take these people's salaries from their own coffers instead of taking them from the taxpayers; because there are many taxpayers who are not interested in trade unionism. Why should you compel a man to contribute to something in which he is not interested and which may destroy him? What is the use of having a strong organisation which you boast is the only one in existence in this island when instead of going to the treasury of the organisation and taking out a couple of dollars to defray the expenses of these delegates you take it from the taxpayers? It is not fair; and what is more, Mr. Chairman, if all this running around that is costing a lot of money every year was of any benefit to the masses one would not mind. But all the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and his co-workers are doing is taking the whole trade union group of workers and handing them over to our imperial masters and compelling us to accept those who in the past terrorised our ancestors, and who are always willing to put us back in the place where they had our forefathers. Let the honourable senior member for St. Joseph get up and refute that. That is all the honourable member is selling his services to the people in England for. That is why the industrialists of England and America have decided to set up the study of unionism and the granting of scholarships. It is not for the benefit of the masses; because those people have been trained to think that every other man must always be their serf. Do you think that such people would ever really want to give the masses equal status?

We all know how not very long ago trade unionists were being hounded in England. If they were suspected of disseminating trade union views—just suspected—they were pilloried. Now just a couple of years, if we think of the progress of a people, these same people are saying to trade union officials "we have undergone a change of heart; come and take our gold." Even in the days when Christ walked the earth you did not get that. Even in the days when Christ turned water into wine you did not get that magnanimous outlook by the ruling classes towards their serfs. Science has helped us to realise that man is only a collection of atoms. He has no magic power. He cannot stand where he is and cause me to develop leprosy. All those things are fallacious to me. They do not ring true.

There are a bunch of hunters today hunting those whom they call communists and using the money of the big industrialists of the two big democratic countries to do it. I am always willing to

praise the Government when I can see my way to do so. They cannot ram this down our throats. They are only sending people to be trained as traitors. I am trying to save those people from falling into the wrong hands, the hands of the person or persons who sponsor these courses and who will see to it that selectees get only what they are to get from the point of view of trade union knowledge which might not fit in with the successful representation of the masses as such. Any such C.D. & W., scheme means that you must get put to your views which coincide with the advancement of the master race against your own race. They must give you certain ideas which might take you off the right track. I speak from the point of view of the advancement of the colonial peoples as such.

Some of these so-called delegates go abroad, and when they return you discover that they have only been trained to abuse those whose views differ from theirs, and to brand those whose views differ as communists. Only recently we heard the honourable junior member for St. Peter refer to communist agents and that kind of nonsense. He comes back here and roundly abuses people. The only impression he gives is that he is doing the bidding of our masters and his masters. We all have a common heritage in suffering. We have an indivisible link which binds us together. I believe that if partial progress would divide us it is better for all of us to be kept down and remain linked together and retain our strength in the common pool so that when we decide to burst our fetters our universal strength would be there. Do not allow some of us to slip out.

The whole purpose of these scholarships and conferences is to cause national division. Cheap colonials must be used in the national game at the sacrifice of the service which they might have been able to give to their separate colonies. I say that that is wrong. I have heard the honourable senior member for St. Joseph attack my colleague. I want to say this: I want to be factual. The newspaper is an organ which guides us in our opinions. What we see in the Press we must take to be authoritative, especially the Advocate. If we see in the newspaper a report coming from a Government Department to the effect that for a period of years a responsible workers' organisation has failed to submit its books for auditing, I think that this Chamber should refrain from spending one cent of Government's money on anything to do with that organisation. To do so would be a slap in the face and a censure of the Government Department which has told us that for years this organisation has failed to keep proper books and accounting of the money collected by them. That statement is not made through the desire to be malicious; but if you put two and two together you will see that the report is right; and if the report is right should we sit here and by our vote censure the department which made that report—a department which tells us that the trade union organisation is incapable of running their business? We would be doing a two-fold wrong, and the members of the Government are always willing to criticise you when you do your duty.

There is another thing. It is a known fact that the international organisation to which this local organisation is affiliated has refused to give it any financial assistance.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—Purely for the records I would like to say that that is absolutely untrue, and the honourable member when he said it knew that he was lying. The Barbados Workers' Union wanted to find out whether apart from the question of giving things like furniture there could

be any provision for loans for capital expenditure. We were told that there was no provision for loans for capital expenditure. That statement has already been corrected, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. ALLDER: As long as I am saying something with which the honourable member does not agree I would be lying.

Mr. ADAMS: An untrue statement has been made and I have given an explanation. We knew before we asked for a capital expenditure loan that there was no precedent for it.

Mr. ALLDER: I hope that the records will show everything that both of us have said. The honourable member at a Labour Day meeting said there was hope of substantial support from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions with which they would be able to erect their building. Now he is saying that that is a lie. If the honourable member said that himself we had to accept it as a fact. If we heard that they were going to get all this assistance from the I.C.F.T.U., and the assistance has not been forthcoming it would be felt that it was because of the failure of the union to keep proper accounts.

The reason why I am so strong against this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is that when, we, members of the working class people contribute our money to give these delegates these scholarships they go abroad and become injected with doctrines which we would have to fight against as a people struggling for our existence. I have noticed that certain trade union leaders, influential as they are in the West Indies and elsewhere in the democratic world, would not open their mouths to say one word about the removal of African kings who look like us. The only thing that can be easily removed by the British Government is a black king, and these black influential leaders of the West Indies would not even—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I would not like you to censure me unreasonably, Mr. Chairman. I am saying it is wrong. There is no limit to one's expression when it comes to the protection of the freedom of underprivileged colonials. Not one word was said; not a protest was made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: The two matters may not appear to be related. But this Resolution is for the purpose of furthering a certain type of education, and one does not know the lengths to which that type of education might go. Not an organisation, trade or otherwise, has said one word which would bring weight to bear in the right quarter—a quarter which can stop the destruction of these people in Kenya and elsewhere. That is what hurts me. Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a comfort to someone who has his hands and feet bound and is being tortured to know that some voice is raised in protest and asking for a relief of his sufferings? I know, Mr. Chairman, that you are always willing to show tolerance to honourable members who are expressing the will of the majority of the people. I regret that there are no means by which a Resolution like this can be torn up and thrown through the window. It deserves that; because the whole method of making the selection and of financing it is wrong.

We have heard, Sir, that certain accusations have been made against Jagan's Government in British Guiana.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution is nothing to do with Jagan's Government.

Mr. ALLDER: When you have a situation in which trade union officials are also members of the Government as is the case in Barbados and as was the case in British Guiana and you get such a government accused of usurping its powers to further the political ambitions of its trade union, and then you get something being done like this Resolution before us I say it is wrong. If we have a trade union dominating the Government, and it does not give other organisations a chance of existence or of furthering their aims and ambitions, it is tantamount to the accusations that were made against Jagan's Government. There is a saying, Sir, which I would like to quote in conclusion. It is that power corrupts, and money can change angels.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of seven Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDERS APPROVED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — I am asking leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day. Order No. 6 is to implement the proposals for the changes in title of certain offices consequent on the introduction of Ministerial Status. Honourable members will realise that unless we get this through tonight there will be a grave danger of not being ready for the 1st of February.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Order No. 6 is as follows:—

Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1953, made by the

Governor-in-Executive Committee on the thirty-first day of December, 1953.

As honourable members will see this Resolution does not deal with any additional building. The Governor's Private Secretary now becomes the A.D.C.; Miss Haskell is now Secretary; and the Cypher Clerk in the Secretariat goes up to Government House. The Secretariat Officers mentioned are those which we sent down in the Ministerial Status proposals. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day. There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Order No. 7 is as follows:—

Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1953, made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the thirty-first day of December, 1953, under the provisions of Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

The addendum fully explains this. It says that the Order provides for the increase of the staff of Medical Officers from six to seven on account of the extra provision of 46 beds which have been made available at the Hospital in consequence of the purchase of "Avalon" and a general increase in the number of patients attending the General Hospital.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Before moving the adjournment, sir, I would just like to say that at the next meeting of the House I may have to deal with Order No. 10 first and then Order No. 5. I move, sir, that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 26th February, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.