

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 29, 1955.

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

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, C.B.E., 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*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Colony by the Accountant General for the month ended 31st January this year.

PAPERS LAID

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay the following:—

Message No. 7/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly inviting the views of the Honourable House on the recommendations in the Report of the Conference on Movement of Persons within a British Caribbean Federation.

The Message reads as follows:—

Message No. 7/1955.

*His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House Of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to paragraph 6 (5) of the Report of the Conference on Movement of Persons within a British Caribbean Federation, copies of which are being laid in the Honourable House to-day, and to invite an early expression of the views of the Honourable House on the recommendations contained in the Report.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.

29th March, 1955.

(M.P. — S. 388 Vol. VI)

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay:—

Report of the Conference on Movement of Persons within a British Caribbean Federation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay:— Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Executive Council of the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux for 1953-54.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay: Statement on Emigration to the United Kingdom.

REPLIES

Also, Reply to Question No. 3 asked by Mr. Allder regarding payment of Production Bonus to sugar workers.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1 and to proceed with Order No. 2. I am also asking leave to deal with that Order.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if there is not an Order before Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is. Does the Hon. Minister of Communications intend to proceed with that matter now?

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I said on the last occasion that that Order stands in the name of

the Hon. Premier and I am not very well conversant with it, and I would rather postpone that matter until he is present.

Mr. LEWIS: I cannot quite understand why that matter should be postponed because of the absence of the Hon. Premier. I see no reason why that matter should be postponed because the Hon. Premier is out of the island.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I was not a member of the Select Committee which dealt with the matter and I know nothing of it.

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

INCOME TAX BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The Order now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Income Tax Act 1921. According to the Objects and Reasons, it has been found that the present system of recording assessments results in unnecessary delays and work. This Bill seeks accordingly to enable the Commissioner of Income Tax to introduce a more efficient system. It seems quite straight forward. This is a recommendation of the Income Tax Commissioner. His observation is that the present Act results in unnecessary delays and work; and the amendment to the Act by the two clauses of this Bill will enable him to introduce a more efficient system. The amendments are as follows:—

Sub-Section (2) of Section (28) of the Income Tax Act 1921 is hereby amended by deleting there from the following words and symbol:—"and shall be signed by him."

Section (35) of the said Act is hereby amended—(A) by deleting all the words appearing in Sub-Section (1) thereof after the word "prepare" and substituting therefor the following: "or cause to be prepared a register of persons liable to pay tax and shall certify the same." (B) by substituting for the word "list" where it first appears in Sub-Section (2) thereof the word register."

I beg to move that this Bill do now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I am glad that this Bill is dealt with at an early stage. When the Hon. Premier was dealing with the Estimates, he told us that the rates of income tax would be the same as last year. [A VOICE: This is not the Bill dealing with the rates of Income Tax.]

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have seen this Bill. I am afraid that I am unable to speak on it.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the Estimates the Hon. Premier mentioned that medical attention and hospitalisation were to be considered in the income tax rate this year, with the idea of having such expenses taken off a person's bill of expense. As far as I know, that would need a separate and distinct Bill; and so as not to be left in mid air since it was mentioned in the Estimates, I have raised the issue again. I would like to say that it has been discussed privately, and I would go further and say that people are looking forward to the passing of that amendment to the Income Tax Act so that they can get expenses for hospitalisation and medical attention to those persons in the home who are not eligible for taxation to be taken off the assessment of the income taxpayer

for the particular year. I would like to know if such a Bill is being contemplated.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: On a point of Order. The hon. member is dealing with the Rates of Income Tax Bill apparently. The point he is making will be covered in the next Bill on the Order Paper. 3.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: The objects of this Bill as stated on the top of the Bill, would give one the impression that it is just the gist of what it is to correct, and that some further information should be given. This is what the "Objects and Reasons" says:—

"It has been found that the present system of recording assessments results in unnecessary delays and work.

This Bill seeks accordingly to enable the Commissioner to introduce a more efficient system."

Certainly we should get some idea of the system which is being introduced. Section 35 (1) of the Act reads:—

"(1) After completing his assessments the Commissioner shall prepare a list of persons liable to pay income tax."

We are now deleting all the words appearing in this Sub-clause after the word "prepare" and the Sub-section will now read:—

"The Commissioner shall prepare or cause to be prepared a register of persons liable to pay tax and shall certify the same." It does appear to me as if the Act does not permit anybody else to make this list or register, and therefore the Income Tax Commissioner would like to delegate that duty to someone else; that is how it strikes me. I do not know what the implications of that are, but it appears to me that it is for the purpose of making the assessments.

Sub-clause 2 of the Act says this:—

"(2) Such list (hereinafter called the assessment list) shall contain the names, occupations and residences of the persons liable to pay income tax, the amount payable by each person, and such other particulars as may be necessary."

Wherever the word "list" appears it is now to be taken out and the word "register" is to be substituted therefor. Instead of a list, a register is to be kept and authority is being given for someone else in the office to have the power to prepare this register. I see no objection to this Bill; it is only strange to me that it has only now been found to be inconvenient in the office. Very likely somebody else has been making up the list already.

It appears to me that you are asking the Legislature to allow you not to have something done which has been done since 1921; and it is not good enough to say that the Bill seeks to enable the Commissioner to introduce a more efficient system. We should have some information as to what system would be introduced. I can quite clearly see what it is, because you say that the Commissioner himself appears to be the only person who can compile this list; it seems unnecessary for the Head of the Department to compile that list, because after all, everybody else in the office who deals with incomes is sworn to secrecy. I do not know the difference between "list" and "register" but I take it that a register is something which will have the names added to or taken from. This is my idea of it.

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. H. 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.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this Clause, Sub-clause 2 of Clause 28 of the principal Act is being amended by deleting the words "and shall be signed by him". Sub-clause 2 of Clause 28 of the Principal Act will now read as follows:—

"Every such assessment shall be made in the form and manner prescribed by regulations, and in default of such regulations, or so far as they do not extend, then as the Commissioner thinks fit." I can not give any legal explanation of that; I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

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

3.35 p.m.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is the Clause to which the honourable junior member for the City was referring. As it now reads, it seeks to delete all the words appearing in sub-section 1 after the word, "prepare", and to substitute therefor the following, "or cause to be prepared a register of persons liable to pay tax and shall certify the same." The explanation given by the honourable member is feasible. The second amendment simply deletes the word "list" where it first appears in subsection 2 and substitute the word "register".

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

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

Mr. LEWIS: I would have preferred the explanation when I raised it. I could see even from the previous amendment that subsection (2) of Section 28, makes it clear that you are getting away from asking him to sign it.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and agreed to.

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

YELLOW FEVER CAMPAIGN REGULATIONS

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the next Order is a Resolution to sanction the Regulations, entitled the Public Health (Yellow Fever) Regulations, 1955. These are Regulations made by the Public Health Board and sanctioned by the Executive Committee. These Regulations must be definitely accepted or rejected by the Legislature. There are other Regulations which are laid for forty days and which are ratified if no objection is taken to them within that period. In this case these Regulations must be dealt with by the Legislature.

The object of these Regulations is to enforce the Yellow Fever Campaign. This Campaign is being met by objections made by certain people, who object to the spraying on the ground that it will damage their furniture, walls, pictures etc. These Regulations are to give the officer in charge of the spraying certain authority to enter premises and carry out the spraying.

There are three types of spray being used. The type of spray to be used is chosen according to the type of paint or furniture; and the people carrying out the spraying are quite conversant with the type of spray to be used in each case. An objection in connection with furniture was made, as I have said, by one of two people. First of all, we are giving the assurance that if left to the men who are trained to carry out the spraying, no harm will be done to furniture, pictures or paint.

Before coming down with these Regulations we tried to get information from other colonies: Trinidad, St. Lucia, and I think British Guiana and also Jamaica, and one or two other islands in the Caribbean as to how they met these objections. We have been informed that in Jamaica only one case ever arose and that was settled amicably. No cases at all arose in St. Lucia and Trinidad.

I mentioned that so as to assure the House that any damage done to furniture, paint and pictures and things of that sort is negligible; and the parties who raised the objection have been assured accordingly. I hope that honourable members have studied these Regulations carefully. They are similar to Regulations by which Sanitary Inspectors are given authority to carry out certain points.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, these Regulations are copied from Regulations used in the neighbouring colonies of Trinidad and British Guiana, but modified somewhat to meet the particular case of Barbados. If they were to be adopted exactly as they were in Trinidad, I am sure that strong objections would have been raised in this House. I will only instance one case. In Trinidad and B.G. the Boards which correspond to our Board of Health have the power to put holes in your gutters. We felt that in Barbados that was unnecessary; that I recall was amended to suit Barbados. They are however more or less the same Regulations that apply in those other colonies which have had experience with similar campaigns in the past.

As you know sir, the present campaign is meeting with some resistance from sections of the people who think that their furniture is going to get damaged, spoilt, stained or something like that. Some of them think they know better than the authorities, and someone has even told me that it is a mistake to use this D.D.T. on a wide scale; that they had read some article in a magazine to the effect that eventually there will be greater harm done than good.

3.45 p.m.

We feel the campaign is worthwhile; and we should try to operate as other countries. It is but right not only to insist on those people that this thing should be done because if it is not done, it would contaminate all over again what is done in the other areas. There are other Regulations as regards the construction of buildings which would have to be built in such a way that no attachment for water would be permitted; if it has been drawn to their attention that faulty construction of a building is responsible, this Regulation would seek to amend that. However, if we once and for all get rid of this Yellow Fever Mosquito it would be a great blessing to this island. As I have said, these Regulations have been made by the Board of Health and they have been modified in a small way to meet the approval of the people of Barbados.

Mr. LEWIS: I merely rise to say that we can do nothing about these Regulations. They are thought to be necessary in the interest of the health.

of the island and the people coming to the island; and it is a matter of recommendation to us that visitors to the island know that we have rid ourselves of this mosquito.

My comment is that I regret it was found necessary to make these Regulations in this island. Once again I feel that I must say that if a proper campaign was conducted in order to inform the people of this colony of what was the purpose for doing this thing, I am sure that these Regulations would not be necessary.

I know that these Regulations are to be served on all and sundry, and I am wondering if they are carried out to the letter what inconvenience they would bring to the people. The present generation does not know anything of Yellow Fever; and I think that in Trinidad they attempted to scare the people when it was said that cases were occurring there. I have had people who came to me telling me that they had asked the inspectors to what extent would the spraying with D.D.T. damage their property. I know of one particular case where the person told the inspector that they had a young child who was in the habit of creeping on the floor, and in assisting itself in learning to walk, the child would hold on to the walls of the house as other children would do, and he would lick the walls with his tongue; and I do not think any assistance was given in that case by the inspector to that person. I do not think the person was given advice to pay some attention to see that that did not happen over a certain period, or to prevent anything from happening. I do hope that every assistance would be given to acquaint the people of the community of what is happening, without any recourse to the penalties that are set out in these Regulations, because I know that they are made in the interest of the colony and the tourist trade. I have sufficient faith in the good sense of Barbadians to know that if a proper campaign was carried out as was asked for in this House, and if more attention had been paid to this matter, we would not have had to bring in these Regulations.

In the introduction of this scheme of spraying to get rid of this mosquito, we were told that it would take about two years or whatever it was to complete it; and I asked then that an expiry date be placed in the previous Regulations. I do not see any such date in the present Regulations; and I hope that in due course when we feel that we have rid ourselves of this mosquito, these Regulations would be repealed. If an expiry date had been put on the previous Regulations it would have helped the Health Department; they would have gingered up and seen that this campaign was a success. Just in case that the Hon. Minister of Social Services should tell me that I am a member of the Board of Health, I should like to tell him that I took no part in the passing of these Regulations.

Mr. HAYNES: I fully realise the necessity and the danger of these Regulations. I have been told that in certain parts of St. Michael and Christ Church where this spraying has been carried out, the inspectors have left dirty walls and furniture as well; and as a matter of fact, they have left some houses in a mess. I think that they should be some proposal for appeal in these Regulations because if this work is done carefully no inconvenience should be caused. Certainly they can allow the occupant to move some of the things from one room to another. I say again there should be some appeal and the householder should be able to get some redress for any damage which has been caused to his furniture or house. I do not see anything in these

Regulations to allow for that and I am sorry over it. I hope that it has not escaped the notice of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, and that he will see what he can do to rectify the matter.

I do not see how you could ever exterminate this *Aedes Egypti* mosquito unless you have a complete spraying right through the island. However, I am asking the Hon. Minister if it is not in the Regulations, whether he could not issue a directive to the sanitary squad which is doing this work to see that as little inconvenience as possible is caused to the householder.

3.55 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I suppose that the honourable junior member for the City will be pleased to hear that the Ministry of Social Services is now investigating the possibility of putting over Rediffusion information in connection with the yellow fever mosquito, [*Cheers*] and perhaps the nature, for the benefit of the public. I do not think the honourable member will have the opportunity of making that charge again.

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

SCHEME FOR BARBADOS TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to sanction the Scheme of Government for the Barbados Technical Institute.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Resolution is to approve the Scheme of Government in connection with the Barbados Technical Institute. Honourable members will see that provision is being made for the appointment of the Governing Body the Principal and Staff, and at the same time financial provisions are being made. This Scheme is not unlike the Schemes which are already in existence, these Schemes are wellknown to honourable members of this House and to the members of the community. These Schemes were drawn up by the Director of Education and it is proposed to bring them into operation by the 1st July this year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Everybody will agree with the setting up of this school; and we hope that it will get the benefit of a good start. There is one point in this scheme, (I do not know if an amendment can be made to it,) which seems to me to be irregular. When you put in this Scheme that the Governing Body shall submit a confidential report on the conduct and efficiency of the Principal, I am somewhat diffident about that; it is not a good thing to ask a Governing Body which will be as wide and varied as this one is, to submit a confidential report on a person who is appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. If you want a confidential report submitted, then that should be submitted by the Director of Education or somebody like that; but I do not see how a Governing Body comprised of so many people could be asked to submit a confidential report on the Principal. I think a confidential report submitted by the Principal is more in order; because the Principal of a school should have the right and authority to submit such a report. I would like to know why it has been put in this Scheme that a confidential report should be submitted by the Governing Body; I do not know the

valid reason for this. That is not in any Scheme of Government now; the Governing Bodies of Secondary Schools do not submit confidential reports on the Headmasters or Headmistresses, and I do not see how you can ask this Governing Body to submit a confidential report on the Headmaster. How can a Governing Body which is meeting three times a year submit a confidential report on a man? They do not know anything about his work; they do not know if he is running the school well; they can only go by reports. I do not see that this Clause can be operative. It is unnecessary and it will only mean that you will have a Governing Body and the Principal of the School not seeing eye to eye on something, and you may get a Governing Body giving an unfavourable report about a man.

I do not feel the Governing Body as such should be asked to give a confidential report of this kind. Anyone who is giving a confidential report to someone should be in position to see daily what that person is doing. The Governing Body which meets about three times a year cannot do that. I do not know if it would be in order to move that this be deleted. I would like to know if you are going into Committee on this Scheme; I think we had better move the House into Committee and pass these things one by one so as to give members a better opportunity to debate them.

I move that the House go into Committee on the scheme before us.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, although I should not be doing so I am going to second that motion. I am going to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister who has taken charge of this Scheme that the Scheme like other Schemes which we have had here dealing with first and second grade schools, can be deemed to be out of order.

When this sort of Scheme first came here, I tried to draw it to the attention of the then Attorney General when he brought them under Sections 31 and 32 of the Act that this procedure was out of order, and he afterwards cut out the Sections and merely said "under the Education Act."

Under the present Scheme they have mentioned the particular Section of the Act under which it is brought. I would have risen to a point of order if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had been here; I would have liked to have heard what he would have said on the point. If you read Section 30 about these industrial and ragged schools, you will see that you have to establish a school first. The Scheme that the Legislature is supposed to pass is a Scheme of establishment. There can be no such thing as the government of the school; the government of the school has to be in the hands of the Governing Body.

A Section says that these Schemes should be prepared by the Education Board which is now the Director of Education and submitted along with the estimate of the cost of establishment. This is for the establishment of such a school and it can be approved, amended or disallowed as the case may be. The Section says, "and the Board are hereby authorised to make rules and regulations for the maintenance of good government and working of such school or schools when so established." When it comes to schools other than Government's schools, there is a particular Section, (Section 33), dealing with the Governing Body. I can bring the debate on the last school that was established in Barbados in a proper way. That was St. Michael Girls' School; I was the person who got them to put in the course of study that was left out.

However, sir, these other Schemes apparently had the force of law; and I am therefore now merely drawing it to the attention of the Minister that the Act should be amended to give validity to this method. We cannot say anything about how a school is to be governed. We are to say what should be the course of instruction and who should be the Governing Body; and after that the Governing Body has to say what the government of the school should be.

I remember that salaries paid in the first and second grade schools were set out in these Schemes, and they do not apply now. The £5 bond is still in these Schemes. If reference is made to the debate of the St. Michael Girls' School you will see that what I am saying is true. That Scheme was piloted through the House by no less a person than the late Mr. H. W. Reece. What was done was that they left out the reference to Section 30 and said it was made under the Education Act, leaving the lawyers free to look up any part of the Act and to see where it applied. I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had to render assistance at the time. These Schemes do not mean anything; there is nothing in them applicable; the salaries are now settled by a Resolution of the House; the £5 bond is not collected.

I know the position of the Hon. Minister or I would have raised a point of order. I would have had an interesting time raising a point of order and asking Your Honour to rule it out of order, and let us see what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would have said. I do not have here when the Coleridge-Parry School Scheme went through the House. However, I see what the honourable junior member for St. Peter means. Perhaps it would be a good thing to go into Committee, because there are some mistakes which can be pointed out and corrected. This is a Scheme which can be amended by the House; there is nothing in it that has any force of law at all. I can give the assurance that I know what I am saying, because I know what happened when one of the other Schemes went through the House.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I have listened to both honourable members. I was of the opinion that this Scheme should not be amended. However, sir, what I want to tell honourable members is that I have always warned against hasty drafting or the hasty insertion of amendments. Instead of going into Committee I would be willing to postpone this; and after I have had the views of honourable members I will submit those views to the Executive Committee and then back to the Director of Education, and have it properly redrafted according to the views of honourable members. I think that that would be a better method than to amend as we go along.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister said he would be willing to have this Scheme postponed. I remember that there is a motion standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Peter. Is that going to be withdrawn?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should not put that question to me.

Mr. TUDOR: Inasmuch as the Minister of Social Services has said what he has, I would like to say something.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must speak on the motion before the House.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the first thing that struck me about this Scheme of Government was that the school itself had not yet been established. None of us knows for instance how many pupils it is likely to accommodate and how the school

when established, is to be integrated into the general educational system of the island; although it has been mentioned in this House before by the Government that the establishment of this school was to cater not only for industrial training, and not only for those young men who were awarded Bursaries, but also for certain boys who are now on the roll of secondary schools and whom it is felt will profit from the training which is non-academic. Before all that can be done, this House and the public generally certainly desire to have more information as to the scope and range of subjects taught in this school. I take it that the Government has in mind to give training to these young people in the Arts and Crafts up to a certain level; and and that that training when given and received, will fit them for employment for which there will be a waiting field. It is at this point which I am most unhappy, because it does seem to me that one of the difficulties which would attend the establishment of this school from the point of view of those leaving it, would be in the nature of the possibility of employment to be found for the pupils leaving this school. Unless of course you have a guarantee to give to the prospective pupils of this technical school that there will be work for them when they leave school, you are defeating the purpose for the establishment of such an institute. Sir, you must remember that if boys of the age of fifteen or fifteen plus go into a school of that sort they cannot stay there longer than the time when they would have reached their twenty-first birthday. Let us say that a young man goes to that school for six years; if at the end of his time there, (and that will be near his twenty-first birthday) he comes out qualified in the trade which he studies and preferred, and is ready for any job which comes in his line of study, it would be very disheartening for him to discover that there is no work waiting for him. It would be a worse factor when his parents may say "Why should we be asked to pay fees for our boy when he is fifteen until he is twenty-one to learn a trade? Perhaps, if we did not send him there he may be earning something and perhaps would be helping to swell the family's budget over those years." It may be that Government has in mind some scheme whereby graduates of this institute can be integrated into jobs, or at least a certain number of them, if not all of them, according to the way in which they have passed their examinations and the satisfaction which they give to the people who teach them. Maybe they will be given some guarantee that if they pass their examinations they will be taken up into the government technical departments, and the second best recommended into other jobs which are either here or abroad. Knowing this Government as I do, I would myself like to see it put in black and white that those pupils passing out of this institute in six years would not pass out and then join the ranks of the unemployed. It is true that if this school is established in 1955 this problem would not come until 1961; but it means that you are going to train young people in skills for which there may not be any jobs for them. Sir, it is worth while to give study to this problem of how they are going to be employed after they successfully pass their own course of training.

The second point which I want to raise is with respect to the staff and other matters allied with it. First of all, I will deal with the matter about the Principal and the subordination which is intended that he should have to the Governing Body. I think the experience of the secondary

schools of this island has shown that heads of such schools work well with their Governing Bodies, because Governing Bodies as set up under our laws are not asked to return that sort of confidential report on the Headmaster or Principal. A secondary school is a very big thing to deal with, as you know; and much of the running of these schools depends on whether the head of the school feels he has the confidence of those who employ him and the confidence of those with whom by law he is associated to work the school. In a school of this nature the Governing Body cannot with certainty judge the success or the scope of the work. It is true that results will show the general work in the school, and the standards which are being reached; but no Governing Body, certainly not one as this one, would be able to say with certainty whether the Principal is doing his job well or not.

4.25 p.m.

At the end of every year or two years when examinations are set, not only the Governing Body, but also the public, will be able to judge the standard of instruction given on the percentage of success of the pupils. The Governing Body has its function to perform so far as the maintenance of the building, matters of convenience, and other matters; and it cannot discharge these other duties even half as well, because it falls outside its province and it would be a reflection on the integrity of the Headmaster. I make bold to say that in a new venture it would not be the wisest thing to saddle the Governing Body with the responsibility of making confidential reports on the Principal. If you insist on that, you will encourage tale-bearing, and back-biting and stooging which should not exist in the administration of any school, and least of all in the administration of a school which is now being established.

I noticed that it is proposed to allow certain pupils of Combermere School to take instructions at this institute. According to what I gather, the pupils of Combermere School will be concurrently attending the institute and will therefore be subjected to two distinct disciplines. It may not in principle work out to be a disadvantage to the pupils, but I think it ought to be stated more clearly than it is stated what is to happen when a pupil discovers that he can no longer profit from the instruction given at the Technical Institute, and who may wish to leave it and switch back over to another course of study which it may be his right to expect, since he still remains a pupil of Combermere School. That is a problem which the authorities of both schools will be well advised to study; I see many complications arising from it. Even in a matter of discipline, I do not think it is quite fair that if a pupil is expelled or suspended from Combermere School he is automatically expelled or suspended from the Technical Institute which he is attending. At least somewhere in the Scheme there is a suggestion to that effect; and I hope I have not made any mistake. If I have made a mistake, I hope it will be pointed out to me; it is to be stated quite carefully whether a pupil can cease attending the Evening Institute and still maintain his place at Combermere School. Some children attend the School rather late and it is possible that in the 15th year a pupil may be shifted over to the Technical Institute either at his request, or at the request of his parents; frustration may ensue and clashes may very well result. It would be a very hard thing if a pupil were to be expelled or suspended from the Technical Institute and could not continue his course of instruction at

Combermere. This affects those who were sent from Combermere to the Technical Institute but who would still be on the roll of Combermere. Conversely parents would be very disturbed to discover that in cases where their children attend both Combermere and the Technical Institute, a pupil who had been expelled or suspended from Combermere School would automatically have to leave the Technical Institute.

There again, there seems to be some puzzling. It is possible if you are working a sort of educational system where children attending two schools of the Government that discipline which arises at one school may not arise at the other. For one thing the boys at Combermere School are required to appear tidy and to be dressed in a manner befitting the pupils of a secondary school; in a Technical Institute such a regulation would not bear that emphasis, because you are expected to be dirty; and it cannot be conceded that it necessitates wearing your best clothes; and the issue of tidiness in the Technical Institute would not have such an outstanding character. That is only an example; it is possible for a boy to be suspended from Combermere School for habitual untidiness but in a Technical Institute that would not be a fault at all. That is a matter which wants to be gone into; it raises the general principle of two disciplines: one being longer established and having a wider application than the other; and it has to be settled to what extent the discipline of the school goes and whether it is possible for a pupil to cease to be attending one school and not forfeiting his place in the other. That is something which I think the parents would like to have settled. Subject to the merits of the particular case, parents would like to know if pupils could be removed from Combermere School without forfeiting their position at the Technical Institute.

Another matter which is a problem found in almost every school, is the problem of parents withdrawing children from schools without seeing that proper notice is being given, and also without noticing the penalties which might be attached to so doing. I do not know what it is like nowadays; but when I was teaching, I discovered that they were actually very few instances of pupils being withdrawn from a school without proper notice being given.

4.35 p.m.

For one thing, parents are well aware of the fact that they have to pay fees as and when they become due; they take very good care not to render themselves liable for the paying of fees when these fees become due. I therefore think it is unnecessary to attach any penal clause to the question of withdrawing pupils from schools, because in actual practice when a parent has consented to allow a child to go to and remain in technical school, the parent will not likely contemplate removing that child. Certainly, it serves no useful purpose to tell parents that they are liable to a fine of \$25 if they do not satisfy the Governing Body as to the reasons for withdrawing a child. If they withdraw and even give notice, they are liable for a term's fees already. If therefore a parent, well knowing what the position is with respect to his liability is prepared to withdraw a child without giving notice, then of course the Government as usual can ask for the fees. That I think is sufficient; but to want to attach an extra penalty for not notifying the Governing Body is I think, a little too harsh and is wrong in principle.

With respect to the position of the Governing Body itself, I think it would be as well if a member of this Legislature were on that particular Governing Body. We are establishing a new kind of school. It is to have representatives of Arts and

Crafts and Industries on it. It is also to have representations from the technical departments of the Government; but it will be a few years very well before that school finds its feet; and after all, it is still going to be an educational institution for which this House is responsible as it is for all other matters which have to do with the spending of money. It would be a sensible thing if on that Governing Body provision was made for members of the House. Not only in order that the people's representatives should be closely connected and linked with the new school, but because we know from experience that when educational matters are being discussed in this House, particularly with regard to the secondary schools, it is always admitted that when they are members of this Chamber who sit on the Governing Bodies of these schools, and the particular case coming up for discussion, any member of the House who happens to be a member of the Governing Body of this school can get up and make his contribution. That has been our experience with schools already established. How much more so is it necessary that this House should have one of its members on this Governing Body, so that he or she might be able to give this House information, not of a confidential nature, but on the general policy of the school; and might be able to answer questions with respect to its control and management which it is in the interest of this House to know, and which the people's representatives as such should be in possession of.

Those are the points which passed through my mind as I read this Scheme. There are, however, matters of detail which I would like to discuss on another occasion when the Minister of Health brings up this Scheme. I would like him to consider carefully the last point which I made. If you exclude members of this House from membership of the Governing Body of any school (and an important technical institute like this) it is really an affront to the dignity of the House and an attempt to prevent this House from having first hand knowledge of the things which arise. It is well that through the Legislature people should be in a position to have information from time to time, and to understand what is actually happening, and all the problems which arise from time to time. That information and understanding can only come from there being on the Governing Body which actually governs the school a member of this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suppose we all welcome this Scheme. I want to find out if this Scheme is like Regulations as far as the procedure of this House is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion now before the House is that the House go into Committee on the Scheme.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I rose to make a similar motion. I am glad it has been made. If this Scheme is like Regulations, much as I feel that we are very glad to see this Scheme—

Mr. SPEAKER: They are not like unto certain Regulations at any rate.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Then we will be able to amend this Scheme. The law says that you cannot amend Regulations. I think the best thing is to annul them or not pass them at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will see that this Scheme comes under the Education Act of 1890. There is no question of annulling.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I want to say is this: I remember well on one occasion when the Hon. Premier wanted us to pass certain Regulations he made a solemn promise that he would in due

course, amend the law so as to give this Chamber the right to amend Regulations rather than to have to pass them or reject them *en bloc*. Your Honour has enlightened me that there is no suggestion from the Government that this Scheme will come under the category of Regulations, so that we will not be prevented from amending it.

4.45 p.m.

I am among those who feel that this Resolution should go to Select Committee. I feel that with this new dispensation in the educational set up in this colony, the Select Committee should be one representative of all sections of this House. It is not that I believe that the framers of this Scheme did so with any intention to create a hardship on anyone, I suggested the Committee merely because I feel that there are many of us who are more acquainted with the habits and customs of most of the people of this colony than the people who framed this Scheme; and we will be able to bring to bear with the Hon. Minister of Education our ideas, and he would be able to make amendments here and there which I am sure the Government would agree with. I was not here in time to hear all that was said. While I have not studied every Regulation thoroughly I have gone through one or two of them. There is a section which refers to a boy who has to be put out of a secondary school. Let me ask this simple question directly to the Government, a boy might be superannuated at sixteen or seventeen in the third form, sometimes even in the second form; at the age of sixteen he might have shown great aptitude in the scale of mechanical or electrical engineering, but according to this Scheme because he was superannuated or expelled from that secondary school, automatically he is debarred from entering this Technical Institute. One wonders whether any sane member of this community knowing the various Schemes of these secondary schools as I do, should sit down and pass this Scheme as it is. I am saying that a Scheme as important as this should be dealt with in Committee; one should be given that much time in Select Committee to read this scheme side by side with the other Schemes of the leading secondary schools of this island.

I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Social Services who is in charge of this Resolution must have taken the opportunity of going through this Scheme, although it was not his portfolio. I am sure he will and not grudgingly agree with me that opportunity should be given us to go through this matter in Select Committee and examine it side by side with the Schemes of other secondary schools. Even at Harrison College, there is a number of boys who are superannuated at the age of seventeen years, but who have the adaptability for mechanics; but apparently, as I see here, you are singling out Combermere School. If you pass this Scheme as it is, then it follows as right follows day that whatever adaptability a boy who was superannuated has for mechanics, he cannot enter this Technical Institute.

Sir, I am going to support the idea of considering this Scheme in Committee because members of this House should be given the opportunity of considering this Scheme side by side with the Schemes of secondary schools and seeing how this particular Scheme would apply. I will not be a party to anyone who says that at this school you can only be eligible for entry if you come from a secondary school. I am not supporting any such Scheme and I want to make that quite clear.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support this Scheme. I feel that it is one which is overdue for a long time in this island. But, Sir

this Scheme as is presented to us is filled with indigestible matter, and we need a lot of help from the honourable Introducer to get it digested so that we can put it into operation, and the best way to do so quickly would be by going into Committee on it. There are a few points, (especially the last one which was mentioned by the honourable senior member for the City) which are very important. I would like to know if students for that institution will be selected on an educational basis only, or if those with mechanical knowledge will also be selected. I say that because I know of boys possessed with much mechanical knowledge who went only to the seventh standard in an elementary school. I do hope that any boy coming within that category would also be considered. If they select boys only on an educational basis that would be very misleading, and it would not serve the purpose for which this school is established. I do hope that when we go into Committee on this Resolution these points will be made clear and to the satisfaction of everybody.

The question that His Honour the Speaker leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Scheme was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Preamble be postponed.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sure that the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution would give an expression of opinion as what the position is. Views were expressed but surely it is not proposed — The Hon. Minister is waving to me that I should sit; well I will sit and hear what he has to say.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As I said earlier, I have always heard that hasty drafting is very often bad drafting; and I said that I would ask individual members if they would give me their views and I would report them in the proper quarters and see that those views are taken into consideration, probably with a view to amendments. I hope that honourable members see my point; we may amend this section and the other section, and it might be not at all in accordance with the original intention. If honourable members will give me their views privately I think that would be a better course to adopt. I now beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister is asking for our views privately. I have great confidence that when the Hon. Leader of the House tells us anything he will carry it out; but to suggest these things privately is not good enough. I must agree with him that in some of the amendments which we make here, the phraseology may not be in accordance with the Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of Order. I understand that there is no motion before the Committee, and I suggest that the Hon. Leader of the House move that Clause 1 stand part of the Scheme so as to hear an expression of opinion. I understand that that Clause has not been moved; I suggest that that Clause be moved and then a motion can be made that the Chairman report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Leader of the House went on to say —

Mr. LEWIS: If there is no motion before the Committee the honourable member cannot speak.

The Preamble has been postponed; I am asking the honourable member to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Scheme and any speech can be made on that motion; but we cannot go on as we are going on.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: My colleague would not even let me make the motion.

Mr. LEWIS: You cannot make the motion; it is a question of spending money.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: My colleague is usually correct when it comes to procedure. It still operates in my mind in spite of what the Hon. Leader of the House has said, that some of the amendments made might be contrary to the intention of this Scheme and must be the intention of the majority of this Chamber. If this Chamber sees something in this Scheme which it dislikes and it amended it, that must be the Scheme. Despite whatever officialdom might say, when this House says this is the Scheme, that is the Scheme. With regards to putting our ideas privately, I say that this Scheme must apply to the entire island; while you had a Scheme governing education, the entire Scheme for the Alexandra or other Schools varied. I think that if a Select Committee of this House would meet with the educational authorities and the Hon. Minister and consider the matter, it would be a better procedure. I do not think it is too late to make that suggestion to the Hon. Minister. Mr. Chairman, you could not tell your constituents that you are familiar with this Scheme as compared with the other Schemes relating to the other schools, and what I suggested to be done at a Select Committee could be done at one meeting. We want to compare certain Regulations in this Scheme with others which are now existing. I am suggesting therefore and I am sure this Committee will agree with me, that the appointment of a Select Committee to go into this Scheme is a correct thing to do. Imagine my submitting something privately to the Hon. Minister and the Hon. Minister saying that the educational authorities are saying something else!

You have postponed the preamble; you have now passed Clause 1; the next step is to report progress. I am appealing to the Minister that instead of doing that you should accept the suggestion to go to a Select Committee. That would do justice to the Scheme. You would avoid a lot of argument when the Scheme comes back here.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the position is this: at this stage we have a Scheme by which we can see what is the policy of the Government. There have been reports about setting up a Technical Institute. If it is against the policy of members of this House they can change it. If you have a Select Committee all the authorities can go before that Committee and when the Minister comes back with the recommendations of the Committee, am I to accept this second-hand from him?

This as I have said, is a Scheme in which the Government's policy is set out. If the House does not agree it can say so. Any member reading through this Scheme can say that he does not agree with this, that or the other. Other Schemes of Government for other schools are something different. The setting up of the Governing Body for this School is setting up something for the running of a Government Department; it is as if you were establishing the Department of Science and Agriculture and you brought the Bill in here. This would be a more expeditious way of doing it. I would be pleased to submit in writing anything I

would like information on. Very often you cannot get Select Committees to meet. I would like to be as helpful as can be. Perhaps some honourable members will favour the suggestion that you not only report progress, but say that you will return this Scheme to the House with the recommendation that it be sent to a Select Committee; but it seems to me that without sending it to a Select Committee any objectionable feature can be mentioned and the Scheme can be amended.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I agree with the honourable junior member for the City. I raised this point because a particular Clause does not appeal to me. I agree that sending a Scheme like this to a Select Committee would be more or less wasting time. The Scheme is before us, and there are not many objectionable clauses. We would have dealt with it today if the member in charge of it had been aware that we could amend it. If he had been aware of that, he would have come prepared to go into Committee on it. We have amended other Schemes before, and have given Assistant Masters the right to be dismissed in the same way as Headmasters.

What I would like to point out to the honourable senior member for the City is that those of us who hold views that a Scheme like this has mistakes in it, should be in a position to point out those mistakes. If the Government had decided to run this school as a technical school without a Governing Body no one would have objected; but many of us felt that since it was a new school, we should let these people assist Government in running it.

I do not subscribe to the view of sending the Scheme to a Select Committee. Many of the objections to the Scheme could be settled easily because they do not interfere with the policy of running the school. As regards the point raised by the honourable senior member for the City, I do not know if the suggestion is to send people from Combermere only; because if it is so, I do not see that they will have the number of boys at Combermere with the aptitude to go to a technical school. What sort of things are you going to teach, just higher mathematics or only skills? If you are going to teach skills it means that some of the boys should be able to go from various places of work to this school. In England you can go from your place of work into a school once a week, and you get advance knowledge in your particular skill. If that is not envisaged, if you do not intend to take some of the boys from various industries, the Scheme will not carry out the most desirable object. There are some boys at the Foundries to whom a school like this could be of great value.

I do not know where Government have got their advice from, but in British Guiana they take people from both places—schools and industries. Those are the points that should be raised. It is not a school that will have 500 children; it will be limited. I do feel that there will not be much value in sending this to a Select Committee, because there are too many of the clauses with which we agree. I feel that the things with which we do not agree can be settled here and now. The Minister in charge of the Scheme is not in a position today to accept amendments and therefore, you can report progress and at the next stage accept the amendments. It is better for him to day to hear the criticisms rather than to amend it hastily and make it worse than it is now. A Select Committee will not carry the various points as effectively as the whole House in Committee. As far as I can see, the Minister is not in a position today to tell

me anything about the point which I have asked as regards Combermere.
5.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is not usual that my colleague and I disagree on a point of this nature. I am still convinced about the Select Committee. The Minister wants us to give him our points privately and not on the floor of the House. If you take Clause 26, and you take Clause 35, and you go through you will see. There is no justifiable reason for taking boys from Combermere only. That is not the only secondary school in the island. If you are going to give preferential treatment to Combermere you will only cause the debate to go on here for a year.

Everyone in this country knows that before you brought this technical school into being there was a move on foot to turn Combermere into a school like this and to make the Headmaster principal of that school.

It is true, Sir, that maybe I am saying this in too broad a way; I am suggesting that you should make all your amendments now. The Hon. Minister of Social Services has wisely said that hurried legislation is bad legislation and our phraseology might not be good. As my colleague has said, you can put anybody on the Select Committee. Bear this in mind: I shall still vote according to the dictates of my conscience. All through this Scheme you will find that it is giving preferential treatment to one particular section of pupils. You are making provision at this school for 700 children, but none from Foundation School or from the Coleridge-Parry. If the Hon. Minister admits that we can amend, let us amend. [A VOICE: You cannot do that.] As I have said there can be no justifiable reason if 35 pupils have applied to give 26. You will have to show us a lot of reasons if you do that. In the Scheme you refer to a boy having to spend six years at the institute; that is provided he enters when he is fourteen years. I ask again: what is going to happen to the boy who is superannuated and he goes to that school? Are you going to send him out when he reaches thirty-one years? If the majority of this Committee feel that this Scheme should not go to Select Committee, it is a matter for this Committee. I do say that the strongest reason why this Scheme should go to a Select Committee as against being dealt with by this Committee, is because members would be able to acquaint themselves with the other Schemes of the other secondary schools. Let me say that the Schemes of other schools are also part of the laws of this country. My colleague has said that they are illegal, but I say that they are binding. When you give an executive body authority to make regulations, they become laws. Therefore, I say that the only way to give us the opportunity to read this Scheme side by side with the other Schemes which apply to all in which we can do justice to this Scheme is for you to send the Scheme to a Select Committee.

The honourable junior member for the City said that this would be an isolated case because it is the only case in which they are running a school of this sort without a Governing Body; but, Sir, this institute is not parochial, it is not of a special religious denomination, and as soon as it is an institution which applies to the whole island, I feel members should be able to compare the Regulations of other schools along with this Scheme. If you are able to do so, you will be in a position to know what would be the best Regulations to make to govern this institute.

I understand that the Hon. Minister has given the pledge that he will postpone this matter in a few moments. Let me ask: what is the difference be-

tween sending it to Select Committee and postponing it to-day. The Hon. Minister is saying that he would put himself in the position to let me meet him at his office and there I can give my views on this Scheme privately to him. Why not let us meet collectively so that we will be able to hammer these points out together? I think it would be infinitely better to do that and it would take up less of his time. If you select one day for all of us to meet you to discuss the matter, would that not expedite the matter more quickly?

Mr. LEWIS: Let the honourable member who has just spoken exercise that common sense which he boasts to possess. This Scheme has nothing to do with any of the other Schemes of the secondary schools. If you decide to send this Select Committee and you do not get a quorum, what would you do? Why certain members cannot go to the office of the Director of Education and discuss it with him clause by clause? Under the constitution, it is my duty as a member of this House to do that, and I am willing to do it. The Hon. Minister has invited you to tell him your views on the Scheme privately and I feel that you can do so. The honourable member has said that the pupils to be selected for that school will only come from Combermere; that is the only school which you expect them to draw their pupils from. I am saying that they can come from any other school so long as they pass the test.

They can come from any home. Clause 25 says that if you can pass the test you can go there.
5.25 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have not said that they cannot go; I was asking about preferential treatment. If you go from Combermere you do not pay; but if you go from other places you have to pay.

Mr. LEWIS: You do not pay, because you pay at Combermere. Anyhow I am appealing to the honourable member to accept the position as it is.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The more the honourable member says, the more he makes out a case for the Select Committee. I am not going to any Director of Education unless I want to see him privately; the honourable member is saying that he will join with others to go to the Director of Education instead of asking the Director of Education to come to the Select Committee. How long since would he agree that three or four members of this House would get information from the Director of Education without any status, so to speak? But if you are appointed by the House together with the Minister in charge of the matter to meet the Director of Education, that is a different matter; all the honourable member is suggesting is that no Select Committee should be appointed but that three or four or five honourable members of this House should get the information and come back here. Let him go to the Director of Education and come back here and say that the Director says something; do you know the Premier of this House? If he says that the "I's" are dotted and the "T's" are crossed already he will not move one bit; but with the Director before the Select Committee all the points we make would be taken note of.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister has made the mistake of not knowing whether these Regulations could be amended in here. I know that they can be amended because we have amended them in the past; the Act says that these Regulations can be amended in here. We made all the Schemes for the Coleridge-Parry and so on. The point I am raising is that we do not need any Select

Committee to deal with these points because these points are commonsense points. I quite agree with the honourable senior member for the City; the Director of Education is not running the Department anymore. If we agree with the deletion or the amendment to Combermere or any other Scheme, there cannot be any harm in putting in all the other schools.

Mr. Chairman, where I agree with the honourable member is this: I do not agree that the number of schools should come in here because the Government does not pay them anymore; the Government subsidises these schools. You do not need any Select Committee to deal with this matter; the point is a simple one. The other Government-aided schools should be included. We want to erase the idea of the Governing Body making a confidential report on the Principal; that should be removed entirely; and you do not need to take that up with any Director of Education. That is the only technical aspect of the matter, and these are matters of policy; I do not think it should be felt that only children of the Combermere School should be given this facility; I contend that children who go to schools other than Combermere should also have this facility; and you do not want any Select Committee to consider that point.

At this stage I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made to report progress.

Mr. ALLDER: The motion has not been seconded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has it not been seconded by the hon. junior member for St. George?

Mr. ALLDER: I should explain that I saw the hon. junior member for St. George intimate to the hon. junior member for St. Peter to make a motion for adjournment. I was on my feet practically during that time; therefore, Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. George could not have been on his feet, and he could only have seconded the motion if he had been on his feet. Therefore, there is no motion before us unless I second it.

To be serious on this matter, the whole Scheme deserves greater study. As the Hon. Leader of the House has said, he wants to get our views on the matter so as to bring a more acceptable scheme for final presentation to the Legislature. One of the best means of getting the views of the non-members of this Chamber is the Select Committee method. I do not see anything wrong in that. We have practised it all along; and it gives an opportunity where the various views of hon. members who, in most cases, as long as they have agreed to a policy before a Select Committee, support that policy when the particular matter comes back to the House.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas, Leader of the House, can accept the appointment of a Select Committee on which he can sit and hear the views of hon. members. It will not be very manageable for us to suggest changes which are definitely necessary in a Scheme like this without going to a Select Committee. When it comes to changes, I feel in the first place that the name of Combermere should not figure as prominently as it does in a Scheme like this. Nor do I feel that there should be only two streams from which students must be channelled into the Technical

Institute. What I mean is, that there are many mothers who walk up and down Bridgetown for months and years asking that their sons be taken on as apprentices at the various foundries, garages, and elsewhere. They are nearly always told that there is no room for apprentices.

I do not share the view that a good technician has to be one who has passed through the forms at Combermere School or any other school. Some of the best artisans we have had in this island have been elementary boys; and such an element deserves first consideration when it comes to a Technical Institute. The youngsters from Combermere have academic training which can help them to get clerical employment; the boys from the elementary schools do not have such qualifications, and therefore they always look around to fill the places in the various trades such as carpentry, masonry and motor mechanics and things of that sort.

I hope that the Hon. Minister who is handling this Resolution will see the wisdom in accepting the appointment of a Select Committee to go into this. I do not agree with his suggestion about four of us going to the office of the Director of Education. The Minister of Social Services can sit on the Select Committee and get the various views expressed. I now beg to second the motion that we report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The question was put and agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

The question was put and agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.45 p.m.

On re-assembling,

ADOPTION BILL RETURNED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Other Place:—

*The Legislative Council
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the House of Assembly the Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the adoption of children which has been passed with amendments which are shewn written on the Bill.

J. D. CHANDLER,
President.

Mr. LEWIS: May I enquire whether the Amendments will be printed and circulated?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

SCHEME FOR TECHNICAL INSTITUTE POSTPONED.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee on the Resolution to sanction the Scheme of Government for the Barbados Technical Institute.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in view of certain information expressed by honourable members in Committee, I propose not to go on

with that Resolution and to take Item No. 5 as the next Order of the day.

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

RATES OF INCOME TAX BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day now stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of this House: second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of income Tax for the year 1955 and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to fix the rates of income tax for the year 1955. There is hardly anything for me to say on it more than to say that the rates are the same as last year; and while it may be argued that the finances of the colony are in a very sound position and therefore the rates should be reduced, yet with such commitments as the Deep Water Harbour, Federation, Local Government and other things, it is considered not a very good idea to make any decrease in taxation.

I am sorry that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy is not in his seat. He made certain enquires with regard to doctor's bills and I think the Hon. Premier in his Budget Speech did say that those things will be considered later. That is still the intention of this Government; but that would come down as a substantive amendment to the Income Tax Act. As I have said, that is the policy of the Government and in due course a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act 1921, having as its object the provision for doctor, nursing and medicine bills to be included in the list of exemptions, will be brought down. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the Hon. Minister of Social Services give us the assurance that the Hon. Premier had agreed that in the not distant future, or before the beginning of the next financial year or even before the taxes for this year are collected, that a Bill will be brought down to amend the Income Tax Act so as to give allowances to families for doctors, nursing and medicine bills. I hope it will not apply to the individual only but that it will also apply to the family of the individual.

As you know sir, we on this side of the table, have raised that question in and out of season. We have been arguing for allowances for doctors, nursing and medicine bills for a long time, and that these should not only apply to a medical practitioner but also to a dental surgeon as well. There is one other thing that I must raise (I have raised it already) and it is with respect to further allowances for children. All income tax payers in this country have been raising the question of further allowances for not only children at school, but for children who go to Universities. There seems to be a great differentiation in this country for children of taxpayers who go to Universities although it has been argued that people who can afford to send their children to Universities should be able to pay their income tax. I want to say that is not exactly correct; because from my experience there are a number of people in this country whose children show ability to gain entry into a University but whose parents can ill-afford the expenses of sending them there. It seems to me rather peculiar to have, let us say, a Barbados scholar who can get up to the tune of £600 a year which is really tax free, but side and side with that Barbados scholar you have children

of taxpayers who must contribute to the Barbados Scholarships and those taxpayers cannot get off any allowances for their children who are studying not only at Universities but at technical schools or other institutes abroad. As you have seen, I am not stressing Universities alone; I maintain that technical or other institutes of learning where parents must remit fees for their children and continue to keep them there, are as much in need of relief as if they were sending these children to a University.

There is also the idea that as soon as a child reaches the age of sixteen, you should not be allowed anything off for that child. I am of the opinion that you remain a child of a parent until you go on your own oars and are able to support yourself. While you may not be receiving that mandatory support for the purpose of education, there are other things for which we feel that some allowance should be given. On the other hand, I think we all agree that the principles of taxation as are laid down in Holy Writ are made so clear that there should be no argument about them. It has been stated that those who can bear the burden of the weak should bear it. 6.25 p.m.

I am sure the Government would agree that with the cost of living in Barbados today and the allowances which are given for children whether they are at secondary or elementary schools or any school for that matter, the allowances given are very little more than what would pay the school fees and the bus fares. While the Government is considering the allowances for doctors' treatment and the allowances for dental care, consideration should be given to a further allowance for children and more especially those who have to go to University Colleges and other training institutes where parents have to pay for them. There is one aspect of the matter which applies to the United States of America and Canada; there is an allowance given for working clothes because of the cost of living and because of where the standard of living is today. You find that a tremendous number of people in the lower bracket have got to pay income tax and no such allowance is given to them. Actually in Canada and the United States of America there is such a thing as an allowance for working clothes and I feel that the Government should give that matter some consideration. More than that I am wondering whether, although within recent years the Government has given some increase in the allowance for a married man from \$1,200 to \$1,300 per year—

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of Order. While what we are hearing is very interesting, at the same time this is not an Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sometimes one realises that Your Honour has given a lot of latitude. This is an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921. With all due defence to my colleague, who is the Deputy Speaker, I hope that the Government will give further consideration to increasing the allowance to a married man. An allowance which works out at \$8.00 a month is rather small; and it is time that allowances for married men should go up to \$300 a year and the allowances for single men should also be increased. From the statistics given recently one can very well understand that with the allowances under the Income Tax Act, you are barely eking out an existence; you cannot live on them. I will not say that everything that is allowed in the United States of America should be allowed here, because in the United States of America there is an allowance for what you give to religious organizations; but whatever allowances you give you should include an allowance for

working clothes, because that applies to people in the lower category, people like waterfront workers whose duty it is to pay income tax.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not know why the hon. junior member for the City saw fit to rise on a point of Order, because it is very difficult to pass these rates without making comments on this matter, and nobody can make an amendment to this Act unless you are creating a charge on the Treasury. I feel that allowances should be given to people who are living in their own houses instead of the tax value of the house being added. The hon. senior member for the City is looking at me and it looks to me as if he gets off! [Laughter.] I do not think any man who is living in his own house should be taxed in that way. It is a matter of thrift and those who have perspired and by putting heavy millstones around their necks, have acquired a home should not be called upon to add that to their taxable income. Just as we have gradually reached the stage where we regard that allowances for medicines should be granted, in the same way a man should not be made to pay income tax on the home in which he is living. I hope that some consideration will be given to the question of allowances to those who are living in their own houses and who are not renting them out.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks made by the last honourable member, I certainly hope that you will take what I am going to say in the spirit in which I am saying it. This is a Bill that has no validity after the 31st December, 1955, except for the purpose of catching someone before the rates are fixed for 1956. The Bill under which allowances should be discussed was passed today. That is an amendment to the Act, but this settles the rates of Income tax for the year. It does not matter how much allowance is given, when you are finished and you have so much left this Bill says that you have to pay income tax on it. Honourable members got away with comments that did not come under this Bill and you were generous enough to let them get away with it.

I am only raising a point that I raised previously, and that is that the word "thereafter" really puzzles me. I suppose it has worked well in the last two years, but I pointed out when it first crept into this Bill that as far as my memory serves me, these rates were put up in the Five Year Plan. I do not know what is meant by the words, "every complete dollar of taxable income for the next \$6,000, 60% and thereafter 75%." I suppose the Income Tax Commissioner must know what it means. However, sir, it was passed by the House already and it is no use my going any further.

The question that Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. 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 and 2 of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. Cummins moved seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox that the Schedule stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to point out that it is within the province of this House to alter these rates as they like; they can increase or decrease them. It is only that under the present form of the Government and by reason also of the fact that the estimates on which taxation at these rates are based have been passed, that the Government may decide at what rates to raise this taxation; but as far as the right of this House to reduce or increase

these rates are concerned, that right remains unaltered.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER, NO. 2

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, No. 2, 1955." It makes provision for the addition of certain staff. I think the Premier in his Budget Speech did mention the need for another Permanent Secretary. As it is now, the Permanent Secretary for the Minister of Communications and Works and the Permanent Secretary for my Ministry is one and the same person. An arrangement of that sort could not allow for the despatch of files to the Ministers as freely as we would like. One man has to do two sets of work, (both voluminous in nature), and it is impossible to despatch the work in the way that it would satisfy the requirements of the Ministries.

This was envisaged at the beginning of Ministerial Status. There were many who foresaw a thing of this sort. We were however willing to give it a trial with the hope that it would work satisfactorily; we have tried it for a year. To mention one thing, members were disappointed that along with the Estimates they did not have the recommendations of the Richardson Report before them; I mean the recommendations of the Government. I should say that the same Permanent Secretary who should deal with that was also engaged in voluminous work in connection with the Deep Water Harbour Scheme. That is not the only instance that I can mention; there are many other instances which show you cannot continue like that unless you want a break down of the system.

In this Resolution there is also provision for an Assistant Secretary who will be a kind of floating man. The reason for that is, that very often Assistant Secretaries of the various Ministries may be on leave or sick, and a junior man who is not familiar with the system has to be put in the place of an experienced man. It was thought therefore, that the opportunity should be taken to get this additional Assistant Secretary who could go to any Ministry in the case of sickness or leave or any other emergency which might cause the Assistant Secretary to be absent from his desk.

As regards the Confidential Secretary to the Governor, as the Addendum says the distinction between the duties and responsibilities of that post and the post of Private Secretary to the Governor was recognised at the time of the introduction of Ministerial Government when the title of the former post was altered to Private Secretary to the Governor, and that of the latter to A.D.C. The Private Secretary is responsible for the running of the Governor's Office including all mail and telegrams, cyphers and codes, shorthand writing and typing, the Governor's official engagements and the official records; and the duties and responsibility of the post call for special qualities of discretion and competence. I think this was promulgated at the time of

the Estimates when the work of this individual was compared parallel to that of the work of Miss Bartlett. Apparently they do work of a similar nature; and Government is now taking this opportunity to bring this individual's post up to the same level of pay. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. 6.45 p.m.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On this matter I hold special views. I do not think Government can say that Miss Haskell was overlooked in any ministerial business, because I have not seen that in any of the public documents; neither do I subscribe to the view that because Miss Bartlett was paid a salary of a Senior Clerk that Miss Haskell should also be paid on the same scale. Miss Bartlett was promoted a Senior Clerk on duties unconnected with those which she is performing now. This is not a scientific basis of reviewing the Service. For all these years there was this post at Government House; for all these years there were these duties in the Secretariat; now, suddenly you come and say that the work at Government House is parallel to that in the Secretariat. Ministerial system has nothing to do with the situation at Government House; far from that, Ministerial system has to some extent reduced the flow of work which used to pass through the hands of the Colonial Secretary. The work which a Minister is doing has certainly reduced the flow of work at Government House. Again, I would say that Miss Bartlett was made a Senior Clerk through duties unconnected with the work which she is doing now. Miss Bartlett could have been made a Senior Clerk and be called upon to work in the Post Office selling stamps. That post at Government House has no greater responsibility than that which a Long Grade Clerk is looking after at the Parcel Post Office. I said at the beginning that I never accepted the view that this post at Government House carried any greater responsibilities than any of the Private Secretaries in the Government Service. All that you are doing is to pay the present holder an increase in salary; this is not an upgrade. In your desire to pay her a greater salary, you are justifying it by saying that it is on a parallel with work which Miss Bartlett is doing. That is no argument. This post at Government House was reviewed when all the other posts in the Government Service were reviewed, and it was upgraded at that time; so this argument of putting her into this special post cannot be justified with what happened in 1950; and up to now you have not yet reviewed the others. Miss Bartlett is an individual of the Civil Service who has been made a Senior Clerk and would have been paid as such even if she were put in the Post Office or sent to Seawell.

Another point which I want to make is with respect to the Public Service Commission and it is not a matter for the Minister but for the public. I said when we were dealing with the Estimates that the Public Service Commission which deals with appointments to the Service needed overhauling; I said so without any reference to the ability, character or integrity of any of its members. I said so with reference to the Chairman of the Public Service Commission who is also a member of the Executive Committee. I am not saying that he should not be Chairman of the Public Service Commission, because I think he is admirably suitable for that Office, but he should not be Chairman of the Public Service Commission and also a member of the Executive Committee at the same time. Another thing is this: I have seen something in the newspapers which shows that a gentleman who has been appointed to the Public Service Commission is going to act as Chief

Justice. I do not think that the Chief Justice of this colony who has something to do with appointing Magistrates should be a member of the Public Service Commission; and I do not think that the acting Chief Justice who is in the same position as the Chief Justice should be a member of the Public Service Commission now he is acting Chief Justice; and that is the position of His Honour, Mr. J. W. B. Chenery. The appointment of Magistrates comes under his portfolio, and I do not think as a member of the Public Service Commission he should say who should be appointed, when he has to recommend suitable candidates to the Public Service Commission; he would be putting into effect his own recommendation. Another thing is this: it might be an accident that two brothers are sitting on the Public Service Commission. Barbados is really a small place but with its redundant population, I am sure you can find somebody else with character, ability and integrity to be a member of that body. Do not let that be thrown at you.

So far as the additional Permanent Secretary is concerned, I have said already that a blind man on a trotting horse can see that that set up which you had could not work. Of course you were not trying out something; you were waiting for enough time to elapse to come back to this House for this. You could not be trying out this, because it is just like trying out a racehorse with a Rolls Royce motor car to see how long he will run with the car. Next year, Mr. Speaker, Government will be coming back to this House for the fifth Permanent Secretary.

Again I must say that I have strong views on this question of the increase in salary of the post at Government House. The reasons given do not impress me as being sound. However, I do not want to start any row; but I do say if you are going to carry this Private Secretary at Government House from \$2,280 to \$3,000 per annum, I hope that there will be no objection to giving something more to the Librarian of this Chamber who is doing the same work and who I hear is going to ask for something more. If you start this thing now, you cannot blame anybody for bringing any pressure to bear on you, because you started the pressure on yourself. 6.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I can remember when the titles of these offices were changed but I do not remember if at that time there were any alterations made in the salaries. From the Addendum to this Resolution I take it that there was no increase made in the salaries. I notice that the titles of officers at Government House were changed. The Government has already had some considerable experience in increasing the salaries of one set of people, and they had to appoint a Commissioner to go into the salaries of the whole service. As the honourable member has said, if they have interfered with one office they will have to be prepared for others.

The Public Service Commission must be kept from politics. You have a politician at its head; if he is a member of the Executive Committee he is a politician. You also have the Acting Chief Justice as a member of the Public Service Commission at the same time. These things need consideration; they are continually being commented upon in this House.

The next thing is this: we have before us today the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order No. 2, 1955 and we also have on the Order Paper the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order No. 3, 1955, and as far as I remember we have already passed a Civil Establishment Amendment Order for 1955. Do you mean to say that the

Executive Committee and the Government cannot put their house in order? You have now in the space of a week or two, three General Amendment Orders, and I am asking all the time if anyone knows what the Civil Establishment is today. Since 1949 when the Act was passed there have been several amendments to the original orders and they ought to bring down a consolidating Order so that honourable members would know what the position of the establishment is. Only those who have kept all the Orders up-to-date can tell you what the Civil Establishment is today. You have had three Civil Establishment Orders already this year; what does that mean? I consider that it should be fairly easy to get a consolidating Order in here every two years, and let us wipe out all the amending Orders and have one Order so that honourable members can say "this is the Civil Establishment Order."

I hope that we are not taking a great deal of interest in somebody who needs an increase in salary merely because he is under the eyes of His Excellency the Governor, and because some others are not so near to Government House and the Governor that they have been overlooked. As I said on a previous occasion, some Governor said he had no doubt that we could pay the same salaries as British Guiana; I do not know whether he knew that he was going there or not. The only decent thing for the Government to do is to pay the salaries of B.G. because that is what the Government agreed to pay; and in some instances they are paying more.

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 3 ORDER

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 14 as the next Order of the day.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the "Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1955.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As we were told by the honourable junior member for the City, this Order deals with the Auditor General's Office. It is consequent to the recommendations of Mr. J. W. Foster who was down here not so long ago in connection with the Organisation and Method in the Civil Service. The amendments are as follows:—

III. AUDITOR GENERAL

For Item 4 Substitute

"4. Examiner \$2,280 x 120 — 3,000 4"

XXVII. GENERAL SERVICE

For Item 1 Substitute

"1. Clerk (a) Senior \$2,280 x 120 — 3,000 22"

(b) Long Grade
\$600.600. 660.840 x
72 — 1,128 (E.B.)
1,296 x 96 — 1,680
(E.B.) 1,872 x 96 —
2,160 x 120 — 2,280 210"

XXXIX. ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

For Item 2 Substitute

"2. Assistant Accountant
General \$4,560 1"

After Item 2 Add

"3. Accountant \$1,920.

1,920 x 120 — 2,880

x 144 — 3,456 1"

"4. Assistant Accountant

ernment has taken the work done by Vestries, the
\$2,280 x 120 — 3,000 3"

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

7.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. SPEAKER, I must say sir, that from my observations, it seems that time and time again we have created departments. The Government has taken over the work done by Vestries, the Commissioners of Highways and people of that sort. At one time the Auditor General did not have the accounts of the General Hospital to audit, and it seems to me that with work of a nature which is meticulous one has to be extremely careful not to place it on the Audit Office without a substantial increase in staff. This is one Department that can be said to be in need of an increase in staff, because of the fact that the work has to be kept up to date in view of our pre-audit system. Any delay in that office is reflected in inconvenience to the public.

I notice that this Assistant Accountant General is a new post that is to be created. Again I would like to say that we should have a more comprehensive picture of our Civil Establishment and discuss it in relation to the recommendations of the expert in Organisation and Method. It seems as if every now and again the Government comes and says, let us create a new post here and there, let us put more clerks in the Civil Service in the Long Grade section or any other section so that they can be distributed to various offices; but we do not get a comprehensive view. What does the Government really want? Are they going to deal with the Accountant General's Office, the Auditor General's Office, and then deal with the Customs and Income Tax Department another time?

I would like to see the whole Civil Establishment set out in a document and laid before the House so that honourable members may be of assistance to the Government in what the Government wants to do. Let us take the Addendum; the Addendum says as regards the Accountant General's Office that the Organisation and Method Adviser suggested that the staff of the Audit Department be increased by an additional Examiner and the employment of two or three temporary clerks until the duties of the department have been revised and the arrears brought up to date. For the Treasury he recommended the re-designation of one of the two posts of Accountant as senior Accountant, the inclusion of the three temporary clerks on a permanent establishment, and the creation of an additional post of Stenographer-Typist.

I would have to read from top to bottom of the Addendum to find out where mention is made of this new post and what is the explanation for it. However, sir, it is not good to deny the Government these posts that they ask for, because if anything happens they will throw the blame on the House. I hope however, that this thing does not get out of hand, if it is not out of hand already. As the honourable junior member for St. Peter is often saying we do not like this *ad hoc* method of increasing this Civil Establishment, and doing many other things besides that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible for us to sit here and agree with this piecemeal way of coming for additional staff for the various departments, whether the increases are justified or not. After the report of the expert on Organisation

and Method was presented to the Government, it should have been the responsibility of the Government to implement it. As I understand it, the purpose was to train someone whose permanent responsibility it would be to bring the Government's attention to methods that would save other than personal or any kind of clerical work to the various departments. In the absence of that, I think the money would have been wasted.

Efficiency means continuous scrutiny of the methods used in the departments. Unless there is some person who has been trained and detailed to do this work, in three years time the report of the expert will be out of date. The Government should take steps to put it on a permanent basis. I think the report said that such a person should have been trained to follow up the expert's recommendations, and should be able to always keep the Government advised, or the Public Service Commission, as to ways and means of keeping the Government's staff up to mark. In the absence of that, it will be impossible for us to say whether this or that increase in staff is justifiable or not. I do not know what the Government is doing about it; and if the Minister can let us know whose responsibility it is and if it is being done I would be glad to hear.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I will promise honourable members that I will make a note of their comments.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND POLICE ACT, 1908

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to proceed with Order No. 15, as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: This Bill, sir, is a short one. It seeks to delete Section 7 of the Police Act which makes provision for the Commissioner of Police to be *ex officio* Superintendent of the Fire Brigade. We have had a Fire Officer about a year or two ago, and there was Civil Establishment Order No. 1, which made provision for the establishment of the office of Fire Brigade Officer. That having been done, this Clause 7 in the Police Act, 1908, has to be deleted. You cannot have two Superintendents of the Fire Brigade at the same time. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, moved seconded by Hon. M. E. COX that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am only rising now because I feel that on this particular motion is the appropriate occasion for me to emphasise what I have been saying all along. We are now abolishing an office, and you have to leave the Chair and the Chairman of Committees has to go in the Chair and report back to you etc. We were creating an office just now thereby spending money out of the Treasury, and no honourable member could even speak twice on it. Watch the procedure for abolishing a title; it really is amusing.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

It reads as follows:—

"Section seven of the Police Act, 1908, is hereby repealed."

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the record, I am going to read Clause 7 of the principal Act. It is a very short one. It is as follows:—

"The Commissioner of Police shall be *ex officio* Superintendent of the Fire Brigade, and shall receive the salary attached to that office."

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE GRANTED TO TAKE ORDER NO. 17

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker. I am asking leave to take Order No. 17 as the next Order of the day, and I am also asking for leave for the Hon. Minister of Communications to take charge of that item.

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

THE ST. JOSEPH HIGHWAYS EMPLOYEES (SPECIAL PENSIONS) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications: second reading of a Bill to make provision for the payment of Pensions out of the general revenue of the island to certain former employees of the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. Joseph.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is consequent of the decision of the Government to take over the responsibility of repairing the roads of St. Joseph. When that Bill was before the House, I said then that the Government proposed to take over along with those roads the assets and liabilities of the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph. I also said then (and I know that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph has raised the question) that no one would suffer as a result of Government taking over those roads; and I pointed out then that there may be an individual whose service the Government might find it difficult to retain. I assured the House at that time that whatever happened, Government was prepared to make good any loss which might occur as a result of our taking over those roads.

Well, sir, the clerk of the Highway Commissioners, Mr. A. T. King, apparently used to get a salary of \$60 per month and as a result Government has decided to give him a pension at the rate of \$288 per annum by monthly instalments; or a gratuity of \$750 and thereafter a reduced pension of \$214.15 per annum by monthly instalments. In the case of Mr. J. A. DaC. Mapp who was the Highway Inspector, it has been decided to pay him a pension at the rate of \$650 per annum by monthly instalments; or a gratuity of \$1,625 and thereafter a reduced pension at the rate of \$487.50 per annum by monthly instalments.

I may mention that these two gentlemen come under the Pension Act of 1925, section 4; and provision has been made for them also under section 9 of the same Act so far as the abolition of office is concerned. As you know, sir, the Act sets out

that a ratio of sixtieths should be paid for abolition of office in accordance with the number of years of service done by the individual. That has been included in the computation of the pensions in both cases. In the case of Mr. Mapp, he gets additional five sixtieths for abolition of office, and in the case of Mr. King, he gets seven sixtieths added to his pension for the same purpose. I should like to make it crystal clear that these two officers have been given all that is really due to them, and perhaps in some cases more.

There is hardly any more for me to say at this stage, except to listen to what the honourable junior member for St. Joseph might say. As I have said already, the Government did not find it necessary to continue with the services of Mr. Mapp. You will also see in the Bill that there are two other pensioners—Mr. A. A. B. Gill, and Mr. D. C. A. Ince. They were formally paid pensions from the Highway Commissioners. That revenue from which these pensioners were paid now falls to Government, therefore the Government has assumed the responsibility for making good these pensions. I think that explains the whole thing, and I now beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

7.25 p.m.

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

Mr. SMITH: I am very glad to see that the Government has considered these men who found themselves out of a job due to the taking over of these roads. In the case of Mr. King one can clearly see that that would be alright; and I believe it will be satisfactory even to the same Mr. King. But sir, as regards Mr. Mapp who is a young man younger than I am, it worries me to see that the Government is pensioning this man rather than allowing him to work for a salary. There is something wrong that the Government would not even allow a representative of the particular parish to know the reasons for not employing this man. I am sure that everything as far as road inspection is concerned, was going alright; I do not know if the former Commissioners of Highways have recommended him to the Government as a bad servant or being unfit or anything of the sort, but I do not know why the Government should pay this man a pension rather than allow him to work.

Since the Government has taken over these roads, the Government has promoted two men who were supposed to be under this man; they have brought them forward and put them in the place where Mr. Mapp should have been; and no reason has been given why Government has not employed Mr. Mapp. It is also worrying Mr. Mapp too, because he feels it will operate against him in the securing of another job since this pension will not be able to keep him, he being a man with a family. If he were an old man he would have put in a sufficient number of years' work so that he could live on his pension.

I have asked questions so that the House would know what are the reasons why Mr. Mapp has not been employed. I have talked over the matter with Mr. Mapp and he himself wanted to know the reasons too. If there was anything fishy about Mr. Mapp, he would not have wanted to know why he was not employed. I am looking forward to the Hon. Minister of Communications letting this House know the reasons for not employing Mr. Mapp.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to say that I know nothing about this matter, therefore I am dealing with this Bill as printed and circulated. I think that these are matters which should be expedited, but they should be expedited before they come before this House. This Bill was given notice of last

Tuesday, it was printed and circulated to honourable members yesterday afternoon and it is being considered today. I do not know if this Bill will appear in the *Official Gazette* so that the persons concerned will read it; I do not know if anybody who is mentioned here knows what is the final decision in this Bill. If we leave it to them to know when the Bill is made public, I do not think that sufficient time has elapsed for them to do so. While the Government may be anxious to do these things there may be some little flaw which, if drawn to the Minister's attention, may be rectified. There are occasions when the Government has said that it is well to reconsider things.

Another thing is that in the first paragraph of this Bill there is a new introduction in the drafting of Bills. I speak under correction, but I think I have seen a commencement date like this, but I do not know if it was retroactive. It says this:

The Accountant General is hereby authorised and required to pay from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee as from the 1st day of September, 1954—

I do not know if the money is to be paid from the Public Treasury as from the 1st September, 1954 or not, but to put in the words "on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee as from the 1st day of September, 1954" seems to me that it is only after the 1st September they can issue this warrant, but it must come after the coming into operation of this Act. I believe that a commencement clause has been put in at this point in an Act; however this Bill reads somewhat awkwardly. Anytime after the first of September, 1954, the Accountant General can accept a warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee but the pensions are to be paid from the 1st September, 1954. That is clear to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have scrutinised this Bill and I do not think it should have been brought here at all. This is a private Bill and it has to pass through the same procedure as other private Bills, it should not have come to this House so soon as it has come.

Hon. M. E. COX: From whom must this Bill come?

Mr. SPEAKER: It has come from the Government but it deals with private individuals.

7.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: If reference is made to the Letters Patent they will see that you are correct. When Government sponsors a Private Member's Bill they always leave out the Clause saving the rights of the Crown, because it would be redundant.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on a point of Order. I agreed with Your Honour's ruling. I think that an unfortunate custom was created when you granted the Sugar Producers' Association the right to use certain Crown lands at Needham's Point. As the honourable junior member for the City and Your Honour have rightly pointed out, the Letters Patent clearly set out the nature of a Private Bill and a Public Bill. Our Interpretation Act makes it unnecessary to have Clause 4 in a Public Bill. If this were not really a Private Bill there would be no need for Clause 4 to be inserted at all.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not quite follow the argument that is being put up. If a Government member does not bring in a Bill to create a charge on the Government who can?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member does not seem to understand. I am not saying that a Government member cannot bring a Private Bill, I am merely drawing to the Minister's attention that a Private Bill introduced by a member of the Gov-

ernment must still go through the procedure that any normal Private Bill must go through. I am not saying that the honourable member is wrong to bring this Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have seen here in this House

M. SPEAKER: There seems to be some controversy. Some research is necessary. That being so, I will order that this Bill be postponed for a short time.

The Bill was postponed.

BILL TO AMEND SUGAR INDUSTRY ACT.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 18, as the next Order of the Day.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) Act, 1952. Since 1952, funds derived from the levies on locally consumed sugar have been used to subsidise one grade of sugar manufactured for local consumption; that is, the brown crystal grade. The levies amount at present to \$13.20 a ton, and last year the total sum raised from these levies was \$185,500. The balance brought forward from the previous year was \$16,800; the levies that we raised on a total tonnage of 10,000 tons was \$132,000, and there was a marginal difference of \$36,700. That brought the total to \$185,500. Of that amount 35,849 bags of brown crystal sugar were subsidised, and the price to the consumer was reduced to 7½c. per pound.

The position this year is that the levies for the subsidy have dropped considerably. There is no balance such as we had last year. There is no marginal difference and we have merely \$133,000 raised from the levy at the rate of \$13.20 a ton. We have decided in view of the fact that the total amount has dropped considerably, to keep the price of brown crystal sugar at the same 7½c. per pound, and to subsidise a larger amount of sugar, a little over 36,000 bags. Last year we subsidised 35,849 bags.

The amount required to subsidise these bags is \$186,278. When you subtract the amount available from the levy, \$132,000 there will be a balance of \$54,278 required for the total subsidy. We intend to get that from the surplus balances which the Controller of Supplies has in hand as a result of bulk trading; and by adding the amount of \$54,278 unto the \$132,000 we will be able to subsidise the same amount of bags last year or little more, to keep the price of sugar at the same level as last year, that is, 7½c. per pound.

I do realise that some members of the House will say that again this year this Bill has come in late. I will explain it was simply because of my visit to the U.K. that this matter has been delayed; otherwise it would have been brought down some time back, at least before the crop started.

I think I have given the House all the information I can with regard to the price last year and the amount to be raised this year. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.
7.45 p.m.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is long awaited by merchants and the planting community, because up to now not a bag of this sugar has been produced; and you can very well understand what is the position owing to the fact that the crop has been very far advanced for the season due to the

dryness of the canes. The Government this year is subsidising about a thousand bags of the same dark crystal sugar more than last year.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I would like to interrupt the honourable member. Last year we subsidised 35,849 bags of this sugar. This year we are subsidising 36,000 bags.

Mr. GODDARD: I was about to say that last year they started off with a balance of \$16,000 and they had another \$361,000 from marginal differences. They did not have these two sums for two years, but to make up that they have taken \$54,278 from a surplus balance from the Controller of Supplies. This may come as a surprise to those who do not know how that fund has accumulated. It is a fund which the Controller of Supplies accumulated during the war years when he equalised prices so that he could fix a ceiling price on one commodity. As a result of that, they built up a huge balance which was utilised otherwise. They have now taken \$54,278 from those balances to equalise sugar. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade how much remains in that fund now that they have taken away this amount of \$54,278? That is my first question.

There are very few things which are equalised now. Is this the beginning of the winding up of the Control Department by your taking this fund and using part of it in subsidies?

Now, Sir, this particular grade of sugar is being subsidised year after year. Last year, I remember that the Hon. Minister of Trade stated he was not satisfied that this was the best way to do it, and as he had only been into office for a couple of months, he was agreeing with it but during the year he was going into it more thoroughly, and he had hoped to study the suggestion which came from the honourable junior member for the City whereby all sugars used for local consumption would be exempted from this tax. In other words, instead of assisting by subsidising any one grade of sugar, you should let these grades find their market value.

The Hon. Minister of Trade made no mention of that tonight, and I would like to know what are his views on that subject. I would like to know whether he feels it is better to subsidise these grades of sugar or not assist to them, and to allow them to meet their market value. That is my second question.

The \$13.20 which is set aside on every ton of sugar for this purpose is done in Barbados, but not in other colonial territories. I remember about three or four years ago, that the honourable junior member for the City drew to the attention of the Government (and that was long before we were subsidising any one grade of sugar) that we were actually taking the cess from off these sugars and putting it to the Labour Welfare Fund, and he argued that we should take the \$13.20 only off the sugar that we exported and not off the locally consumed sugar. The Government since then has decided that that money would be used for keeping one grade of sugar at 7½ cents per pound. By doing that, it is putting a strain on that grade of sugar. There is not sufficient sugar in that grade, and by December we will not have a pound of dark crystal sugar in any of the warehouses. Last year we subsidised a similar quantity; we did not start to do so before May, and by Christmas it was out of supply. This year, we will start to do so in April and naturally it will go off the shelves in November. Government is subsidising this grade of sugar so heavily that it is creating a great demand for this sugar, which is out of proportion to the other grades of sugar. I think the Government should revise its

policy on this matter in the light of what was proposed last year.

Whether Government or the Minister did not have time this year to do it or not, I would like to know tonight if the Minister has considered this matter thoroughly.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Relative to the subsidy on this sugar, it is an understood fact that the people whom you want to help are not getting this sugar as they should get it, because the small shopkeepers as well as the merchants cannot sell this sugar in great quantities; you have to buy the dark crystals and the yellow crystals at the same time. You cannot tell Mr. "A" that he is in a position to buy this sugar and he must leave the sugar sold at 8½c. a pound to those who have to buy it. As the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, these people are out of this sugar early in the year; you are only confusing the people with this subsidy when they cannot get the amount they want. I think that those who are responsible for this matter should go into it and see the amount of sugar which they will want to run through from year to year and subsidise that amount, regardless of where they get the money from. You either have to subsidise all of this sugar or none of it; rather than keep it at 7½c. a pound put it at 8½c. a pound so that the people will be able to get all they need.

This sugar is being subsidised in April and by September you will not be able to get one pound of it; these same people whom you are trying to help have to fall back on buying sugar at 10c. a pound. The Government should determine the amount of sugar which is being consumed and subsidise that amount; if you do not have the money to subsidise the sugar then you will have to get sugar from somewhere. What is the use of helping people for three months of the year and then there is no more of this sugar for them, and they have to buy expensive sugar just as other persons who are in a position to subsidise it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is a question which will show you how false is the theory of trying to subsidise something at a price which you have to admit is unrealistic. The honourable member who has just sat down is not aware of what has happened at all. You are subsidising 10,000 tons of sugar and all the sugar therefore cannot be available. The Hon. Minister said last year that he was only in office for a short period, but he would see that this system will not work this year. The system has worked worse than last year; the Hon. Minister must explain to the House how the marginal difference came and as a result you have this \$36,000, and why there is no marginal difference this year. Does the Hon. Minister know the quantity of sugar subsidised and whether it is reaching the people? Is the Hon. Minister satisfied that this island is in a position to get all the sugar which is manufactured for local consumption in this island? I can say that last year this island was in the invidious position of manufacturing sugar which you could not purchase; I mean by that, that this island was nearly left without that sugar. I would like to have some explanation as to the points I have raised; you are still tying the price of locally consumed sugar to the price of exported sugar. I want to say that the British Government should not pass any Act saying what the price of sugar should be.

8.05 p.m.

Now what are we doing in Barbados? We are manufacturing sugar; we admit that we are not paying too much wages, but at the same time

we are doing something unscientific. As I said, you are not paying too much in wages to those who work in the Sugar Industry and admitting at the same time that the Sugar Industry is making too much money, because you are subsidising something that local consumers are using. Your manufacturing costs are either too high and therefore the community cannot pay a price that can be regarded as reasonable.

There can be no political baiting in the fact that you want to provide sugar at a cheaper price. You manufacture soap here, and you subsidise soap. The housekeeper has to pay whatever price can be regarded as reasonable for soap. It is unscientific to go on with this subsidy on sugar unless you are suggesting that the price is too high, or that the manufacturing costs are too high. Are you going to have an inquiry into the Sugar Industry or are you going to continue with this subsidy each year?

The Hon. Minister talked about marginal differences. I will ask why is it that last year the Government did not collect money under this Act from the Price Stabilisation Fund? There was an old agreement that you should get 5/- a ton from Price Stabilisation. Why is it that the Government did not seek to continue the 1951-53 Agreement whereby they could collect that 5/- a ton?

I am not going into detail at this stage; I am waiting until we get into Committee. What I would like to say is that if you continue this system and you do not subsidise enough of the sugar, you will not know if the people are getting it or not. I understand that shopkeepers are mixing this sugar with other sugar and charging ten cents a pound for it; I do not really know; I only use the sugar that is put before me. I do feel that when the Government is spending this large amount of money, when they are subsidising 3,000 tons out of 10,000 at a cost of \$185,000, the Government should state whether they are satisfied that the money is being better spent in this avenue, as against if it were spent in another avenue.

If the amount of sugar consumed in the community is 10,000 tons and you are subsidising 3,000 tons, it means that you are subsidising about a third of the total amount consumed. If after spending that money you cannot supply all the people all the year, I think it would be better to spend this money by way of lending people amounts to repair their houses. If you are reducing sugar from 9½ to 7½ cents a pound, but you are reducing it for such a short period of the year, it is not going to make any difference in a man's budget; the money that you are spending on this could be more usefully spent on some other project that will benefit the worker right through and through. If you loaned \$400 to a man to repair his house, that would mean more to his budget than if he paid two cents less for sugar for a part of the year. It would be better to put this \$185,000 in the Labour Welfare Fund or some other project where you could do a greater amount of benefit. You will be doing more for the economic benefit of the community.

You are not subsidising all the sugar that everyone is eating; nor are you subsidising all the sugar all the time that the poor are eating. It might have been a good idea to start this subsidisation; but you have seen as clear as daylight that it does not mean what you thought it would mean. It means that the same people still have to spend more of their money. Everyone who goes to the shops knows that usually you have to study economic. As the honourable junior member for St.

Joseph says, when you go into a provision store to buy a bag of subsidised sugar you cannot get it unless you buy a bag of the other type. Then when a man goes to a retail shop and he wants a pound of the 7½ cents a pound sugar you cannot get it unless you buy something else. The shopkeeper is seeing that he gets off all the old things on the shelf along with the sugar. Some people have to get what they want by sending other people to buy for them in stages.

I want to know, sir, how is it that the marginal difference does not exist any longer. I would also like to know why the marginal difference was used to subsidise this local sugar last year and not the money from the fund which the honourable member says he is now using. I want to know what has become of the proposed change that the Minister was to bring before the House this year. The Minister said this Bill was delayed because he was away; we cannot accept that. We have a Government and a Legislature running this colony. Because he is away is no excuse for bringing this late, or at least, this very lame excuse. 8.15 p.m.

The Ministers must have their arrangements whereby if one Minister leaves here some other Minister can carry on the work. I wonder when a Minister leaves here whether we do not have to pay him. This is becoming a personal affair and it is not a personal affair, it is a public matter. No excuses should be given. A matter of this magnitude should have come to the House of Assembly at an earlier stage. On one occasion, the honourable junior member for the City hinted that this subsidy should have been put out by now, otherwise it would give the fictitious impression that the subsidy of this sugar was lasting longer than it really was. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a good excuse to say that because the Honourable Minister of Trade was absent from the island, therefore the things which come under his portfolio could not be done.

As I have said earlier, I do feel that there must be a different system to deal with the price of sugar for consumption locally. When Government is subsidising sugar at a price which is unrelated to the export price it is always going to get this trouble.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has a history; and it is a history which if the Government had been willing to see the error of its ways and amend the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Act, 1947, all this difficulty would have been over. It should have been amended so that the cess funds should not be collected on locally consumed sugar; we should have brought this in line with the other colonies.

If I may go a step further, that is, to say what the honourable junior member for St. Peter said, this is a locally produced item and you should fix a price for it. Do not let the sugar producers manage you. This is a scheme which the Executive Committee had some years ago; and it was pointed out to them that the only thing with which you can subsidise sugar is sugar. You depend on sugar for your revenue; therefore it is the only thing with which you can subsidise it. You are collecting a cess on sugar and trying to confine the subsidy on one grade of sugar. Government feels that if you keep one grade at 7½ cents per pound you will encourage the people to buy it. I would tell the Government that in the same way as they manufacture molasses and they equate it to sugar so as to encourage the Sugar Industry not to make all sugar but to make molasses also,

you can also do something with sugar for local consumption. You now equate sugar and molasses to the crop of the island. You get one price for the sugar which the Government of Great Britain takes from you, and you get another price for the local market and you get another price for the molasses which you sell to Canada; why cannot you add all three prices together and give all of them the same price for a ton of sugar? It certainly can be done. You have a price-fixing body and they can say what the price of sugar should be; you do not have to create another authority for doing that. All that the Government has done is to accept what somebody in the Other Place has said. The people in the other islands used to sell the sugar consumed locally for more than what they got from exporting it; therefore they are entitled to adopt another method. I think we should adopt a method which is in keeping with commonsense and fair play.

I am not in agreement with the honourable junior member for St. Peter. I do not agree with the suggestion that you should collect \$185,000 from all the people in the island so that you can lend it only to sugar workers; I think that is wrong. You collect that amount from everybody who eats sugar, therefore everybody should benefit. You should never have included the locally consumed sugar in the Labour Welfare Fund; and I remember well at the time I pointed out that you were making the workers contribute to their own labour welfare. If the Government wanted to be true to themselves, they would never do this. They got into all this trouble when the export price started to fall. When it went too high, they found themselves in difficulty with respect to charging the people for locally consumed sugar. This is a most unsatisfactory system and I sincerely hope it would be abandoned. I am sure there are persons in this island who can equate these prices; and Government should get these people to do so in order to give a true picture.

Now, sir, the honourable member for Christ Church mentioned the various items on which they collected a cess. The time for all of that is passed. Dr. Saint said that was an admirable thing to do during the war but we should cut it out now. In the first place it was illegal to do so. None of these accounts was brought to the House of Assembly so that anybody could see what was happening. This fund should have been abandoned ever since. We allowed them to collect money from the consumer and to do as they liked with it. It is time to stop all of this nonsense. All that you are doing is to make work for somebody. It is time to let everything take its course.

I hope that the Honourable Minister of Trade would see the wisdom of bringing in an amendment to the Act and cut out this cess on the local sugar and to compel factories to manufacture sugar for local consumption. I know that some of them have said that it cannot be done; but if some of them manufacture molasses and you say that 290 wine gallons of molasses are equal to a ton of sugar, then you can find a method to equate locally consumed sugar with that which you export. It only needs a little calculation; everybody would get the same for a ton of sugar, so that the factories which make sugar for local consumption would not be placed at any disadvantage. 8.25 p.m.

When the Hon. Minister was asked why this Bill was not brought in here before, he told us that it was because he was out of the island. This Bill has been brought in now when everybody knows

that when it was first introduced in the House before it was late and the next year it was later still. This is about the third or fourth year in which this Bill has been brought in, and it must be brought in late because they are only subsidising a small quantity of sugar, since they have not got enough sugar. That is the real reason for it; it is not because any Minister was out of the island. Of the three or four grades of sugar sold here you are only subsidising one grade; I am making my suggestion because from the time this thing started I have had a conflict with the Government over this method which is unique and self imposed on Barbadians.

Mr. TUDOR: What disturbs me first of all about this matter, is that I do not think the Hon. Minister can claim that very much more is to be done this year than has been done last year. From the figures it appears that this year we are going to subsidise 36,000 bags of sugar; last year we subsidised 35,849 bags and there is only a difference of 151 bags as I see it. It is within the experience of all of us that after the month of December it is very difficult to get this sugar; therefore one inescapable conclusion that you can draw is that there is not enough sugar. I was not in this House last year when this same matter came up, but I wonder whether it had been pointed out to the Government that if they had managed to fix the price at 8c. or 8½c. per pound, they might have subsidised more of this sugar. If 36,000 bags of sugar last until December, and between December and the time when the new prices are fixed people have to do without it, it can only be that another five or six thousand bags more would have met the demand until the new lot of sugar appeared in the shops. It is therefore worthwhile considering whether a few thousand bags more cannot be subsidised with the whole lot and at a slightly higher retail price. For one thing, the demand for it will not be so great, because the rush to get it would not be so great since there would be more of this sugar. If you do not consider any such scheme you are liable to run into difficulties. Since there is so little of this sugar, there is always the temptation on the part of some shopkeepers to hold it up. I do not think the Government need have had any difficulty in explaining to people what the position is; if you can tell the consumer that by raising the price of sugar you can give him more he would see the reason for this Bill, because he remembers that in November last he had to buy sugar at 10½c. a pound; or if you tell him that that is going to stop because by producing six or seven thousand bags more you give it to him at 8½c. a pound, you will be allowing him to save something. I can say at least the Government might have thought it good politics to say to people that "we have brought you cheap sugar," but they have not done that. If you let people buy sugar at 7½c. per pound for eight months and in the remaining four months of the year you have to make him purchase it at 10c. per pound, you would not have done much. In the first case you would have permitted him to buy the sugar for a longer period. 8.35 p.m.

I do not think, therefore, that this matter should be looked at from the purely political angle or from the point of view of substantiating the theory that you are doing something for the people; because the figures themselves and the experience of the consumers of sugar show that you do not help. My plea therefore is that more of it should be made available, and let the price go up another half cent. You would be able to subsidise more of it, and you would save the consumer the hardship

of having to spend an extra two and a half cents or possibly three cents in the three months of the year when he cannot get any of the subsidised sugar at all. Secondly, as long as you make less of it than is required by the people who actually consume it, you are creating a standing temptation to influential merchants to corner the most of it and hold it up.

There is no reason therefore why this sugar should not be available all the year round; it is not something that we are importing; it is something that we are making here; and it is for the Government to see what are the needs of the consumers, and when they have seen what those needs are, to say to the Sugar Producers' Association, "you have got to make so much and so of this or that kind of sugar," and that is the end of the matter.

Of course I do not know how the Minister will reply to the questions raised by the honourable members who have spoken so far. Perhaps it would be well if he could tell us who advises him on these matters. It would be interesting, I think, for us to know; and we would also like to know in addition to who advises him, what is the basis of their advice. How do they arrive, for instance, at the quantity that you should subsidise. You are subsidising this year 151 bags more than last year if my figures are correct. Why 151? Is it only because last year you ended with 35,849 and you wanted round figures; so you decided to put on an extra 151 so as to bring it to 36,000? There must be some reason.

I know of course we heard him say that they only subsidise what they can pay for. But it should be borne in mind by the Minister and his advisers that the people are capable of using more of this sugar than they are allowed to eat at the moment. I wonder if the Minister and his advisers decide that since no money can be found to subsidise the extra 5,000 or 6,000 bags necessary, they will not subsidise it.

I know that no money is taken out of the Treasury to do it; but even so there must be other funds. That is what we want to know. It may not be necessary to ask the consumers of sugar as taxpayers to subsidise the consumers of sugar. It would be interesting, and I think it would help us, if the Minister could give us a little background information as to whether he could manage to have a few thousand bags more of this sugar produced; and what effect, if any, it would have on the general sugar position if they had it sold at say, eight cents instead of at seven and a half cents a pound. I do not think there would be any revolt about it because of the advantage of getting it all the year round, which would outweigh the disadvantage of having to pay a little more for it. I think that would be more appreciated than getting it at 7½ cents a pound for nine months of the year, and then having three months of the year.

I do not think that Minister should feel nervous at all about taking that step, because the guiding principle after all is that you want all the people to get all the sugar all the year round; and any step taken to bring that boon within the reach of the people is, I think, a justifiable one, especially in view of the fact that you would not need much more sugar for the last three months for the year—possibly 5,000 to 7,000 more bags. That is the most that would be needed to allow the people to get this sugar all the year round, and there need not be any very big increase in the price.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: We have had many interesting points raised in this debate. Some of them I cannot answer off hand; others I will try my best

to answer. I also want to correct a few false impressions which may have been created by certain honourable members. The honourable junior member for St. Joseph said, (and I think the honourable junior member for St. Peter created the impression) that we were only subsidising one third of the amount required.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I said one third of the total amount manufactured for local consumption.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I had written one third of the amount required. What the honourable junior member for St. Joseph was referring to, was that we were only subsidising one third of the total amount of Brown Crystal sugar required. But our figures show that we are subsidising more than two thirds of the total amount required to last a full year. We estimate it to last nine months. In any subsidisation scheme, let us admit that the best system possible to ensure that you are benefiting all the consumers would be a rationing system. That is the only means of ensuring that it reaches all the people whom you intend to benefit.

The last honourable member in a very logical speech pointed out that if we allowed the price to go up by a half cent, we could subsidise more bags and spread it over a longer period. My reply is that I think it would be a very serious thing for us to allow the price to go up at this stage when the cost of living has risen in recent months, owing to the fact that the prices of certain goods have gone up. I do feel that it would be a very serious thing for us to allow the price of sugar to go up by another half cent, although as the honourable member said, it would mean that the people would get the sugar all the year round.

8.45 p.m.

I do realise the force of his argument; but I say again that it is a matter of timing. If the cost of living were falling, we might have considered doing it; but I did not agree to the price of local sugar rising by a half cent at this particular time.

Now, sir, I would just like to give the House these figures. If we take the levy and subsidy off these sugars, the price of the grade at 11½c. per lb. would come down by half cent; that is to 11c. per lb. and that which is sold at 10½c. per lb. would drop to 10c.; but the grade of brown crystals would rise by a whole penny, that is, it would go up from 7½c. per lb. to 9½c. per lb. It is true that the hon. junior member for the City has put up the idea of working it in the same method as we work the molasses; that is, to put on a cess to equalise the position between the factories. However, I am sure he will admit that you cannot compel a factory to sell sugar at a loss; and this scheme whereby you would put on a cess, just as you do to equalise sugar and molasses so that when the price of molasses falls the manufacturers of molasses do not lose, and alternately when it rises they do not get any more than the sugar manufacturers, would take some working out.

When the world price of molasses goes up you should have something to balance it, or when it falls, you should have something from the good years to equalise it; but if you compel local manufacturers to manufacture a sugar to sell at a lower price, you would be compelling them to operate at a loss every year. We have investigated these figures. I say again if we do away with this system, you will have to institute a very rigid system on factories and you will have to call on the Union to pay a different price to workers in the industry. [A VOICE: I will show you how it can be done. It is easier than kissing your hand.] You can do away with the

system altogether and allow the industry to have free play; but there will be no guarantee that the sugar produced will be sold at less than 9½c. per pound. I challenge any honourable member to say that he does not buy this grade of sugar and does not look for it.

In reply to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, I would just like to tell him that if we had budgeted to subsidise the full amount which would be used in a year, we would require a sum of about \$228,000. We would have to look for \$95,659. At present, we are taking from the surplus balances from trading \$54,278, but if we subsidise the full year's requirement of this grade of sugar, we would need more than \$95,000; and we do not consider that it would be wise to do so at this particular time. In fact, we cannot find the amount to subsidise a full year's requirement.

I think the honourable junior member for St. Peter will agree when I say that he has been dealing with this matter for a long time—since 1950. I have heard him argue in this House that this price must be tied to the price which is paid by the Ministry of Food, because it affects the workers and the other funds. I do not agree that the workers would welcome this money going to the Housing Fund. There is money earmarked to that Fund already, and it is a revolving fund. At this time I cannot agree that these workers would view any increase in the price of sugar by a penny a pound with equanimity. I have considered it again and again from all angles, and I think it best to continue this system especially at this time when the Cost of Living is rising.

The honourable junior member for Christ Church asked for the balance of the Fund from the Controller of Supplies. I do not have all the figures.

8.55 p.m.

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. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, 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. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am taking this opportunity to thank the Hon. Minister for the information he has given; but when I asked about the marginal difference I did not ask him to tell me what he knew about it; I wanted him to tell the Committee. The Government does not sell sugar to anybody. What he is saying is that the marginal difference is the workers' money which was used for subsidising this sugar. There is no such thing as the Government deciding to sell sugar to the Ministry of Food; the Government had an agreement with the Sugar Producers' Association. I do not want the hon. member to give the Committee the impression that this is any fund of the Government; this marginal difference is not a levy which the Government has made in this connection either. I want that point to be made crystal clear; this is an arrangement but not a levy. What I asked and what has not been answered is this: the Government might have made a levy of 5/- in connection with the Price Stabilisation Fund, and why that was not done; that was in the Government's power to do. I did not say that you should increase the price of sugar; I said that if the workers are only getting a small portion of this

money for a short period then this money could be better used in another direction. The point which was raised is that this \$185,000 could be better spent in other avenues than the amount of money which the people are getting. I would like to say that more people are asking for money to use in the Labour Welfare Funds than whom the Government is helping. I repeat: the marginal difference is not a trading arrangement with anybody; there is a trading arrangement with the Sugar Producers Association and the Ministry of Food. I would like the honourable junior member for the City to know—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is making a second reading speech.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is in connection with Clause 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can only talk about what happened in 1955.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am saying that the amount of money which was used to subsidise this sugar came from money which was not obtained from local sugar; I am pointing out that the amount of money which was used last year to help subsidise the sugar was obtained from sugar other than local sugar. That is why I asked the Hon. Minister about the levy in respect of Price Stabilisation. When we are dealing with these matters the Chairman allow more latitude in having these points raised.

Mr. GODDARD: The Hon. Minister did not reply to my question because he did not have the figures; but he said that the amount of money was substantial. If that is so, my contention is that he should have subsidised more sugar because more funds were available. However, it would still be very interesting to know how much more money he has and whether he intends keeping that Fund there for next year. We should like to know if this Fund is going to grow during the year or if it will be diminished. I also asked if there is going to be a liquidation of this Department; I would be grateful for some enlightenment as to that matter. If the honourable member cannot give us figures, he could give us an idea of the funds in the Control Department.

9.05 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I think the honourable junior member for St. Peter must have misunderstood me when I replied about the marginal difference. I did not mean to imply that we were entering into any trading arrangement.

The marginal difference amounted to \$3.67 a ton. That was added to the \$13.20 a ton because in that year we sold these sugars and got a good price. We got the currency difference from the dollar area. As I said we added this increase to the \$13.20 a ton, and those two amounts, plus the balance, provided \$180,000 odd that we had for subsidisation last year.

I hope it is not thought that we are using anything that we should not use. I made it clear that the additional money we used last year was from the 1953 crop. We could not use last year's money collected from the 1954 crop. I do not think that I would have to stress that. You collect and spend the marginal proceeds from the previous year's crop.

Now, sir, as regards what the last hon. member said, there are no funds of the Control Board implicitly or explicitly involved in this matter at all. As far as the remainder of the amount is concerned, and as far as the balance is concerned, it is there for the Government to use. We have come to a decision which the House will know about in the near future, as to how to use these funds. It seems easy to take more money and subsidise more bags of sugar; but is is a

serious thing because you may be faced with a changing situation, making it necessary to look to other methods in future years. It may be as the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has stressed that taking into account the cost of living index next year, we may have to do that. You will have to take many things into consideration; but you certainly could not envisage taking over \$200,000 to subsidise one grade of sugar.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to say that when an hon. member makes a second reading speech and does not answer satisfactorily, the only way to get the points cleared up is to wait until you go into Committee. I would like you to allow me under this section to make a few remarks. If you take off this cess and you do not use it to subsidise it will mean that the price will have to be so and so. That is a defeatist argument; that is what someone has told him. His Ministry can say what the price of sugar must be.

They do not sell all the exported sugar at one price. They sell to the United Kingdom at a guaranteed price; they sell on the open market and to places like St. Kitts, St. Lucia and such places at God knows what price. Put all the prices together and get the mean. If you can equate what you sell at a guaranteed price, what you sell on the open market and to West Indian colonies and what you sell in molasses, cannot you arrive at the mean price at which you should sell local sugar? The Hon. Minister of Trade is murmuring something; if he wants me to tell him at what price to sell, he can sell it at five cents a pound. [Hon. M. E. COX: Why not sell it at a penny a pound!] Let the Minister of Communications fix the price. No one will lose anything. The price of export sugar dropped 5/- one year and 5/- another year and no one got any less in wages. You did not collect the \$2.00 for the Deep Water Harbour, and did anyone get anything?

I do feel that we are accustomed to these questions and I am putting up a reasonable proposition. It can be done quite easily. Do not let anyone browbeat you into saying that there are difficulties in it. If you get over the first year you will see that it is as easy as ever.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, sometimes I do not know if the hon. member studies what he is saying. He is saying that if you sell to the Ministry of Food at one price and on the open market at another price you should put all the prices together and get the mean. Put what together? I have told him that we have gone into this question of fixing the price and it is not as easy as it may look. You must have some basis to work on.

Now when you are selling on the open market there is no fixed price. The only price that is fixed is that at which you sell to the Ministry of Food. You cannot therefore talk about putting prices together and then arriving at a mean. I sympathise with what the hon. member has in mind. He and I are on all fours as to the need for working out a system better than this, and at the same time guaranteeing the local price. But you have to have some basis to work on; you have to see that the manufacturers of sugar for local consumption are reimbursed in relation to the manufacturers of the sugar that is sold to the Ministry of Food. They have to pay the same price for canes and pay the same wages. It is not so easy.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There can be no such thing as a mean price when you are selling 130,000 tons at one price, 20,000 tons at another price, and 10,000 tons at another price. Has the Minister yet realised that you cannot tie local sugar to the negotiated price, because that price is higher than the price

on the free market? What you have to take is a weighted average, based on the difference between the price negotiable with the Ministry of Food and the price that you get on the free market. If you do not do that you will be asking the community to pay the higher price. As I have said you must work out a weighted average price.

9 15 p.m.

It is purely a matter that nobody has given sufficient thought to, or has really got down to the matter; because the people who manufacture sugar locally are only a few, and they feel that if you call upon them to manufacture sugar for local consumption you are not going to give them the same price as those who are manufacturing it for export. I do say that it is unscientific to subsidise sugar produced locally when you are satisfied that the local product is not too dear. I see no reason why we should not pay 9½c. per pound for dark crystal sugar. Nobody should be vexed to pay that price for it so long as they are getting their normal requirement. The reason why you said so is because we have been wedded to the idea that we cannot pay more than 7½c. per pound for sugar.

The price of sugar has fallen, and the whole point about it is that we are subsidising a market which is falling. You will be forced to limit your production in the course of time; and now that you should be thinking of limiting it, you are still subsidising a certain grade. The Cost of Living has not risen to that extent that you are trying to point out, although I am not saying that the Cost of Living is not high. I am saying that the weighted average price can be worked out. I am satisfied in my mind that the sugar producers in this island can come together and work it out, if the Government has a point of view; but the local manufacturers are not going to come and say to you that they are going to make sugar for local consumption and do not mind if they are getting the same price as those who are exporting it. If the Government is satisfied that 7½c. per pound should be the standard price of sugar sold in the island, you should see on what basis you can produce it to sell at that price.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

3 15 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I think sir, that we have had a very nice time indeed during the past few weeks. On one occasion, we sat from 12 (noon) until half past six of the morning of the next day. I think we really have earned a holiday. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 3rd May, 1955 at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I would only like to say that we will be coming in from the adjournment when cricket will be taking place at Kensington Oval.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, while I am not upholding this motion, I want to say that we were out of the services of a Messenger and Library Assistant for a very long time, and that should not be so; especially when so much unemployment is rampant. I do not feel hon. members of this House should be so long handicapped, especially when we have competent persons, one of whom can be appointed.

We want somebody to fill the shoes of the late lamented Mr. Gittens; I think we should make that appointment. It is necessary that this vacancy be filled; hon. members are being inconvenienced when they want anything done. I am asking that this matter be given attention now so that we will not have to wait until the month of May before we have that post filled.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am quite in agreement with the hon. junior member for Christ Church; there are those of us who like going to cricket and there will be no point in adjourning the House to a date when the Australians are here. I am sure that on the 3rd of May the Australians will be playing the first colony match and if I am in the body, the House will be minus one of its members. Of course I will see the cricketers next week but I want to see them in my homeland.

Mr. LEWIS: So far as the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy relative to the post of Messenger and Library Attendant, if he had come to the House earlier on at least two occasions when this matter was down for consideration he would have assisted me. When the House is about to be adjourned the hon. member is interested but he does not come early; perhaps if he had been here earlier he would have helped me. Nobody has a proprietary right in this matter and therefore it should not await the arrival of the Premier or anybody else. The most junior member of this House could be in charge of this matter.

I am going to play a very big role on this occasion; I am wondering if it would not be better for this House to meet either on the 19th or the 26th of next month and then adjourn during the Cricket Tournament. If we are going to adjourn from now until the 3rd May we may not have a quorum, which would be nonsense. Let us have a holiday. I beg to move as an amendment that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 26th April, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am accepting that amendment; I really did not realise that the Cricket Tournament was commencing so early.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 26th April, 1955, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.30 p.m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th April, 1955.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. HAYNES, F. L. WALCOTT and BRYAN entered the House and took their seats.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:—

Statement of accounts of the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation for the year ending the 30th June, 1954.

Also Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended the 31st March 1955, from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. Philip.

Also Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 31st March this year from the Commissioners of Highways of St. Philip in connection with tenantry roads.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor, Papers were laid as follows:

Hon M. E. COX, for the Premier: Report of the Department of Education for the year ended on the 31st August, 1953.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the year ended 31st December, 1953.

Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to the 31st March, 1955.

Statements showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the periods ended on the 30th September and 31st December, 1954, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 28th February 1955.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) Regulations 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX for Minister of Social Services: Reports of the Registrar of Friendly Societies for the half years ended 30th June 1951, 31st December 1951, 30th June 1952, and 31st December 1952.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Report on Work and General Use of the "Investigator" from the time of launching to the 30th June 1954.

Statement from the Barbados General Agricultural Society regarding the appropriation of the Legislative Grant for the year 1954.

Bulletin No. 21 of the Department of Science and Agriculture: "The Yield of Sugar Cane in Barbados in 1954."

Hon. M. E. COX: Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to the 28th February, 1955.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Reply to Question No. 7 regarding the erection of Standpipes and the laying of water mains in St. George.

Hon. M. E. COX, for the Premier: Reply to Question No. 12 regarding the pay of the Unestablished Staff at Bowmanston Pumping Station.

Hon. M. E. COX: Reply to Question No. 23 regarding an Aided Self-Help Housing Scheme for St. Andrew.

Hon. M. E. COX, for the Premier: Reply to Question No. 26 regarding the provision of Standing Counsel for the Speaker of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX, for the Premier: Reply to Question No. 28 regarding the employment of the Road Inspector of St. Joseph.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX for the Premier: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled the "Income Tax (Amendment) Regulations, 1955."

Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with the present holder of the office of Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital to undertake Plastic Surgery.

Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve in the Department of Medical Services in the office of Medical Officer of Health.

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,793 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56 No. 1 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$14,431 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56 No. 3 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax in respect of deductions from salary and wages.

Bill to amend the Anglican Church Act, 1911.

Mr. Alder entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Private Members' Notices were given as follows:
Mr. MILLER: Of the following address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly is of the firm opinion that the United Nations Universal Declaration of the Human Rights should be given the immortality it deserves in the minds of the people of Barbados by making the Articles of the Declaration one of the principal themes of our educational system.

The House further feels that the Government should demonstrate its acceptance of the Declaration as the charter of the basic rights and fundamental freedoms to which all men are entitled by adopting the suggestion of the United Nations' General Assembly and honouring the 10th December, the anniversary of its adoption and proclamation as Human Rights Day.

The House is of the further opinion that in order that the full significance and purpose of the Day should be appreciated by all peoples, the Government should sponsor a programme for making the articles of the Declaration and their meaning known by inviting the educational authorities to arrange that all schools and colleges should hold special efforts to mark this Day; by enlisting the aid of local authorities and non-governmental organisations in planning official ceremonies, exhibitions, study groups or other appropriate functions for celebrating the day; by obtaining posters, pamphlets, filmstrips and other literature obtainable from the United Nations Headquarters for distribution; and by inviting the local Press, Radio and Cinemas to carry special Human Rights features in their programmes that day.

The House feels, too, that the influence of this Declaration should be reflected in the future legislation of the Island.

Mr. TUDOR: Of the following addresses:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

1. The House has not, as yet, received any convincing reason for the existence of the Revenue Equalisation Act, 1952. Moreover, it believes the

Act to be wrong in principle and harmful in its application.

2. Furthermore, the House questions the wisdom of a policy of extensive overseas investment of Public Monies, a policy which aggravates the unemployment situation at home, and increases the resources of better off communities at the expense of our own.

3. Accordingly the House respectfully requests Your Excellency to send down Legislation both designed to Repeal the Revenue Equalisation Act and to regulate and control the Investment of Public Monies.

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

1. The House wishes to draw to Your Excellency's attention the desire of a large number of Government Employees to have the Cost-of-Living allowances added on to their basic salaries as a permanent feature.

2. Accordingly the House respectfully requests Your Excellency to send down the Legislation necessary to give effect to this desire.

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

1. The House, views with grave disquiet the reluctance of the Government to establish a Hot Meals Scheme for children in Elementary Schools, and is firmly of the opinion that such a Scheme would greatly increase the health of the children of this island.

2. The House therefore urges upon Your Excellency the need for such a Service, even a limited one, and thus respectfully requests that detailed proposals be submitted to the Legislature for its approval.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of Order. With reference to the first Address of which Notice has been given by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, I think that the honourable member has the right to introduce a Bill to repeal the Act which is on the Statute Book. To entertain that Address, is in my submission, to make us feel that we have lost that right. The honourable member is at liberty to introduce a Bill to repeal the Act, and the Address is to my way of thinking out of order. I merely say that for Your Honour's consideration.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to give Notice of my intention to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes at the next meeting to discuss a matter of very grave importance relative to the acquisition of land at Colleton Plantation, St. John and the difficulties that are being experienced as a result of the delay. I prefer to give the Minister responsible, an opportunity of getting the necessary information for the discussion.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which I have given notice earlier.

QUESTIONS

The following notices of questions were given:—

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Minister of Education:—

1. Will Government state why the Governing Body of Combermere School is still without its full complement of members?

2. Will Government (a) state the reason for this surprising departure from custom and from law, and (b) take immediate steps to appoint the number of persons required to fill the vacancies?

3 Will Government also state why certain persons, hitherto serving on the Governing Bodies, both of Combermere and St. Michael's Girls' Schools, are now serving on one Governing Body and not on the other?

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Premier:—

Is the Minister aware of the fact that since September 1954, there have been no admissions to the Preparatory Form at Combermere School?

If the answer is "yes" will the Minister say whether this was done,

- (a) at his own direction, or
- (b) on the Governing Body's Authority, or
- (c) on the Headmaster's initiative.

If the answer is "no" will the Minister take steps to have that Form re-established at this School?

Mr. MILLER: To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries:—

1. Will the Minister be prepared to recommend that legislation be introduced to make tuberculosis in cattle and other domestic animals a notifiable disease and will the Minister cause a campaign to be initiated enlisting the assistance of all practising veterinarians in the Island, by means of which all cattle in this Island would be tested with a view to the complete eradication of this malady?

Mr. MILLER: To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries:—

In view of the fact that, in spite of the efforts being made by the Government to improve the strains of cattle as milk-producers in the Island, many individuals, especially in the country districts, still breed to unsuitable bulls, will the Minister be prepared to introduce the appropriate legislation to require registration of all bulls, with a view to eliminating all unsuitable bulls?

Mr. MILLER: To enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries:—

In keeping with the Government's policy in improving the strain of pigs in the Island, will the Minister be prepared to introduce the appropriate legislation to authorise the Department of Agriculture to exchange suitable pedigree and graded Boars for any unsuitable boars at present being used for service by any individuals, making good any differences, the unsuitable stock being handed over to Government institutions for use as meat?

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to this last question, a little change is necessary. I think the question should end at the word "individuals."

Mr. MILLER: Very well, Sir.

Mr. MILLER: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:—

Will the Minister state why the Communal bath which has been erected near the parish Church of Saint George has not been made available for use by the Public?

Mr. MILLER: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:—

1. Is the Minister aware that the section of the playing-field at Ellerton in the parish of Saint George which is used by the Cricket Club has been rendered unserviceable as a result of an attempt to level it?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Minister take the necessary steps to bring this playing field back into use?

Mr. F. E. MILLER: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works & Housing:—

In view of the urgent need of the residents of Woodland Tenantry, Jehovah Jirah, Cole Hole,

Campion Castle, Windsor and South District, in the parish of Saint George, will the Minister give immediate consideration to the installation of water services in these districts?

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry & Labour:—

1. Is Government aware that acute dissatisfaction still exists among displaced coopers with respect to their grants from the Molasses Fund?

2. Is Government also aware that many coopers from the Parishes of St. Lucy and St. Peter have not yet received the money to which they are entitled?

3. Will Government state (a) the amount of money remaining to be paid into the Fund, (b) how this sum has been arrived at, and (c) how many more coopers it is proposed to pay?

4. Will Government also state how it is proposed to administer this Fund in the future?

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: To enquire of the Minister of Health and Social Services:—

1. Will Government state how many pigs were sold from the Mental Hospital Farm in 1954?

2. Will Government state (a) the number of purchases and (b) the prices charged and paid for such pigs.

3. Will Government also state how many pigs were slaughtered for consumption within the Institution during the same period.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, the Bill to amend the Law relating to Income Tax in respect of deductions from salary and wages was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma, the Bill to amend the Anglican Church Act, 1911 was read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Trade to deal with Order No. 1.
3.45 p.m.

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

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING RE ST. JOSEPH HIGHWAYS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House with respect to Order No 13 which is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to make provision for the payment of pensions out of the General Revenue of the island to certain former employees of the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. Joseph, honourable members will remember that on the last occasion, when the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works began to move the second reading of this Bill, the point was raised as to whether it was a private Bill and that if it were a private Bill it should be submitted to the customary procedure laid down in respect of private Bills. I have had time to re-consider the point and I maintain that this Bill in its nature is a private Bill. However, I must point out that the Minister who is in charge of it would be in a rather awkward position to introduce a petition to this House seeking permission to have this Bill initiated.

The Rules, usages and customs of this Chamber do not make any provision for dealing with Bills which I might interpret as "Hybrid" Bills, therefore I refer back to many precedents by which such Bills have been accorded in this Chamber the status of Public Bills and have been dealt with accordingly.

I therefore rule that this Bill be treated and proceeded with as a Public Bill.

AMENDMENTS TO WAGES COUNCIL BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Labour may proceed with Order No. 1: to move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill relating to the Establishment of Wages Councils.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, these amendments which the Other Place made to this Bill are, for the most part, minor amendments particularly of a clerical nature. Honourable members will have noticed that by reading the various amendments; I need not go through these amendments *seriatim* because the most of them as I have said, are minor ones. The only amendments of any substance are the addition of Clause 20 which makes it an offence to disclose information given to a Wages Council except with the written consent of the person who furnished that information, and Sub-clauses 2 and 3 of Clause 22. Those are the only amendments of any substance and I am asking the House to agree with these amendments which do not differ from the former Bill which was passed by this House. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, these amendments must be discussed. The Hon. Minister says that these amendments are in order and they are merely typographical. I am moving that we go into Committee on these amendments so that I can speak more freely on them. I am not agreeing with these amendments at all; what the honourable member says about the addition of Clause 20 would apply to anyone who does not understand what the Act means. This Wages Council is to take the place of the Wages Board; the Other Place has inserted a new paragraph which reads as follows:—

"Any person who, being a member of a Wages Council or at or concerned in any proceedings of a Wages Council, discloses any information or the contents of any document which had been furnished to such Wages Council, except with the written consent of the person who furnished information or the document and of the Council, shall be liable on conviction by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding \$100 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or to both such fine and such imprisonment."

This Wages Council is to take the place of a normal Conciliation Board; by this amendment if you ask an employer what wages he pays that information is to be regarded as information which cannot be disclosed. Imagine my representing a Trade Union! Somebody goes to a Wages Council and he cannot tell the Union what is the information connected with the wages which an employer proposes to pay. If he discloses that information he would be subject to imprisonment. For the Hon. Minister that does not mean anything; I say this is the guts of the whole matter. If any member of the Wages Council discloses any information he receives he is liable to a fine unless he gets written permission to disclose this information.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the first reading of these amendments and I do not think I should allow any debate on the first reading. The honourable member should speak on the second reading of the amendments.

The question that these amendments be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that these amendments be now read a second time. I would

like to correct the honourable junior member for St. Peter in saying that I said these amendments do not mean anything. What I said was that the amendments were minor ones; and the only one which made an important change in the Bill is the amendment to which he is referring. We would like to see this Bill put on the Statute Book; there are people who are waiting on it; for those reasons we are asking the House to agree with these amendments.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will repeat what I said. The Hon. Minister stated that some of these amendments were of a minor nature and the only comment he made was in connection with Section 20. These are fundamental changes which the Hon. Minister has accepted; and I am asking if he is aware of what these changes really mean; they are so fundamental in character that I cannot agree to them. You do not set up a Statutory Board except there is the case where there is no representation in the industry. What organisation could agree that you should go to a Board meeting and say that the information you are getting from that meeting is information which you cannot disclose to your principal? We ask an employer to submit information, but that information cannot be disclosed to the Union of which you are a representative! This will mean that no worker's representative can disclose anything unless he gets written permission from the employer; if you cannot pay more wages, there is nothing wrong in telling the public that you cannot pay anything more. I was not here when the Wages Councils Bill was passed, but this does not mean anything to the industrial position in the island. In the main industry of this island there are at present comprehensive agreements; they are some who are scattered about who will be regarded as marginal people who want representation, and there is no medium through which they can be represented. If you want to put something in the Statute Book you should put something which would not meet with any general objection.

I do not see how the Government could come with an offensive Clause like this which strikes at the root of what a Trade Union has to try to preserve — the getting of information, and not only confidential information, but information which should be made public. I say that because the reason why a Conciliation Board meeting is secret, is that the public should not know what is going on at the time you are discussing a particular matter; but with this particular amendment a Trade Union Representative will not be able to tell his union or the Union's Council what the employers are saying.

This Bill has to deal with wages, conditions of employment, superannuation schemes etc. This section is not copied from the English Act; this is a local idea. I want to know why the Minister has come to this House asking them to accept an idea that is so foreign to our taste, and which is opposite to what the Wages Councils set out to do. The purpose of the Wages Councils, is to carry out certain activities in industries, the workers of which industries are not members of a Trade Union.

What is the sort of information that you will get? It will be wishy-washy information about employers who should pay girls \$7 a week and who only pay them \$5 a week, and when they have to dismiss them they will have to pay them \$100 in back pay. That is the sort of information you will get. What are we agreeing to? I cannot understand how the Minister could put this forward as a Labour

Minister. I cannot understand how the Minister could ask us to agree to this so as to get the Bill on the Statute Book.

This strikes at the workers more so than anyone else. All the employers know what one another make in a general way. They do not worry, because they are not going to pay much more; they agree to pay low wages. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew is talking in an aside about carrying information down Broad Street; why can you not carry that information down Broad Street on display? The workers business can be displayed; their wages can be known to the world so that they can be sued, but the employers' business must be sacrosanct. What is the fundamental difference between my knowing your profits and you knowing my wages? If you do not have the ability to pay, the world should know it. This is a new section. The Old Bill had 23 clauses, and this will make 24; this is an insertion. If the Minister realises that it is something foreign to his nature he should not have put it in. No Trade Unionist could agree with this; this information should not be anything secret. It is nonsense to talk about accepting this amendment of the Other Place so as to get the Bill passed.

I want to know what the Government intends to do about these amendments; if Government intends that they must be passed we will have to go into Committee. I cannot see the House agreeing with an amendment like the one which we are discussing. It is a retrograde thing; it is not in the English Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: After the amendments have been read a second time and the question is put that they be agreed to, someone can make a motion that the amendments be further amended.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, for the relatively short time which I have had the privilege of being a member of this Chamber, it has not been my experience that the members of the Government were known to accept any amendment put forward by the Other Place no matter how obnoxious and inimical to the interest of the working class these may be. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, the present members who grace the Ministerial Benches resent not only constructive suggestions put forward by members on the floor of the House, but also accept with subservience any amendments which come down from the Other Place. It is another indication that neither the members of the Other Place or the Hon. Ministers themselves have made a detailed study of the nature of this Act which we passed in this place and to which these amendments have now been made.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy, I encourage and I solicit the attention of the Hon. Minister of Labour to study the provisions of the Wages Council Act as passed by this House itself; and he will see that his acceptance or his failure to criticise or to make any reservations about the amendments placed before us today, must be symptomatic of the failure on his part to acquaint himself with the reasons of the Bill. I say that for the very reason that the Wages Council Act makes a slight departure from the provisions in the 1945 English Wages Council Act which has been used as a precedent for this Act, in that they have laid it down that before any Wages Council order must be made the proposals must be published, and by publication I mean published not only for the benefit of the members of the particular trades or calling, but published for the benefit of the public.

I would refer the Hon. Minister of Trade to Section 7 of our Act and the equivalent section of the English Wages Council Act. One deviation made by our Act from the English Act is that the

English Act says that the proposals must be published by the Wages Council itself. Our Act says that before the Wages Council Order is made, the fact that the Order is going to be made, the Order must be published by the Executive Committee. Now, I invite the Hon. Minister of Labour to read the English Wages Council Act of 1945 as amended, and to read Section 7 of our Act. Whether he chooses to reply now or to wait until Saturday to reply to what I have drawn to his attention, I want him to say whether what I am saying is not correct. In the United Kingdom before the proposals become binding on the respective parties, they must be published. Here in this amendment, we are invited by the Other Place to make illegal something which our Act in an indirect fashion (not in a direct fashion as the English legislation) says must be done when the Order has been made by the Executive Committee; that is, that the details must be published for the benefit of members of the public.

What is the purpose of a Wages Council Order? The purpose of a Wages Council is to provide the machinery for negotiations in those trades where adequate machinery does not already exist; such as in trades and occupations which come under the catering profession: domestic servants and such who were overlapping in the catering trades and kindred organisations of that kind, which are too anamolous and difficult to organise. I would like to know from the Honourable Minister of Labour if by his acquiescence to these amendments he means to say that the details put before a Wages Council are so secretive in nature that members of the public should not see whether the employees or employers on the other hand are getting a fair deal or not. I say that for the very reason that the rationality of the Wages Council is to see that these trades which are not substantially organised, and which are not in a position to provide machinery for negotiations would be able to provide that machinery whereby they could arrive at decisions which would be in the interest of the particular trade or calling, and in order to give a full light, publicity would have to play on the decisions of any Wages Council. Moreover, I am submitting that for one to say that a member of a particular organisation cannot after a Wages Council meeting release a statement on behalf of his organisation to the Press as to what their proposals are, is a direct contradiction of the whole spirit and terms of the Act which we have already passed. I would go further and say that the amendment proposed by the Other Place is a direct reflection on Section 7 of this Act. We cannot pass Section 20 as proposed by the Other Place without repealing Section 7.

I would also like to point out to the Honourable Minister of Labour that the English Act says that the full details must be published before it can be even put forward as something binding on the respective parties. Sir, I do not think I should say anything more on that score; but I do think that the Government is all too willing to accept any amendment by the Other Place for the sake of a compromise, especially in instances such as this where the amendments are not in the interest of the working class or the people of this country in general.

Sir, I for one cannot support this amendment sent down by the Other Place—Section 20. I for one do not consider that it is in the interest of the people in this country to have a section such as this insinuated into the provisions of this Act.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In reply to the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I think he is guilty

of misinforming this House when he states that even the Wages Board Act did not have this provision.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I make an apology to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker. I meant to say that it had in this provision but it did not run as far as this.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I am not defending the present amendment put forward by the Other Place; but the honourable member should know that often in this House we have adopted the procedure of passing amendments by the Other Place even though we do not agree with those amendments; but in order to get the Bill on the Statute Book we accept those amendments and later on we come down with a Bill taking out the objectionable amendment and restoring the Act to the former manner as passed by the House before the Other Place amended it. That has happened often in the past and the honourable member knows that. It is only because this Bill is of pressing necessity, (and it is important to have this Bill passed as quickly as possible) that I am asking this House to agree to these amendments. 4.15 p.m.

And if the dangers of passing this amendment were as serious as has been stressed by the honourable junior member for St. Peter who is in a position to know about matters concerning labour relations, then his attitude would be a correct one; that is to say, do not let us agree with this amendment. The Wages Board Act has this same provision and it was not the dreadful weapon he said that this amendment would be. We all know that machinery such as the Wages Board and the Wages Councils do not go as far as we would like; but that is because the workers are not organised; so you should go further to have the means whereby a body could meet with employers to bargain for conditions of work. The danger of disclosing information really arises when machinery like this breaks down altogether. The workers must either join a Trade Union body, or go on as they have been going on; when the point arises at which you want to reveal information and fight, when that point arises, then the machinery breaks down altogether. Although the principles of the honourable junior member for St. Peter might be alright in theory, yet in practice it is not so; I ask the honourable member to face the logic of that situation. In effect we are not putting workers to any great disadvantage by agreeing to this amendment on the understanding that we will come back down with a Bill restoring the position to what it was before.

I can only say that I hope this House will not be led away to an exaggeration of the dangers of this Clause. The honourable junior member for St. Peter is simply exaggerating the position; the honourable member has not seen fit to come in the past with a Bill to amend the Wages Board Act wiping out that provision years ago, because the situation has not yet arisen.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I object to that statement. The honourable member knows that I do not believe in the Wages Board at all; the honourable member should say what I told him when we were discussing this Bill.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am just stating a fact. If the dangers the honourable member is talking about were so real that they would interfere with the normal working of the Boards, he would have seen fit to come in with a Bill to wipe them out. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not believe in them.] Well what is the point in saying that these amendments should be thrown out? The

Government believes in Wages Board because every worker who is not organised should have a provision such as this. In every country you set up some machinery where workers can bargain; therefore it is of no use saying that you do not believe in Wages Boards. What about the workers who are not organised? Should they be left out in the cold? It is of no use arguing first principles. It has been found necessary to do so in advanced countries like the United States of America and other big countries, and it is not strange that we have to follow suit in this island. It is purposeless to argue on first principles; by accepting this amendment the House can rest assured that it is not endangering the position of the workers to such an extent that we will be closing our eyes to any fundamental principle in which we believe. With that assurance that we will return to this House with a Bill to wipe out that particular Clause, I am asking the House to agree with this amendment and let us have this Act on the Statute Book.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that these amendments be now agreed to.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Honourable Minister talks about arguing first principles; if he wanted to be truthful to this House, he would have said that from the beginning—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I object to the honourable member saying if I wanted to be truthful. 4.25 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will repeat what I said: if the Hon. Minister wanted to be truthful—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member said "if."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: What is the inference? Let him phrase it better.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the honourable member wanted to be truthful—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is disorder. The honourable senior member for the City is breaking the Rules of the House by standing in the corridor.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the honourable member wanted to be truthful he will remember that before anything about this Bill was published, the attitude of our Barbados Workers' Union was that the Union was not in favour of Wages Councils, but if the Government was sending the Bill down they would not make any objection. When the Minister says today that I should have done something about the Wages Board, I want to say that that does not answer the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this point I would say that I do not see that there is any need to say "if the honourable member wanted to be truthful."

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister started to talk about falsehoods. He inferred that I was trying to give a false impression. When the Hon. Minister spoke about Wages Boards I was the one to get up and make an apology. I said that it was in the Wages Board Act but that it did not go as far as the present amendment has gone. The honourable member talked about falsehoods as if I were trying to introduce an argument that should not be introduced. The honourable member knows that I have been against the Wages Councils or Boards for years; there is no question of my having acquiesced in anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if it was the best thing to use the phrase, "if the honourable member wanted to be truthful."

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Then I will use the statement "without any doubt," because the statement which the honourable member made would leave people in doubt as to my position. If the Government intended to have this amendment in, why is it that the Hon. Minister said in his opening speech on the Bill that the Bill was something new, and that it was a model Bill dealing with recommendations from the Colonial Office? If this is a model Bill, is not the honourable member saying that this Clause was left out in the model Bill?

The Hon. Minister is suggesting that because the provision was in the Wages Board Act there is no great harm in its being in this Act; but the Wages Council Act is different from the Wages Board Act. You will find that the Wages Board Act was enacted in a day when in this island there was no Trade Union organisation; and such an Act was introduced to take the place of Trade Unions. The Wages Council Act is to provide for workers who are not organised in Trade Unions.

The honourable member talked about going on a platform with information. When you go to a Wages Council the information that you require is information on an industry in general. You do not enquire what Mr. John Brown or Mr. Harry James is paying. Names are not supplied; the information that you require is how much money is being paid out in industry in Roebuck Street for instance.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I am rising to a point of information. I am saying that since I have been in the House this is the first time that I have seen honourable members speak more than once on a matter with Your Honour in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter is now speaking on a separate motion that these amendments be agreed to.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I thank you for your explanation, sir.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is surprising that a member who has been here in the war years has taken 15 years to find out that a member having spoken on one motion can speak also on any additional motion that is made. What I want to point out is, that this prevents workers' representatives from representing them properly. What I am saying is that Clause 20 should not be in the Bill at all; it does not make this Bill workable. It restricts the action of the representatives of workers who go on these Wages Councils, because if you get information and you disclose it, you are subject to a fine. My suggestion is that this Clause 20 be deleted. I beg to move that these amendments be accepted with the exception of Clause 20.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I have already given the House the assurance that if this House accepts these amendments, later on the Government is going to bring down a Bill to wipe out this particular section. Mr. Speaker, the last honourable member who spoke seems to feel that this is an amendment by Government. [A VOICE: I did not say so.] Sir, the actual Bill which this House passed did not contain this amendment. [A VOICE: And why did you accept it?] The honourable member has asked why we accepted it; I have already told this House that this machinery is needed very much in this island today. This clause does not endanger the worker; it has not prevented the Wages Board from

functioning. I say again that hotel workers and unorganised workers are waiting on this Bill. There is absolutely no danger in passing this Bill with this amendment; and to say that we are doing something fundamentally to endanger the workers is not true. The honourable member knows that when you want to force the hands of employers that you must go before a Trade Union. Workers have come to realise that the only machinery that can be forcibly employed is the machinery of a Trade Union; but there are workers who are difficult to organise and who are unorganised, and we would be short-sighted if because the Other Place has gone back to a position which obtains under the Wages Board Act, we allowed that to prevent us from putting something of this nature on the Statute Book to help those workers. I again repeat that this amendment is not as dangerous as the honourable member is saying; I hope the House will agree with these amendments. I again give the assurance that we will bring in a Bill to amend this section as soon as something is put on the Statute Book.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am still at a loss to know why the Hon. Minister of Labour should be asking for the retention of this clause which is not a Government amendment, which is not vital to the Bill itself, and which is at the same time repugnant to the whole idea of conciliation for which he is arguing. It must be understood by the Hon. Minister that this is an amendment which comes from the Other Place and it has been put into the Bill making the Bill, so to speak bigger, because it is a separate clause. It bears no relevance so far as any of us can see to anything that has come before or anything which comes after. It has been inserted into the Bill as an afterthought and purely for penal reasons. I was interested to hear the first remarks which the Hon. Minister of Labour made about it. I gathered from him, (and I do not want to misquote him) that he himself was not too happy about this clause and he has since told us that he is anxious to get the Bill passed because the people are waiting on it. I have no doubt that the people are waiting on it; but that is no argument for bad legislation. If the interests of the people are really canvassed and looked after, it will be seen that they do not want bad legislation but good one; therefore, Mr. Speaker, the task of the Minister should be an easy one. He should say to us that he is uncomfortable about this amendment. It has been put in by the Other Place without reference to anything at all to what is in the Bill and it is completely ruinous to the letter and spirit of the Bill. It injects into the Bill an element of revenge, of penalty, and a harsh element which is disagreeable to its spirit.

He could say this to us: the House need not think that by rejecting this Clause that the Bill will suffer in any way, as indeed it cannot; it cannot suffer because the House is still aware of the fact that this particular amendment is none of its own doing. It is not an extension of a Clause which already existed; it has not been put in by the Other Place to make something already in the Bill more explanatory; it has just been stuck in as a separate Clause and it is repugnant not only to common-sense but to the interest of the worker as such. I entirely reject the argument that an amendment coming from the Other Place must be accepted not because it is good, not because it fits smoothly into the context of a Bill, but because if you do not pass it they are likely to send it back to you and we are likely to have a tug-of-war with them. I do not know that this is the first occasion that a tug-of-war on a matter of principle is going on between this

House and the Other Place, and it will not be the last. I am not convinced that the Minister has a case; he argues that because people are waiting for the machinery in this Bill we have to pass any amendment sent in by the Other Place. After all, if the Minister is arguing so strongly for an amendment which is not of his own composition and which makes him feel unhappy, how much more strongly would you expect him to argue for a Government amendment? He could scarcely be more convinced in what he was saying. I reject that contention entirely; I want to make it clear that this particular amendment is one which is not vital to the Bill as such; it could be left out, it could be rejected and it ought to be impressed upon the Minister that members of this House are disturbed by this one-sidedness.

Why should the Minister appeal to us to pass this Bill with this amendment which we dislike on the ground that the passing of it brings the Act into operation earlier; and at the same time why does he refuse to tell us that he wishes us to reject this amendment since it forms no part of the Government's policy? This is not a Government amendment but an amendment put in by the Other Place and the Minister and the supporters on that side are perfectly within their right to tell this House that since they are not in agreement with it, they are not having it at all cost. From the speeches made in this House, notice would be served on the Other Place that we do not look too kindly on amendments which are not necessary or which do not strengthen Bills in any way and which are only contentious and one-sided. I think that ought to be made clear to the Other Place; the Minister has not convinced me and as a matter of fact, I heard him say that the amendment itself does not interfere in any way with the interest of the worker. That of course is debatable; but I would have thought that in matters like this where there is a doubt that a bit of legislation or a Clause in a Bill would militate against the cause of the worker, the thing to do would be to give the worker the benefit of that doubt.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of Order. I am sure the honourable member did not hear me say that. I drew attention to the Wages Board Act which does not prevent workers from getting an increase in their wages; the workers are waiting on this Bill and I gave the assurance as we have done in the past, that we will return with a Bill and restore the Act to its former position. But do not let us postpone this matter any further.

Mr. TUDOR: Could the Minister be really serious? Fancy he says that if we pass this Bill as amended here, accepting these amendments, and he finds out that the dangers to which we are drawing his attention are in fact present, he will bring back a Bill to the House and ask us to take it out.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I gave a definite assurance as to what we would do; I have not made anything conditional. We have done it on former occasions. I ask the House not to take the risk of having this legislation thrown out. Honourable members who meet these workers' representatives should be aware of this fact. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is a joke].

Mr. TUDOR: Again the Minister has strengthened my contention in what he has said. If at any time he has to bring back this Bill to this House so as to get this Clause about which we are now complaining repealed, it would have strengthened and substantiated what we are now telling him. If we feel doubtful about an amendment which is not

of his own making and which he feels uncomfortable about, we are asking him to carry his discomfiture to the extent of having this amendment deleted. Let us see how uncomfortable he is; let him carry the disturbance and anxiety to the extent of having this amendment out. As a Minister he should not put himself in that position of appearing to be bullied by the Other Place; this House has a right of its own in matters of legislation, and it should not be said that you must accept bad amendments in order to get any Bill at all on the Statute Book. When that has happened, we will have to raise the question of our relationship with the Other Place in the Legislature of this island.

I wish to impress upon the Minister that we are arguing on points he has made; and it is his own argument which has strengthened us. He admits that the amendment is not vital; he also admits that if anything happens after it has become law and our prophecies come right, he will bring it back to us and have the Clause which we are now complaining about taken out. If the Minister has those important reservations about this Clause that is sufficient to put a sense of caution in him and to make him take out this amendment.

As regards the other points raised by the honourable senior member for St. George and the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I take it that the Minister is well aware that legislation such as this becomes necessary if workers are not organised. I think he admits that that is well known, so that there is no need to labour that point.

4.55 p.m.

I will only add that that being the case, you have no right to put penal clauses in legislation which you hope will be on a temporary basis; since you are admitting that this Bill is only a substitute for the real thing which is Trade Union representation, and that the Bill is a temporary measure to ease the situation which exists because the workers are not properly organised. If you put in penal clauses you are not helping the workers, but possibly the employers; and secondly you are not hastening the day when you will not have to do these things because then you will be properly organised and represented.

I cannot say too strongly that I oppose the inclusion of this amendment; not merely because it comes from the Other Place, but because it is of such a nature that it is frankly one-sided and designed to give effect to the point of view which is very prevalent in this island: that only people with a lot of power and authority at their command should have a lot of protection while those who are weaker cannot have it. Although this Clause says that no one who is a member of a Wages Council or who is present at or concerned in any proceedings of a Wages Council can disclose certain information, I think it would be found in practice that the people who will be prosecuted and penalised under this particular Clause will be almost exclusively workers or their representatives.

I would also say that the Minister in arguing on it has weakened his case by telling us that he is not happy about it. The third reason why I do not like it is because the Minister in trying to strengthen his case, weakened it further by saying that if things turn out badly and the Clause becomes a burden to the people he wishes to help, he will come back to this House and ask that the Clause be removed. In any piece of legislation which a Government is introducing, and the Government is prepared to state firstly that it is unhappy about it, secondly that it does not know what effect it will have, and thirdly that if it has a bad effect on the people it is introduced to help it will be repealed, are the three reasons

why this particular bit of legislation should not be passed.

For those reasons sir, I have no hesitation in casting my support on the side of those who wish this Clause deleted. It is obnoxious, repugnant and unnecessary.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the argument of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has refreshed my memory. It has made me to recall that I was one of those members representing workers on the first Wages Board established in this island, and I cannot remember any provision like the one in this Clause being in existence then. I cannot remember anything like a penal clause being in existence. I am one of those people who believe that it is because of all these penal clauses that you have the jail overflowing with people. I am supporting the contention of those members who are clamouring to have this Clause deleted. I hope that the Minister of Labour will accept the suggestion that it be deleted.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologise to the Minister of Labour for speaking after him. I rise to say that in fairness to him we should accept what he said as meaning that he intends to take this Clause out in the future, whether it works a hardship or not. I want to make that clear so that he himself will remember that those are the conditions under which he said he would take the Clause out.

I would like to ask if any breach of the Clause in the previous Bill ever took place. If it has not, I suppose that the argument will be that no one disclosed information because it was stated that you could not do it and the penalty was there. It has been drawn to my attention that the previous Act was not only a Wages Board Act, but a War-time Wages Board Act. The argument of the Minister which I disliked is that we are running a risk in either by having it deleted or not having it on the Statute Book at all. I feel if you have a model Bill and the clause is not in it, and it is not in the English Act, we should not put it in here at all. Members of the Other Place are always saying that you should copy things from the Mother Country; and perhaps that argument will appeal to them.

It appears to me as if amendments in the Other Place have become matters of bargaining between the Government and the Other Place; that is dangerous. It appears to me that the Government is bargaining with the Other Place using one Bill against another. This Bill might have some relation with another one that is being discussed. My view is that if legislation which is in the interest of the people meets with our approval and is in accordance with our convictions, we should not bow to anything.

You do not expect any Trade Unionist to like this Bill. This is an anti-Trade Union Bill; it is a sop to workers who do not want to organise and who will never organise because they say they can rely on this particular legislation. If workers refuse to organise they should pay the penalty of not organising. A Trade Union wants to see Trade Unionism going; but this Bill tells workers that if they do not want to organise, there is no need to worry because this legislation will look after them. Wages Councils will be set up with employers on one side and representatives of workers on the other, and he will get jail if he brings out information.

5.05 p.m.

You cannot expect a Trade Unionist to be in love with this Bill; this is a capitalist's Bill. Sir, I do not like the expression that the Other Place delays legislation. Many a time, members of this House have to thank the Other Place for something

it has done for legislation by way of amendment. We have to thank the Other Place for a few things it has done by way of amendment to this particular Bill. I would like hon. members to know that I dislike the idea of kowtowing to the Other Place.

If this is something which we think is right we should follow it; but if we think it is something which would militate against the successful operation of the Bill, we should cut it out. For this reason, I do not know whether I should support the amendment or not. However, again I would like to correct the honourable member who thinks that this is a Trade Union's Bill. This is an anti-Trade Union Bill so you cannot expect a Trade Unionist to agree with it. The Hon. Minister has given the promise that whether this amendment works a hardship or not, he is going to accept it so as to put the Bill on the Statute Book and after that he will bring in a Bill to cut out this amendment. I do not agree with that; that sort of thing has been going on too long. When it gets to the point that you accept something with which you disagree you are getting your very moral fibre weakened.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, the only reason that caused me to get on my feet is the argument of the last member who spoke. It is the duty of the Government to protect organised and unorganised workers. When he talks of anti-Trade Union Bill, I cannot agree with him again. It is the duty of every citizen to join a Trade Union, but because a citizen has not joined a trade union, or because there is no organisation which he can join to protect himself, do you mean to say that the Government should not introduce legislation to protect him? The argument of the honourable member suggests that every worker should join a Trade Union. Let me say that in every society in the world you have unorganised groups.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. I think the honourable member is debating the principle of the Bill. I merely drew to the attention of this House how a Trade Unionist would view this Bill.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I am arguing on what he has just said. This Bill was not drafted with the intention of favouring a Trade Unionist; it was introduced to protect unorganised workers and there is nothing against doing that.

Sir, as far as I understand this amendment, it is made with the purpose that during negotiations of the Wages Council no information should be brought out which might prejudice the results of those negotiations; that is how I understand the amendment although the Hon. Minister has apparently given the impression that he is totally opposed to it. As far as saying that unorganised workers should join some organisation, that is absurd; that is the introduction of a totalitarian state.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like honourable members to pay some attention as to the manner in which I am going to put the question.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before you put the question, I would like to contribute my quota. I listened carefully to the debate on the matter and I have studied the amendments by the Other Place. I wish to say that one of these amendments makes it rather difficult for honourable members to make up their minds. With my experience in business, I would say that part of this amendment seems necessary and part unnecessary; the more I read it, the more I see that. It therefore strikes me that the best compromise for this is a further amendment to that amendment. Personally, I do not believe that the Other Place put this amendment in with the object that there should not be a further amendment. This

amendment is one which can be amended further; and that is why I made the suggestion that it can be amended. In all societies, in all countries you have unorganised labour; there are workers whom it is not possible to organise, more especially the white collar worker. I do think it is necessary to have legislation to protect workers in that walk of life. The amendment by the Other Place reads as follows:—

20. Any person who, being a member of a Wages Council or present at or concerned in any proceedings of a Wages Council, discloses any information or the contents of any document which has been furnished to such Wages Council, except with the written consent of the person who furnished the information or the document and of the Council, shall be liable on conviction by a Court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

What I am worried about is to say that a penalty should be imposed on me if I happened to be a member of the Wages Council and I caused to be published in a newspaper something concerning this meeting or gave information that transpired at a meeting, or discussed the matter with somebody. That does not seem right to me and I am not supporting it. I agree that if I caused to be published something that transpired there that I should be penalised. Even at the risk of saying that I am a supporter of big business, I am saying that. It is a matter of indifference to me what some honourable members may say of me.

5.15 p.m.

When a man is in business or when a business is in operation, in Barbados the profits of a business are public property according to your system of trading. According to the present law of the country the profits of your business are public property. I go a little further; in another few months it would be further public property because the right is given not only to a few taxpayers, but to all and sundry to be able to see that business. But there might be some differences in the average of a person's return; there may be differences as to the profits shown. However a man's business can really be injured. I want to say this: all of us go into business with one idea, the Socialists might tell you not, but the one idea of going into business is to make money out of it. The youngsters go into the business of protecting the workers when they are making money so that they can get a share out of it. There is the question of a man's business being injured if you allow publication of things, but I cannot agree that this amendment should remain as it is. It is too broad. If because I happen to be working or in charge of a business and I have to give information at a Wages Council and I meet somebody afterwards and discuss it, some member of the Wages Council might dislike me because I have taken a certain stand and I can be fined. I am not agreeing to that at all; where this amendment stands now I cannot support it. This amendment says "any person who, being a member of a Wages Council or present at or concerned in any proceedings of a Wages Council . . ." That is too wide for me. If you are a member of the Wages Council you cannot get on a platform in Queen's Park and disclose that a man owes away so much money at Barclay's Bank or something like that; you cannot damage a man's credit. To publish information which you get from a Wages Council which has been carrying on its investigations—[Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You cannot get the information.] The honourable member says that you cannot get the in-

formation; the way in which things are going you have the people who are running the *Beacon* and they may publish something in that newspaper. I suppose the honourable junior member for St. Peter can speak with greater authority than most of us in this Chamber, but I say what matters is how people band themselves together to operate a business to be able to hire people in this country. Nobody will want to ruin a man's business but this amendment is too wide. I may be summoned to produce documents in connection with the Miller Bros. Ice Company for instance; I had to go into the documents and I happened to meet Mr. "X", "Y" or "Z" and discussed something, and after the meeting of the Wages Council I referred to the five-year averages as being contrary to principle and we cannot see eye to eye with this or that; Mr. "X", "Y" or "Z" then discloses that to a member of the Wages Council and I am prosecuted! I cannot vote for this amendment at all. This amendment goes on: "discloses any information or the contents of any document which have been furnished to such Wages Council, except with the written consent of the person who furnished the information or the document and of the Council, shall be liable on conviction by a Court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars . . ." I am asking the Hon. Minister to postpone these amendments and have this clause re-worded. It should be an offence when negotiations are going on against anybody who is concerned with any matter, to disclose any information in Queen's Park. If the honourable senior member for St. Philip disclosed in his newspaper anything that is under negotiation, that could be an attempt offence. Such a thing will ruin a man's business. Many a business after three or four years might find a bad patch, and it is during that bad patch that investigations from a Wages Council might come up and you may find that a man might be merely struggling. Most people know that the enterprising Jews from the U.S.A. can buy in England at ridiculously low prices.

[*Interruption.*]

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the fact that a visitor in the gallery has made use of insulting remarks to me. I can point him out to you; it is the person sitting there. I am asking for Your Honour's protection.

[*The visitor was ejected.*]

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for the City may continue.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Some businesses during the War appeared to be prosperous and gave several months' bonus, and then a drop came and opportunists with the necessary funds came along and bought and caused private business to turn themselves into firms in order to get through. These are things which we must guard against; therefore, I say it is not good enough to throw out the whole section; but if the Government insists that this section must go in as it is I have no alternative but to vote against it. I agree that we should have an amendment prohibiting people from publishing people's business during negotiations; and you should have in this Bill a section saying that no newspaper can publish any such information during any negotiations.

5.25 p.m.

You cannot propose on your feet a further amendment of this nature. I am sure that you will see with me, Mr. Speaker; and however zealous members might be in protecting workers, one must also protect industry because it is from industry and the ingenuity of the people who build up industries that

you get money to hire workers. There is a necessity for such amendment, but an amendment of so wide a nature should not go into this Act; because in Barbados you will have a tendency to ruin business, and it will be too great an infringement on the privilege of the individual.

On these Wages Councils one would be entitled to have the representation of lawyers or solicitors or accountants. What will be the position of an accountant who would have to discuss with a solicitor something that happened on a particular Wages Council? I say with the greatest respect to the Other Place that you should not pass something like this. I therefore beg to move that this matter be postponed for further consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that. The reasons that the honourable member has given are very strong indeed. Everyone knows how difficult it is to keep things secret in Barbados. No matter whether this Clause is in or out things will leak out; but it was purposely put there, I believe, to prevent harm being done to the large number of small businesses in particular. It may be thought that the big businesses wish to keep things secret from Trade Unions. While that may be so, I think that the harm small businesses will suffer as a result of their private arrangements going on a public platform or in the Press will be greater than most people imagine. If the Clause is taken out entirely, I am sure that pressure will be brought to bear on small businesses; and they will be forced to shut up shop, and instead of protecting the workers you may be causing them to be idle and unemployed.

I think the point was very well put by the honourable senior member for the City. It should be postponed because I do not think it was intended to preclude all discussions by members of the Wages Councils of things which were discussed on the Councils. There are things which will be discussed on Councils which if the members of those Councils are to do justice to their jobs, they will have to discuss privately; but to publicise private business and the financial position of private business will affect adversely in the large majority of cases the small businesses rather than the large ones. No business likes having its private arrangements discussed. It is all well and good when the business is sitting pretty. This Clause was put in to protect businesses. It may need further curtailment, however, and I will counsel honourable members to vote for the postponement so that something acceptable to the wishes of the Other Place should be put in.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I do not think I need repeat what I have already said or the assurances that I have given to the House. I will say that in view of the attitude of the Opposition on this Clause I will accept the motion for postponement. As far as the honourable senior member for the City is concerned, I think he must amend his attitude towards this; because as he said, when it comes to a matter of conciliation machinery such as this, you must see that the dangers of an amendment like this can be exaggerated. In this respect there may be a case for temporising.

The honourable junior member for St. Lucy said that this is a substitute for Trade Unionism. It cannot be that; and it is an insult to the workers of this island to suggest that they would ever substitute a thing of this nature for Trade Unions. The same provision that is in this Clause is in the Wages Board Act, and it did not prevent the Wages Board from functioning. The honourable senior member for the City has made an acceptable suggestion.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the motion made by the honourable senior member for the City. I think that if the workers of this island wanted one illustration of the active collusion between the Oppo-

sition Party and the Government, and the sort of coincidence of views between them on matters vitally affecting the workers of this country, they are provided today with a perfect illustration.

I am counselling those honourable members who feel as strongly about the interests of the working classes as I do to oppose the motion made by the honourable senior member for the City. He has had a long experience in Parliament and he is probably more acute in his perceptions than the Hon. Minister of Labour, and he realises that with the weight of representation which the Government has today the suggestions of honourable members on my left will be carried in the interest of the people of this country. 5.35 p.m.

It is always surprising to me that this Government is so willing to accede to the wishes of the Other Place and to succumb to the blandishments of the Opposition whose views are diametrically opposite to those of the Government theoretically, but in actual practice are synonymous. I am warning members on my left not to be led away by the atmosphere of amiability which is now being spread abroad and exuded from both the members of the Government and members of the Opposition. I am warning honourable members not to be led away in this cross-current of amiability which would tend to sweep away the rights of this Chamber. Time and time again, I have drawn to honourable members that this Government is more intent on carrying out the wishes of the employing classes than the wishes of the employed. We have had the spectacle of a person of the one organisation in this island which at present is supposed to be representing the working class in the industrial field, explaining his views in no uncertain manner; and now we find the Hon. Minister of Trade getting up and attacking an honourable member in the most vitriolic terms because that member suggested that this amendment which says that people who give information, which the Act says must be given, must be prosecuted; and the honourable member said so because his organisation was opposed to that section—Section 7. Sir, because a member who represents that organisation gave those views, he was attacked by the Hon. Minister of Labour, although the Minister himself went so far as to say without any reservations whatsoever that he intends to bring back a Bill with an amendment to wipe out that Section which we are saying should be deleted here and right now.

The Hon. Minister of Labour is saying that there are people at the back door waiting and panting for this Bill as amended by the Other Place. I have caused a search to be made and I cannot find any organisation or unorganised set of people waiting outside of this Chamber for this Bill. I doubt whether anybody outside knows anything of this Wages Council Act. Even the Hon. Minister himself is unaware of the terms of the Wages Council Act. I have already cited from the Wages Council Act of England of 1945 which has the previous legislation of 1909 of the Wages Board Act re-activated and embodied in it in the light of the English industrial experts. Here it is now we have the honourable senior member for the City telling us that some business man would be ruined if his profits are made public. He is saying that there is the possibility that a newspaper may publish that some businessman has a large overdraft. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has tried to point out time and time again that the whole purpose of a Wages Council is to negotiate in these industries, not to settle a dispute between an employer and his employees; but to settle anything with respect to the wages and holidays of employees in those industries or any such industry in which there is inadequate machinery for the settlement of such matters. How then can the honourable senior

member for the City in employing his blandishment on the Government, get up and suggest that an individual employer may be prejudiced if information of his business is divulged. That is the situation which I would like to put before this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, — I rise on a point of explanation. The honourable member has said that I said that an individual may be prejudiced if information of his business is divulged. Sir, you cannot take that out of the context of what I said and the honourable member knows what I said. If he does not know I am prepared to remind him of what I said.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding of what the honourable senior member for the City was attempting to say. I understood him to say that an individual industrialist or employer who had an overdraft at the bank or a private matter which he did not want divulged, might be ruined if some member of a Wages Council divulged that information or caused it to be published in the Press of this island. I am not trying to paint the honourable senior member for the City; I believe his motives are beyond reproach. I believe he spoke in this way not because he wanted to represent a certain class in this island, but because he arrived at too late a stage in this debate to know everything of it. I say again that the whole rationality of a Wages Council is to set wages in industries in which adequate machinery does not already exist; and therefore, there would be no question of an individual employer being prejudiced by the disclosure of any information which might have been given to the Wages Council when it was in session. I would like to point out to the honourable senior member for the City that under the 1945 English Wages Council Act which is not in contradistinction to our own Act, (and we are saying that we are modelling ours on that Act) that the very proposals of a Wages Council have to be published before an Order is even contemplated which would bind the parties. All that we have done here in Barbados is to say that the draft Order must be published, but in England they have gone further and said that the proposals must be published; and those proposals might be part of the information which may arise in the course of settlement by the Wages Council.

5.45 p.m.

Let us take an illustration. An employer's representative may come forward and say, "We have discovered that our profit has been 20% during the past three years and we are therefore prepared to give you a rise in wages of 8%." That representative in supplying information to the Wages Council and a workers' representative may meet representatives of the Press outside the door of the Wages Council and they may ask him what is the big hold-up of proceedings, and he may answer quite innocently in order to show that his group of workers are not responsible for the delays in reaching an agreement. He may say: "the employers say that they make an average profit of 20% in the industry and they are only prepared to give an 8% increase in our wages, and we do not consider that to be fair." On the next morning he may be hailed before a Police Magistrate and fined \$100 because he has given information which has been given to the Wages Council. People can marshal the sympathy of the public on their side before the meeting takes place, by picking out information and giving it to the Press. Because the representative of the workers tells the reporters that the employers are unreasonable because they are making 20% profit and they are only paying out an 8% increase, he must

be imprisoned for four months. When you see this amiability subsisting between the Government and the Opposition, I am warning honourable members that somebody is getting squeezed in between; and invariably it is the working-class man in this island.

For the reasons I have given I will not vote for any postponement of this amendment. I cannot accept the proposition made by the Minister of Labour that he will take out this amendment anyhow, but we must not offend the Other Place and we must not run into the danger of postponing this legislation because these unorganised workers are waiting for the Bill. Is the Minister suggesting that the workers are waiting on this House to pass this Bill? I challenge him to name one trade in this island including the hotel workers to whom the provisions of this Bill has been put and explained in all its implications; let him name one person in the trade apart from the honourable junior member for Christ Church, before whose eyes this Bill has ever passed. I want to say that people like the Minister of Labour are not fit to represent the working classes of this island, when they can make suggestions like this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to make any personal reference to any member of this Chamber.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to assure the honourable senior member for St. George that I agree with him in part. I am not agreeing to this amendment for the same reason he has suggested, we are aware that in this Bill much has got in the way other than the amendment. I should like to point out that the Wages Council is constituted on a different basis from that of the Wages Board. The Labour Commissioner was Chairman of the Wages Board but the Labour Commissioner will not even be on this Board. Section 18 of the Act dealt with information which the Labour Commissioner has received, and all the information he would receive is the production figures and the wages sheets to the time you employ outworkers; and the honourable senior member for the City should not have made this mistake because the Labour Commissioner cannot now tell you that "John Brown's business has made a profit of 20%." The Labour Commissioner cannot do that; all he can say is "I visited Roebuck Street and the information is that the average wages are so much." This Wages Council cannot disclose anything about a profit and loss account, because it will not be available to them. The wages which the Wages Council would pass is what a representative must know; the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association can make a request to the Government to form a Wages Council for the purpose of dealing with people who come in from outside. The Governor-in-Executive Committee can choose executives from among them, but the type of information which should be available is what the representatives would like to know. That is why I said that this particular Clause enforces that these people do not have information that they can disclose about somebody's credibility; that is not available to them. Under this Act the Labour Commissioner cannot tell anybody that "John Brown" has made a profit of 20%; he is prohibited from doing that; he cannot tell you the name of the person under this Act.

5.55 p.m.

Under this Act the Labour Commissioner cannot tell you the name of the person; therefore, the question does not arise that the Wages Councils can know what Messrs Johnson & Redman or Da Costa & Co., Ltd., are making. They can only know that a particular trade is paying such

and such an average wage, and that such and such are the conditions prevailing. No more information will ever be available to the Council because under the Act the Labour Commissioner cannot give you any more information.

The reason why I will urge the Minister to agree to the postponement is that those who think we are talking monumental nonsense will have time to see that there is something in what we are saying. What I want to point out, is that the Wages Board Act was enacted to give representatives to Boards an opportunity to tell the Government or anyone else anything. There are some people who do not take any interest in these things; but those who take some interest in them will realise that this is something which you cannot just allow to slide. I will urge that the postponement be agreed to because even the members of the Other Place who put this Clause in did not realise that all the information which the Labour Commissioner can give is as regards the average wages and conditions of work in a particular trade or industry. The Labour Commissioner has no authority to go into any place and disclose any one's pockets, nor can the Wages Councils subpoena anyone to come before them. That is why under this Act the Labour Commissioner and the Assistant Labour Commissioner are mentioned. It is only through the Labour Department that the Board can be supplied with information; and as I said before, in giving that information no one's name can be mentioned.

One of the reasons why I will agree with the postponement is that this Clause is really unnecessary; and it only creates in the minds of people the idea that there is information to hush-up. This is not conciliatory machinery; there will be no two sides meeting; this will be only a body set up to make an agreement. There will be no negotiations going on; this will be like a Board of Directors. You do not negotiate with yourself. I would agree with the postponement so as to allay the fears of the honourable senior member for the City; because it is impossible for the Wages Council to do what he thinks they can do. They can only arrive at salaries based on what an industry as a whole is paying. The profits of an industry will never be given to this Board, and there is no provision in the Act for that to be done.

The Act shows what information the Labour Commissioner can get. He can require the production of wage sheets or other records of wages kept by an employer, and records of payments made to outworkers by persons giving out work, and any other such records as are required by this part of this Act to be kept by employers, and to inspect and examine those sheets or records and copy any material part thereof. He cannot look at balance sheets. I would like him to be able to ask for more but he cannot.

This Bill talks about a Commission of Enquiry. A Commission of Enquiry will be likely to have more authority to investigate an industry to see if it is necessary to set up a Wages Council in respect of that industry. I am agreeing to the postponement so that members both on the Government's side and the Opposition can allay their fears. I am not abandoning my original position but I feel so sure that I am right, the Government can take as long as they like before they see the point. There need to be no fear of any balance sheet or profit and loss account being examined.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know that the honourable member is very conversant with all these things, but I would prefer to have this postponed in any case. I cannot see that the Labour Com-

missioner has no power to do the things which I have mentioned. All I am asking therefore is that if there is anything in this amendment of this Bill which is unnecessary, let it come out. If when you postpone this it is found that many a person who is doing business could be ruined if permission is given to people to broadcast private business arrangements on a public platform or in the Press, I will say no.

6.05 p.m.

I do say that the other points which I have made, I have not made in any collusion as the honourable senior member for St. George has made other honourable members to believe. I have not made that point with any idea of protecting any interest. Let me say that many a business in Bridgetown and many a prosperous looking business in Bridgetown which employs dozens of people is in such a position that if you get at the root of it and that business was disclosed publicly, instead of its being able to go on hiring people it could be closed down by the stroke of a pen. Many a man doing business may be given security which has absolutely nothing to do with the business, but if you were to have a public investigation of the business, you might find that such facts might come out that persons who might be opposed to that business could use that information to close it down.

I counsel honourable members of this Chamber to be wise in their deliberations on this matter. Honourable members should be able to see the wisdom in this amendment put forward by the Other Place. I did not hear all the honourable Minister had to say, but he has an idea that this amendment should come out in the Bill. If you feel it should be put in let us put it in; but if you do not feel so do not put it in; be man enough to say that it is either necessary or unnecessary. In my opinion, I believe the amendment needs not be as broad as this.

I do not agree with what the honourable junior member for St. Peter said because the section he read is very far-reaching. They can possibly ask for any and everything outside the man's life.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to understand what is the position now. A motion was made that this amendment be agreed to and another motion was made and seconded that this amendment should be postponed; and the Mover of the first motion accepted the motion for the postponement. What I would like to know is, what is the position when this matter comes back to this House.

The question that further consideration of the amendment be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker —

ADJOJURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was asking whether having made this motion for the postponement of the amendment which we were discussing, whether it would be in order to suggest that a Select Committee should deal with it. Having heard the views expressed on both sides of the House on it, I think the Government should accept the suggestion that this matter be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House but it has not been seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second it.

The question that this House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
6.15 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

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

AMENDMENTS TO THE ADOPTION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communication, Works and Housing: "to move the consideration of the amendments of the Hon. the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled "An Act to make provision for the Adoption of children".

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

Hon. M. E. COX: In moving the second reading of these amendments I will say, as hon. members will see, that there are only two major amendments. The first amendment is in Clause 2, Subsection (a) where two commas are inserted; one after the word "full-blood" and the other after the word "half-blood". The second amendment is a marginal note to Clause 11 and I hardly think that there will be any disagreement with that. Then in Clause 17 (a) there is an amendment by the addition of the word "the" after the word "that" in the third last line. An important amendment is in Sub-clause 4 of Clause 21. When this Bill was discussed in this House, hon. members felt and did express the view that the Social Welfare Officer should not be wholly and solely in charge of this matter; or that this officer should not be the person to decide whether a child should be adopted by "A", "B" or "Z". The amendment now seeks to delete the words "Social Welfare Officer" and insert the words "the Court" in place thereof, so that the section will now read:—

"(4) For the purpose of any application for an adoption order and in any proceedings under this Act the Court shall appoint some suitable person to act as guardian ad litem of the infant upon the hearing of the application or in connection with such proceedings with the duty of safeguarding the interests of the infant before the Court:"

I think hon. members have pressed for some similar amendment and other amendments to this Bill. Before the amendments were passed by the Other Place, they were referred back to the Executive Committee who agreed with them. In subclause 3 of Clause 22 the Other Place has amended the word "purpose" occurring in the first line to read "purposes". Then in Subclause 2 of Clause 30 the word "dispensed" has been deleted and the word "dispensed" substituted therefor. The last amendment is an addition to Clause 31; that addition is Subclause (e) and it reads as follows:—

"(e.) For securing that the Social Welfare Officer shall with respect to any matter concerning the adoption of an infant be advised by such persons as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may prescribe."

When this Bill was being discussed in this undertaking that provision would be made for regulations to be made to assist in the functioning of this Act. This amendment also deals with the making of those regulations; it seeks to honour that pledge

which was made by the Hon. Minister to the House at the time.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, it is rather surprising to find the form of amendment which has been sent back to this House after the impression was given of the type of amendment that was needed. I am wondering whether these amendments are really what the Other Place intended. When this Bill was before us, it was particularly pointed out that the assurance given could not be carried out. That has been found to be true so that you had to make some provision in the Act itself for making the regulations. What I mean is this: you had to provide in the Act for what the regulations can do because what we were told they would do in the regulations, was contrary to the Act itself. It was really nonsense to say that it was an assurance, a saving-face kind of promise, which could not be carried out and it is a reflection on the ability of this House that points brought up to its attention, ordinary simple propositions, are not understood merely because they come from members of this House.

7.05 p.m.

This Bill has taken a lot of time and it is not yet in the shape in which it should be. In my opinion the Government was afraid to come back with the type of amendment which was foreshadowed in the consideration of this Bill in this House. They could not face the House although the House would have been most generous to them as they have been on previous occasions. I remember a particular Bill that came back to us with nineteen amendments, every one of which was pointed out in this House and everyone of which was accepted by the Government on the recommendation of the same member that rejected them in this House. The Government has got itself into a position where it is a shame to bring back amendments which Government itself has seen necessary.

The Social Welfare Officer has no right to be in this Act. There were two model Acts and the Government copied the one from St. Lucia rather than the one from Trinidad, (at least as far as the adoption of children is concerned) and then they made the sole deciding authority as to someone's qualifications for being an adopter, one particular person. That person may have all the wisdom in the world, but that is not how we work a democracy.

What this amendment does is to secure that the Social Welfare Officer shall with respect to any matter concerning the adoption of infants, be advised by any persons that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may prescribe. That is the only way the Social Welfare Officer need take into account anything that is said by anyone. If this is what the Government wanted, this Bill could have passed the House in this form ever since; because although it does not meet all the wishes of honourable members, it is better than it was originally. The Government had to accept this compromise so as to save their faces; that is the sole cause of this amendment coming down in this form.

However, sir, this is the Bill that we are told a lot of people are waiting for; and it is certainly one in which the Government should be made aware of the stupidity of the provisions where other people are allowed or prevented from adopting children. I will accept this amendment and not vote against it because it seems to me that this is the only way to get the Bill on the Statute Book at this time. The persons who have rejected it this time are the Government, not the Other Place. The Government would be stubborn enough to reject it if it had been done in the proper way, and that is why it has to go on the

Statute Book in this form. In a lot of these amendments opportunity has not only been taken to put in something that the Other Place wanted, but also in these two Bills you will see that errors in the drafting of the legislation have been corrected.

The question that the amendments be read a second time was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by the Hon. C. E. Palma, the amendments were agreed to.

ST. JOSEPH HIGHWAY EMPLOYEES PENSION BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 13, as the next Order of the day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion the honourable junior member for the City was speaking on the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I will leave off where I was speaking, otherwise I will be getting myself in trouble. For the present I will reserve my private opinion. Therefore, all that I would like to say is that I would be glad for an assurance that at some time or other the persons concerned have been made aware of the provisions of this Bill. I would like to have that assurance, because if the Government can continuously say that this has happened as an act of courtesy we will be willing to commend them. These things are usually done and there is a way of doing them. Someone is liable to have made a mistake in their calculations and the actual people concerned may feel it is not to be like that. I hope that I will hear that these people have been told that so and so is the case as a mere act of courtesy. I have not been approached by anyone of them on whether it is right or wrong. I hope every one concerned is satisfied.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Minister replies there is just one question I would like to ask. The Objects and Reasons of the Bill say in part, "This Bill seeks accordingly to enable the Government to pay to A. A. B. Gill, and D. C. A. Ince the pensions which they formerly received and to award pensions to A. T. King, and J. A. Mapp as the Vestry is no longer in a position to do." I understand that there is a somewhat different basis in computing pensions between the Vestry and the Central Government. I would like to know on what basis these pensions will be given.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to assure the honourable junior member for the City that these gentlemen were told what Government intend to do some months ago; and the provisions made in this Bill are exactly what Government servants would have received were they placed in similar circumstances. The first two gentlemen mentioned in the Bill (to whom the honourable junior member for St. Michael referred) are pensioners of the Highway Commissions of St. Joseph. I should like to say at this stage that this Act is deemed to come into operation from the 1st September, 1954, but although the Act is so worded, you will not need money for these gentlemen from that date, because the Vestry of St. Joseph has already made payments to those two individuals.

I will say again that Mr. A. T. King and Mr. J. A. Mapp are paid similar pensions as Government's servants would have been paid if their jobs were abolished as I mentioned when I introduced the Bill. They are being paid for abolition of office under the 1925 Pension Act. The pensions to the respective parties are as follows:—

In the case of Mr. A. T. King, he is being paid at his option a pension at the rate of \$286 per annum by monthly instalments or a gratuity of \$715 and

thereafter, a reduced pension at the rate of \$214.50 per annum by monthly instalments.

In the case of Mr. J. A. Mapp, he is being paid at his option either a pension at the rate of \$650 per annum by monthly instalments or a gratuity of \$1,625 and thereafter, a reduced pension at the rate of \$487.50 per annum by monthly instalments.

In both cases, the law in so far as abolition of office applies. Mr. King gets 7/60 and Mr. Mapp gets 5/60. Let me repeat that they are treated as well as can be, and are given all that should come to them or to anybody who might have been employed under similar circumstances by the Government.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. R. G. Mapp, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"2. The Accountant General is hereby authorised and required to pay from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee as from the first day of September, 1954:—

- (a) Alvin Arrindel Barnes Gill a pension at the rate of three hundred and ninety-nine dollars and twelve cents per annum and cost of living allowance thereon at the rate of two hundred and sixteen dollars and forty-eight cents per annum by equal monthly instalments;
- (b) Douglas Cowper Alport Ince a pension at the rate of two hundred and eight dollars and fifty-six cents per annum and cost of living allowance thereon at the rate of one hundred and thirty-seven dollars and sixty-four cents per annum by equal monthly instalments;
- (c) Alfred Theodore King at his option either—
 - (i) a pension at the rate of six hundred and fifty dollars per annum by monthly instalments; or
 - (ii) a gratuity of one thousand six hundred and twenty-five dollars and thereafter a pension at the rate of four hundred and eighty-seven dollars and fifty cents per annum by monthly instalments."

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know sufficient of the computation of these pensions really to ask the Hon. Minister intelligently the question which I have in mind; but it follows somewhat in line with what the honourable junior member for St. Michael asked him. The 5/60 and 7/60 which the Hon. Minister talked about for the abolition of office appears to me to be more along the Parochial method of calculating pensions than along Government's. As I have said, I may be wrong. I am not saying that it is an injustice because if those people never actually worked with the Government, it might not be fair to give them Government rates. After all, when the Government abolished their posts they were not Government's employees. The Government, so to

speak, actually abolished parochial posts. Of course, I would be very happy to know that these gentlemen who will not be employed by the Government will benefit from the Government's scheme.

I would like the Hon. Minister to make sure that what he said is absolutely correct. I do not believe he has any intention of misleading the House, but it is possible that the actual question did not occur to him, and therefore he did not make himself very well acquainted with it.

As I have said, I am not for one moment saying that this is wrong. If these people did not work for Government they are not entitled to the Government's rates. The honourable junior member for St. Michael wanted it pointed out whether this 5/60 of 7/60 were Government rates. It strikes me to be that of a parochial method of calculation, because I think the Vestries work sixtieths whereas the Government works fiftieths.

7.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to assure the hon. member that this is not a Parochial Pension Act: it is an Act for pension of Public Officers.

If the honourable member will look at Section 4 Sub-paragraph 2 of the 1925 Act he will see that it says this:—

"If the Officer shall have served in this island ten years and upwards and under eleven years an annual pension of ten sixteenths of the annual salary and emoluments of his office."

You can stay in office until 65 years under the old Act; you have to go home when you are sixty under the new Act, but the question as to what the pension should be is not altered. In section 9 the Act says this: "In the case of service of more than ten years, five sixtieths;" in the case of Mr. Mapp he did around ten years and he gets ten sixteenths; and in the case of Mr. King he cannot get more than seven sixtieths. This applies to the abolition of office. If the Government abolishes an office before an officer assumes duties you have to pay him for abolition or superannuation. I want to assure the Committee that everything which is due to these gentlemen will be given to them.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to point out that there were people under the 1925 Act who were told that a new Pension Bill was coming in, and they were asked whether they would elect to remain under the provisions of the 1925 Act; if it was found more advantageous to them they have remained under that Act. We have had to bring in Bills in connection with enabling people who did not elect to remain under one Act or the other to remain until the end. I know that there are certain Government servants who were asked to elect under which Act they would remain and they elected to remain under the new Act.

Mr. BARROW: I do not understand the argument of the Hon. Minister of Communications; the definition of a public employee under the 1937 Pension Act states what a public employee means. The gentlemen whose pensions are being discussed now have not been employees of the Government of this island and as the honourable junior member for the City has already pointed out, when the new Pension Act came into force a special dispensation was made to those members of the public who joined the Service under certain conditions of employment. They had to be given the option of deciding if they would continue under the subsisting conditions or under the new conditions. The honourable member has already pointed out that the public officers who were already members of the Government service and who were given this dispensation

had to elect within a prescribed time whether they would continue their service under the pre-existing arrangements or whether they would accept their pensions under the new Act. The position of anyone who joined the Government Service subsequent to the passing of that Act would be that they would not be joining the Service under the 1928, 1937 Acts or any other conditions prior to the passing of the Act. It would therefore seem to me — although I do not know about mutual agreements made between former employees of the Vestry of the parish or the Minister or the Crown Law Officers—It would appear to me that the conditions of service which existed in 1928 or 1937 could not be made applicable to the offices now. Because of a special waiver made by the Speaker these employees are being considered as public employees. These gentlemen have not been employees of the Government of Barbados and therefore if provision is being made now to provide them with pensions on the same basis as Government employees, they should not be considered for pensions being made retrospective. The inference is that they are only Government employees as from the date of the separation of the employment from the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph and the taking over of those roads by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Their tenure of office cannot be related back to a set of conditions which prevailed in 1928.

7.35 p.m.

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.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to withdraw Section 4, which has been found unnecessary.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable member to be more specific and to get up and thank me for drawing this to his attention on the last occasion.

Hon. M. E. COX: I thank the honourable member.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member to withdraw Section 4.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that we now report the passing of this Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of on. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that is the end of Government Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, Orders 1, 2 and 3 under Private Members' Business stand in my name. I have been asked by the Leader of the House not to deal with Nos. 1 & 2 yet inasmuch as the Government is still investigating certain things connected with these orders. The Leader of the House is not here today and I will not do Nos. 1 & 2. But as far as No. 3 is concerned, I think that all will agree that that is very straightforward, and the only hold-up has been settled.

I am now asking leave to deal with Order No 3, under Private Members' Business.

MARY SONIA CARTER (EXEMPTION) BILL

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this lady has obtained the degree of Bachelor of Laws, a degree that in England would exempt her from having to take the legal part of the Solicitors Intermediate Examination. According to the Barbados Act however she would not be so exempted, and this Bill seeks to give her that exemption so that she will not have to wait a number of years before she can take the final examination. The Bill has been in the hands of honourable members for some time; and without further ado, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that, and in doing so I would say that I unfortunately (I use that word very advisedly) I do not belong to the junior branch of the profession which is the more lucrative branch in this island. From my contacts with that branch of legal profession I have not heard of any objection to the passing of this Bill by any of the members of the Solicitors' branch of the profession.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain anomalies (and I am sorry that the honourable senior member for Christ Church is not here at present) in the Solicitors Act which is of ancient vintage, nearly sixty years old; anomalies which are not found in similar legislation in any of the British colonies or in the United Kingdom itself. Some of these anomalies have already been drawn to the attention of the House, and it would not be expedient for me to discuss these anomalies now because they may be the subject of debate on another occasion.

In support of the motion made by the honourable junior member for Christ Church, I would like to point out that this is not in favour of a citizen of this country who has no pretensions to legal qualifications; the lady who seeks to pursue her studies in this way has already passed one of the most vigorous examinations which obtain in the practice of law, that is, the Bachelor of Laws Examination. In other places, as we have heard, that particular degree would exempt her from those parts of the Intermediate Examination for Solicitors, other than accounts and book-keeping.

7.45 p.m.

My information is that in pursuit of her intention, the lady is prepared and has prepared to take these two examinations, therefore, there is no question of circumventing the professional training which the Legislature in its wisdom has laid down as a prerequisite to this honourable profession.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a full and frank disclosure of the professional and other qualifications of Miss Mary Sonia Carter, and I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of the honourable junior member for Christ Church.

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

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

The preamble was postponed.

Clause 1 was called. It reads as follows:—

1. This Act may be cited as the "Solicitors (Mary Sonia Carter) Exemption Act 1955."

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to enquire if the inverted commas appearing in that clause are correct. They begin at the word "Solicitors" and end at the figures "1955". Is it a quotation? If they are not necessary, I think they should be taken out.

Mr. GODDARD: I accept the amendment.

The question that Clause 1 as amended do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follow:—

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Solicitors Act 1896 (hereinafter called the principal Act) Mary Sonia Carter of "Pine House" in the parish of Saint Michael in this Island, Spinster, shall be:

- (1) exempted from being examined in legal subjects in the intermediate examination mentioned in the principal Act, and from service under Articles of Clerkship before being eligible as a candidate for other subjects required in the said intermediate examination.
- (2) eligible as a candidate for the final examination mentioned in the principal Act after she shall have passed the said intermediate examination.
- (3) entitled to be admitted as a Solicitor after she shall have passed the said intermediate examination and final examination and have served as an articled clerk for at least two years instead of five years as provided by the principal Act.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: There is something wrong in this Clause too. I notice that the second word of the words in brackets is "called". We do not usually have that type of method in referring to the principal Act. We usually have *referred to as* the principal Act.

Mr. GODDARD: I accept that amendment.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not sure that the following words are wrong, but I am raising the question. I notice in sub-Clause (2) that it begins with the word "eligible as a candidate" and in sub-Clause (3) it begins with the words "entitled to be admitted as a Solicitor." I do not want to give anybody the right to be put on the roll of Solicitors because I believe they have to be admitted to practise. I do not know what is the full explanation for using the word "entitled." It may not be wrong, but I raised the question. If you say that after you have done a certain thing you are entitled to apply for admittance, that is different from saying that you are entitled to be admitted as a Solicitor.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I pointed out to the honourable junior member for the City that Section 24 of the Solicitor's Act of 1896 reads as follows:—

24. Every person who shall have entitled himself under the provisions of this Act to be admitted and enrolled as a Solicitor shall before he shall be so admitted and enrolled, proved by the written declaration of himself and the Solicitor or Solicitors and Barrister or Barristers under whom he has served, to be duly made and filed with the Registrar, that he has actually and really served and been employed by such Solicitor or Solicitors and Barrister or Barristers during the whole time and in the manner required by this Act.

Sir, all I want to point out is that this Clause deals with the admission and enrolment of solicitors; it entitles every person who have equipped himself; therefore it seems to me that anyone who has performed the prerequisite laid down in the Act is entitled to be enrolled as a Solicitor. It is not in the power of anyone to say that a person having performed these prerequisites should not be entitled to practise as a Solicitor.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, there are other words in the Act for that. What I am saying is that after the word "admitted" you have the words "and enrolled"; and I am wondering if to safeguard this lady we should put in that too. They are entitled to be admitted and enrolled and if that is in the principal Act covering Solicitors who qualify in the normal way, let us use the same phraseology if we want to protect this lady. There may be reasons for not doing it like that. If there are, I would like to hear them.

Mr. BARROW: The question of a person being entitled to be admitted to practise is a right, but the question of enrolment is within the discretion of the Chief Justice. Therefore, you cannot say because you have passed the local examinations and other examinations and performed the statutory things, that you are entitled to be enrolled. Section 25 lays it down that it is within the discretion of the Chief Justice to enrol and to allow a person to be enrolled; and the term which is used is that when a Solicitor has proven to morally fit to maintain his status in the profession or is struck off the Roll and is to be re-admitted (as has happened in other colonies where Solicitors are struck off the Rolls), it does not preclude them at a subsequent date to be enrolled again. Therefore, sir, you cannot say that with the passing of the examination according to Section 25 of the Act, that that is a sort of passport for enrolment. It is a passport for admission but not for enrolment.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I had all of that in mind. I had in mind that the mere passing of these examinations did not entitle you to practise because you are refused admission to practise after you have done them. I do not want it to be put in this Bill that you are entitled to do something and anybody can stop you. Section 24 of the Act does not deal with the Chief Justice; Section 24 says that you must not only be admitted but enrolled. It is the same identical thing which we are trying to put in here; the Act refers to those who shall have entitled themselves to be admitted and enrolled. I think we should do exactly what is set out in Clause 24 of the Act; although it might be superfluous, it might protect this lady. If those people who have passed these examinations are entitled to be admitted and enrolled, why should this lady only be entitled to be admitted? One honourable member has said that if you are admitted you are automatically enrolled; but the Act of 1896 does not say so; it says that you must be admitted and enrolled. I feel that I should point out this matter to honourable members; it might be an oversight but I suggest that these words "and enrolled" should be put in. In the interest of this lady I do not think it would do any harm in putting in these words and allow this lady to practise just as any other solicitor who has entered the profession in accordance with the Act. If she does not come in under this provision she is not coming in under the Solicitors Act; she is coming in under her own Act.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: By way of attempting to assist the honourable member who has just sat down,

I feel that we should include the words "and enrolled". The passing of the necessary examinations entitles this lady to be admitted, but it is left to the discretion of the Chief Justice as to whether she shall be enrolled. You not only have to enrol but you have to be re-registered every year. Although you are a solicitor and might have been admitted and enrolled, you have to be re-registered every year otherwise you would not be a solicitor. I feel that we should have the words "and enrolled" inserted after the word "admitted".

Mr. GODDARD: I accept that amendment.

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

Clause 3 was called.

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

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that this is the old-time way of doing these things, but I think that the present Chief Crown Law Officer has evolved something else which the honourable senior member for St. Michael has just cut out of a Bill. I suggest that in order to prevent this Bill from coming back to us from the Other Place we should put in the words which we have cut out in the previous Bill. They are as follows:—

"Any bodies politic and corporate and all others." I think that is the form which the present Attorney General says should be used.

Mr. GODDARD: I accept that amendment.

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

The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. BARROW, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

The CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

8.05 p.m.

PAROCHIAL EMPLOYEES PENSION BILL

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 4, under Private Members' Business as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

BILL TO AMEND PAROCHIAL EMPLOYEES PENSION ACT, 1944

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, therefore, stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City: second reading of a Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act, 1944, as amended.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker this is a Bill that has been passed annually since the institution of Cost of Living Bonus to Parochial Employees. It has been argued all the time that it cannot be put into the Expiring Laws Continuance Act, and therefore, it must be introduced annually. It gives permission to the various Vestries to raise rates to pay increased pensions by way of Cost of Living Bonus. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the question is put I would like to say that I notice that there is a petition accompanying this Bill; and

in that petition there is the name of a Vestryman, Mr. Vincent E. Griffith. If I remember correctly, this gentleman has been out of the island for approximately nine months. I want to know if something legal or illegal is being done, and if he can really sign the petition. I am just asking for information; I do not want to embarrass anyone.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There is no embarrassment where I am concerned. Before all these Bills dealing with Local Government are debated the Bills must be put in the possession of the Hon. Minister of Social Services according to the ruling made by that Minister. They must also be submitted to the Crown Law Officer. These Bills were advertised, the Petitions were brought in and the Bills were put in the hands of the Minister of Social Services; I take it that he found them to be in order.

As far as Mr. Griffith is concerned, I would like to draw to the attention of the House that it is the right of every Vestryman after he has been elected to ask for leave, and that leave can be extended. I would like to assure the honourable member that the Vestries' solicitors prepared this Bill for the approval of the Attorney General and the Minister of Social Services. I take it that if it were not in order it would not have been allowed to reach this House. I will add that a Petition need only carry the names of the vestryman; but it must be signed by the Chairman and not by the Vestry. I will repeat that since Ministerial Status came into being the Government has said that before any of these Bills can be introduced into the House they must be submitted to the Minister of Social Services. I take it that that gentleman is quite capable and would not subscribe to anything that is out of order. The honourable senior member for St. Michael cannot embarrass me. I have not reached the stage where I have to draw a pension.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is quite likely that a technicality like this could pass the Minister of Social Services. As I see it the Petition merely mentions the constitution of the Vestry; but the actual signing is done by the Chairman on behalf of the Vestry.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Clause 3 was called.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to ask my colleague to tell me if the reason or reasons why this Bill could not be put on the Expiring Laws Continuance Act, were given. 8.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is the ruling of the Hon. Minister of Social Services and the Attorney General. I must say that it would save a tremendous amount of trouble and expense if these Bills could be put on that Act, but that is the ruling. The Crown Law Officer has said it must be done this way.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to know if a reason was given.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The reason given was a legal one. That is all I can say.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

The Preamble was called.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the Preamble stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the Petition from which the Preamble is derived, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleague that Clause 3 of the Bill which we have just passed—

A VOICE: That has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: Is it not that this Bill is for the several Vestries of this island? We have only received a Petition from the Vestry of St. Michael.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That has been made clear because it is considered a Private Members' Bill but not a Private Bill. That has been settled long ago in the Other Place.

Mr. LEWIS: I think my colleague has misunderstood me entirely. This is not a Bill amending the Vestries Act. I know it has been done for years but I am pointing out—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: With what are you dealing?

Mr. LEWIS: I am dealing with the Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We are dealing with the Parochial Employees Pension (Cost of Living Allowance) Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: I am sorry Mr. Chairman.

The question that the Preamble stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Mr. E. D. Mottley, seconded by Mr. Goddard, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. E. D. Mottley, seconded by Mr. Goddard in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

VESTRIES C.O.L.A. BILL

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order of the day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City: second reading of the Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act 1947, as amended.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947. There are certain Parochial statute, therefore under no circumstances can the Vestry lay a rate to give its employees a Cost of Living Bonus; the Act says that you can only pass money to pay them a salary. This is an annual Bill and it is brought because the Vestry of St. Michael feels that there should be no differentiation with its employees.

I repeat what I have said before and that is, we have made several attempts to see whether this Bill could not be put on the Expiring Laws; but it has been stated that it cannot be done. The reason given is that it is a Private Member's Bill. No doubt, as it seems to my colleague, there seems to be some ambiguity about this Bill. You will notice in the Act that it is referred to as the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947 as amended, then later on in the Preamble it says: "Whereas the Vestry of the Parish of Saint Michael have by their humble petition to the Legislature" It has been argued here that the several Vestries are hereby authorised according to this Bill to pay a Cost of Living Bonus to its employees but only the Vestry of Saint Michael has petitioned for it. Let me say that there are certain employees of the several

Vestries throughout the island that the Legislature of the colony has actually fixed their salaries by law. When Cost of Living Bonus came into being you could not raise a rate to pay these employees one cent more than what was set out in the law, unless the Legislature gave you permission; and as a result this Bill has been brought in to make the necessary amendment to the Vestries Act so as to empower the several Vestries to do so. I am no constitutional lawyer, I am not a legal practitioner as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy; so I cannot tell hon. members why the Attorney General of that day has drafted this Bill in this way. All I can say about it is that it has been going on since 1947. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: What strikes me as peculiar about this Bill is that the Vestry of the Parish of Saint Michael has petitioned the Legislature to pass a Bill for the several Vestries of the island. That is the only peculiar thing about it. I know the reason for this Bill. The Vestries Act does not empower the several Vestries to pay a Cost of Living Bonus, therefore this Bill is quite in order. However, if it empowers the several Vestries to pay Cost of Living, before the others can do so we would have to get a Petition from them.

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

On motion of Mr. E. D. Mottley, seconded by Goddard, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1, 2 & 3 were called and passed

The Preamble was called and passed.

On motion of Mr. E. D. Mottley, seconded by Mr. Goddard, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
8.25 p.m.

On motion of Mr. E. D. Mottley, seconded by Mr. Goddard in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if honourable members have no more business to deal with, I shall fix the Order Paper for the next meeting.

The Order Paper was fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

MESSANGER & LIBRARY ATTENDANT

Appointment

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, while I am not opposing that motion, may I again point out that honourable members are being greatly handicapped owing to the fact that there is no successor to the late Mr. Gittens in the Post of Messenger and Library Attendant. For a colony like this where unemployment is so rampant —

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if honourable members want to go on with this appointment I am perfectly willing to withdraw my motion. [VOICES: Yes. Let us do it now.] I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection leave was granted the

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, actually under the Orders of the Day this matter stands in the name of the honourable and learned senior member for St. Joseph but the report of the Select Committee is signed by Your Honour. If Your Honour gives permission, as the next senior member of this House

in the absence of the honourable member in whose name the matter stands, I shall ask leave to proceed with that Order of the Day

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those interested in getting this matter done. But I must point out that this matter has been on the Order Paper and there are honourable members who were here and who have left this Chamber, and who might have come to the conclusion that it was not the intention of the House to proceed with this matter today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House has granted leave to the honourable senior member for St. Lucy to proceed with this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: I will be in my seat when this matter is discussed, but this matter was put down before Order No. 1 and I repeat I am in my seat to discuss it; but I am saying that if there is any member who was here today and has left this Chamber he could not have come to any other conclusion than that the House did not intend to deal with this matter today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making any objection to the leave being granted?

Mr. LEWIS: I am drawing to the attention of the House that while it might be a good thing to deal with this matter, inasmuch as it was not done at the time when it should have been done, honourable members would have left this chamber with the impression that this matter would not be dealt with today. I have not only regretted that it has not been done in the past, but speaking on one occasion on the motion for adjournment I regretted that it did not come up for consideration. I only hope that in expediting this matter no injustice will be done to the other honourable members who might have wanted to take part in this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Lucy may proceed.
8.35 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: As we all realise it is over six months since the office of Messenger and Library Attendant of this House has been vacant as the result of the much lamented death of the former holder of the office, Mr. Alfred Gittens. Sir, as you know this Chamber appointed a Select Committee to consider the 200 odd applications which we received, and that Committee divided itself into 12 Sub-committees to consider the various applications and to interview the various applicants.

I suppose sir, that careful as we always do our work in this Chamber, there is no work that we have done with greater care or more meticulous care than the interviewing of these candidates and the consideration of their applications. As a result of that work, these six applicants mentioned in the report of the Committee were recommended for the consideration of the House.

It is, I submit, high time that this vacancy should be filled; not merely because it does not do us any credit that for six months this vacancy has remained unfilled, but you will recollect that at a recent meeting of the House the Leader of this Chamber agreed with the suggestion that at the next meeting this matter be proceeded with. It is therefore with no attempt to take advantage of his absence today, that I am proposing that we attend to this matter and thereby provide this House with the assistance which members of necessity require of the services of the Messenger and Library Attendant.

As you know sir, this office was most admirably filled by the late Mr. Gittens whose impartiality and lack of bias were his outstanding characteristics. He

treated every member alike; and I suggest we should take no chances in appointing his successor, but choose one of whom we have had considerable experience, and who is likely to fill well the shoes of the gentleman whom he is succeeding. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation because of the experience with him during the considerable time that he has been working with us (not as a member of our staff, but in close association with all of us) to propose the third on the list, Mr. Lionel Giles for the post of Messenger and Library Attendant of this House.

I now formally beg to move the appointment of Mr. Giles.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I would say that Your Honour is well aware that this House as a Committee was divided into several sub-committees to consider these applications. I had the misfortune of sitting in sub-committee with the Premier when the two of us had to interview some twenty-five people. Among those whom we interviewed was a young man recommended here: Mr. Orlando Blackman. The Premier and I recommended him because he had acted already in the Government Service. After recommending him, as a member of the sub-committee I have much pleasure in moving now that he be appointed Messenger and Library Attendant of this House.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, even at the risk of incurring the displeasure of certain honourable members, I wonder whether since this is a domestic matter it should appear in the Minutes of Proceedings of the Chamber, and whether it is a matter which we can discuss in normal circumstances without making it clear by a procedural motion that it be discussed as a domestic matter. Your Honour will appreciate the point which I am making. I always feel that matters which are not of general public interest but purely within the competence of members of this House, qua members of the House, and not as representatives of constituencies, that these matters should be dealt with under a domestic basis.

I look forward to the time when we will have some machinery other than discussion on the floor of the House, for the appointment and discipline of officers and other matters relating to our officers and servants. I am only throwing this out in order to get the feeling of other honourable members; but I do not want to make a specific motion. Therefore, I invite the opinion of other members of this House who have had longer experience than I have had in matters of this kind.

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 17 of the House deals with the election of officers on a particular occasion, and such elections have always proceeded in the usual way. Rule 17, makes provisions for the election of this officer. The Messenger and Library Attendant is now a servant of the House. If it is the desire of the House that it be done by procedural motions I have had no indication of that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I rise to second the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the last honourable member who spoke drew a point to the attention of the House which we should consider if we really want to preserve our dignity. This matter was referred to a Select Committee. What has the Committee done? They have thrown the ball right back into the lap of the House. We have been given names to consider. I think it is absolutely ridiculous. We have been given six names. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Out of 200.] I really think that matters of appointment and discipline should be considered by a Committee and not by the House of Assembly.

The honourable senior member for the City said that the sub-committee of which he was a member put

forward the name of Mr. Blackman. The Committee of which I was a member put forward the name of Mr. Dawson Layne, and I am going to complicate matters a little further by proposing that he be appointed. He is married, and has a family to support. He is not from my constituency. [VOICES: Shame.]

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. It appears that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas did not understand what I was trying to say. I did not make myself explicitly as if I had been making a formal motion. My position is invidious because I am not making a formal motion. I am merely trying to find out what is the feeling of other members of the House. This is purely a domestic matter. It is a question dealing with the appointment of one of our servants and we should proceed to deal with the appointment purely on a domestic and internal basis. That is all I am saying.

8.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before any other honourable member speaks on this matter, there seems to be some innuendo that we should clear the House of strangers. If that is the feeling, let honourable members be outspoken and make a motion.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the Select Committee which dealt with this matter but I still feel that a proposition coming from me would be admissible. I beg to propose Mr. Wilfred Turney.

This Post of Messenger and Library Attendant has been removed from the Civil Establishment and made an appointment of the House. I feel that when one considers the space of time that elapsed between that change and the cause of filling this post, it would be advisable to give it to one of the old messengers of the Civil Establishment. It would certainly give encouragement to the messengers of the Civil Establishment. [Loud talking].

Mr. SPEAKER: If honourable members have no desire to listen to the honourable member, I do. I must hear what he says; it is my duty to hear.

Mr. BRYAN: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that we should appoint someone from the Civil Establishment to this vacant post.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I agree in part with what the honourable senior member for St. George and the honourable senior member for St. Thomas said. This is really a sad reflection on us. Despite what criticism may be made of the Public Service Commission, it is true that when it comes to making appointments, Parliament is not a suitable body to deal with such matters. No matter what we feel about our right to deal with this matter, there is too much politics around things like this.

I am going to make this criticism. Here it is you appointed a Committee to deal with this matter, and the Committee has been afraid to make a positive recommendation. This is what the Report states: "The Committee after deliberation beg to recommend the following six applicants to the consideration of the House;

Mr. Wilfred Turney
Mr. Dawson Layne
Mr. Lionel Giles
Mr. Arthur Jordon
Mr. Orlando Blackman
Mr. Wilbert Mc. Collin.

A VOICE: They are six out of over 200 applicants.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: They could have been 10,000. What must we do? Should we put these six named in a hat and raffle them? My criticism is that the Committee was not capable of making a proper recommendation and that is why we are placed in so much difficulty. As it is, I can go

back to the names of the 200 applicants and nominate one of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must remember that the Committee is not telling this House whom to appoint. The Committee was empowered to make recommendations, not to appoint anybody.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I know that the Committee was not empowered to do more than what it has done. All that I am saying is that I can go back to the list of applicants and nominate anyone whom I feel. You have appointed a Committee to deal with this matter, yet you are back to the same position where you were before you appointed the Committee. [A VOICE: That is the fault of the House, not the Committee.] The Committee could have come here with only two recommendations or even one particularly, when it is considered that it was a Committee which represented 50 per cent. of the members of this House. [A VOICE: There were 13 members.] I understand that there were 13 members. I do not know if the unfortunate member was responsible for this. At any rate the Committee has placed members of this House in this invidious position. This is the lowest paid job of this House for which we are going to appoint someone and the difficulty is, that on my left honourable members are canvassing for one particular applicant and on my right they are canvassing for someone else.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question honourable members have to consider is the appointment of a Messenger and Library Attendant. I do not think at this stage there should be any recommitments coming from any member from any side of the House as far as making this appointment a reality. I would implore honourable members not to create the sort of scene which I foresee is developing; because after all, this is just the appointment of a Messenger and Library Attendant. We have had six recommendations from the Select Committee but any member of the House is free to make nominations.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I cannot understand why certain honourable members are so touchy about making this appointment. The comment which I made as regards the Committee is that it has placed us in an invidious position because it has not helped us. That is why I agree with the honourable member for St. George and the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. The Committee has placed the matter in an open form which should not be. This House of Assembly should not be placed in this position to discuss matters like these. It does appear as if you are putting somebody on the guillotine. [A VOICE: But the House has done this.] If the House has done this it still remains that members of this House should not be placed in this invidious position.
8.55 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I must challenge the remarks of the honourable member who has just spoken. He has said that the Committee was incompetent to appoint or recommend individuals, but there is precedence for what that Committee has done. I think that honourable members will remember that when applications were called for in connection with the Marshal of this House, quite a number of people applied for the post and we only submitted three or four names out of about 100 to the House. I have known of other occasions on which more than one person was selected; if we had selected one individual some honourable member might have been inclined to feel that the scale went down heavily on one man for some reason or other. We felt that we should

have selected six individuals, two in each group; we felt that that was the correct thing to do. I do not see that there is any difficulty in the House coming to a decision in appointing one of these persons to this post. It is not fair to say that the Committee was incompetent.

Mr. SMITH: The Honourable Minister of Communications and Works rose to challenge the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Peter relative to saying that the Committee was incompetent. Well, I would say that they were 15 cowards. Here it is you have 15 people to consider and select from 202 and out of that 15 only six were recommended. I do not know the feelings of particular members as to the particular candidates but we have done it this way. I think that those honourable members who interviewed candidates should try to find out the one with the greatest ability, how he acquitted himself and answered the questions and so on; and out of the 15 candidates they should decide "this gentleman is the one whom we recommend to the House for this Post". In other words it should be recommended from one side that "John Brown" is a fit person and the other side could nominate another one and give us the opportunity of choosing whom we want. I do not know the ability of the people who have been submitted. Now we are left to decide on somebody about whom we know nothing. Mr. Speaker, I should like the honourable senior member for the City to behave himself. I do not know whom I should support but honourable members know them.

Mrs. BOURNE: I would like to add a few words in support of the candidate who has been proposed by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, and to reply to remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down. The honourable member who has just sat down says that he knows nothing about the candidate who has been proposed by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy. I would like to draw to his attention that Mr. Lionel Giles is very well known to him because he serves him day after day. I am sure that although the honourable senior member for the City has proposed his candidate he will join with me in saying that in Mr. Giles we will be well replacing the late Mr. Gittens. I feel that in Mr. Giles we have a candidate of calibre similar to that of his predecessor, Mr. Gittens.
9.05 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: The whole trouble about this matter is that the Select Committee did not consider the candidates at all.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed I would just say that when Your Honour is a member of any Committee you are automatically the Chairman, and therefore, you cannot present the Committee's recommendation to the House. That has to be done by another member of the Committee. That explains why you signed it and some other member's name appeared.

What I want to say is that the Committee as a Committee did not consider the candidates. As far as I have heard, the Committee adopted an unusual procedure. I am saying that this difficulty has arisen because on the last occasion there were only four members present and their were applicants that they had never seen. All the applicants have only been seen by two members of the Committee. How therefore, can the Committee make a recommendation as a Committee? Therefore, they had to take one out of each six names presented by the little sub-committees and say they recommended so and so. It was a wrong procedure. The thirteen members appointed should have sat on vari-

ous days and the whole Committee should have interviewed every candidate; that is the only way in which the Committee could have made a proper recommendation. I am saying that for future reference for the benefit of any Select Committee appointed by this House. The Committee should have been able as a Committee to have told the House that so and so are the characteristics and manners of each applicant before they could make these recommendations. That was not done and it has landed us into the trouble of having to pick one of six. However, we have a precedent for it. I take it Mr. Speaker, that a proposition need not have a seconder.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you go by Rule 17 which is the only Rule that can be used for guidance in this case, there is no need for a seconder. The first proposed has to be dealt with first.

Mr. LEWIS: The Rule Book came over here, but I did not have a chance to read the Rule. Since however other propositions have been seconded, I am going to second the one made by the hon. junior member for St. Michael, so that it can be in order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask what procedure is to be used? Can we do this by ballot? If hon. members write the names of the candidates they intend to vote for a decision would be made right away and it would save time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can make a motion to that effect.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that we make this appointment by secret ballot.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that on account of the absence of six members of this House this matter be postponed.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to say that I am not allowing any member to prevent me from acting in an intelligent manner. I am not saying that there is no precedent for this, but we all know that the votes of this House have got to be recorded. That is the law of the land. I do not know if that applies to the election of officers or not.

Mr. BARROW: The hon. member should remember that you only record what the decision is. It is only when a division is called for the vote is recorded. A division is not being called for here; we are voting in a different manner altogether.

Mr. LEWIS: The votes of this House are recorded. You either record that a vote is carried unanimously or they show what is the division. This is not a matter you can vote on in this particular way.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In answer to what the hon. junior member for the City has said, the vote will be whether this House decides to go by secret ballot or not, and that decision will get recorded. If members agree to take it by ballot that will be the vote of the House, and not how the ballot is taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House proceed to the election of this officer by secret ballot. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and

those against will say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

On a division being called for the question was put and decided in a tie, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: MR. SMITH, MR. E. D. MOTTLEY, MR. BRYAN, MR. BARROW, MR. F. L. WALCOTT, MR. J. C. MOTTLEY, MR. ALLDER, MR. TUDOR and MR. GODDARD—9.

Noes: HON. M. E. COX, HON. C. E. TALMA, MRS. BOURNE, HON. R. G. MAPP, MR. LEWIS, MR. MILLER, MR. BRANCKER, MR. VAUGHAN and MR. CRAWFORD.—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has resolved itself in a tie, nine hon. members voting "Aye" and nine voting "No". I now vote with the "Ayes." 9.15 p.m.

Secret Ballot Taken

Mr. SPEAKER: The results of the secret Ballot are as follows:—

Mr. Lionel Giles	8
Mr. Orlando Blackman	7
Mr. Dawson Layne	1
Mr. Wilfred Turney	2

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Must not this be done by a majority of members of this House, Mr. Speaker? There are 19 members in this House at present. I do think Mr. Speaker, that you will have to put the names of Mr. Giles and Mr. Blackman to the vote again.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what basis have you come to that conclusion?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, I want to see that this House goes right on the matter. I am submitting that there are 19 members around the Table of this House now, and I do think that anyone who is elected must have a majority vote of members here.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what basis?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not questioning anything which Your Honour rules, but I do suggest that in all these ballots there is always a majority of hon. members present. I submit that there are 18 members in this House, and for anybody to be elected to this post you must have a majority of the House present whether it is by secret ballot or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not entertain that suggestion and I do not know on what it is based. I have the honour to declare Mr. Giles duly elected to the post of Messenger and Library Attendant. [Cheers!]

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly. 9.30 p.m.