

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th September, 1956

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); 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. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY; Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN and Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meetings which were held on the 1st and 8th of May, 1956, respectively, having been printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. ALLDER, F. L. WALCOTT and Mrs. BOURNE entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS:

Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 19 Order, 1956.

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 20 Order, 1956.

Report on the Barbados Fire Service for the Year, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX:

Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Regulations, 1956.

Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th June, 1956.

REPLIES

Reply to question asked by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. L. E. Smith) on the 19th June, 1956, respecting houses damaged by high winds on the 15th June, 1956.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS:

Resolution to place the sum of \$15,342 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 23, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$51,246 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57 Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1956-57, No. 24, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 19 Order, 1956.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 20 Order, 1956.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I should like to give notice of my intention to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal later in the day with the Resolution for \$15,342 and the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 20 Order, 1956 of which I have just given notice.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to approve the Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Regulations, 1956.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly having agreed to the principle of modern Secondary Schools in the Island further request that wherever suitable Buildings and sites are available, one of such modern Secondary Schools should be set up in each parish of the Island.

The House are aware that there is a suitable Building in the parish of St. John known as "Verdun" which has attached to it 13 acres of land and request, that the Government open negotiation with the owners of such property for its acquirement and conversion into a Modern Secondary School.

The House are aware of the provision of a sum of money in the 1956-57 Estimates for the setting up of an open air school in the said Parish and request that the said money be used in the purchase and conversion of the said property known as "Verdun".

The House feel that this School when set up would meet the great need of this, and other adjoining parishes. Thereby, reducing the high cost of living to those parents who have to send their children to Bridgetown daily.

The House hope that Your Excellency would give this Address your favourable consideration.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will again draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that Addresses of that sort are going to be ignored. Look how that Address ends! It ends with a prayer that the Head of the Administration will give his favourable consideration to this Address, when the Head of the Administration is asked to accept the advice of his Ministers. As far as this Address is concerned, it is superfluous anyhow, because if the honourable member had made enquiry before hand, he would have discovered that the Public Works Department has already been examining the merits of this property called "Verdun."

However, what I really rose to point out is that an Address of this sort, especially when the honourable member purports to tell the Governor what the policy of this Party should be, is just absurd, and he must not be surprised if, when he attempts to get through this Address, the Government votes against it.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I think you will give me permission to reply to the Hon. Premier. It is true, it has been suggested in a casual manner ever since Ministerial Status has come about, that it will be useless for this Place to pass Addresses to the Head of the Administration, but we have also noticed that since such casual statements were made, Addresses have been passed and the Hon. Ministers have stood and voted although on some occasions when Addresses did not suit them, they have walked out. If the Government feels like that, let them prevent themselves from voting as they like. I would say that Government has not made it possible for honourable members to move Addresses without that repeated feeling of rancour.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, can I comment on the Address in a factual manner?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing to speak on.

Mr. VAUGHAN: What I am going to say is not controversial at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I repeat: There is nothing to speak on.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I forgot to give notice just now that it is my intention next meeting to consider the Money Resolution for \$51,246 of which notice has just been given.

QUESTIONS

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay the following questions:—

Mr. O. T. ALLDER: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:—

1. Will the Honourable Minister state whether the acquirement of land from Society Estates Limited for the erection of a Bath and Latrine at College Bottom, St. John, has been completed?

2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will the Government state when will permission be granted for the erection of such Bath and Latrine at such place?

3. Is the Government aware that the Sanitary Commissioners of the parish are desirous that such services be extended to this District as soon as possible?

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Hon. M. E. COX: The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Resolution to place the sum of \$2,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I—Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimate, 1956-57, No. 21 met and reported, and I have the honour to submit a report of its findings.

I should like to inform the House that it is my intention to seek approval of the recommendations of the Committee at a later stage today.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with Order No. 1, as the Hon. Premier has intimated earlier that he intends to ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 & 89 in order to proceed with a Money Resolution of which notice was given earlier, I do formally ask leave that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to state—

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member allow me to put the question? The question is that leave be granted to move the suspension of Rules 88 & 89.

Mr. GODDARD: Is this motion with respect to the Resolution which Government intends to deal with today and of which notice has just been given?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. The Resolution for \$15,342.

Mr. GODDARD: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution could have been circulated in time for honourable members to study it. You come in here and you are told by Government that they intend to deal with something which they just brought in and right away they proceed to deal with it, which means that you have to study it the same moment you receive it. We have complained of that on many occasions already. It is true the Order Paper is very light and the Government may want to do something today. It is just a matter of my registering a protest in having to deal with this Resolution immediately.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, that is just what I rose to say when you stopped me to put the question.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I apologise over the fact that honourable members did not have this Resolution circulated to them earlier. I am sor-

ry that the necessary steps were not taken at the office to get this Resolution circulated to honourable members before. It is true we did not meet last Tuesday. However, this matter is absolutely urgent if we are to go on with Local Government in the time we hope to do. It is necessary because we have to get Valuation Officers to get the rates fixed. As it is, it is going to take months to get the rates fixed.

There are three documents in honourable members' hands: (1) an Order to establish these posts; (2) a Resolution to approve of the Order; and (3) a Money Resolution for the sum needed to establish these five permanent Valuation Officers.

I may say that the Commissioner of Income Tax is going to be the Chief Valuation Officer. He is due to go on leave soon and it is very essential that we pass these things today in order that he may be able within a week at the latest to have his Valuation Officers. Again, I apologise to the honourable members. It may be that certain things have presented this Resolution from being circulated earlier.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House while in Committee of Supply to consider the Resolution for \$15,342.

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

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

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

Supplementary Estimates No. 23 Income Tax Dept.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I propose to deal with this first because it is a matter of more urgency than the first on the Order Paper. If honourable members have had the time to read the Addendum to the Order, the effect of this Order is to change the title of the Income Tax and Death Duties Department to the Department of Inland Revenue, and to create certain additional posts in that Department. As I said this Order is almost entirely due to the fact that we have got to get on with reviewing the new system and laying rates for the new Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, rising on a point of order, you can clearly see we are a little bit out of step. If you are going to agree with this, it is obvious you will have to pass the Order first because the money only deal with the offices you have created. These are new offices as you see here in the Addendum to the Resolution which you are going to pass; and these new offices have not yet been created. You have new offices in your hands but as a matter of proper sequence the House should pass the Order first and create the new posts in accordance with the Civil Establishment Order; because you should never pass money for new posts until they are created, and if you are not aware of it, I will draw it to your attention. You are going to create the posts of a Chief Valuation Officer, two

Grade 1 Valuation Officers, two Grade 2 Valuation Officers and the post of Steno-typist, so that if you pass the Money Resolutions now before the Order, you are telling the House that they must agree to the Order, while the proper procedure would be to pass the Order and then the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, more than once we have put on the Estimates something entirely new, and I have told the House that the Order has been made or will be made in due course and passed on to the House to be dealt with among the various Items of the Estimates. If they feel the Order should be made first or that the Order having been made should get the assent of the House, that has been more than once agreed to. After all, the Order is made and it is up to the House to agree to it or not to agree to it. In this particular circumstance, I repeat, this is nothing new. It is a matter where the House will agree or not agree. It is nothing new to come here and ask for money to pay for a post which has not yet been created, but if the House says "we are not going to agree", you do not pass it and the Order is not made. But it is not even as vague as that. As it stands now, the Order exists and everybody has agreed to the principle of Valuation Officers in the Maude Bill, and that the Income Tax Commissioner should be Chief Valuation Officer; and this is merely to say we are carrying out the principle. The Act is there to be brought into operation and it has been passed by Legislation making provision for this. These Resolutions are formal and I suggest we are wasting time if we have to come back to the House and then the Committee. This is not the first time the House has agreed to a matter of this sort. I do not think there could be anybody in this House who would want to waste time which would mean stopping this and then coming back for the House to agree to the Order and then coming to the Committee again with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Sir, it is not a question of wasting time; it is a question of observing correct procedure. It is not fair to compare the circumstances of a case like this appearing in the Estimates with a case appearing in the Supplementary Estimates, for the simple reason that it may happen that during consideration or preparation of the Estimates, the Government may not have had time to prepare all the Orders necessary for the creation of new posts. But this is entirely different. Here you have Government coming down saying certain new posts must be created and simultaneously telling them they want money to pay new posts if and when they are created. If the honourable member wants to be gracious and acquire the full support of the House, let him admit that he is wrong in proceeding with the Order first, and now that it has been drawn to his attention, do not let him say we are wasting the time of the House.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When I spoke just now I was not dealing then with the stubbornness of the Hon. Premier, because he is never wrong; he is always right. The analogy he drew had nothing to do with this case today because he was asking for special permission not only to deal with the Resolution in all its stages today. What I wanted to draw to the attention of the Premier is that this is a Resolution to approve an Order: the first Resolution sets up posts, another amends the Income Tax Act, and the third Resolution provides an amount of money for the offices. You, Mr. Chairman, and the Premier are saying it does not make any difference; I am saying it does because if you have these Orders being passed like that, the Estimates is no analogy because in dealing with the Estimates we accept the principle of voting money for new posts, and it is better to do it this way rather than not knowing what the money

is being spent on, or to have to come back to the House to deal with it. How can there be money for new posts in the budget before the Orders are made? If you want ten thousand dollars for new posts, you put the new posts in the Estimates and you vote for it through a Supplementary vote. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the policy adopted is that when you need a new post you say you need it and Legislation has to be agreed to for the new Orders made. I am saying it is irregular on this particular occasion, but the Premier is going to accuse us of wasting time because we know it is not being done the right way. You can reverse the Speaker from the present position to the back of the gallery, and have him enter the Assembly from the opposite entry to the one now used, but it does matter in the sense that we are accustomed to the seat being in its present position and you do not want to come here and see it facing the other way; so if anyone has reached the stage that he cannot do anything wrong, God help him.

4.45 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Law today which has been passed by this House provides for Valuation Officers. In a formal way, you have to deal with the matter by a Civil Establishment Order, and we are asking the House to vote the money now. [Mr. CRAWFORD: It is irregular]. This is a purely formal matter; this Legislature has passed an Act saying that there shall be Valuation Officers run by the Income Tax Department, and you start working by creating an Order under the Act and by passing a Civil Establishment Order. The post of Chief Secretary exists by Law today; all you have to do, is to get an Order made and publish it in the *Official Gazette*.

It is sheer ignorance to say that this procedure is out of order. I am not putting the cart before the horse; the Law already provides for Valuation Officers, and this is the formal way of getting the money to pay them.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. Why does the Hon. Premier go on talking about the Law? The Hon. Premier is a Lawyer, but under the Laws of this Island, the Governor cannot appoint any Officer until this Resolution is passed. You create the post under the Act, but it must be put in an Order. We are not quibbling about the creation of the post; we are saying that instead of asking that this Resolution be passed, the first thing you have to do, is to pass the Order, and the Resolution to approve the Order is a matter of course. If it were not so, you would not have this Order and then the Resolution; the fact that the Hon. Premier has to bring down two Resolutions, shows that you cannot appoint any of these Valuation Officers until you have passed the Order. To go by what the Hon. Premier is saying, you would only have to bring down the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I repeat that we have already passed the Law establishing the post of Valuation Officers in order to carry out the Local Government Act; this is purely a formal way of getting them appointed. This is just carrying out the terms of the Act, Section 69 and 146 of which have been mentioned in the Addendum to this Resolution to approve the Order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that an Order is also established by the Law of this Island. Whether we pass an Act or not, the Order establishing a post has to be passed by the Legislature, because that is the means of creating posts in this Island. Under the Laws of this Island, the Government can come down tomorrow and appoint somebody. You have

this post of Stenographer-Typist; if you look at the Order, you will see: "XXV11 General Service for Item 2, Substitute '2 Stenographer-Typist \$624 X 48 - 1,200, 51,'" which means that you are adding a Stenographer-Typist to the Civil Service of Barbados, and you are not doing that by the Act which you have passed in respect of the Valuation Officers, but by the Order which you are passing today. This Order also includes the amount of money which you are going to use under this Resolution.

It is not a question of passing a Resolution and creating the post; this Order will create a Stenographer-Typist which you did not have before, and this comes in the same Order in which you are adding Officers to the Income Tax and Death Duties Department. You have passed an Order creating the number of people which you are having in a post; it is not a matter, Mr. Chairman, of what you rule and what you do not rule; it is purely a matter of commonsense and everyone can see that if you are creating new posts the position would be to have your Order creating the new post passed and then the Money Resolution would follow. Anyone other than the Premier can see that.

If you look at the Act by which the Legislature agreed to have these Valuation Officers, you will not find anything in that Act giving approval for the post of Stenographer-typist; you could not appoint a Stenographer to the permanent establishment of the Island unless you have the Order creating the post. All I am saying is that you should have the Order creating the post before you have the Resolution. This is purely a matter of procedure and regularity because the Stenographer-typist stands in the same position as the other two officers. If you say that a mistake has been made, then that is alright; but if you say that other people are talking nonsense, then you have reached the stage in which you can do whatever you like.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This office has been created by statute but you have to deal with it by a Civil Establishment Order. You are not repealing the Act, or repealing some of the Sections. It is not a matter where you start *de novo* and create a post in the Estimates or otherwise; this is a question of something which exists by law and I repeat that this is purely a formal matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not saying that this is not a formal matter.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am speaking on a point of Order. Even in a formal matter there should be some procedure. What I am saying is that the honourable member cannot say that although the posts of Valuation Officers have been created by the Act, in respect of the Stenographer-typist the Government has not got to come down with an Order and say how many Stenographer-typists they want. Now you cannot appoint any person to any post until the Order creating the post has been made. The Act which has been passed by the Legislature must be implemented in accordance with the Act which gives the Government the power to create a post under an Order. The Order creating the post must be dealt with in a formal way before you deal with the Resolution. That is all I am saying.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I shall proceed with this matter. As honourable members will see, the sums are set out here in the Addendum to the Resolution. Under the Local Government Act, the term "Valuation Officer" includes "Servant". You can include a Stenographer-typist, Janitor or anybody else in that term "Servant". The only thing new with which we are dealing in this Resolution is to change the name of the Depart-

ment, but the Act, has already been passed. If honourable members will read the Addendum to this Resolution they will see that we do not know, nor is it possible for us to say, if five or seven officers are enough to start with.

We may not need all five Valuation Officers on a permanent basis but obviously—
4.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. Will you give me your ruling?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is nothing to rule on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the position is this: the Hon. Premier himself admits that the Addendum to the Resolution refers to the Order and that he does not know yet how many Valuation Officers are needed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I said on a permanent basis; because obviously we would need more to start with than to carry on in the future.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you do not know how many you need, how can you say there will be created the following additional posts for that department:—

- 1 Chief Valuation Officer,
- 2 Valuation Officers, Grade I
- 2 Valuation Officers, Grade II,
- 1 Stenographer-Typist.

Section 69 of the local Government Act says that valuation lists shall be prepared and amended by valuation officers at the times, in accordance with the conditions and subject to the rights as to objection and appeal as specified in this Part of the Act.

Now, what Section 146 says is this: "valuation officer" means any person for the time being holding the office of valuation officer established by order made under the Civil Establishment Act, 1949."

In other words, no "valuation officer" exists until the Order has been passed and the Hon. Premier is deliberately misleading the House that under the Act we have provision for valuation officers; therefore, we can proceed to pass money to pay them before we pass the Act. That is not true. Section 69 of the Act only claims that these valuation officers will have fresh duties and Section 146 says what their duties are; but the fact that their duties are defined under the Act does not mean that you have created them.

The Hon. Premier himself says that he does not know how many we need. The Order which has been given notice of will tell the Legislature how many officers we need. We must create the posts first, and after we have done that, we can then proceed to vote money for the posts we have created. If we pass the Order after we have passed the money, then the Act is wrong.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You have an Act which says that there will be a Police Commissioner and forty constables. That makes sense, but formally before you appoint these Valuation Officers you must pass a Civil Establishment Order. The Local Government Act says that in order to prepare valuation lists, you must create posts of valuation officers and then it describes what their duties are. You must have an interpretation section and in that section you say that a "valuation officer" means any person for the time being holding the office of valuation officer established by order made under the Civil Establishment Act, 1949." The Act creates the position of valuation officers to prepare valuation lists and then having said "valuation officer", you do not know who a valuation officer is until you put him in the interpretation section.

I will draw to the attention of the Committee that it obviously means that with this new venture we may need four, five or six valuation officers but it is reasonable to assume that we will need more to start with. Mr. Marriott is the person appointed

to run the show. He is the only person who has practical experience of valuation; not even Mr. Lightburn although this gentleman has a world of experience in Local Government. Because that is so, we have considered that it is right that Mr. Marriott should do the valuation and so on. It follows as a consequence that we must make provision for these valuation officers and fix their salaries. These are the salaries which we are fixing for them.

I repeat: to attempt to suggest that this is something new and that we are doing it the wrong way around is not an accurate statement. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$15,342 do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I merely want to say putting it mildly that we are disappointed in your failing to give a ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I asked you if there was something for me to give a ruling on as I did not see anything on which to give a ruling.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Why did you ask me when the honourable senior member for St. Michael also asked you?

I want to draw to the attention of yourself and the Committee that according to Section 146 of the Local Government Act, an officer is not a valuation officer until he has been created by the Order. The Section says that "Valuation officer" means any person for the time being holding the office of valuation officer established by order made under the Civil Establishment Act, 1949." In other words, Mr. Chairman, so long as no post is established by order, no valuation officer exists; therefore, this Committee is voting money for posts which do not legally exist.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before this question is put, I want to say that by this action which we are doing today we are creating such a dangerous precedent that you ultimately will nullify the whole purpose of what a Civil Establishment Order means. I wish to draw to the attention of the Committee what is the purpose of a Civil Establishment Order. It should be made clear to this Chamber that originally, before the Civil Establishment Order was created by an Act of this Island, every single post that was created was sent down to be created by an amendment to the Act. That was the position as existed in the old days. In the old days, every time you wanted to appoint a boy in the Civil Service, you had to amend the Civil Service Act. We have changed that to the position that you make an Order to create a post; therefore, you do not pass an Act, for example, to say that there must be 137 Clerks. What you do now is this: the Government can come down with a Resolution to approve an Order to amend the Civil Establishment Order; that is to say, they can come with an Order to make provision for an additional stenographer-typist.

In this case, you are providing for valuation officers before those posts are created. They cannot come into operation until you put them in a Civil Establishment Order and the Legislature gives approval. But you have not done that yet. By your action today, Mr. Chairman, you have allowed a Resolution to pass for the payment of posts which have not yet been created: and that means, in the future, should there be any controversial Order to be passed, say, the Government may require ten clerks which the House may think is unnecessary, without any explanation, you allow the Resolution to pay them to pass and then when you go to the House to approve of the posts you get the argu-

ment that you have not reduced the amount of money to pay them.

5.05 p.m.

It is purely a matter of procedure because you start in the House before you go to Committee; and we could have done it in the House without going to Committee, and when passed in the House it would be regarded as a formal matter because when it went to Committee it would be passed without further debate. There was nothing to rule on and that is your judgement, and in constitutional practice we have to abide by your judgment; but it does not mean you are necessarily right. I will counsel you that Parliament is a serious business and it reflects on all in here who hold responsibility for the conduct of parliamentary procedure, and you need to be aware of the importance of parliamentary business. It is later than you think.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I differ somewhat from the other members of the Opposition. I am not worried about the question of which should come first. I would support the Leader of the Opposition in opposing this without giving us a little further notice because it can be argued that it is not an ordinary Resolution; and with a Resolution of this sort, one should have been given some time to refresh one's memory on the Bill. That is why I would oppose it. I have always given opportunity to the Government when it is necessary to do any Resolution or anything else without giving us notice when it is an emergency, but surely in this case one can hardly say it is an emergency, but without giving us an opportunity to refresh our memory on the sections to which this would apply is asking us to do too much. The Leader of the Opposition offered much protest and he was defeated. Now, Sir, what I am concerned with is this, if I may term it, new dispensation with reference to making an amendment to the Income Tax and Death Duties Department, in the salaries: Chief Valuation Officer \$4,320 two other Valuation Officers \$2,280 x 120 = 3,000, then two more Valuation Officers \$1,800 x 120 = \$2,400. You know, Mr. Chairman, you are creating these new posts which are to take the posts of Assessors under the old Act. They are going to take the place of the Assessors and the salaries are less than what the Assessors got, and you are asking us to appoint a man in a responsible position where he has got to value property in this island and at a salary which will leave him open to temptation. What is \$150 a month for a Valuation Officer? That is somewhat of a scandal and a joke. I counsel the Premier — and I do not know who put it up, surely not the Commissioner — to review the salary scale. What sort of man do you expect to get at \$150 going to \$200 a month? Surely if you are bringing this now, the Salaries Commissioner has not reported and so it will come under review again. Why bring it here at this stage? Whatever the Revenue might be, take the present salaries. Are you going to pay a Valuation Officer at \$150 a month going to \$200? Never mind what you are going to pay the senior Valuation Officer, I am opposed to the £400 difference in salary between the senior Valuation Officer whose duty is to be a Valuation Officer and the other Valuation Officers at \$150 a month. This leads to further study and I counsel honourable members that it is not good enough to see this before us. It is a serious and important matter when you consider you are going to change the entire system of Local Government and to take the place of Assessors you are appointing people to permanent offices at \$150 a month going to \$200 a month. May I tell the Chamber today they get much better salaries than this, and those who do not are only working part time? You are making the jobs whole time and offering them \$150 a month. I think it is scandalous and

you are opening people to temptation. You are doing this not only for the purposes of Local Government taxation but for the general purposes of taxation in respect of Income Tax. That is a fact, and if you look through the Bill you will see it, because when the Valuation Officers are finished, people who own property must make returns in Income Tax; and if the Government is serious about appointing people they should pay them proper salaries. It is understood that they are going to be local people from the salaries that appear here. I understand from the Premier that the salaries will be reviewed by the Salaries Commissioner, and I have got to accept that; but I have been hearing via the grape vine that the Committee will report in time for elections which are just around the corner, and if I were in his place I would adopt the same policy and report in time for elections. What I am worried about is how you are going to get this before the Salaries Commissioner. It is very rare that this Chamber criticises salaries, but today those of us who have any acquaintance with what this means must criticise the salary of \$150 to \$200 and wonder what type of people you are going to get, because those you appoint are going to be open to temptation. I repeat it is a tremendous responsibility because it is for the purpose of the entire revenue of the island for Income Tax purposes. I suggest that honourable members do not let it go by lightly. I differ from the members of the Opposition on the question as to which should come first, and I should put it this way: it is not of great importance to me because I do appreciate in the Bill you have established, so to speak, the posts in the Bill, and although the posts have not yet been created, it must be taken for granted that they will be created; but I am afraid I have got the suggestion to make — and I do not know if the Premier will still accept — that this should be postponed (a) first of all because we have not had the opportunity of refreshing our memory with what is in the Bill, and few honourable members would be able to get up and speak on it unless they were in touch with Mr. Lightburn in dealing with this matter. We in the Opposition always give the Government an opportunity to do these things when there is an emergency, but in this matter it cannot be argued that it is an emergency and therefore I think it should be postponed.

The second point for the postponement of this matter would be that I am not at all satisfied that the Government, or those who made the recommendations to the Government, have given sufficient and serious thought to this matter. If this matter is to be reviewed by the Salaries Commissioner now, what is the point of bringing it down here at this time? Let the matter be dealt with and brought before us once and for all. In these circumstances, I am moving that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, by this procedure you have allowed the honourable senior member for the City to speak on the Order; he was not speaking on the Resolution at all. If the honourable member had been dealing with the Order, it could have been pointed out to him that it might be a very good thing that these salaries are what they are. What the honourable member has been speaking on for the whole time is the Order and not the Resolution because all the Resolution deals with is the amount in the Order. When you have dealt with the Order the Resolution just follows; whatever debate you have, you have it on the Order. Nobody discusses the Resolution after you pass the Order because the Resolution is only formal. It would be bet-

ter to get on and agree with the Order and postpone the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In view of the fact that the honourable senior member for the City has asked a simple question, it would not take long to answer him. The honourable member has been extremely helpful to Mr. Lightburn in everything during the course of making his recommendations. You are putting this question of assessment in the hands of the Income Tax Commissioner; two Assessment Officers are already in existence in the Income Tax and Death Duties Department in the scale of \$2,280 x 120—3,000. We say that we may need, and we do need, Assistant Officers put in two grades; therefore in order to get the grade below, you put them at this salary \$1,800 x 120—2,400. You are really only adding to the list; you are creating the post of Chief Valuation Officer and therefore you should go above the maximum of \$3,000 for the higher post and go to \$2,400 for the lower post. The honourable member will be able to refresh his memory. The Act says how the valuation has to be made; you post it up for 21 days for public inspection. If a man is rated at \$40 and another is rated at \$50, he can object to his valuation being too high and to the other man's valuation being too low; therefore where is the temptation in respect of the Valuation Officer? The honourable member's fear falls to the ground.

Mr. Godsall, the Salaries Commissioner, is dealing with the matter of salary revision. Mr. Marriott, the Income Tax Commissioner, is going on leave shortly and we are asking him to forego going on leave in order to get through with this matter. This is a matter of urgency; I would not say it is a question of an emergency; this gentleman's contract is coming to an end and we are trying to ask him to get on with the job. He is the only person who has had previous experience in the matter of valuation. Honourable members know that this will be a matter of months and months and we do not want the Local Government Act to be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, why is it that we are dealing with this Resolution and you are permitting this friendly conversation between the Hon. Premier and the honourable senior member for the City? The Hon. Premier has answered the question in connection with the Order dealing with Assessment Officers and Valuation Officers. At this time the Government could not work on the hypothesis that these Officers are going to be paid at rates higher than what they are at now, and therefore you have to send down the salaries of these Officers at what they stand today and leave it to the Salaries Commissioner to say what should be paid for these posts. However, you are not dealing with this Order at all; you are dealing with the Resolution. What I am saying is that during the consideration of this Order the opportunity would have been given to honourable members to discuss all these things which you, Mr. Chairman, have allowed the Hon. Premier to discuss, and the Resolution which would be regarded as a formal matter would be dealt with after the Order.

Even although you might pass this Resolution for \$15,342, these posts cannot be implemented under the Acts of Barbados until the Order creating the posts has been appointed by the Legislature; but Mr. Chairman, you have allowed this friendly conversation to take place between the Hon. Premier and the honourable senior member for the City on the very thing to which the Hon. Premier objected but which should have been dealt with first. The Hon. Premier has answered the honourable senior member for the City as to what these Assessment Officers' salaries should be; he had also given the

honourable member the satisfaction of debating the Order and he has replied to questions dealing with the Order, which Order is not before the Committee.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am always after a friendly conversation. I am courageous enough to say when I am convinced about a point of view, but I will say that the Hon. Premier has not convinced me at all. We know that there are Assessment Officers attached to the Income Tax Department, but I am here to tell the Hon. Premier that the duties may be similar in some ways and quite different in others. The Government has taken as the basis for fixing these salaries the fact that you have Assessment Officers, but what are the duties of these Officers? In some cases their duties may be more technical than in others; they have to prepare balance sheets, arrive at the amounts to be paid and what not.

I am absolutely sure, I am not wondering about it, that there is a great difference between one job and the other; and Mr. Lightburn and Mr. Marriott are bound to tell me so. The Assessment Officer which you have in your Income Tax Department sits in his office and makes out Income Tax Report. He deals with the individual himself or with his auditor. There is a big, big difference between the Assessment Officer and the Valuation Officer. The Hon. Premier told you just now that if a Valuation Officer rates a property adjacent to another at more than the other, anybody can object. Let me say that it may be perfectly legal to rate one higher than the other, though they be side by side. Today, you have legal luminaries who differ as to whether a property should be rated on the actual rental value, if inflated, or on what is in the opinion of the Valuation Officer that property is worth. For the Hon. Premier to get up and say that is not good enough and it is for that reason I suggest that if you are going to have these Valuation Officers (they will be appointed; you are changing over from one to the other), there is a big difference between them and Assessment Officers. As I have said, an Assessment Officer sits down in the Office of the Income Tax Commissioner and reviews the returns of a taxpayer and what not. With the Valuation Officer, it will be a different thing; therefore when you state that your standard of a Valuation Officer is in accordance with that of an Assessment Officer you are wrong.

What I am saying is that there is no reason why you should pay Valuation Officers a salary under that which you pay Assessment Officers. You should not go under that at all. I cannot see any responsible person who is appointed a Valuation Officer working for a salary of \$150 per month. The Hon. Premier has said that while the creation of these posts is not an emergency, it is a necessity at the moment: and because of that, he wants to get this Resolution put through today. I would like to say that on several occasions I have dealt with this matter of valuation not only with the Income Tax Commissioner but with Mr. Lightburn and I am sure that both of those gentlemen will say that valuation is a very hard job to perform. I cannot imagine, with the standard of things what it is in Barbados that you will put the salary of a valuation officer at \$150 per month. What I see happening in the Income Tax Department is that you take youngsters with Higher Certificates in Mathematics and you put them in the position of a Long Grade Clerk, just slightly above the position of a Cadet, and put them to do the job of Assessment Officer. Is right? Of course it is a question of dealing with figures and he has the help of the Income Tax Commissioner and the Death Duties Officers who are trained men. But what is the position as regards these Valuation Officers? You are going to send them out into the field. That

is not the same thing as regards the Assessment Officers. These new Officers are coming under the aegis of the Income Tax Commissioner, and in due course will be streamlined into certain directions. There is no reason why because you have the salaries fixed for your Assessment Officer and you feel that you should not step above that for the payment of Valuation Officers, that you should take Long Grade Clerks and put them to do the job of a Valuation Officer. Valuation Officers, I repeat, are not the same as Assessment Officers.

Sir, I am moving that this Resolution be postponed for further consideration. The Hon. Premier has said that the whole of the Income Tax Department will come under the review of the Salaries Commissioner. If this Department is coming under his review, and there is no emergency and no necessity for these posts immediately, then we should postpone this Resolution. [A VOICE: The Hon. Premier says that this is an immediate necessity.] If there is a necessity for it immediately, you can postpone it today, and bring it next Tuesday when you will have discussed it further with your Income Tax Commissioner.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if I should be allowed to interrupt the honourable member, let me ask: where do you think Government got these figures except from Mr. Lightburn and Mr. Marriott?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Of course, Mr. Chairman, you know that when the Salaries Commissioner comes to review salaries, that somebody writes his recommendations before he comes into the Island. In most cases, he knows exactly from where he must begin. He knows he must begin from the top.

I am at a loss to understand how the Income Tax Commissioner could recommend these salaries. I do not want to give away anything but I do not know how to believe it. I am suggesting to you that you go back to the Executive with this matter because there is something wrong with it. The Government had asked that a panel of advisers should be appointed to discuss with and advise the Commissioner. I do not know if the Hon. Premier remembers that. All these matters were discussed. I cannot see how they arrive at these figures. Postpone it, and bring it back next Tuesday after you have discussed it again in Executive. Actually, the Assessors whom you have attached in these posts work for much more than \$200.00 per month, and a lot of them are part time at that. I now beg to move that this Resolution be postponed for further consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: How can you put that question when I moved that this Resolution be now postponed for further consideration?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not know that it was seconded.

The question that this Resolution be now postponed for further consideration was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows—

Ayes: Mr. Tudor, Mr. Barrow, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Alder, Mr. E. D. Mottley and Mr. Goddard.—6.

Noes: Hon. G. H. Adams, Hon. Dr. Cummins, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. Talma, Hon. R. G. Mapp, Mrs. Bourne, Mr. Holder, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Miller, and Mr. J. C. Mottley.—11.

Mr. Barrow rose to speak.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member want to speak on the Resolution?

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the Resolution. Mr. Chairman, under the Civil Establishment Order 1949-5, which if the hon. members of the Government are able to read, I doubt very much they can. . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What are you speaking on now;

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the Resolution which I hope Your Honour has read. I am giving you the background. . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you speaking on the Civil Establishment Order?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Clerk, will you show him the Resolution? As I was saying, Sir, under the Civil Establishment Order 1949-5, I am just giving Your Honour a clear picture of the situation which concerns us at this moment. Under Section 3, subsection 1, it states "it shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee from time to time by order to establish offices in the public service of this island;" and other matters set out in the same section of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949-5.

Now in the Resolution which the hon. member is trying to foist on reluctant members of this Chamber, we are not objecting so much to the voting of money in order to implement the provisions of the Local Government Act, Section 69 and Section 146, but if we look at all the relevant Legislation it will be clear to anyone but the recalcitrant member for St. Joseph who is known as the Premier, that they are putting the cart before the horse. In Section 69 of the Local Government Act, it states that "valuation lists shall be prepared and amended by valuation officers at the times, in accordance with the conditions and subject to the rights as to objection and appeal specified in this Part of this Act," but Section 69 did not define the valuation officer. We then have to turn to Section 146 of the Local Government Act which is the Interpretation Clause, and indeed, I cannot even say the penultimate clause, because there are two more sections at the end, and this, Mr. Chairman, is also putting the cart before the horse, as the member is so fond of doing, by putting the interpretation clause at end instead of at the beginning (but nobody has accused him of being a good draftsman, not even in the Police Courts in making out complaints) but when we read the interpretation clause which has been added on as an after-thought at the end of the Local Government Act (and this is something concerning Local Government itself, and indeed so irrevocably bound up with Local Government Act, that we are placing the Income Tax Office and the Local Government Act on the same anomalous location in the island) but to return to the point the valuation officer has been described in Section 146 of the Local Government Act as "any person for the time being holding the 'office' of valuation officer established by order made under the Civil Establishment Act 1949" to which I have already referred. I should like to read that again because it is very important. "Valuation officer means any person for time being holding the office of valuation officer established by order made under the Civil Establishment Act 1949." That is my second reference. Now if we return then to the establishment of posts in the Civil Service and in offices under the 1949 Civil Establishment Act, we read that under subsection four of section 3 to which I referred, "an order under subsection (1) of this section shall be provisional only and shall be of no effect until it has been laid before the Legislature and approved by a resolution of each House", and I should like to underline the word "each". There was a famous case, Mr. Chairman, sometime around the year 1948 which Mr. Springer, an Inspector of the Barbados Police Force who in true Barbadian fashion, due to his efficiency was promptly exported overseas, brought against a member of this community whose name it is not necessary for me to mention and who indeed is unimportant for the sake of my argument. But in

that particular case it was decided that certain regulations which I supported when the orders made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee were law until they were disapproved; but no one entering into any Law Court in this Island or outside of it after reading Section 3, Sub-section 4 of the Civil Establishment Act can argue that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has the power and authority to create a charge on the public Treasury as if the Order had already been made and was of legal effect until it had been approved by each Chamber of the Legislature, and I would like to read it again: "An order under subsection (1) of this section shall be provisional only and shall be of no effect until it has been laid before the Legislature and approved by a Resolution of each House."

How there are two Resolutions before us which have been foisted upon us with no notice at all; I do not know what the hurry is. I do not know whether Government before elections is trying to stampede through Local Government and subsidiary legislation necessary to make Local Government effective. Whatever their motive, it is a matter of supreme indifference to myself and to members of my Party and to those on this side of the House, because that would not save them when the time comes anyhow; so it does not make any difference to me. But after sitting down on their haunches for five years they come in the evening of their days as members of a Government to try and make this a swan song from the point of view of capturing the unintelligent electorate—and it is certainly not in the interest of the people of this island; but we have had several resolutions of this nature, ill-considered, badly drafted and stampeded through this Chamber by sheer weight of numbers. Let that be as it is.
5.45 p.m.

I would like to point out to you Sir, because where the members of the Government are concerned, I know that my words are falling on deaf ears as far as that there is no Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 20 Order, which has any legal or binding effect at the present moment; because even if they get it approved here, the Other Place has not got a meeting scheduled for today to approve of the Order which we have passed, and the Resolution would be *ultra vires*. We know that when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph gets up to fulminate and to defend the indefensible, several honourable members on this side of the House write out sentences which he will use having reference to people's parents and the number of times when he has had to save people from things. Such sentences we on this side of the House write out when we have nothing to do, before the honourable member even utters them. We expect the honourable member to be consistent today and to raise his voice to feverish pitch until the time when it is on the verge of breaking. The honourable senior member for St. Michael who is challenging him even now to get up and abuse me, like a Charlie Mc Carthy—the Hon. Premier has descended to such depths since 1939 that he is now at the beck and call of the honourable senior member for St. Michael; the only thing which has prevented him from rising before is that the honourable senior member for St. Michael is not in a position to push a pin in him and make him get up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member keep to the Resolution which is now before us?

Mr. BARROW: I am merely explaining a point which is appreciated by everyone on this side of the Table with the exception of my colleague at the extreme right. Everything the Premier says seems to be accepted as if it has been sent down from Mount Sinai with the Holy Tables, but we will not let this

House sit down and be the laughing-stock either of the members of the Other Place or of the Salaries Commissioner. Now I come back to the Local Government Act. At the time when I pointed out that the Representation of the People Act made no provision for Local Government Elections, I was told that I was talking nonsense; even when I cited the 1944 Act and produced the logic of having one list instead of two lists, the honourable member said that I was talking nonsense. I was surprised to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, in making a positive statement to the senior member for the City, ask whether the honourable member had come in here without consulting Mr. Lightburn and the Income Tax Commissioner; because it is the same Mr. Lightburn who has said that he was talking nonsense and that there should be one Electoral List. Of course, we will be entertained by the fulminations of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, but we know that this Civil Establishment Order has not been placed before the Other Place, it has not been approved and it has been foisted upon us without any notice at all. We consider that since no date has been proclaimed for the establishment of the Local Government divisions, we do not see why it should be so urgent to have this Resolution passed creating the posts of Valuation Officers when there is nothing to be valued at the present moment.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

Ayes: HON. G. H. ADAMS, HON. M. E. COX, HON. C. E. TALMA, HON. R. G. MAPF, MRS. BOURNE, MESSRS. HOLDER, BRYAN, VAUGHAN, MILLER, F. L. WALCOTT, J. C. MOTTLEY and DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS—12.

Noes: MESSRS. BARROW, CRAWFORD, TUDOR, ALLDER, HAYNES, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—7.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. Cummins, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, the postponement of two and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

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

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolution was read a first time and second time and agreed to.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 20 ORDER, 1956 CREATION OF POSTS OF VALUATION OFFICERS

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker. I now ask leave of the House to take as the next Order of the Day, the Resolution to approve of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 20 Order, 1956.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Premier.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to approve of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 20 Order which seeks to establish the posts of one Chief Valuation Officer, two Valuation Officers, Grade I, two others, Grade II and one Stenographer-typist. These posts are to be established under the Department of Income Tax and Death Duties which will be known by this Order as the Department of Inland Revenue.

It is unnecessary for me to say anything more than what has been said in the previous debate. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I believe a very important duty devolves upon you; therefore, I would like to have your undivided attention in this matter. It is your function as Speaker to dictate to this House how Orders should be dealt with. It has been stated that for some time past Orders have been dealt with in any fashion. I should like to draw to your attention that an Act has been created by Parliament giving the Government the right to create additional posts to the Civil Establishment from time to time by a Civil Establishment Order. Usually, when there is a new post to be created, Government comes down with a Resolution to approve of the Order creating that post. That Order is made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In addition to that, you may get a Resolution coming down for money if it is a post that requires money to be voted for it. I feel it is your duty in these circumstances to rule on the procedure that should take place in this House on matters such as this. It should not be left for the House to say that it is going to do it in this way today and in another way next week. We have this novel case today where a Resolution has been passed to provide money for posts to be created under the Civil Establishment Act and you are now dealing with a Resolution which makes reference to an Order to be approved by the Legislature. If you read the Addendum to this Resolution, you will find out that we have already passed money for posts, the creation of which we are now going to seek approval. Bear in mind, you have already passed the money for something of which you have not given approval. In other words, it presupposes that this Order has been passed.

I think it will be better if this Chamber appears to the world as a Parliament which knows what it is doing, and that we do things in common with other Colonial Parliaments. We should not, because we are Barbadians, want to do things so differently from other established Parliaments. Why should we pass a Resolution for money for something before we pass the Order to create those posts to which the money pertains? That is the normal thing which we should do. I am sure from the debate which you have heard—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard the debate.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. There are people from other Parliaments in the gallery to this House listening to what we are doing.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of order. I am wondering if I understand correctly, if the honourable member was calling Your Honour's attention to strangers! [Laughter].

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will not take these facetious remarks seriously. I am asking Your Honour for a ruling on this matter as it is one involving procedure. It is obviously a difficult and complicated matter for the Chairman of Committees at all times to give a ruling.

I feel it is your duty, Mr. Speaker, and your duty not only to Parliament but to the public generally, if there is anything dealing with procedure to state what procedure should be adopted. It should not be willy-nilly; it should be something given from the Chair. You should state that this should be the order in which it should be dealt with. In Orders with which we are now dealing, you should say that the Resolution to approve the Order should be dealt with first in the House. It is asking the House too much to approve of things in Committee and then bring it back in the House like this matter with which we are dealing. That is why I am asking Your Honour to give a ruling. If you cannot give a ruling today (and I am not expecting you to give it today without your looking up the Civil Establishment Act) you can give it on another occasion. I am sure from perusal of the

functions of a Speaker, that matters of procedure to be adopted should be a ruling from the Chair, and not as to how the House should feel about them. It is your prerogative to say if the Resolution to approve this Order should come first or if the Money Resolution pertaining to it should come first. When you make your ruling, all of us will have to abide by that ruling.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there is one remark which was made by the hon. member which I take exception. I have my private differences with Your Honour but I never thought that Your Honour would be unable to make a ruling. It may not be one which I appreciate.

6.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter has requested a ruling on procedure that has taken place in Committee just before I resumed the Chair. [A VOICE: We cannot hear!] I am not going to shout. As soon as honourable members compose themselves, I will continue to speak. As far as the honourable junior member for St. Peter's complaint is concerned, I should tell him first that unless the Chairman reports any irregularity to me, it is assumed that all things done in Committee had been done correctly; and the Chairman has made no report of irregularity as far as touching the priority of the Resolution on the Order. It appears to be obvious that this Resolution should have preceded but if the honourable member knows the circumstances under which these Resolutions were introduced this afternoon, he should quite understand that I cannot give any direction as to the priority of the House, I came in rather late, and I myself had to report rather hastily; but on a future occasion I do not think any such thing is likely to arise when there is time for me and my clerical assistants to peruse such documents. That is all I need say at the moment.

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

COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT AND WELFARE GRANTS

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a statement about Colonial Development and Welfare Grants which have been approved by the Secretary of State.

"Since the beginning of the present financial year the Secretary of State for the Colonies has approved grants totalling \$1,374,384 (£286,330) from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds in respect of the following projects:—

Roads

A grant of \$475,200 (£99,000) towards the cost of the development of roads in the various tenancies throughout the Island. This grant may only be applied to those tenancies which were developed before 1928, i.e. before the legislation contained in the Public Health Act, 1908-8 controlling the lay-out of housing estates came into operation.

Water Resources

A comprehensive plan for the development of the water resources of the Island over the years 1956-1960 has been prepared. The programme falls under three heads: the exploitation of the water resources of the subterranean lake at Sweet Vale in the parish of St. George, the development of existing pumping facilities at the Haymans and Belle pumping stations and the expansion of the distributor system through additional mains and standposts. The

total cost of the plan has been estimated at \$889,000 (£185,210) towards which the Secretary of State has approved a Colonial Development and Welfare Grant of \$791,184 (£164,830).

Health Centre, St. Philip

A grant of \$108,000 (£22,500) towards the cost of the establishment in St. Philip of a Health Centre for the Southern district.

2. *Airport*

An application has been submitted to the Secretary of State for a grant of approximately \$650,250 (£135,470) towards improvements at Seawell Airport which will include.

- (iii) Provision of additional fire appliances.
- (i) Extension of the runway
- (ii) Enlargement of the terminal building

The Secretary of State has given advance approval for the expenditure of \$192,000 (£40,000) so that work can proceed on the extension of the runway. This expenditure is reimbursable from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds if and when a scheme is approved.

The Government has thought fit to give notice of what approval has been given and what is under consideration in view of the fact that the House is not yet aware of all that is contemplated in the next Five Year Plan.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, September 11th, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Addresses Passed in the House

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: On the motion for the adjournment, Sir, there are two matters to which I want to draw attention. The first is this: At a recent meeting of the House the honourable junior member for St. Lucy introduced an Address in connection with the provision of milk for children under five years old. The Government Party saw fit to vote against that Address, and subsequently in the Public Press

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, that question was discussed at the last meeting of the House. It cannot be brought up at this meeting.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And subsequently both at public meetings and in the Press Government spokesmen have endeavoured to explain their refusal to support the Address on the grounds that since the introduction of Ministerial Status they have opposed Addresses introduced on the floor of the House on matters of policy. It is not fair, Mr. Speaker, for that deliberately mischievous and mendacious statement to go to the public unchallenged; because as you are

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I oppose the use of the word mendacious.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to the Minister when he uses the word "mendacious"?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that statements made at public meetings and in the Press are mendacious and maliciously misleading.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is not concerned with statements made outside the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Lest the public remains misinformed as to the true position, I regard it as my duty to present the facts to the public today.

Now since the introduction of Ministerial Status in 1954, a number of Addresses have been passed in this House on matters affecting Government policy, and I do not propose to tire the House with the long list I have before me. I have a list before me of nearly thirty Addresses, but I only intend to quote a few. There was an Address introduced by myself with regard to emigration to Canada in 1954, and passed; an Address introduced by myself for permission to land here being granted to Dr. Jagan and Dr. Burnham and passed by the House. The Chairman of the House, Mr. Smith, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, brought an Address with regard the purchase of Joes River Factory, and you could not want a more important Address than the nationalisation

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of Order. Your Honour has just said the House is not concerned with any remarks which revolves around remarks made outside the House. All the hon. member has said reflects upon the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: What reflects upon the House?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The remarks made outside the House some weeks ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has long refrained from that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: He has drawn attention to remarks made outside this House, and they are not consistent with remarks made inside this House, and they are not consistent with remarks inside this House. If Your Honour has said that remarks made outside the House do not concern the House, how can he be allowed to proceed with them?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is a long time since I read Moliere. I think it is L'Arve who makes one of his most famous Harpagon, say "qui se sent meurre, q'uil se mouche which" means, whom the cap fits, let him draw the string."

The Hon. Minister who has just sat down has been explaining the actions of his Ministry for a long time in the public press.

6.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will desist from making any reference to the Hon. Minister, he can well develop his point. He can well do that without having recourse to any personal reflection against any hon. member of this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You could not want a more vital Address on Government policy than an Address having been brought in here asking the Government to nationalise the Sugar Industry. Such an Address was brought in here by the colleague of the Premier; that is an Address which the hon. member had no right bringing in here at all, because if he is a member of the Government Party he should have been able to ask the appropriate Minister what was the Government's policy in the matter.

On the 15th June, 1954, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph brought in this Address asking his own Government to nationalise the Joes River Sugar Factory, but we did not have any objection from the Government Party, nor did we see any statement in the Press nor did they get up on any platform in the Ivy or Brittons Hill and say that the Opposition was using the procedure of Addresses to question Government policy and that whenever any such Addresses were introduced they would vote against them. The truth is that they have no policy at all as regards Addresses in this House; when it suits them to vote against Addresses, they vote against them; and when it suits them to vote

for Addresses they vote for them. Because of that, they try to delude the public with the incorrect statement that it is the Government's policy, since the introduction of Ministerial Status not to support Addresses reflecting or affecting or involving Government policy.

Let us proceed with a few more Addresses. There was the Address introduced by the hon. senior member for the City with regard to Pan American Airways. Certainly every single member of the Government Party supported that Address because they were afraid not to support it; but they would oppose it in the quarters that matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must warn the hon. member that he cannot refer to that Address in such a manner as to bring it again before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The time is coming when we shall carry it to the public. What I am saying is that in a matter like that affecting an important aspect of Government policy, the Government supported the Address which was passed by the House, the Governor replied to it and even the Premier himself moved the appointment of a Select Committee to go into the matter. How then can they tell the public that they would oppose Addresses on matters of policy? Mr. Speaker have you ever heard a more mendacious untruth?

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. member has learned from outside sources is not the business of this House: as far as the Ministers are concerned they are quite challengeable in this House, but I do not think I can allow the hon. member to dilate in this Chamber on matters which he has heard outside.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If Your Honour will recall, I said what I did say, with reference to the Address dealing with Pan American Airways and I said on the floor of this House that the Governor replied to that Address. I am now referring to action which has been taken in the House by the Government completely contradictory to the impression which is being given outside. I said that the question involving the granting Landing Rights at Seawell to American Flag-Bearing airlines is one of the biggest questions involving Governmental policy; there could not be anything bigger than that. The same Ministers were there when we passed the Address and they said nothing; the Governor replied to it and then the Premier himself appointed a Committee to go into the matter, so that we have on the Order Paper under the Head "Select Committee" this item:—

"To consider and prepare a draft reply to His Excellency's Message No. 6/56 regarding the granting of Landing Rights at Seawell to an American Flag-Bearing Airline."

The Committee which was appointed to reply to the Message was as follows: The hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. GODDARD), the hon. senior member for the City (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN), the hon. senior member for St. Andrew (Mrs. BOURNE) and our distinguished friend, the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. VAUGHAN) [Laughter].

That is the Committee which was appointed by the Hon. Premier himself. How in the face of all that—I have not even begun to deal with the Addresses which have been passed by this House—but how in the face of all that, in this current session, could people who are occupying positions of responsibility, from whom certain standards of integrity are expected, be expected to create the impression publicly that the Government never expresses any

view in the House on matters tabled by hon. members involving policy? That is not right. 6.35 p.m.

It is not right, and my attitude today is merely to use the highest forum in the country to give the lie direct to any statements of this nature, regardless of the source from which they come. I am not prepared to allow the country to be misled on an important matter like this. There has been no fundamental change in the Constitution which up to now prevents any hon. member in this House from introducing an Address and passing it to the Governor. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Government Ministers themselves do it, and Government back benchers also do it.

You must have been astounded, Mr. Speaker, to read if you saw in your own Workers' Organisation newspaper—what I will call in certain sections of the *kennel Press*—that it has been Government's policy since the introduction of Ministerial Status not to support Addresses to the Governor because the Addresses go to the Ministers. Now, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Hon. Leader of the House have themselves introduced Addresses to the Governor, the Hon. Minister of Communication introduced an Address on the Deep Water Harbour, the Hon. Leader of the House introduced one with regard to fire protection; the Hon. Premier introduced one with regard to the Police Training School, and another with regard to the Intra-Regional Shipping Service, and another relating to the Report of the Conference on Movement of Persons in the British Caribbean Federation, and yet another relating to the Foundation School. As a matter of fact, all sorts of Addresses were introduced by everyone of them.

With regard to members of the Opposition, or floor members of the House, they have also introduced Addresses. I will begin by quoting some. There is one by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy on the composition of the form of the Delegation to the London Conference, when the entire Chamber was aghast on the way in which the Federal Delegation was selected when it would fall on another Government—not that Government—to implement the Federal decisions. The principle has been set in the Mother of Parliaments that when matter affecting the welfare of the nation are concerned the possibility arises that there may be an alternative Government on whom the responsibility would fall to implement those decisions, and both the Government's spokesman and the Leader of the Opposition should have equal share in those decisions. That principle was made clear at the time of the Potsdam Conference that Sir Winston Churchill took Sir Clement Attlee, and subsequent history proved he was correct and we know that the same thing can happen in Barbados. We know that the same Opposition in this Chamber which was ignored on that occasion will have the responsibility and obligation to implement the Federal decisions. As I have said that Address as regards the manner in which the Opposition was to be strongly represented at the London Conference, was moved by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and passed by this House. There are countless others. In June, 1952, an Address by myself with regard to loans to fishermen was passed by this House. There is a list of others from which all hon. members except those who are illiterate can read.

There is, Mr. Speaker, an open secret on this matter on which this deliberate effort is being made to mislead the public that public opinion is very

strong on it, because we have had the spectacle of other important British Colonies in the area having taken steps long before us in the endeavor of obtaining nutritional supplies for children.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is straying.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The burden of my complaint, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not true that Addresses were not passed in this Chamber by private members and the Government since the introduction of Ministerial Government. Can there be anything more important than the Administration of Justice in the Colony? On the list before me, you will see that in November last year, the honourable, learned and gallant senior member for St. George introduced an Address in connection of Administration of Justice and it was passed by the House, and without a division at all. In due course, it found its way in the hands of the officials for whom it was intended.

The time has come when such matters must be arrested at the source. Any attempt to mislead the public, and to create in the minds of the body politic or to create a wrong impression designed to perpetuate the stranglehold which a particular Party has for some time on the thinking of the minds of people must be stopped. I am prepared, at any time that published statements can be substantiated to say nothing; but I am not prepared to allow the public to be fooled into a particular line of thinking, merely because there are people in this community clever enough to endeavour to foist on the minds of the public a subtle, insidious nauseating and noxious propaganda which we have seen done in other countries to the ultimate destruction of national prestige and character.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak against the adjournment of this House. It is very remarkable, Sir that today we have a Resolution to deal with the relief for hurricane sufferers. It is a year since some of these sufferers have been awaiting Government's assistance; there are still some houses on the ground, Sir, and there are still some Government's aid. There are also many of these sufferers resting in propped up roofs awaiting sufferers who have already started to pay the Housing Authority allotments on their prefab houses some months ago now, and cannot get delivery of such. This Resolution calls for forty-one thousand dollars, and one would have thought that Government would try to expedite the passing of it so as to assist those who are responsible for carrying out such projects in enabling them to do so at this time: and it does appear very disheartening for Government to be willing to adjourn this House at this hour.

Certainly at a time when one who worked for them died, the important business of the State was left undone so as to give Party members an opportunity of presenting themselves at the funeral; and now today, Sir, the business of the Government and of the people must be deferred so as to give the Labour Party an opportunity to get a little boost from a visitor who is in our midst today. I feel it is a disservice. Nobody prevents them from having their meetings and having the verbal aid which they hope to get tonight, but what we want to know is that this Resolution is dealt with so that the various Departments can go ahead in relieving the sufferings of these hurricane victims, many of whom have been waiting for some time on Government.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am also opposing the adjournment of the House at this stage, because in the past we have been kept here until the wee, small hours of the morning on debates of a frivolous nature by certain other members of the Other Side of the Chamber. In my parish, there

are countless houses which have not been repaired since the hurricane unfortunately passed over this island, unfortunately, that is for the victims of the island, and not for those ghoulish people who sought to make profit out of the disaster of others; but nearly a year has passed.

The organisation for reconditioning has been taken out of the hands of the Local Government authorities and such relief and reconstruction and rehabilitation as there is has been placed in the aegis of the Housing Board. The result is that it is very difficult for anyone who is not a personal friend or relative of a member of the Government Party to get anything done, because the new scale of social priorities appears to have been drawn up by someone at the head of the organisation. This month is September and it is nearly a year ago; and I intend to call a day of mourning in St. George, on the actual date of the hurricane, for those who unfortunately lost their limbs, and for those who lost their lives, and as a protest against the ineptitude of those who had such enormous funds at their disposal and which have subsequently been squandered and mis-appropriated, and which could have done more for the suffering people of this island than has been done up to now. On the day of the hurricane—and I am sorry that my colleague is not here—I liberated the food which should have been in the Centres from District "B" Police Station because at 5.30 in the afternoon not one relief station or emergency shelter had either food or light, and I had to go and demand of an officer—who unfortunately is no longer with us—and his attendants whether they had a warrant of arrest for the food which should have been distributed throughout St. George, because I had information that the food was locked up in the Police cells. I remonstrated in as polite a fashion as I could over this lack of organisation and the inefficiency in my parish, but I would like to say this in due fairness to the members of the Committee: in that parish they rectified their mistakes. On that day that I did not have my book with me, and I do not intend to make it a document to the House, but keep it purely for information of the members of the other side. The houses I have seen, I have made periodic checks on; and you would be astounded at cases in which not one single thing has been done. Some are lying flat, and a lorry has driven by and put a private convenience at the side of some houses. My Colleague has been making certain remarks about my not being here on the day of the hurricane, but this book was started on that day and I am going to lend it to him, and I doubt some of the districts I have on this book he has ever heard of, because certain districts he will not go into and some he cannot go into at this time. I have made periodic checks on this which I shall show to my colleague and my Party and to those responsible that only in about 15% of the cases has anything been done. That is not satisfactory. Quite apart from the houses which have been actually destroyed and not rehabilitated in St. George, there are those cases in which people were directed to take receipts and bills and vouchers into the authorities and they would receive relief. They have gone, but in every single instance in which some kind of relief has been given, in the first place it was not adequate and in the second place some kind of relation could be traced between the political profession of the householder and his receipt of relief.

6.55 p.m.

I do not want to say anything more than that; I am prepared to prove it in Court. That is not a satisfactory way of conducting public affairs in this island; if any Minister is going to say that he did not know about these things, he ought to know the statistics at least; and if they are done without his

knowledge, he ought to have known about them. If it is suggested that public employees are responsible, then those employees should have been dismissed a long time ago, and they should have got on with the job with more efficient employees. I therefore fail to appreciate how all matters of such great pith and moment, could have remained in such a state of suspense to the discomfort of my parishioners in particular and the other victims of the island in general, for twelve months. How could any honourable member on that side of the House, with a Resolution in this connection, a Resolution of which we have had notice—not like the ones with which we dealt today, but which has been placed on the Order Paper—how can they have the temerity to move the adjournment of the House so that they can collect money somewhere else? That is what to fail to appreciate.

The district of Bel Air is one of the districts in which my colleague and I would not go on his injunction and advice; perhaps that is why that district has been left out now.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of Order. The honourable member has referred to a district in St. George and he said that it was on my suggestion and advice that he did not go into that district. I do not know of any district in St. George—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of Order.

Mr. BARROW: Such an injunction is apparently a perpetual injunction because not only can a member of that Party be restrained from going into that district, but the Government Enquiry officers also have an injunction not to go into a district like that. There is a long list of names which I have and I am prepared to give the honourable member bus fare, if the buses are running, to go into the district and see if what I am saying is true or not. When you come to Frenches district, I would like the honourable senior member for St. Michael to make a note of what I am saying and come back here next week and say whether it is true or not, but he will find that there is a long list of houses which have not been rehabilitated.

As regards the Ellerton district, I understand that there is a substantial Union membership up there and therefore there is not much cause for complaint; these are coincidences which certain honourable members cannot ignore. When you come to Salters and Parish Land districts, they have been on the prescribed list of the Labour Party for a long time. Then there is Bridge Cot and when you leave Groves you have to traverse roads the like of which have not been seen for a long time. When you come to the hinterland between Groves and Cottage, then you will see the abomination of desolation; they have never been up there to see about one house in that district. As regards Drax Hall, Hope, that should have been called Drax Hall Despair, because there is no hope of getting any relief up there. I could go on *ad infinitum*, Mr. Speaker; I have the description of the damage and so on, all of which I have placed at the disposal of the Local Government Committee and I have made representations to the House Authority. Yet they have the gall to get up on a public platform and say: "We have done this for you!"

Another matter is that of sanitation under Hurricane Relief administration. They seem to have the idea that because the people are in the country it is good enough for them to dig a cane hole; and when they bring the privies to the people, I understand that the lorries do not stop. The privies are just thrown at the side of the road and if there are not any strong men up there, the latrines would not get

erected at all. You can journey through all the parish and see these privies lying on their sides. These conveniences are of no use to the people in the position in which they are left lying, but there are thousands of them at the Pine and people are not being given the facilities which they deserve.

I am not saying anything about the quality of the houses which have been erected; we do not expect any social thinking or any aesthetic ideas, proper planning or anything of that nature from Government. We expect just rough-shod things. It is not any idea of mine to criticise them because you do not expect to get anything better; but if something had been done in order to rehabilitate these parishioners of mine, there would not have been any need for me to protest at this stage over the adjournment of the House when there is a Resolution of the nature of a Hurricane Resolution, if I may so call it, the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: I want now to draw the attention of the Government to the Act to consolidate the Laws of the Island relating to the Representation of the People. I have a very good reason for so doing because it is something which the honourable junior member for St. Thomas said he would rectify, and there are the chances that this matter may be stampeded through this House when I may possibly be not in the Island. Therefore, on the motion for the adjournment I want to ask the honourable junior member for St. Thomas what has he done about amending Sub-clause 4 of Clause 44 of Part III of the First Schedule to the Act? I hope the honourable member will write that down because it is very difficult for him to understand Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the Clerk that it was the honourable senior member for Christ Church who made that promise.

Now, the position is this: On the last occasion when we discussed the Representation of the People Act, the honourable members promised this House faithfully that he will either go into Committee on the matter or he would have something done about it. This particular sub-clause reads as follows:—

"Subject to the last foregoing paragraph the deposit shall be forfeited if a poll is taken and, after the counting of the votes by the returning officer (including any re-count) is completed, the candidate is found not to have polled more than one-eighth of the total number of votes polled by all the candidates."

7.55 p.m.

Speaking under correction, I am told that the promise was made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church who is the Minister of Agriculture; therefore, if I made any unfortunate references to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, which is being controversial, I am sorry for that. I forgot that this would not be his portfolio. We can substitute the hon. senior member for Christ Church for any references to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

The reason why we have insisted on the revision of sub-Clause 4, is that it is a departure from the existing law. Mr. Speaker, I will read sub-Clause (3) first:—

"If the candidate is not shown as standing nominated in the statement of persons nominated, or if the poll is countermanded by reason of his death, the deposit shall be returned as soon as practicable after the publication of the statement or after his death, as the case may be."

Now, sub-Clause (4) reads follows:—

"Subject to the last foregoing paragraph the deposit shall be forfeited if a poll is taken and, after the counting of the votes by the returning officer

(including any re-count is completed, the candidate is found not to have polled more than one-eighth of the total number of votes polled by all candidates."

Now, before I go on, I just want to warn members of the Government not to ask for any latitude; we on this side of the House are not worried about the risk of our deposits being lost, being doubled or quadrupled. That is not the point. The previous position was that it depended on the number of votes cast, which is an entirely different thing from the number of people voting.

When we come to sub-Clause (5) of the same Clause 44 of Part III of the First Schedule, it says:—

"Notwithstanding anything in the three last foregoing paragraphs, if at a general election a candidate is shown as standing nominated in more than one constituency in the statements of persons nominated, not more than one of the deposits shall be returned and, if necessary, the Accountant General shall direct which it is to be."

Now, I would like to deal with the absurdity which was also being pointed out to the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention that there is no quorum. I will ask the Clerk to ring the bell.

The bell was rung, and a quorum was had.
7.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: As I was saying, Sir, sub Clause (5) of Clause 44 of Part III of the First Schedule states that not more than one deposit shall be returned.

Mr. Speaker, when a late member of this Chamber who had made a great contribution to both to the constitutional, economic and social betterment of the masses of this island passed to the great beyond, the Government Party did not think fit to allow the House to be adjourned so that members who belonged to the human race and who were aware of the contribution made by the late Mr. C. A. Brathwaite could attend. There is some fiesta on tonight in which they hope to dip more heavily into the purse of the public body, and I understand the Leader of the House is outside discouraging members from returning to the Chamber. Anyhow I need say no more; these things are matters of history. I am not talking here for my health; I would sooner be at home doing my work or my clients' work, but the people have put me here to represent them and I am going to make sure that the affairs of the country are carried on and in an efficient manner no matter whom it affects. In sub-Clause 5 of Section 44 of Part III of the Representation of the People's Act which may be stamped through the House next week when I am not here, and therefore Your Honour would bear with me, it states: "not more than one of the deposits shall be returned and, if necessary, the Accountant General shall direct which it is to be."

Now, it is possible—I do not want to put fear into the hearts and minds of any of the members on the other side of the House—that people like myself, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the hon. junior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy might all be nominated for more than one parish and for each nomination we may pay our deposits, and the chances are that we will be victorious in everyone, as Your Honour knows, especially the parish of St. Michael; it will then mean although we had trounced the people of the ilk of the members who represented them in that parish present in the House, that we would not get back our money although we got 32,000

votes. It means if you got back part of the money which you have spent, which in England and in Barbados you are entitled to get, you will only get back the deposit from one. It is setting a premium on our popularity; and therefore we have an upside-down situation in Barbados where ignorance is elevated into a virtue and unpopularity is the paramount consideration of getting back deposits on Election Day. I hope that the hon. senior member for Christ Church who has had the decency to stay in his place since I referred to him, will give the public and the House some statement which he had promised to give us of the quality which he has been giving us in the past and which he has promised to give us in this particular matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation. The hon. senior member for St. Philip pointed out to the House that Government members had supported Addresses he referred to, and one which he claims I sponsored in this House. I should like to inform the House of the Address and the form which it took which shows in no uncertain manner that it is quite different from the Address which was moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and also the Address moved by the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker,.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I am speaking on a point of explanation.
Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking on a point of explanation and must be allowed to continue.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am endeavouring to explain.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying that the House will remember in 1953 His Excellency the Governor set up a Committee to enquire into the possibilities of establishing a Deep Water Harbour and that Committee reported on the 23rd December, 1953. The hon. senior member for St. Philip was a member of that Committee, the hon. junior member for Christ Church was also a member and the hon. senior member for St. Peter was Chairman. Consequently upon that His Excellency the Governor sent a Message to this House with a copy of the Report and this is what the Message said:—

His Excellency the Governor
TO
The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to submit for the consideration and approval of the House of Assembly a Report of the Deep Water Harbour.

Now, Sir, that is what was gone into members of the Committee and of this House after the Ministerial Government had started and that Message was replied to on the 1st of June, 1954 and this is what we said in that Message:—

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 9/1954 forwarding for their consideration the Report of the Deep Water Harbour Committee.

The House of Assembly accept and agree with the recommendations of the Deep Water Harbour Committee as set out in the Report of the said Committee, and sincerely that the necessary steps

will be taken at an early date to implement the said recommendations.

After that when this House was informed of the procedure in relation to Addresses this is what this House did on the 28th June, 1955.

"Resolved that this House place on record its acceptance in principle of Sir Eric Millbourn's Report on the Deep Water Harbour; and that the House pledges itself to support the Government in the implementation of the terms of the said Report."

So you will see that we agreed to the principle or policy of establishing the Deep Water Harbour and it was not a question of passing an Address. It was then stated by the Premier that no Address should be passed by the Government relative to any policy and this Resolution was passed by the House and sent to the Governor, and not an Address as

the hon. senior member for St. Philip will have you believe. I am saying Sir, it was merely an Address replying to an Address which His Excellency sent to this House. I must deny and refute any statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip who said that I

NO QUORUM

[A VOICE: There is no quorum and you should ring the Bell.]

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no need to ring the Bell. I have accommodated members on two former occasions.

There being less than nine hon. members in the House. I now declare the House adjourned until this day week, Tuesday, 11 September, 1956.