

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th October, 1954.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Messrs. J. E. T. BRANCKER, L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), O. T. ALLDER, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*) and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting of the 21st September, 1954, have been printed and circulated, and if there is no objection, those minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection the Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

By Command of His Excellency the Governor the following Papers were laid:—

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

MESSAGE NO. 25/1954.

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that Her Royal Highness The Princess Margaret will visit Barbados early next year during the course of a tour of the British West Indies. Her Royal Highness, who will travel in Her Majesty's Yacht "Britannia", will

also visit Trinidad, Grenada, Antigua, Jamaica and the Bahamas.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados,
1st October, 1954.

Report on the Treatment of Offenders for the year 1953.

Hon'ble M. E. COX:

MESSAGE NO. 26/1954

*His Excellency the Governor's Deputy
to
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Honour the Governor's Deputy has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that the eighth meeting of the Regional Economic Committee held in Barbados from the 22nd to 25th June, 1954, recommended that the Governments of the British West Indies should enter into an agreement with the West Indies Navigation Company Limited for the provision of an intra-regional Shipping Service with the object of improving the communications between the territories concerned.

2. In view of the necessity of proceeding urgently with the matter, the Executive Secretary of the Regional Economic Committee was authorised by the representatives of the Governments to negotiate through the Colonial Office and with the assistance of the appropriate departments of the United Kingdom Government the terms of a draft Agreement with the West Indies Navigation Company Ltd. In order to facilitate progress the Regional Economic Committee also agreed that the Law Officers of Trinidad should examine the agreement and the Governor of Trinidad should act as the contracting party to the agreement on behalf of all the Governments concerned.

3. The draft agreement, a copy of which is attached, in the main,

- (i) places an absolute obligation on the Company to provide a regular three-weekly service for an initial period of three years. The agreement to be terminable by six months notice in writing on either side;

- (ii) enables the company to fix passengers, fares, freight rates and other charges, but provision is made for consideration of Government representations on behalf of consumer interests. The Company will have no privileged position in this respect vis-a-vis existing commercial operators;
- (iii) requires the company to maintain a ship in condition to run the service efficiently. Provision is made for the suspension on abatement of the annual payment in circumstances of suspension of service resulting from causes other than marine casualties, hostilities etc;
- (iv) requires the Company to furnish to the Governments annually its Trading Accounts, audited Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Accounts and other information at any time reasonably required;
- (v) provides for the annual payment to the Company of \$240,000 in consideration of the maintenance of the services and of their compliance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement.
- (vi) requires the Company to carry mails on payment at prevailing rates;
- (vii) provides for the employment as far as is practicable of West Indian crews;
- (viii) provides for a regular periodic review of the service of the Government and the Company jointly.

It is proposed that in due course legislation should be enacted in each of the territories concerned to give legal effect to the agreement.

4. The draft Agreement in many places (vide Clauses 1, 2, 3 (2), 4 (1), 4 (4), 4 (5), 12, 13, 14 (2)) contemplates collective action by the Governments concerned and it is desirable and in the interests of each of the Governments that there should be some agreement among themselves as to the manner in which decisions binding on each of them in their contractual relationship with the Company are to be arrived at, and otherwise regulating relationships as between themselves. It is therefore proposed that the Governments agree among themselves as follows:—

- (a) that for the purpose of taking any decision affecting the contractual relations between the Governments and the Company, a decision shall be regarded as binding on the Governments if concurred in by any Governments whose annual contributions towards the sum to be paid to the Company under Clause 6 of the Agreement together represent 75 per centum the sum exclusive of the amount contributed by the United Kingdom Governments;
- (b) that the question for determination shall be submitted to each of the Governments for its consideration and decision either by the Executive Secretary of the Regional Economic Committee or by any of the Governments and that the reply of each Government shall be addressed directly to the Executive Secretary;
- (c) that the Executive Secretary shall record the decision of each Government.
- (d) that the Executive Secretary shall be empowered to act without further delay upon communication to him of such number of decisions as represent a decision binding on all the Govern-

ments in accordance with paragraph (a), but that it shall be his duty without delay to forward to each of the Governments, a report of the decisions of the several Governments, and of the collective decisions of the Governments for the purposes of the Agreement;

- (e) that in the event of any liability or expenditure being incurred on the part of the Governments under the Agreement, each of the Governments undertakes to contribute towards the discharge of that liability or the meeting of that expenditure a sum which bears to the amount of the liability or expenditure in question the same proportion which its annual contribution towards the sum payable to the Company under Clause 6 of the Agreement bears to that sum exclusive of the amount contributed by the United Kingdom Government;
- (f) that any right of abatement or refund accruing to the Governments under the Agreement shall be shared by the Governments in the same proportion as is mentioned in paragraph (e).

5. In order to assist in the inauguration of this Scheme, Her Majesty's Government has agreed to make a contribution of \$48,000 a year towards the annual subsidy to the Company for the initial three year period. The remainder of the subsidy has been apportioned between the West Indian Governments; of this Barbados' annual contribution will amount to \$21,120.

6. The final stage of the preparation of the Agreement has now been reached; in order that the Agreement might be executed on behalf of this Government, the sanction of the Honourable House of Assembly is sought for this Government's annual contribution of \$21,120 and for concluding the Agreement with the Company to the effect in the attached form and an agreement between the Governments as outlined in paragraph 4 of this Message.

R. N. TURNER,
Governor's Deputy.

Government House,
Barbados.
5th October, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like at this stage, to inform the House that this is a very urgent matter. I would like, if possible, a Select Committee to be appointed to-day to reply to this Message.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to authorise advances of not more than \$250 in any particular case being made on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet cash payments on account of incidental expenses and minor miscellaneous services.

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$5,775 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55, No. 20 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon'ble C. E. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of \$10,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55, Part II, Capital, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1954-55, No. 21 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1954."

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Chaplains and Printing Committee Act, 1891.

Notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has been given to-day.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

MR. BRANCKER:

To His Excellency, Sir Robert Arundell, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Officer of the most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Barbados

A vacancy having occurred in the General Assembly owing to Lorenzo Alexander Williams, Esquire, a member for the parish of St. Lucy, having vacated his seat,

We, the representatives of the people in General Assembly pray that Your Excellency-in-Executive Committee will be pleased to issue a new Writ for the election of a member to serve in the General Assembly for the parish of St. Lucy in place of the said Lorenzo Alexander Williams.

REPORT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to lay the report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message delivered at the opening of the Legislative Session 1954-55.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORTS PRESENTED

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and recommend the persons to serve on the Statutory Boards.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Chaplains' and Printing Committee Act 1891, be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO REPLY TO MESSAGE NO. 26/1954 ON THE INTRA- REGIONAL SHIPPING SERVICE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to reply to His Honour the Governor's Deputy's Message No. 26/1954, to the Honourable the House of Assembly, regarding an intra-regional Shipping Service.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say that at least a Message which is deemed to be so urgent, should be circulated after notice has been given of it today. We should share the view of the urgency of this Message, if we could see what the Message looks like. Certainly, the Message should have been cyclo-styled, and hon. members given the courtesy of seeing what it is.

Hon. M. E. COX: I appreciate what the hon. member has said; but I only received this Message

an hour or so ago, and I have been trying to get cyclo-styled copies of it made.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I do not want it to appear as if I am blocking anything, but I am asking what is Message No. 26 of 1954? We do not know what that Message is, and whether the Committee should be appointed to reply to it, or not. There may not be any harm in the matter; but if we are appointing a Committee to go into something, we should know what that matter is. Perhaps the hon. Minister would be kind enough to enlighten us as to what that Message is. (Mr. LEWIS: He says it is in connection with an intra-regional Shipping service).

Hon. M. E. COX: This message deals with intra-regional shipping service in the Caribbean area.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is, that a select Committee be appointed to reply to this Message. Hon. Members in favour of that will please say "aye", those against please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. Subject to the approval of the House I appoint the following members to serve as such select Committee:—

The Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing, (Hon. M. E. Cox.) the hon. sen. member for St. John (Mr. Alder) the hon. sen. member for St. Lucy, (Mr. Brancker), the hon. sen. member for the City (Mr. E. D. Mottley), the hon. sen. member for St. Andrew, (Mrs. Bottrne) and the hon. jun. member for Christ Church, (Mr. Goddard).
3.35 p.m.

REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—Rule 28 of this House reads as follows:—

"At the first meeting of the House after the day of the opening of the session the Chairman of the Committee appointed to answer the Governor's Speech, presents the Address prepared by the Committee in reply to the same, and moves its being read, which is seconded, and the Address is read accordingly." I beg to move that the draft reply —

Mr. LEWIS: I rise on a point of Order. That Rule would apply if the Draft Reply had been brought in at the last meeting, but not today.

Mr. SPEAKER: In such circumstances, I think it is best that a motion be put.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: If hon. members will agree, I will have a copy of the Report printed and circulated.

APPOINTMENTS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to ask that the House proceed with the Report of the Select Committee of senior members of this House, who were appointed to make recommendations for the special Boards.

Mr. LEWIS: I am objecting to leave being granted. At least, the honourable member should be able to say that he has cyclo-styled copies of the Report to put before the House, for us to be able to proceed with the matter. The honourable member has not intimated that he has such copies.

Mr. GODDARD: I am also objecting to leave. The question that leave be granted was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER—10.

Noes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—4.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that following on the recommendations of the Select Committee's Report, the following be members of the Printing Committee. I take it that it is the desire of this House to deal with each Board separately.

Printing Committee

Mr. SPEAKER, Mr. BRANCKER, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. F. C. GODDARD and Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. BRANCKER: In accordance with the recommendations, I beg to move that the following be the personnel of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, and Mr. F. E. MILLER.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

3.45 p.m.

Board Of Agriculture

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to move, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee, the following members be the personnel on the Board of Agriculture: Mr. J. A. Haynes, B.A., Mr. L. E. Smith, Mr. O. T. Alder and Mr. E. StA. Holder.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Mr. BRANCKER: Also in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee, I beg to move that Mr. F. L. Walcott be the member of the House on the Board of Agricultural Credit Societies.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Agricultural Credit Societies

Mr. BRANCKER: Again, in accordance with the Select Committee, I beg to move that the members of this House on the Board of the Peasants' Loan Bank be: Mr. L. E. Smith, and Mr. E. StA. Holder.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—In keeping with the principle which I enunciated, it will be contrary to my convictions, if I do not express my view again here. I did it before the Select Committee was appointed, and also in the Select Committee. I am sure, hon. members will appreciate that if I offer opposition to any individual, it will be because I am offering my opposition on principle. It is because I do not agree with the policy of the Government, or with the view expressed in this respect, by the Hon. Premier. Also, I do not agree with the Select Committee in adhering to those views.

I still maintain, despite the argument of the Premier which was backed up by his Ministers in Select Committee,—the argument being that this is a sort of Administrative Board and responsible for policy,—that if by statute, two members of this House should be on that Board, especially now that we have a system of Ministerial Government, a mem-

ber of the Opposition, either the organised or individual opposition, should be a member of the Peasants' Loan Bank, as they are members of other Boards.

I maintain, my argument is in keeping with the policy followed in Great Britain, which the local Ministers are pledged to follow. It is true, on these Boards, the Government usually, and rightly so, holds the majority of members. It might be argued, that apart from members of this House being on these Boards, the Boards also carry Officials etc. In answer to that, I would say,—and one should be fully cognisant of this fact, — whatever view might be held privately by an official, when he is the Head of a Department or an official, and by virtue of his office he goes on a Board, he will have to carry out the policy of the Government. I repeat, sir, whatever may be a private view of a Civil Servant or an Official, as soon as he becomes a member of the Board by virtue of his office, his views must be the views of the Government in power. It is so in the U.K. with Ministerial Government, and it is so here.

The argument offered by the Premier, and other members of the Government, that the laws say that two members of the House should be on this Board, and therefore the two should be two from the Government's side instead of one from the Government and one from the organised or individual Opposition, does not hold water. I cannot imagine, anyone being so stupid, as to think, any Head of a Department or Civil Servant under this new form of Government, can very well say; "this is my view; and, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, I will vote this way."

It is true, there is hardly much point in making a nomination here; but if you have a principle, you must stick to it. I feel, sir, the hon. senior member for St. Philip or the hon. senior member for St. John, interested as they are in the predominantly agricultural areas, and having been in this House sufficiently long, should have a look in on this Board and see what is happening. I remember when the political complexion of this House was different. One of the main things which members of the Government now in power protested against, was that those in power at that time, would never allow other persons to come in and state their views, or look in on the Boards. There was not even Ministerial Status, then, where a similar argument would apply. Two wrongs cannot make a right. As soon as there is Ministerial Status, you must have two members from the House along with the officials. As I have said, the Officials are bound to carry out the policy of the Government. I beg to move, sir, that the hon. senior member for St. Philip be on that Board.

I do not think that any majority of this House, of the Government, should be on any Board. You have to look at things clearly and squarely. I repeat, a member of the Opposition should be placed on this Board. The hon. senior member for St. John, whom I have nominated, is not prepared to be defeated; but as far as I know, he is not the type of person who does not like to fight. Realising that he would be defeated, the hon. member says that he would not like to face the position; and therefore, I beg to nominate the hon. senior member for St. Philip as a member of the Peasants' Loan Bank.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that. The principle has been enunciated, by the Government members, that the time has come when Ministers must vacate seats on these Boards. Some Ministers, have removed themselves from these Boards by resignation or otherwise. I understand, the Hon. Minister for

Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries has left the Board; but there are on this Board, two members of the Government's party. However, it is right for a member of the Opposition to be on this Board. It may seem strange to the public, that members of the Opposition are excluded from this Board; and if you want to remove any suspicion, let us include a member of the Opposition on this Board.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would merely like to comment on certain misapprehensions, under which certain hon. members have been labouring. The Peasants' Loan Bank, in truth and in fact, is a separate and distinct entity, which functions not as a Government Department, but as a limited liability company. Although the question of Ministerial Status has arisen, one would think, under the Ministerial system, the Minister has charge of everything that happens at this Board; but that is not the case where the Peasants' Loan Bank is concerned. The Peasants' Loan Bank is comprised of two members of the House of Assembly, one from the Other Place, one from the Agricultural Society, and one nominated by the Governor. Those members function as directors of a limited liability company. They make appointments, recommend dismissals, and they see after the running of the Board, awarding contracts and so on. It is only after they have made appointments, and recommended dismissals, that the Minister becomes aware of them. It is only Government Departments which function under the Ministerial set up, and not a limited liability company. I could say a lot more on this matter; but I do not think it is necessary to do so on this occasion. If you put a member of the Opposition on the Board, it means that the policy of the Government would not be carried out.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I would like to find out, if it is in order to follow the hon. member's motion. That would be adding another member to the Board. (MEMBERS: Oh no.)

Mr. LEWIS: I have never been a member of this Bank; but I have heard that peasants who get their cheques not fully signed at the bank, have to go around the city to get the number of required signatures completed by a director. I suppose, it might be easy to get hold of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, although he is not actually in the city; but honestly, if the practice still obtains, could not the convenience of the people be considered? The hon. junior member for St. Joseph may happen to be in St. Joseph on a particular day, and the hon. senior member for St. James himself is not available for a whole day, because he may be in St. James,— must a peasant be held over for a whole day? At least, there must be other members who could facilitate the peasants. I am asking, if the practice is still the same, whether we could not consider the convenience of the people. It would appear to me, from the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, that he should be a member of this Bank. If as he says, this Bank is a separate entity, and the policy can be made and then brought to him, it would seem to me, as if he should be a member of this Board. In the normal course of his duties, he would be accessible to persons who want to have their cheques signed. I have nothing more to say on this question, except that I would like some member who has functioned as a member of this bank, to say if what I am saying is not true; and if what is proposed, will not inconvenience those persons who have to get the completion of the signatures to their cheques.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,— We have three members proposed for two places. I think the only way we can settle this matter, is to vote for each

person separately. Otherwise I think we will get into trouble.

Mr. SPEAKER: Taking into consideration what the hon. junior member for the City has said, I think some difficulty may arise, if the two questions are to be resolved. My suggestion is, that the matter be resolved by ballot. I am not allowing the motions; because in case they are passed, we would have three persons instead of two. I shall therefore ask some honourable member to move that the question be resolved by ballot.

Mr. LEWIS: I hope you do not mean by secret ballot. I do not agree with that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to move that the decision of the personnel be determined by secret ballot. That is, each member of the House to vote for two of the three members who are nominated to this Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to move that each name of the three members nominated, be put separately.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second the motion made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. LEWIS: Before you put the questions, I would like to get some information on the motion of a Secret Ballot. So far as I know, every vote of this House has to be recorded. I think there is something in the Letters Patent about that. I cannot for the life of me, see how you can decide this matter by secret ballot. I draw attention to the fact that the rules of this House state that every vote of this House has to be recorded.

The question that each name be put separately for the voting for the personnel to serve on this Board, was put and agreed to without division.

The question that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. SMITH) be appointed a member of the Board, was put and agreed to without division. (Cheers).

The question that the honourable junior member for St. James (Mr. HOLDER) be appointed a member of the Board was put, Mr. SPEAKER declaring that the "Noes" have it. On a division being called for the question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House divided as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. BRYAN and Mr. BRANCKER—(8).

Noes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—(7).

Mr. SPEAKER: I now declare that the "Ayes" have it. (Cheers).

Fancy Molasses Board

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to move that in accordance with the recommendations of the Select Committee, the following be the members in the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board:—

Mr. Vaughan, Mr. D. D. Garner, Mr. Nigel Reece, and Sir John Saint.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

Housing Board

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to move that in accordance with the recommendations of the Select Committee, the following members of this House be members of the Bridgetown Housing Board:—

Mr. T. O. Bryan, and Mr. F. E. Miller.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must be up again. There are occasions when you can never compromise on principles. The Premier in his usual dogmatic style, made a statement last week, which I criticised. That statement was relative to the Peasants' Loan Bank, and also in respect of putting two members of the Government side on that Board. One saw even though the logic of the Opposition's argument must be obvious, members of the Government out of loyalty, support the expression of the Premier. On the other hand, Sir, the Ministers in Committee was quick to express the view, that this expression by the Premier, could not apply to the Housing Board.

I cannot be accused of agreeing to anything in Committee and coming on the floor of the House and changing my view although it is possible for anyone to do that, if he is convinced after the meeting of the Committee, that something is wrong or right. In such a circumstance, he is entitled to change his view. In this instance, I want to assure honourable members that such cannot be said of me, because the views that I express here, I expressed in Committee also. I maintain that, without further ado. The argument which I used in respect of the Peasants' Loan Bank, I use now. The composition of the two Boards is almost the same.

Nothing that I can say will convince those whose minds are already made up. But if you take the speech of the Governor made on the last occasion that he addressed us, and observe that he used the words "My Government" and "My Ministers", you will see that out of sheer decency, Government should really avoid any suspicion; and wherever they have a majority on a board, they should let someone from outside have a seat on that Board.

I suppose it will be said that I am a member of this Board; but I am not there because of any fancy of the Government. I therefore feel since the honourable senior member for St. John has been clamouring so extensively for a Housing Scheme in St. John, the opportunity should be given him to become a member of this Board. I beg to move that the honourable senior member for St. John, be a member of the Housing Board.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am going to say, as far as I remember, the members who were last on this Board at the end of the session, were there for a very short time. Since these two members have only been there for such a short time, I feel, it would be a good gesture on the part of the House, to allow those members to remain there long enough, to make some valuable contribution which they might want to make on the Board. I should like to say, the period during which these members were on this Board, should be extended for the same purpose as we extended the life of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move, that each member who has been nominated, be voted upon separately.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The motion was agreed to.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Bryan) be a member of this Board was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the hon. junior member for St. George (Mr. Miller) be a member of this Board was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMANS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. BRYAN, LEWIS and BRANCKER—9.

Noes: Messrs. CRAWFORD, VAUGHAN, ALLDER, GODDARD, HAYNES and E. D. MOTTLEY—6.

Sugar Production And Export Control Board

Mr. BRANCKER: In accordance with the final recommendations of the Select Committee, I beg to move that the following members of the personnel of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board: The hon. junior member for St. Peter (Mr. F. L. Walcott), the hon. senior member for St. John (Mr. Allder) the hon. senior member for the City (Mr. E. D. Mottley) and Mr. H. O. Emtage.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mrs. BOURNE: I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City, (Mr. Lewis) be a member of this Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I thank the honourable member for so kindly proposing me to be a member of this Board, and the honourable member who seconded the motion but I feel that a member who is representing an agricultural constituency, should be given a chance at membership of this Board. I am perfectly willing and ready to give such a member that opportunity. I therefore beg to decline the proposal for membership of this Board.

The question that the members proposed to serve on this Board be the members of the Board, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Victoria Emigration Society

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following members to serve as members of the Victoria Emigration Society:—

The hon. sen. member for St. Andrew, (Mrs. Bourne), the hon. sen. member for St. George (Mr. Barrow), and the hon. jun. member for the City, (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Although it is your prerogative to appoint the members of this Board, I am sure, it must have slipped Your Honour, that the House has requested, in keeping with the principle of changing the policy of putting only the Government members on these Boards,—I think Your Honour—

Mr. SPEAKER: This is my prerogative.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: While it is your prerogative, I was wondering whether Your Honour would not let it appear to the general public, that the policy of the House has to be carried out by the Speaker even in selecting members to be put on Boards and not merely members of the Government party. But if Your Honour desire to go along with the old system I will register my protest.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not protest.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know I cannot.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Sir, I am asking leave to proceed with Order No. 1 and other Orders standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking that leave be granted to proceed with Order No. 1, and other Orders standing in the name of the Hon. Premier. If there be no objection, leave is granted.

There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.

4.35 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of this House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I would just like the honourable junior member for St. Thomas—in case he does not notice it,—to refer to the Schedule of this Resolution for the sum of \$5,720. He will see that it is not copied exactly as it is in the Annual Estimates.

The question that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, was put and resolved in the affirmative.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO. 19 : Re YELLOW FEVER CAMPAIGN

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution is to place the sum of \$5,720 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Supplement Estimates 1954-55, Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954-55 No. 19 which form the Schedule to this Resolution. Honourable members are aware that there has been for some months in the past and up to this moment an eradication campaign going on in this island, against the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito which is responsible for yellow fever. In view of the fact that there are some cases of yellow fever next door to us in Trinidad, it is felt in order to be on the safe side, that the campaign should be stepped up; so that we would be in a stronger position to resist any introduction of yellow fever in this colony. Hence, this vote. We are asking for additional personnel and other expenses as follows:

Preparation of truck for service	\$ 600.00
12 sprayers at \$50.00	600.00
Upkeep of truck including wages of	
Chauffeur and Insurance	700.00
8 labourers at Key Scale Rates &	
C.O.L.A.	2,100.00
Subsistence allowance—W.H.O. Consul-	
tant 150 days at 26/- per day ..	936.00
	\$4,936.00

or approximately \$5,000.

It is considered necessary that we should get in this World Health Organisation consultant at this moment. He has been offered to us; and one of the agreements is, that we would have to pay his subsistence.

The total vote is approximately \$5,000 to defray expenses, in order that the consultant should be here for a few months, and that the campaign should be stepped up. I am sure honourable members will take a sympathetic view of this, in consequence of the urgency; and because, as I have said, the Yellow Fever outbreak is next door to us in Trinidad. I beg to move that this Resolution be now passed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—We started this campaign some six months ago. We had plenty of time for preparation. About a year ago, selected inspectors were sent from this colony to Trinidad to be trained, to come back here and spread the gospel, as it were. They were trained, to see that the work was properly carried out. His Excellency the Governor in his recent speech, when he reopened the Legislature, said that this campaign was well on the

way. In spite of that, there is a statement now in the notes to this supplementary Estimate, a statement made by the Director of Medical Services, that the present programme is progressing too slowly. One statement does not tally with the other.

I agree, the scheme is going much too slowly. Four months ago, when Government came down for a supplementary vote, I told the Government it was not enough, and that the campaign was going too slowly then. I also said that there had not been sufficient propaganda at the outset of the campaign; and that we should have a Health Week, so as to clean up all those old tins, etc. That is being done now. Christ Church and St. Michael are two parishes, which have constant campaigns for clearing up things like old cans, from the side of the street. We send our lorries for the refuse after hours, for which we pay extra money; and the refuse is collected and dumped. Things like old cans and coconut shells, are breeding places for the *Aedes Aegypti* Mosquito.

It is regrettable, Sir, that the Press has been constantly referring to this mosquito as the Yellow Mosquito; as if Barbados has Yellow Fever. I believe, the Newspapers in Trinidad spread the Yellow Fever so much there, that that island is now being boycotted as the result. I want to see this scheme progress, as fast as possible. It started off slowly, and is now picking up. Why? Because they are supposed to have the Yellow Fever in Trinidad. I see here, in the resolution, provision is being made for the painting and the roofing of a pick-up truck which was loaned, or given by the World Health Organization. As a member of the Board of Health, this is the first time I have heard about it. I do not know whether it is in the island yet. The purpose of this truck has not been explained. They have not said if they will use it for carrying the gangs around, or for picking up old tins. I would have thought, as a member of the Board of Health, that something of this matter, would have been explained to us.

At the outset of this scheme, a consultant from the World Health Organization did arrive in Barbados. He had two meetings, both of which, I believe, were held under the auspices of the St. Michael's Sanitary Commissioners. That consultant was here for two weeks, and then left. He, or another consultant, is now coming back again for about 250 days. I think that should have been done from the beginning. I hope, the subsistence allowance for him is enough; because, unless we are only paying half of the allowance, it does seem to be a very small sum. I would like the Hon. Minister of Health to explain exactly what this allowance is for, and what it means. Perhaps, W. H. O. is paying half of the allowance; I do not know, and I would like some explanation on it.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—It will be remembered, when the last money was being voted, that the question of the method of carrying out this campaign, was brought up in this House. We had to pass regulations etc. I told the House, when this campaign was being started, the people should have been told in advance, what was going to be done; so that they would be prepared for this spraying etc. A real propaganda campaign should have been started: It was said that that would be done. But the campaign did not well get under way, before we had to vote money for people to clean up places, so that the sprayers could come in and do their work.

At that time, I criticised the Supplementary vote. We were told that we had the Yellow fever mosquito. It is a dreaded disease; but we allowed the Director of

Medical Services to go on holiday, immediately after or before the campaign was started. Other Civil Servants, are told that a Civil Servant is not entitled to anything except 24 hours a day work. That is only a slight exaggeration of what we are told. A Civil Servant is not entitled to privileges. In spite of that, the Director of Medical Services was allowed to go away at that time. It is not, that I think you could not do without him; but certainly, there is no use depleting a department, when there is a special job for that department to do, and especially a job that it has never undertaken before.

Now, Sir, the honourable junior member for Christ Church will bear me out, at every meeting of the Board of Health since the Yellow Fever and Infantile Paralysis became epidemic in the area, the Director of Medical Services has been asked at every meeting of the General Board of Health for a Report on what is happening. Right up to the last meeting, held on the second or third Wednesday of last month, an entirely different picture was painted of this situation. The honourable junior member for Christ Church will remember, the Director was asked a direct question about Seawell Airport, about the parish in which the Airport is situated, and all around where people landing from Trinidad and elsewhere must traverse, and where they can distribute the disease at least in the first stages, if it can be distributed that way, immediately after they have landed.

According to what we have heard, everything seemed to be alright. Now we get this resolution coming here, a comparatively short time afterwards, saying that the successful completion of the eradication programme is one of compelling urgency and it is going slowly. Even in the case of the Board of Health's vote, I had to draw it to the attention of the House last year that he asked for supplementary estimates without putting it to the Board.

4.55 p.m.

That is the kind of dictators which we have; and we are passing laws every day, to make them more and more dictators, and giving them the power of life and death over the people of this colony. I particularly asked, if there were an outbreak of Yellow Fever in this colony, who would have to make regulations. I was told the General Board of Health would have to make them. I should like to say, common decency should have allowed the Head of the Department to tell the Board what the position is. He does not care anything of the campaign. He can run away from the Yellow Fever and the Polio and he would be the first to go and get the best treatment and leave the people who had been feeding him, to get it. Now we find, this consultant is coming here for a period of four or five months, in accordance with article one of the agreement between the Government of Barbados and the W.H.O., made in August, 1953. This consultant is coming here in accordance with an agreement, which has been made ever since in 1953; and nothing like this is told to the people who comprise the General Board of Health in this colony. This situation has been kept as a secret from the General Board of Health by the Director of Medical Services, who is taking part in the meetings! That is a disgraceful state of affairs. If you are going to abolish the Board, then abolish it; but this state of affairs should not be allowed to continue. It is a serious state of affairs, where you have someone who has this idea of this matter, sitting down with the people who have to advise as to how the regulations are to be made in case of an outbreak of these diseases, and does not tell these people what the position is, although he has been asked.

We are not told we need any more equipment; and now you find in one of the early Resolutions, you have to deal with, that this matter is one of compelling urgency, and that in the opinion of the Director of Medical Services, the campaign is going too slowly. Hints about how to avoid the Polio and Yellow Fever were put in the newspaper, as if the Director of Medical services were the author. It is a serious state of affairs, when we can have a Civil Servant in such a responsible position, concealing information which should be divulged in the proper quarters. I am asking the Minister of Social Services to regard this as information on which he should act. Let him give a warning to people of this sort, they have no right to behave in this way. For the members of the Board of Health to read this resolution, and be given an entirely false impression of the situation facing this island, is something which is reprehensible; and the Director of Medical services should be told so. An agreement made in 1953 is only now being implemented; and we have heard, these people have done some work already. We do not know if this is something which is out of date. Did anybody else come out in execution of that agreement? To my mind, this is a very serious matter. I am just telling the honourable Minister exactly what has happened; because he himself, has not had the time to see about this matter I wish that he had attended these meetings, to hear the concern of people who had children and families to catch this disease, asking for information, and asking that the public be told something suggesting precaution which may be taken, and that the public be kept informed. People have been writing in the Press of what has been going on; and here, the situation is being kept a secret from persons who should have been told about it. I say, do not let a Civil Servant treat members of the Board of Health in this manner.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I suppose, I must say, the Hon. Minister of Health is congenial, that he gives us the impression that he is rather dormant where some of these matters are concerned. However, in respect of this particular matter, I can say, he has evinced great interest, when I drew to his attention, the great indifference on the part of his department when this campaign was first started. The indifference could have been greater. As a matter of fact, I drew to his attention, the scant courtesy with which this officer from the W.H.O., was treated; and one becomes very suspicious of the reasons why this officer was treated with such scant courtesy. Anyone who is interested in Public Health, will realise and appreciate, if an officer from the W.H.O., comes to Barbados, to deal with a matter of such magnitude and importance as to the eradication of the Yellow Fever mosquito, would have thought, all the various Health Departments, headed by the Government, would have been put in full gear to receive and put the works into operation. However, as my colleague and the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, all was not well. A few days ago, His Excellency the Governor in his speech from the Throne, told us that everything was progressing favourably; and those of us who read newspapers other than the local ones, might view with some alarm, the conditions which exist in the neighbouring colony of Trinidad. The world has become so small, it is nothing surprising for a Yellow Fever Epidemic breaking out in Trinidad or Venezuela yesterday, to be in Barbados today, tonight or tomorrow. Therefore, those of us who are interested in Public Health especially, must view such a lack of interest or enthusiasm on the part of the Health Department, with alarm.

5.05 p.m.

I am practically sure, the Hon. Minister of Health is bound to say, it is also surprising to him. We have received this resolution because of the alarm in Trinidad; and for nothing but that reason. The note says, "especially on account of Port-of-Spain, and continuous areas in Trinidad being declared infected with Yellow Fever, the successful completion of our *Aedes Aegypti* Eradication Programme is one of compelling urgency." My colleague, the honourable junior member for Christ Church, and myself, knew nothing of the pick-up. It is also stated, for the six months ending March 1955, the sum of approximately \$5,000 will be needed as follows:—

Preparation of truck for service	\$ 600.00
12 sprayers at \$50.00	600.00
Upkeep of truck including wages of	
Chauffeur and Insurance	700.00
8 labourers at Key Scale Rates &	
C.O.L.A.	2,100.00
	\$4,000.00
Subsistence allowance—W.H.O. Con-	
sultant 150 days at 26/- per day	936.00
	\$4,936.00

or approximately \$5,000.

Hon. members will recall, on a former occasion when a resolution was presented to this Chamber for \$2,100, how I criticised the parsimonious attempt by Government, in handling this matter. I was convinced, and I believe, the Minister of Health at that time, thought that all was not well. I am going to grant, that when I told the Hon. Minister of Social Services what was happening in this matter, he took time off and visited some of the places. He too saw that the barriers between laymen and the Doctors had been broken down.

Quite recently a memorandum was sent out. I do not know, if the honourable Minister is acquainted with it. It was pointing out that the Government would be asking Commissioners of the various parishes, to acquire more labour for the carrying out of this campaign. This is the very Government, which had accepted the advice of its professional officers, that more labourers were not necessary for the carrying out of this campaign. It is the very Government, which meted out scant courtesy to this officer, and at that time, displayed a lack of interest. The fact that this Government knew that the W.H.O. was assisting in this campaign, and did not say one word about it in this Chamber when somebody was sent here by that Organisation, leaves one to come to the conclusion, that were that person an Englishman who was sent here, the radio, the Government, and the Minister of Health, would have been geared to the utmost. Not one word was said; and that shows the lack of interest by the Government. I want to say here now, I was practically ashamed, after discussing with the Officer who also discovered it, that there was lack of interest; and who I suppose, will have to report back to W.H.O. Suppose he is going to say, Barbadians know everything, and that this country is a law unto itself. Mr. Chairman, just fancy, not one doctor had been informed of this campaign. I would like the honourable Minister to contradict this statement. Imagine W.H.O. sending somebody here to assist you in something, and the medical fraternity of this island not being asked to come in, and give the necessary co-operation. When the Officer who was sent out here, asked "What has been done?" "Have you published anything about it?" "Have you given any talks about this Yellow Fever?" all that could be said, was: "nothing; nothing at all." As a matter of fact, some members

of the Government did not even know that this Officer was here. I must admit, when the Hon. Minister of Social Services was informed, he got up and went down to the Goodland tenantry, and saw how the scheme was operating. Now that there is an outbreak of Yellow Fever next door, and you are scared about it, you want to do something with the greatest urgency. I hope it is not too late for the sake of our people. Those of us who are interested in public life, and who have read of this very dread disease, not only to the individual, but to the country, know what it must mean, should there be an epidemic in this colony, to such a proportion where it is necessary to raise a quarantine is as far as shipping is concerned to Barbados. Surely more interest must be taken, when health is offered to you.

The Director of Medical Services is now saying, that the present programme is progressing too slowly. It has taken him all this time to see it is progressing too slowly. When laymen drew that to his attention and to the Minister of Health, and to the Government, from the floor of this House, one wonders if there was any wish, that it should progress at a quicker rate. The note says:—

2. He urges that the present programme is progressing too slowly and must be accelerated and proposes to start inspection and eradication in two other areas, namely, the Northern area and Christ Church. Surveys in these areas have elicited a dangerously high index of *Aedes*. The Director of Medical services proposes to use the sanitary inspectors of the parishes concerned to do the inspections and carry out treatment under the supervision of departmental officers. This will, however, necessitate the employment of two extra labour gangs. 5.15 p.m.

I am sure, the Hon. Minister of Health must smile, when he sees that his own suggestion which he made, has come back to him. In this note, we are told that they have got a pick-up. The Minister of Health, in replying, will tell us more about that pick-up. We are told in the note, it needs repainting, and the body needs roofing. We are also told, it is necessary to secure an officer or consultant from W.H.O.

Now, the way in which this campaign is being carried out is, we have sanitary inspectors in the various parishes, and we have our Board of Health Inspectors. This campaign is being carried out by men going into places and spraying. With the greatest respect to the Director of Medical Services, the Minister of Health, and all the gentlemen concerned—the titled and lettered gentlemen—I pose this question; it is the very question which I posed, when the consultant was down here: is it absolutely necessary, to have a trained inspector to spray the insecticide and the like? Is it absolutely necessary, to have a trained inspector go around in charge of the gang? I pose this question for the honourable Minister to go into, even at this late stage. Is it necessary for an inspector, any more than it is necessary for a doctor, to go out and use a sprayer? In every parish, there are certain compulsory notifiable diseases like T.B., Typhoid Fever, etc; and after such cases of diseases are notified, it is the duty of the various Commissioners of the parishes, to have the homes of those affected by the disease fumigated. Would you take a man working for \$160 a month, give him a spray gun, and tell him to do this work? Do you need a trained inspector to go into the honourable Minister's house or garage, and use a spray gun, to eradicate the Yellow Fever mosquito?

Why do not these professional people, learn to take advice from other people at times? This pro-

fessional bigotry, and not wanting to listen to advice, is something which we must put our foot down on. I am addressing that especially to the Ministers. When they speak to these professional men at the head of departments, the Ministers should listen to them for technical advice; but when they come down to the hard commonsense view of things, they should put their own points of view.

I am saying, this scheme would have progressed better, if the method were used, of having one inspector in charge of a gang of about six labourers to an area. It would have been much cheaper in the long run; and it would have found employment for a lot of unemployed people. The labourers could go forward and clean up; others could follow and spray. But no commonsense was used in this business; absolutely none! When I say what I am saying here now, I am not talking through my hat. I drew those things to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Social Services. I can with justification, say, 'I told you so.'

Having eight labourers at Key Scale rates, is not good enough. Tell me how you will use them. It may sound stupid, but I know that the department was asking for eight or nine labourers to three inspectors. That is nonsense. The scheme is going too slowly now. In St. Michael, you have six inspectors, taken from the staff; three are inspectors who listened to the lecturers of the Consultant who visited the island. I could never see why you needed inspectors to do spraying. As a matter of fact, I advised them not to do it. I had to fight the department. Inspectors must go in houses and bring out bottles etc. I said, if I had bottles under my cellar, and they did not have water in them, no one could touch them.

If you have 22,000 houses to spray, you could use the same method that was used when you took the census. Put one inspector to a gang of six labourers, and put them in one area. Within a month's time, they could cover an area at less cost than keeping an inspector doing about ten houses in a day. If you had an inspector with the technical knowledge in charge of a gang of six, that would be all that you would want. There are some people, who feel, if only recently, that inspectors have reached the status that they now enjoy; therefore, let them carry along these sprayers. In some places, an inspector has to go down in the water barrel, under the water barrel and even under the bed, and spray. Under some beds, he found things that you have to spray too. What is the use of spraying with this special insecticide, things that Barbadians already know how to deal with? I believe that the Minister should know all these things; because, there has been much ado about this business already.

I want to show the Minister, someone is fooling the people. You want eight labourers to start in Christ Church. If they really wanted this programme to progress, they would not come for eight labourers. Suppose you said they took on three inspectors and put six labourers to an inspector. You would need 18 labourers. There are a lot of unemployed people about, and you would get a lot of work done for \$12.00 a week. The inspectors' job is to go around and see that the work is properly done. But the actual work should be carried out by labourers. But they come here for eight men, and tell us that the work is not being done fast enough.

What I am saying here, I advocated before; but it was only when the Honourable Minister of Health intervened, I was able to convince them to put on some more labourers. They were using inspectors, and when you look up the book to see

what an inspector did for a day, you only saw ten houses. What more could he do?
5.25 p.m.

The question of organization, is not given to everybody; still, professional medical men should take advice from somebody. I ask the Honourable Minister of Social Services to tell us how they propose to use these eight men? What are you going to do with the truck? I ask that question for this reason: when a petition was sent up by the inspectors asking for transportation to certain areas, it was turned down; and it was pointed out, that the Government Inspectors were given that transportation and the Parochial Officers were seconded for duty. I am very glad to see that the truck has been given to you; but what are you going to do with it? I see that there are to be twelve sprayers. These sprayers are nothing which will rot. If there is this great urgency, and the tendency is to co-operate now, how are you going to defend this matter? The other day, we had the scare of infantile paralysis around here; everybody was watching and waiting. Everybody wanted to see whether there was really a case of this disease, and where it was. People came to me as a Commissioner of Health, and I told them not to worry with where the case is now. I want to assure you, if the case was in the right place, the Government would be urged to action. I do not mean that as an offence. They told me that it was nearly in the right place too. In my opinion, twelve sprayers are just a joke. You have a few in St. Michael, and when they are out of order, what are you going to do? I hope, the Honourable Minister of Social Services will be able to answer the questions I have asked. I would like to know how are they going to use these things in proportion to the inspectors. If the particular Department is really interested in this matter, it would carry out the campaign.

Before I sit down, I want to draw this matter to the attention of the Honourable Minister. When you are dealing with Public Health, there must not be any 'hush-hush' policy. In the United States of America, when you are dealing with Public Health, you must give it all the possible publication. I am going to say something now, which will shock the honourable minister: would you believe, quite recently, the Public Health Department circularized a letter, drawing to the attention of the Health Authorities, that it had been drawn to their notice, certain cases of notifiable diseases when reported to the Commissioners of Health were leaking out, and that did not do any good. Imagine a Public Health Department, in this twentieth century attempting, for reasons which I do not know, to conceal these things! A little scare was here; a particular type of person at a particular place, was suffering from infantile paralysis. I have never seen anything more dishonest, than for a letter to be sent to a Public Health Board, saying, certain notifiable diseases when reported to Departments were leaking out and, "I would like to draw attention to the fact that the Inspectors must not do that." When somebody in St. Andrew is suffering from T.B., you must hide it up; the poor bare foot servants must contract disease, and you must not hint anything about it. I hope that a volcano would swallow them all up lock, stock and barrel, when they make these suggestions. The mind from which that suggestion came, must be corrupt. What clean mind, could conceive the idea that you must have a hush-hush policy, when there are cases of notifiable diseases which are highly infectious and contagious? I would take it out. I have my own family, and

why should I let them go to places where there are these diseases, whether it be a club, a Guesthouse, or what. When the high and mighty suffer, nobody knows it; but when the poor and lowly suffer, everybody knows it.

Mr. HAYNES: Much as I welcome this vote, I am sorry that it has taken so long to come here. I spoke on this matter when the first vote had been put down, and I asked on what was the money to be spent. I got nothing definite, and the amount only went to St. Michael. The other parishes had been cleaning up their tins and bottles months ago; and it will mean a lot of extra trouble, to remove this rubbish and put everything in order again.

Another matter is this. In connection with the van, I see that mention is made of one van. In the country districts, distances are far; and some parts are hilly, so that transportation will be the main difficulty. I want to know how this one van will be able to accommodate the Christ Church area, and other areas as well? I would like to know exactly what the programme is, and what we must expect from this Resolution. If we do not get proper transportation, especially in the northern district, there will be very slow process. I would like to hear from the honourable Minister, in connection with this matter.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: We have heard very much about this vote. First of all, this campaign was intended to last for two years, because each house has to be sprayed three times, so as to make sure that the mosquito has been eradicated. After that stage, there will be a re-inspection. It would appear from ordinary observation, the campaign was going too slowly; but as I have said it is intended to last for two years.

5.35 p.m.

I said that as a result of the Yellow Fever outbreak being next door, we are now trying to speed it up. Much has been made of that. It is ordinary common sense. You insure your house against fire, because should there be a fire next door, you will not lose all your worth should your house catch fire. It is quite natural, if there are a few cases of Yellow Fever next door, everybody around would get insured against it. Even Venezuela has done so. It is therefore only natural, at this stage, that we should try to step up this campaign. We should see that this campaign is not held up.

Now there are two types of sprayers. The one used in St. Michael and in certain parts of Christ Church, does not take a very heavy machine; but the other type which is to be used in country districts, takes a very heavy type of sprayer. Those machines, did not come down when they were expected. Hence, the campaign in the country, did not start as early as was thought. I repeat, there are two types of machines,—the lighter type of machine, and the heavier type.

I was asked something about the pick-up. As can be seen from the note, this pick-up truck was received from W.H.O.; it now needs painting and a roof-body. As you will see, there is a certain amount of money set down for that. You will also see, there is a certain amount of money set down for the spray-transported in the pick-up. As a matter of fact, that is the reason for which the pick-up will be used.

I was also asked about the subsistence allowance for the W.H.O. consultant. There is an agreement with the Government of Barbados about that. This is no haphazard thing; it was arranged, as a result of a conference between Barbados and the W.H.O. I think those are the three biggest points to which I was called upon to reply. There are one or two other

things which have been said by the honourable senior member for the City, which should be investigated. He mentioned something about a hush-hush campaign; and I am saying, if there is this hush-hush campaign which he has talked about, I do not know anything about it, but I would make enquiries. I never heard anything about it until now. However, if there is an incidence of Yellow Fever, we should put our house in order. I think I have answered all the points which were raised.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Can the Hon. Minister of Social Services say whether there was an agreement with respect to the Consultant coming here? I refer him to paragraph 3, which reads as follows: "It is also necessary to secure a W.H.O. Consultant to serve in Barbados for a period of four or five months in accordance with article one of the agreement between the Government of Barbados and W.H.O. made in August 1953." Does that mean that the Consultant should be here all the time?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Consultant is to appear periodically, as and when asked; especially after one phase of the spraying has been completed. It is not an instruction that he should be on the spot all the time.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to assure the Hon. Minister of Social Services, that sitting at a meeting of the General Board of Health face to face with the Director of Medical Services, whose duty it is to inform us of these things, the Director misrepresented the situation to that Board. I would like to tell the Hon. Minister, if this kind of thing is to continue, you would be unable to pin any faith in any statement given by people like the Director. Health is very vital to a community. This Medical Officer has misrepresented the situation to an important body like the General Board of Health, which is appointed to work with him; and that has been borne out by this statement which we have before us. So far as the presence of the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquito in Christ Church and the Northern area is concerned, I would hate to tell the Hon. Minister what I was told. I am surprised to know that this mosquito is in the Northern area and in Christ Church.

Another thing is this: if each house is to be sprayed three times, and this campaign is to be completed within two years, it naturally follows, in the first eight months every house should be sprayed for the first time. If we come through safely from this disease, we certainly have not got to thank the Director of Medical Services for it.

5.45 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The honourable member has said he hates to say that the mosquito is in Christ Church and in the northern area. May I inform the honourable member that the mosquito has been all over Barbados for as long as he has been living, and God knows for how much longer.

Mr. J. A. HAYNES: I wonder if the honourable Minister would answer my question. It is about the allocation of this pickup. How will its service be divided between the various districts of the country parishes? It seems to me that there will be great difficulty in transporting these people, if there is no organisation.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I cannot answer the honourable member's question off hand; but if he wants to know, I will give him the answer at the next meeting of the House.

The question that Head XXIII stand part of the Schedule was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Committee do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to, and the Chairman left the Chair. Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the House adjourned for half an hour.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:—

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.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Head, Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, is for the sum of \$720.00. It is for telephone rentals, transfers and installations at Summervale. The system up there, is a very antiquated one. The line at Summervale is attached to the main switch in the office of the Superintendent at Doods. At night when the office of the Superintendent is closed, Summervale is shut off from the world. That has been so for some years. Recently, there was a case of a girl who was taken ill at Summervale at night, and the matron, along with two of her staff, had to walk from Summervale down to Doods, and knock up the Superintendent, so as to be able to phone a doctor. The Committee will agree, such a situation is intolerable, and should not be allowed to continue. The Government has therefore decided to change the telephone system at these two places, so that Summervale will have its independent telephone, which will be served from the exchange at St. John. This Resolution is to make the necessary transfers and installations, so that the telephone system at Doods and Summervale will be brought up to date.

I beg to move, sir, that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—What I would like to ask is, how could it happen that this inadequate system has been in existence so long, and the Government is only now changing it. I gather that the incident of the sick girl, is what has brought the situation to the attention of the Government; and that is why, this money is being asked for. It looks as if someone should have been thinking along these lines long before now; and should have brought it to the attention of the Government. A situation like this, should not have been allowed to continue for this time, when a sum of \$720.00 could remedy it.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I notice that when the Superintendent's door is closed, Summervale is entirely shut off etc. As far as I can gather from the note, the service at Doods will, under the new arrangement, be connected to the Bridgetown Exchange; and will also provide inter-communication between the Superintendent's house, the office, and the Night Duty Overseer's room. Internal and external calls would be made from any of these points, but would be controlled from the P.B.X. at the Superintendent's house. But, sir, if the internal control of that small exchange panel is in the house of the Superintendent; it is obvious that you can look forward to having similar trouble.

Again, the note says in Para 4, the service at Summervale would be connected to the St. John's Exchange. Each service would therefore be entirely independent of the other, each school being served by a normal automatic service. In spite of all that, sir, the main control will be the P.B.X., which will be at the Superintendent's house. Probably the note is wrongly explained, or all the details are not fully covered.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—I think it is quite in order. There will be independent lines; one at Summervale and one at Doods. When the Superintendent is about to close up, he will hardly do so without switching over to the other control. It is the way in which you controlled Summervale in the past, which is now being rectified.

The question that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule was put and agreed to without division.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$5,720 do now pass was put and agreed to, without division.

6.40 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, in each case the Resolution passed in Committee of Supply was read a first and second time and agreed to.

BILL TO AUTHORISE THE PAYMENT OF GRATUITY AND PENSION TO MORTIMER HALL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the payment of a gratuity and pension to Mortimer Hall.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill deals with the granting of a gratuity and pension to Mortimer Hall, who was the head gardener at Government House, and who retired as from yesterday. Mr. Hall was engaged at Government House for the past 34 years. At one time, the gardeners at Government House were considered as servants of the Governor; but the vote under which they are now paid, appears under the Head "Unestablished Staff" Public Works Department. The Crown Law officer has given it as his opinion, the gardeners at Government House are servants of the Executive Committee, inasmuch as Government House and its grounds are the property of the Executive Committee. They are no longer considered as servants of the Governor, but as servants of the Government. Hence, they were changed from the vote under the Head "Governor" to that of the "Unestablished Staff," Public Works Department. Inasmuch as it has only been for the past two or three years, that the vote was put under the Head "Public Works Department," it was considered advisable that this Bill should be brought, making this 34 years of service, as service to the Government, and therefore pensionable. As I said, Mr. Hall retired yesterday; and the Government would like him to benefit from this Bill, in which he is treated as a Government servant. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS : Mr. Speaker,—I am very glad to know that this gardener is getting this treatment. I know that these anomalies do now arise in the Government service; and a great deal of legislation has been brought down so as to rectify them. I am wondering, if there are any other employees of the Government, who have not got this reward, because they were not so near to Government House. I do hope, if and when those cases are brought to the notice of the Government, they will receive the attention which this case has received. I should just like to say, this is a Private Bill; but it is sponsored by the Government, and I wonder if this Clause at the end of the Bill is necessary, since the Government is sponsoring this Bill. I hope that it is in order.

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. 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.

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

Hon. M. E. COX : I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS : I am sorry I did not ask this question before. Is there really one gardener at Government House? Although you might have changed the others who are not retiring now, their previous service will have to be protected. There must be more than one gardener, except the prisoners supply the rest of the labour. I hope that the other gardeners are having their service considered.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS : There is more than one gardener at Government House. When the time comes for them to retire, they will be dealt with in a similar manner in which this one is being dealt with.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker — This bill is an amendment to the Civil Establishment Act, 1949. There was an amendment to the Clerical Service Act in 1949 amending the Act of 1947. Up to then, the power was given to the Governor to adjust the salary of any officer, who was on an incremental salary scale, in case where circumstances involving any undue hardship arose. The Civil Establishment Act at present makes no provision for the adjustment of salary or increment, after the initial salary has been fixed. It is considered desirable that the Governor should continue to exercise this power. Accordingly, this Bill seeks to amend the Civil Establishment Act 1949, so as to confer on the Governor, powers similar to those previously vested in him under

the Clerical Service Act, 1944 as amended by the Clerical Service (Amendment) Act, 1947. Also, this Bill seeks to resolve all doubts which may have arisen, as to the powers of the Governor under Section 4 of the Civil Establishment Act 1944; and consequently, to cover those cases to which adjustments have already been made. This Bill seeks to give effect to the amendments as from the 1st April 1948.

In other words, by the amendment to the 1947 Act, the Governor lost his power. It might have been an oversight; but the fact remains, there was some doubt as to the powers of the Governor. As a matter of fact, there are certain cases, which were dealt with according to the 1947 Act. That is to say, the Governor would give an increment or two where he thought it was necessary. The Crown Law Officer thought that the Act should be amended, and that the Governor should have the power which he originally had, in order to regularise those cases which were dealt with before the mistake was found out.

6.50 p.m.

As I have said, we would have to go back to the Debates, in order to find out whether this was the intention, or whether it was a mistake in the drafting. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX : Sir, in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill, I would like to draw to the attention of honourable members, that Sir Errol Dos Santos in his Report, made recommendations which this House accepted; and that officers who had certain qualifications should be given certain increments. That recommendation, along with many others, was accepted by this House; but on close scrutiny by the Crown Law Officers, as the Hon. Minister of Social Services has said, there was some doubt as to the powers of the Governor under Section IV of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949. I for one, believe, it was always the intention, that the Governor should have this power.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : Mr. Speaker,—I would like to hear more than what is set out in the Objects and Reasons, and what has been said. I would have liked the honourable Minister to have made some specific reference to points which he had in mind. The last speaker made one reference to what was stated in the Dos Santos Report. What was stated in that Report, was purely a matter for the Government. The Governor knows very well, he himself cannot decide to award an officer an increment, on the basis of qualifications, except to the policy of the Government. The Government of the day, must decide by some concrete policy and say, if an officer is working in some particular capacity and is given some other task, or it is well through some circumstances, he should be placed higher in the salary scale. The Government must decide what is the amount of the increment, it should award to such an officer. The Government must come with a statement saying, it is our considered opinion, such an officer should be placed at such an incremental scale; so that there is nothing of the Governor acting within his discretion.

As it now stands, we are not in a position to know whether this is a mistake in draughtsmanship or not; and added to that, I do not believe that is the point. Prior to 1939, when the Civil Establishment was under the old system, the Governor acted in his own discretion in many instances; and I know many of the Civil Servants did not like it. There were protestations in many instances. What

I do feel is, the Government should be able to say quite clearly what the position is. Government should say why it has reverted to the old system. Speaking for myself,—and I have no desire to oppose the idea, that the Governor should have the discretion of awarding increments in certain instances,—I would like to say, with this system of Ministerial Government, one wants to be in a position where he can feel that Ministers are responsible for the running of the country. This Bill is not dealing with the question of appointing persons in the service. This Bill deals with the emoluments which the officer should get,—the money to be paid out of the public treasury. If you are going to give the Governor the right to act in cases of this sort, how are you going to get Ministers to be responsible for something which may take place in matters of this sort? For instance, during the last session of this House, I asked a question: 'Will the Government state what are the Rules and conditions that govern the award of War Service Credit to members of the public Credit and others, who have not received it. This is a new session, and I suppose I will have to ask that question again. Up to now, practically six months after I have asked that question, I have not received an answer yet. The 1949 Act did not empower the Government to award War Service credit; but we know of people in the service, who have been drawing credits for their services performed, and others who have performed war service, who are not drawing any credits. When that question was asked, one would have thought that the Minister dealing with that particular matter, could have given some clarification on the point; but up to now, nothing has been said on that point. You also have another instance, where at the end of the last session, the House debated the question of the appointment of a Surveyor-Draftsman to the Department of Highways and Transport. There was a man who was working in that Department whom you wanted to appoint to that post. The Resolution was eventually passed and that officer was to be appointed to that post. The question is: who has decided the amount of increment that man should receive? How are we to know whether it was a recommendation of a Minister? Under this constitutional development, it is necessary to be able to say who is responsible for such things. There can be no point that you are responsible for certain things, and certain things which appear essential, are to be couched in Legislative terms.

I am not in a position to say who are the persons affected by this Bill, and how the increments which they have received would work out; neither have we heard any word to-day, as to whether you should regard it as a hardship. A man who joins the service, cannot claim any special hardship, when he is put at the foot of the incremental scale. I know that they are some people in the service today, who during the war, was working in what I would regard as a quasi government department; and some of those departments have become incorporated in the public service since the war. The Fishery Office, was one of those C.D. & W. posts which is now being taken over by this Government. You are likely to have some clerk who was working in that particular part of the service at the time, when that was a department of C. D. & W. In instances such as these you are rewarding an officer for his service; you are not giving him any undue advantage over his counterparts. You are only putting him in line with a person who had joined the service at the same time as a person who began to work in a quasi-Government Department.

7.00 p.m.

The honourable Minister should be able to bring examples of cases, where this would apply. It is not for me to cite such cases. It is for the introducer of this Bill to make clear what is meant; and to what limit they intend to go with these increments.—Will it be a case for the Governor to use his discretion? It must be the responsibility of the Government to say how far it is intended to go, where the giving of these increments is concerned. I hope, what happened at Crickledon in the U.K., would be sufficient to show the Government that Ministers are always responsible for administrative matters. When there is Ministerial Government, Ministers must be able to say what is their view with respect to such matters as these increments. The Minister in charge should be able to give us some examples of what he means, by the hardships to which he has referred.

Some people may make out a hardships for themselves, because they feel they should be in a better position than some one else. When a man joins the service, and gets a qualification in a particular branch, there is no case of hardship if the Government does not give him an increment. If the Government calls on him to take a particular examination, that is a different thing. We have a young man in the Service today, who has been seconded to the Regional Economic Committee. He has taken the B.Sc. in Economics; but if he remained in the local Service, how many more increments would you give him because he has taken that degree? He qualifies himself, and now, not only can the Barbados Government look to him, but he has been seconded to the R.E.C. at a higher salary than the Barbados Government will be willing to pay. But you cannot say, because a man gets a qualification, *ipso facto* he should get three increments. For those reasons, I think that a clear statement should be made at this stage.

The situation prior to 1949, was different from the situation today. If anyone has fallen into the error of talking about hardships and qualifications he must be prepared to say what he means. No schoolmaster at an Elementary School will get additional increments because he has taken the B.A. degree. That does not put him on the same scale as a degree man at any of the Secondary schools. All that we say is, maybe if a man in the teaching service takes his degree, he may be a better teacher and he may deserve some consideration.

A Minister cannot expect that what is stated in the Objects and Reasons of a Bill is all that you are prepared to tell the House. If that were so a member could read the Bill at home and send a written reply saying that he agreed or disagreed with it. The Objects and Reasons state, it is considered desirable that the Governor should continue to exercise this power, and accordingly this Bill seeks to amend the Civil Establishment Act, 1949. It also says, prior to the passing of that Act, the Governor, by virtue of the provisions of Section 5 (4) of the Clerical Service Act, 1944, as amended by the Clerical Service (Amendment) Act, 1947, No. 2, had power to adjust the salary of an officer who was on an incremental salary scale in any case where circumstances involving undue hardship to such an officer arose. This means sir, this is one of those powers which the Colonial Regulations is likely to give to the Government. But according to the system we are developing, we do not want to perpetuate a system which is likely to give dissatisfaction, if it is not clearly explained. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Minister in charge to say, what is meant by this amendment. You should enlighten the House as to the reason why it is considered necessary to give the Governor this discretion. Although the Bill is non-controversial in some respects, certain aspects of it

are very important. We want to know why it is necessary to revert to the situation under which the Governor had these powers. The honourable Minister talked about cases of qualification. That is not a case of undue hardship.

Mr. LEWIS: The 1949 Act states specifically that it is in the case of the initial appointment that the Governor is allowed to make this adjustment. It must have been thought, when someone was coming into your service for the first time, or was being transferred from the Service of another colony to the local Service, that that was the stage at which he should be given two increments instead of one so as to compensate him for coming to the island and accepting an appointment in the Service. But why after that? Why can't he earn his increments in the usual way after that?

Section 2, subsection (4) of the Clerical Service Amendment Act, 1944 says: "If on the coming into operation of this Act or at anytime thereafter it shall appear to the Governor that the provisions of this Act with regard to the earning of salary or annual increments would cause undue hardship to any officer, or if at anytime any case shall arise in connection with the earning of salary or annual increments in respect of which there is no provision in this Act the Governor may take such adjustment as he shall deem expedient provided that the limits prescribed by this Act shall in no case be exceeded."

I would like to have some example to guide me. Some particular case must have occurred. I can quite see the case in respect of an initial appointment, and probably in respect of a transfer of an officer here. You might need to put up such an officer in the scale; but I would like an example. There must be something that the Government thought, apart from the whim of the Governor. I know that people become qualified, and they are not given employment in that branch of the service in which they are qualified. You may get an engineer in the Post Office, or a lawyer in the Income Tax Department. Whose fault is it? Why do these escape attention? I feel there should be some policy on the part of the Government, quite apart from the whim of any particular man.

7.10 p.m.

I do not know, if it is justifiable or not, but there seems to be some disagreement with the system as worked before; but the 1949 Act says, the fixing or adjusting of salaries on an incremental scale, applies only on the initial appointment. As a matter of fact, the 1949 Act broke the constitution of this colony, in so far as taking money out of the Treasury is concerned. By this Act, the Other Place can approve of a scale of salaries being taken out and paid to officers, before this House considers the relative Civil Establishment Order at all. However, I would like to hear instances given; and I hope we will hear them in committee. We do not have to call names, but instances can be given.

This amending Act strikes me as being most peculiar. It is an Act to amend the Civil Establishment Act of 1949, and it is to come into effect as from the 1st April, 1948. I am not in a position to say whether it is right or not; but it strikes me, you are amending an Act, and the amending Act is to take effect from the 1st April, 1948! I hope that if anything is wrong with this Bill, we will postpone consideration of it, and get it put right. I really cannot see how you can amend an Act of 1949 and make the amendment retrospective as from the 1st April, 1948. This 1949 Act has several Schedules. What strikes me is this, if you say that before 1949 this matter was alright, I do not see any necessity for

making it retrospective; because it must have existed before. The Governor had these powers up to the repeal of the 1947 Act and since then, it does not appear to be very clear whether he had these powers or not. I am merely saying, I hope this House will not be led into passing some thing which is obviously wrong, and have it sent back to us. I am sick of that state of affairs.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The honourable junior member for St. Peter knows as well as the world, the Executive fixes salaries, incremental or otherwise, and after that they have nothing more to do with the matter. All granting of increments and the withholding of increments, are matters for the Governor. Now sir, the 1944 Act says this:—

"If during the first year after the coming into operation of this Act it shall appear to the Government that the provision of this Act with regard to the earning of annual increments would cause an undue hardship to any officer, or if thereafter any case shall arise in connection with the earning of annual increments in respect of which there is no provision in this Act, the Governor may make such adjustments as he shall deem expedient provided that the limits prescribed by this Act shall in no case be exceeded."

The 1947 Act is somewhat similar. It says this:—

"If on the coming into operation of this Act or at any time thereafter it shall appear to the Governor that the provisions of this Act with regard to the earning of salary or annual increments would cause undue hardship to any officer, or if at any time any case shall arise in connection with the earning of salary or annual increments in respect of which there is no provision in this Act, the Governor may make such adjustments as he shall deem expedient provided that the limits prescribed by this Act shall in no case be exceeded."

And the 1949 Civil Establishment Act says this:—

"Where the Emoluments attached to an office established by an order under Section 3 of this Act include a salary on an incremental scale the Governor may order that the initial salary of any person appointed to such office shall include such an amount of increment as he thinks proper."

In the Clerical Service (Amendment) Act of 1947 the words "at any time thereafter" are used and, as I have already said, the object of this Bill is to restore to the Governor the power which he had originally. There are cases, principally of School teachers, in which adjustments were made by the Governor; and it was thought that the words 'at anytime thereafter' should be omitted. This Act of 1949 makes provision only for the initial salary. There were a few teachers whose salaries were adjusted by the Governor under the law of 1944 and 1947, and it was doubtful whether the Act of 1949 gave him the power to do so.

7.20 p.m.

Because there were eight cases, mainly teachers, whose salaries were adjusted, as the Governor thought he had the power to do that is why it is asked to make this Bill retrospective as from 1st April, 1948. It has been asked to make this Bill retrospective, in order to legalise what was done.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, there is just one question I would like to ask the Honourable Minister. Why was the power which the Governor had in this matter, withheld at the time the 1949 Act was drafted? There must have been some fairly valid reason, for discontinuing to give the Governor that power which he previously held under the 1944 Act. It is to be assumed that the people who drafted the 1949 Act, and those who presented it

to the Legislature,—the honourable members opposite,—were fully conscious of what they were doing at the time. Here it is, you have two sets of legislation before the House dealing with the same matters; each giving the Governor this same power. You seek to give the Governor this power, only when the officer enters the service but you give him no power afterwards, to order any increase that he may think is proper. I cannot imagine, the Attorney General, the Executive, and the Governor of that time, could have failed to realise the omission they were making. What we are doing here now, is to legalise breaches of the Law by the Governor, since 1949; since he thought, he had the power which was previously conferred upon him by the 1944 and 1947 Act. If the Governor fully realises he was short of this power, and he proceeded to make salary adjustments after 1949, well then, let him face the consequences for his actions. Don't ask the Assembly to back you in saying that you had no valid reasons for doing it, or that we were careless in our drafting; and now in the considered opinion of the Government, that power should be restored to the Governor, because he previously enjoyed it.

Now, sir, nothing so far has been said, to make it appear justifiable that the 1949 Act, was carelessly drafted, or irresponsibly dealt with by the Legislature. Until that can be stated and proved, this House is justified in feeling that the 1947 Act, represented the maximum power which we thought should have been conferred upon the Governor under the circumstances; and that there must be some special reasons, which make it necessary for us, retrospectively, to consider the power which we had conferred upon the Governor again. One would have thought that the constitutional development of this colony, as well as the development with regard to the administration of the Civil Service, that is, the establishment of the Whitley Council and the Civil Service Commission, both of which have been established since 1949, would have added something to the argument that the 1949 powers represented the utmost which the Governor should have in this matter; or whether it was to the contrary. There has been no such argument. If the opposite be the case, sir, it certainly devolves upon the Civil Service Commission, and the mover of this Bill, to explain to our satisfaction, what are the real reasons to induce them to reconsider their view of 1949, and to re-confer the power which was conferred on the Governor in 1944 and 1947; and of which he was denied, with a full sense of responsibility, by the Legislature of 1949.

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

On the motion of Honourable Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Honourable M. E. 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 II was called.

"2. Section four of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, is hereby amended by deleting the words from "that the initial" occurring in line four thereof to the end of the section and by substituting therefor the following paragraphs—

"(1) that the initial salary of any person appointed to such office shall include such an amount on increment as he thinks expedient;

(2) that, in any case in which it shall appear to the Governor that there are special

circumstances relating to the amount of salary or annual increments of a person already appointed to such office which operate unfairly upon or to the prejudice of such person and which warrant special adjustment, the salary of such person shall be adjusted within the limits of the scale in such manner as the Governor may deem expedient."

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that clause II stand part of this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I do not want to prolong this debate; but I want to make quite clear, the point which I put forward just now. I think, I can do it easily, now that the House is in Committee. I never said that the Executive Committee had anything to do with the granting of increments. What I said was, what you are now introducing has nothing to do with that. You are not now agreeing to increments which have been agreed to by the Civil Establishment Act of 1949. Suppose a man was appointed in the Service at a salary scale of \$1,200 rising by \$120 to \$2,400 annually; the Governor does not now interfere with the increment of \$120 which that man is now getting. What the Executive is now saying is that there are cases in the service, where it is felt, with respect to the incremental raise of a man's salary, if the Governor feels that there is need for some re-adjustment, that is, that the man should be put at some other point in the scale other than what he is getting, the Governor shall have the power to make the adjustment. What the honourable mover and seconder of the Bill seem not to appreciate, when they read the 1949 Act, and when the honourable mover was advised by his advisers on it, is that the 1949 Act is an improvement on the 1944 and the 1947 Acts. We changed those Acts, so that the Governor should not appoint a man who entered the Service, at a salary above the initial salary. In the case I put forward as an instance, the Governor would have to appoint the man at \$100 per month; he could not put him at the maximum of \$200, or at any point within the salary scale. According to the 1944 Act, the Governor could have done that.

7.30 p.m.

As the hon. junior member for the City said, you are going back to 1948. This is the pertinent question which should be answered: Are you taking service into consideration from 1948? In other words, are you giving the Governor authority to back pay people from 1948? If a man should have been getting \$100.00 a month in 1948, are you going to put him to-day to that point in the scale taking the years since 1948 into consideration, but not necessarily giving him back pay? What do you mean by this retrospective Act? Are you paying money retrospectively, or taking service into account retrospectively? The Government must feel that something has gone wrong within the Service, or they would not have come down with this. You are going back to the 1944 Act and giving the Governor power to adjust salaries. There was a time, when the Governor's hands were tied. You could not employ a man in the Long Grade Service unless he started at \$50.00 a month. The Governor can to-day, employ a man in the Long Grade Service at a certain point above \$50.00 a month; and even now, there are still anomalies in the Service. A man is a senior officer, he is appointed to an executive post, and he has to stand still for three or four years. What is the position about that?

Some Ministers sit here with their smugness and all the time, they know nothing about the serious administrative matters which they are supposed to be responsible for. When they are not importing motives, they make stupid asides. The Government

is laying down a policy. They must tell the Governor this is their view. What does the Minister mean by qualification? He mentioned people in the Teaching Service. There would be no matter of letting out a secret by saying that a school teacher was appointed at such a salary and—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I feel that the hon. member is making a speech.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Of course I am making a speech, Mr. Chairman. I am making a speech on Section 2; and I make no apology for doing so. Read the section that I am dealing with, and draw to my attention where I am out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am merely asking the hon. member to keep to the section which is before us.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the Governor will have these discretionary powers, let us know precisely of a case or of cases, where the Act as it stands was too rigid for him to work within it. The question of qualification just does not arise. What would be the recommendation with respect to a surveyor, who is not a qualified surveyor to-day, but who becomes qualified tomorrow? What increment would he be given? A file must come to a Minister for him to approve or not approve, in cases where you are breaking new ground. That must happen, when there is a Ministerial System of Government. One would expect, in such cases, where the paying of money out of the Treasury is involved, cases which are likely to give rise to dispute, because some people may feel that others have had better treatment than they, one would feel that those responsible for government would be in a position to give us the facts. The hon. member simply asked, what are these cases in which you feel, increments should be given, and how many increments? This Bill could not have come before us, unless the Minister responsible for introducing it, saw what the Establishment Officer wrote on it. He must have written something in the files on it.

When a member of the House asks a Minister for information of this sort, information which is not secret, that member should not be regarded as someone in the street asking someone else about their private business. This is a public issue involving the spending of public money.

7.40

There is too much smugness, when a question is being asked in this way; and it is not asked with the object of any pin-pricking. You want to be clear in your mind, that when you have passed these amendments, you know what you have passed. I am voicing something, which is going to affect people who work in the Public Service. Anything which I do of a public nature, I should be clear in my mind, as to what I am doing. The Hon. Minister did not answer the point I have made; and I hope he will do so now that he has an opportunity of doing so.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure the hon. member was not serious when he suggested that Ministers should be interested in the administrative duties of any Administrator. If I remember correctly, the question of regulating increments, was one of the things to which the hon. member agreed; also that no Minister should have anything to do with it, under the Ministerial set up. The hon. member agreed that the Public Service Commission should function, without interference, where Ministers are concerned. The Public Service Commission makes recommendations for appointments to the Civil Service and so on, to the Governor, and the Governor executes those recommendations. In paragraph 8 of the Acting Governor's Message, which went to the Secretary of State for the Colonies relative to Ministerial Status, and with which the Secretary of State for the Colonies

agreed, says, any system which is introduced now, should ensure that the Public Service and the Police, should not in future come under any political control or influence. We studiously avoided meddling with the Civil Service. I think that we were right in doing so; because there might be an officer who might not be favourably disposed to something, and one might be inclined to say this officer should not get this or that. That is one of the reasons, why we said we would not have anything to do with any appointments, dismissals or proposals. I think it would be a sorry day for Ministers, if they were to become involved or entangled, in these purely administrative matters. I think, the Hon. Minister of Social Services has clearly outlined the reasons for the amendment to this Act.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, the 1949 Act is an improvement on the Acts of 1944 and 1947. I am afraid I cannot agree with that. While on the one hand, the Acts of 1944 and 1947 gave the Governor power to adjust an officer's salary, on the other hand, under the Act of 1949, the Governor was only given the right to put a man at any point in the scale, which he felt was reasonable at the beginning. After he has been put in the scale, the Governor has absolutely no right to give him any increased emoluments. I believe some people might like the 1944 Act, because the Governor had the right to adjust salaries; whereas, under this Act, where you have made the initial appointment and fixed the salary, despite the qualifications which an officer might attain afterwards, the Governor cannot increase the salary or give any accelerated increments.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies, in agreeing to Ministerial Status, noted it had been agreed upon, that any system which is introduced now, should ensure that the Public Service and the Police should not come under any political control or influence. He regarded the maintenance of these principles as being essential. We all agreed to that. The honourable junior member for St. Peter was a member of the Whitley Council; and I am sure, he has propounded that principle and agreed to it for some time now. The honourable member is now suggesting that the Ministers should come in and make recommendations or interfere in matters such as these. I do not think it is in the interest of the community, for a Minister to interfere with that part of the machinery of Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not know at what stage of my remarks I could have given the impression that I was suggesting that a Minister should interfere in these matters as mentioned by the hon. Minister. You are now introducing a Bill, and you must be able to say what is your position with regard to the proposition which you are putting before the House. You are asking that increments be granted; and we are asking for what purpose these increments are to be granted. You must know what are the reasons which are guiding you to go back to what existed before. What we are saying is that if Mr. "A" has requested that this incremental stage should be so adjusted, the Governor should be able to act fairly and squarely to him. We are asking what those cases are? It is no question of Ministerial interference. This is a question of presenting a case; and you must know what the instances are. I repeat, this is not a question of Ministerial interference. It is within your province to know, if the salary of a particular office is \$200 a month, the Governor cannot appoint anybody at a salary higher than that. What I am saying is this: the Executive Committee must know what is really in their minds to give people. The Executive Committee have

agreed, in respect of any qualifications a man gets, he must be given a reward for it. My views about Ministerial Status are even stronger to-day, than they were before; because I can see, it is devolving upon people to run their own business.

7.50 p.m.

I am of the opinion, if Barbados is to have a Ministerial Government, it should be as close to reality as possible; and not merely a gesture of some constitutional change. What I said earlier, was nothing to the effect that a Minister should go and appoint a man, or should appoint their friends to a job. All that I am saying is, what you have said, and what I know is the case in the Service; that is, where people join the Service at a certain stage, like after they were employed in some quasi Government department, (they were working with the Government, but were not Civil Servants), those are the kind of cases where the Governor can make adjustments for the first time when they have been appointed in the Service. I know of two men in the Customs Department now, who were not in the Service when they first started out to work; they had been employed seven or eight years before in some quasi Government department. Have they received any War service credit? (A VOICE: Yes). An hon. Minister has answered "Yes"; but the hon. mover and seconder of the Bill, had nothing to say on that point. Those are the cases of hardship which I mentioned. I would like to know, when are you going to take such cases into consideration. Are you taking into consideration all the years of service of cases of that sort, or only some? The Government must know those persons to whom War service credit should be given. You cannot say, a Minister is interfering with the Civil Service, if he is seeking to find out why the Government has given some people War Service credit, and has not given others. Are you interfering with the Service, when you say what is good for one, is good for all? Sir, I would be the last person to suggest that under any constitutional development, you should allow a system where a Minister could interfere with the normal running of a department. There is a Minister sitting now, whom I hope has changed his mind in that respect. When it comes to certain people, some Ministers would like to bring down the earth, God, and the whole Universe.

Sir, I never suggested that you should dismiss any Attorney General or Accountant General because you felt they did something or drafted something, against you. I am not asking any Minister to interfere with the prerogative given to the Head of the Administration.

Mr. LEWIS: Just for record purposes, I would like this point made clear. As I understand the hon. junior member for St. Peter, when a Bill of this nature is about to be brought down to this House, some information on the objects and reasons asking that the Bill be passed, is normally given to the Minister who is to introduce the measure. He should be told, in a case like this Bill, these things existed before; but were cut out either by an oversight or something. Also that these particular cases have arisen now. They would certainly say, to the Minister, the case of Mr. So-and-so has arisen, and the Law as it stands now, prevents any interference with his salary; or that Mr. So-and-so is now at a disadvantage, because no adjustments can be made to his salary.

I now see the reasons for the 1949 Act. At that time, you were given the opportunity to go through your whole service and re-appoint people to posts. You were given the opportunity to say that such a man had a grievance; therefore you adjusted his

salary to suit. What right have you to interfere with that, after you had been given that opportunity? As far as teachers are concerned, this House has agreed to a principle, whereby, if a man obtained his degree or goes to Erdiston College, he should get an additional increment for those qualifications. I am quite sure that is so. I would really like to know, what is the complaint the Teachers have, to get this adjustment. What I suspect is happening is this; not only the initial salary, but the salary of these people at anytime is to be interfered with so that if you wish to keep a man in a particular position, or you wish to put somebody in a job which you think he should be doing, you will be able to go back to him and offer him a sop. I would like to question whether the House is willing to agree to that. What you are doing now is this: a man is in the Income Tax Department, and he becomes a lawyer, and you do not want to send him to the legal department, you can keep him in the Income Tax department and give him another increment; or if he cannot get on with a particular job, you can keep him in another department over a time, and to prevent him from having a grievance if you push up somebody beneath him, you can give him another increment. This is really brought down for that purpose.

What the hon. junior member for St. Peter is asking, as I understand him, is: are we going to allow this subsequent adjustment? It seems to me, as if we are afraid to say anything about it; because, we feel we should not interfere. Do you mean to tell me, even now it would be wrong for us to enquire? Certainly you can give me a concrete case. You can give it. You can say, here is a man who was appointed in 1949 to a post in the Civil Establishment. After taking into consideration everything with regard to his service otherwise, you gave him two increments. That was in 1949, but you want to give him two increments this year; therefore, you want to make this Bill retrospective so as to give him the two increments. My question is: why did you not consider the case properly in 1949?

8.00 p.m.

I am asking for a concrete case. Tell me, someone has come into this Service, or has been transferred from another Service to this one. Tell me, they are still in this post, and they have not been given, or have been given increments; and that certain circumstances have arisen to cause you to give them another increment or other increments. Give us a concrete case that has clinched you, in restoring these powers to the Governor. I do not know what we are doing at all. It seems to me, we are giving the Governor power to keep people in certain posts, and he will look after their salary from time to time. The only time that the House will hear anything about it, is when two people start off together and one gets twice the increments that the other gets. It would appear that you are giving the Governor the power to create dissatisfaction in the Service.

The Governor has to make these decisions. I hear a Minister saying in an aside that the Governor will make his decisions on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. I do not see that anywhere in this Bill. If it is so, we should be told. What we should remember is this: an officer is in a position through the Whitley Council, through the Civil Service Association, and through the Public Service Commission, to state his grievances. He has an opportunity to put his own case. There is no one, who would think of grievances for another person, as he would think of them for himself.

Are we to give the Governor power to go ahead and spend money out of the Treasury when he likes? And are the members of the Government afraid to explain it, because they fear they may be interfering with the Public Service Commission? The hon. Minister seems to have a lot of faith in the Public Service Commission. I hope he will never find that his confidence has been misplaced.

You have been working the 1949 Act for the last five years. If as a result of your experience, you find that this amending Act is necessary, certainly you could give one concrete example. If the 1947 Act gave the Governor this power you now want to restore by repealing the 1949 Act, why should this Act be retrospective to 1948? It must be intended to cover up something. There is something behind this. It is just like the other day, when the Government wanted to bring in five clerks, and they waited until the Legislature was to be prorogued so that they could rush it through. Let the Natural Gas Corporation employ the staff they want; and let the people in their service have an opportunity of saying if they want to remain in the Service, or if they want to go elsewhere. If it were an attempt to amend subsection (4) of Section 3, that would be something which the representatives of the people would like to amend. But not deliberately giving away the power of the House of Assembly; and now giving more power to the Governor. Unless I can get the concrete examples which I asked for, I will not support this section.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, sir, I would say, there must have been some valid reason for having shorn the Governor of this power in 1949. Like the hon. junior member for the City, I am at a loss to find out why if the 1949 Act amended the 1947 Act, the 1954 Act should only be retrospective to 1948. The position that obtained in 1948 also obtained in 1947; because the 1947 Act did not repeal the 1948 Act.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order, sir, the hon. member is making a second reading speech. He is criticising the principle of the Bill which has been agreed to by the House. (Mr. LEWIS: He is speaking on clause 3, which he should not be speaking on).

8.10 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The position is this; I am strongly of the opinion that there must have been some really valid reason for taking this power from the Governor in 1949. Since 1949, the Public Service Commission was responsible for dealing with matters such as these; and I am therefore proposing an amendment in the penultimate line of Section 2, so that the end of the section will read "within the limits of the scale in such manner as the Governor on the recommendations of the Public Service Commission may deem expedient". It is either, we have some confidence in the Public Service Commission as an instrument of Civil Service policy, or we have no confidence in the Public Service Commission. I want to say that at any time we can propose that such and such a person be removed from the Commission; but we must keep in mind, the reasons why a Public Service Commission was appointed. You are now in 1954, reverting to legislation ten years ago, which ignored the Public Service Commission; without in 1954, paying due attention to the fact, that you have got a duly constituted and operative body to concern itself with matters relating to the Civil Service. One is justified in assuming that the 1949 Act was either a great oversight on the part of those responsible, or that the Governor has abused or was likely to abuse his power. Therefore, the 1949 Act

took the power from him. If that was felt in 1949, let us be assured that the Governor cannot do that in 1954. He should use this power with the concurrence of the Public Service Commission. I therefore propose, section 2 of this Bill should read as I have suggested; and I am confident, the Government, if it appreciates the responsibility thrust upon the Public Service Commission, and appreciates the position which it occupies in the controlling and conducting of the Public Service of the colony, the Government cannot do otherwise, than endorse the suggestion that the Governor should exercise this power only after consultation and agreement with and by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the Government still employs the system of the Whitley Council, I should like to know if an agreement has been reached with the Whitley Council. As the position stands now, it is the Public Service Commission which is advising the Governor. What I want to know is this: has there been any agreement reached with the Whitley Council? I ask that question, because the Government cannot say, they believe in Trade Union rights, and then do not give their own servants something which is elementary. If they agree with this, then they should say, while they do not have to ratify everything which the Civil Service Association recommends, at the same time, Parliament is quite willing to approve of something, where an agreement has been reached between the Civil Service representatives and the Government. If there has been agreement, then that eases the position; because it will show, that the Government has acted in a democratic manner. I want to know, if the Civil Service Association and the Whitley Council have discussed this matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The object of this Bill, is to regularise any Act which might have taken place between 1949 and to-day. This Bill is to make it doubly clear that the Governor still retains the power vested in him under the Acts of 1944 and 1947. As far as the amendment proposed by the hon. senior member for St. Philip is concerned, I would like to remind him that the Governor appoints a Public Service Commission and accepts recommendations made by that body; but he need not accept them. The Chief Executive nominates his Public Service Commission, and the Public Service Commission and the Establishment Branch work hand in hand, dealing with appointments, promotions, the granting of increments, questions of behaviour, and things of that sort. As the hon. senior member for St. Michael, has said, it was made clear in all the various memoranda dealing with the Ministerial System, that questions of appointments, promotions, discipline and things of that sort, would not be vested in any Ministerial set up. (A MEMBER: We are not dealing with that.) I am dealing with that, because I have heard it mentioned over and over again. This Bill is merely re-vesting in the Governor, the powers which he formally possessed, and which are rightly and truly hidden. I repeat, what is before us now, is a question of regularising the position with regard to the Civil Establishment Bill of 1949, and bringing it into line with the Clerical Service Acts of 1944 and 1947. The amendment of 1949 was simply an oversight. There was no intention of taking from the Governor the power which he previously enjoyed.

8.20 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is usually sound in his arguments; but his argument now, is a contradiction to what both the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Hon. Minister of Communications said. The question of

regularising does not arise; that does not follow. You do not regularise a situation, when you have stated quite clearly that you have amended the original Act. I was a member of the Executive in 1948. I do not know if it is an oversight now; but that question was never regarded as an oversight, because it was never discussed in the sense that somebody left it out. This is a new decision which has been put in this Bill, because the Ministers feel that the Governor and the Government should not have difficulty in regrading people in the clerical service. They should not have difficulty in removing people from one part of the Service to another. If you take the instance of Teachers, you can now remove them from that part of the Service to the Civil Service, because their salaries can be adjusted. This brings to my mind, that this is a matter which should be discussed by the Whitley Council. When you can tell the House of Assembly, this was agreed to by the Whitley Council, the House would feel it is right. As I have said, this is not a question of regularising a position; we are amending an Act. We are not regularising it. The reason why you are doing it, is because you feel that the Governor should have the power he had in 1944.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clause 3 was called.

It reads as follows:—

"3. This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 1st day of April, one thousand nine hundred and forty-eight."

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. introducer, why is the Act supposed to come into operation in 1948?

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I think I made that point distinctly clear in my remarks. I said the Governor thought he still had that power and there were certain cases which he dealt with after 1949, by way of adjusting salaries. Since it was found out that it was doubtful whether he had that power under the 1949 Act, in order to legalise those cases which were done since 1949, it was asked to make this Act retrospective from that time. There were eight cases: most of them teachers. They were dealt with by the Governor, because he thought that the Act of 1949 gave him that power.

Mr. CRAWFORD: According to what the hon. Minister has said, it only remains for us to say that the Governor would be well advised, to have his legal advisers correctly informed as to what his powers are under legislation passed by the Legislature; and not to break the law and then expect the Legislature to say that what he did was legal. Normally, Mr. Chairman, so far as the average person is concerned, ignorance of the law is no excuse; and with respect to the Governor's position, where he has Crown Law Officers to advise him as to what is his position, there can hardly be any excuse for his flagrantly breaking the law. What we are told by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is that we are seeking to regularise the position. (A VOICE: He did not mean that.) Let us say, he meant to legalise the position. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is too familiar with correct English usage, to make such a mistake.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—When I said regularise, I meant to bring it into line with the two previous Bills, because it was not the intention of the Legislature to deprive the Governor of that power. The Governor continued to exercise that

power until now, because he was under the misapprehension as to the true state of the Law. All sides of the Legislature and the Crown Law Officers, felt that the Governor had the right to continue. 8.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That cannot possibly be true. We have legal advisers. Do you mean they are so careless and irresponsible, as not to consider exactly the powers of the Governor under the 1949 Act? The honourable Minister cannot expect us to believe that. As I said earlier, ignorance of the law is not constituted as an excuse. If the Governor breaks the law, he like everyone else, should face the consequences of doing so. Do not say that we are legalising or regularising his breaking of the law.

The only excuse that there could be, was that the 1949 Act unwittingly omitted the section that we propose to put back in to-day. We do not believe that is the case however, and therefore I repeat, it is highly unsatisfactory; and one cannot refrain from emphasising, in matters of this sort, people like the Governor should be careful in seeing to it that they act within the spirit and the letter of the law.

Mr. LEWIS: Even if we accept all that we have heard, I still cannot see why we should make this Bill retrospective to 1948. The Governor could not have broken the law in 1948, if the 1947 Act were in existence, and he acted under it. He had these privileges up to the 14th day of February, 1949 when he signed this Act.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am wondering if the honourable Minister can tell me this: I would like to know if people working in quasi Government Service, and who were not appointed to the Government Service, will come in for special treatment.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I will tell the honourable member that the Government is quite aware of the cases which have occurred, and that they will be dealt with.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Honourable Dr. H. G. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was read and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking permission to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes, in order to discuss a matter of great importance. It relates to—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will realise that the motion for the adjournment of the House until this day week, must take precedence over a motion to adjourn the House for five minutes. I will therefore have to put the first question first.

Mr. ALLDER: Before you put the question, sir, I would like to explain why I made my motion. Government members know my reason. The reason why I am making this appeal to the House is because I want to ask the Government to expedite the transaction which is currently going on between the Housing Board and the owners of Colleton, as regards the acquiring of land to carry on a Housing Scheme.

In view of the fact that Rosegate Tenantry has been sold, many of the tenants expect to be given notice to leave; and we know, they have no land on which they can move their houses. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Communications as well as the Hon. Minister of Social Services, to see what they can do as regards acquiring Colleton pasture, so that when the tenants of Rosegate have to move,

they will be provided by the Government with some place to which they can move their houses.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 12th inst. was put and agreed to without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the accordingly.

8.40 p.m.