

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th August, 1958

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. L. St. A. THORNE; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

Messrs. F. G. SMITH, BRYAN and WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

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

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order, 1958.

Hon'ble M. E. COX: An account of the transactions in rum in the several Districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 30th June, 1958.

Hon'ble R. G. MAPP: Statement of Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders, to the 30th June, 1958.

Hon'ble D. D. GARNER: The Markets and Slaughter-houses Regulations, 1958.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, praying the House to pass a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, 1943, so as to increase the remuneration paid to the members of the Bank and to the Auditor.

The Petition is respectfully worded, and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition was taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:- Resolution to place the sum of \$150,292 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 20 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon'ble D. D. GARNER:- Resolution to place the sum of \$30,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No. 21, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order, 1958."

Hon'ble M. E. COX: - A Bill to amend the Pioneer Industries (Encouragement) Act, 1951.

Hon'ble M. E. COX:- A Bill to make provision for the establishment and development of industries not being carried on in this Island on a substantial scale and in aid thereof to grant relief from income tax, rates on trade profits, trade tax, interim traders' licence fees and customs duties.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, 1943.

QUESTIONS

Mr. L. E. SMITH: To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Is Government aware that there is grave dissatisfaction on the part of the workers of the Department of Highways and Transport in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew through lack of proper supervision and administration and a continuity of regular employment in these parishes?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider immediately the advisability of appointing a Resident Engineer for these parishes who will be able to administer the work of the Department in these parishes, and so avoid or remedy such disharmony before it reaches such proportions.

Is Government aware of the fact that the Housing Authority has been unable in the parish of St. Joseph

to keep to the schedule of their building programme, due to the difficulty of finding a suitable area of land for their purpose?

Will Government consider the substitution of a number of smaller plots in several districts of the parish which may be more easily acquired, and which would be better from the point of view of would-be residents, and thereby speed up the housing programme in this parish?
12.25 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Pioneer Industries (Encouragement) Act, 1951, be now read a first time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to make provision for the establishment and development of industries not being carried on in this island on a substantial scale and in aid thereof to grant relief from income tax, rates on trade profits, trade tax, interim traders' licence fees and customs duties, be now read a first time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank Act, 1943, be now read a first time.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking three months' leave of absence from the House as from the 30th of this month.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking three months' leave of absence from this House as from the 30th of this month, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Hon. Legislative Council:-

"The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Hon. the House of Assembly the Bill to provide for the establishment of a Tourist Board charged with the duty of developing the tourist industry in the Island and for matters connected therewith, which has been passed with amendments which are shewn written on the Bill."

Also, a Report of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and Accounts to the 30th June of this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour; to move the House into Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this first Resolution is for the sum of \$4,854, and as it applies to more than one Department, as usual I shall take them Head by Head.

Head XXIII - Medical was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Head XXIII deals with the General Hospital. This amount is required to purchase

a Volkswagon "Kombi" Station Wagon to replace the Chevrolet ambulance which was extensively damaged in an accident on the 13th December, 1957, and subsequently sold by auction. I think the Hon. Minister of Social Services would be more acquainted with the details. The Chevrolet ambulance was badly damaged and it was considered uneconomical to repair it and it was sold by auction. An inquiry was made by the Police and I think the Hon. Minister of Social Services will give you the details. After the inquiry it was considered that the damage was so considerable that it would be more economical to purchase a new Wagon; hence the necessity for the Resolution before us.

I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (2) General Hospital, stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Head XXIX, Sir, is for Ex-gratia payments for compensation to Mr. L. T. Eversley, a postman who was knocked down by the Fisheries Division's Land Rover which was not then covered by insurance. I think it is the policy of Government since then to carry their own insurance. The note reads as follows:-

"In December 1956, while riding his motor cycle, Mr. L. T. Eversley, a postman, was knocked down by the Fisheries Division's Land rover which was not then covered by insurance.

Mr. Eversley instituted legal proceedings against the Attorney General and the driver of the land rover in December, 1957, but on instructions from the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries settlement was negotiated out of court and agreement reached on the sum of \$1,500 in full settlement of all damages and costs. Legal fees total \$53.60.

I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous, stand part.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think we should get some information on these things. I did not query the first part of the Resolution, but we should know what the van was sold for. What I want to query is whether it is a fact that the Government is carrying its own insurance. What do you mean by that? On what basis is the Government carrying its own insurance? If they were carrying their own insurance, they would not have to come with a Resolution to cover this money, and there would not be any question of going to Court. If you carried your own insurance, your funds would have settled this; so we want to know whether this is something new which Government has instituted, and whether you have a pool from which you could take money.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I said that since then the Government has decided to carry its own insurance.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the Government has now instituted an insurance scheme, we do not know anything about it. With whom, and on what basis can you carry on an insurance scheme? I think the public should know that the Government is carrying on its own insurance and on what basis, because the members of the Cabinet cannot carry on an insurance scheme among themselves.
12.35 p.m.

We should like to know what is meant by that. I may say that this is very laudable and I would agree with the Government carrying all this insurance including Workmen's Compensation instead of so much money going out of the island in insurance. You can have a Board established to administer the funds. I am in favour of that in a general way; I am also in favour of your carrying your own insurance on your buildings. All the buildings are not going to burn down at one time; if all burn down at the same time, then you will have to go and beg. It is similar in the case of insuring against hurricanes. What I would like to know

is, if the Government is carrying on its own insurance scheme and, if that is so, how that scheme is instituted and what is the basis of the scheme which the legislature does not know anything about?

Mr. GODDARD: The law of the land is that everybody who owns a motor vehicle before he can take it on the road has to take out third party insurance. Every vehicle must carry third party insurance. Why was this not done with this vehicle which belonged to the Fisheries Department? Are they exempted under Government's scheme? If what the Hon. Minister said is so, Government long ago should have been carrying on its own insurance scheme. We had this Motor Vehicles Third Party Act on the Statute Book for years. Why was this vehicle not covered? It is a bad example to private individuals when a Government Department can put on the road vehicles without proper insurance coverage. It is against the law of the land. Let the Hon. Minister point out where they have gone wrong and then tell us if they have stopped it. I think that insurance on all the vehicles should have been carried from the day you passed that Act, if not before. If you have a comprehensive scheme of insurance for all Government Departments, let us know of it. I am saying that it should not have been done only since this accident but from the time that you had put that Act on the Statute Book of this country. I think the Hon. Minister should let us know more than only saying that this has been done only since the accident has taken place. Let me repeat; it is a bad example which you have set to private individuals.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I really have no right in assisting Government but just to set the records straight, I wish to point out to the hon. member that he will see from Section 3, subsection 5 of the Motor Vehicles (Third Party Risks) Act, 1952, that Motor Vehicles to be insured against third party risks does not apply to any motor vehicles owned by Government when such vehicle is used and employed exclusively upon Government service.

As hon. members will see, the principle is there. As the law stands Government needs not insure its vehicles if they are used exclusively upon Government service.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I thought that hon. members would have been willing to ask questions; therefore, I did not say anything in the first instance. The facts are very clear as regards this matter. Sometime in December, 1956, just before I was installed into this Ministry, this accident occurred in the parish of St. Philip between Mr. Eversley who was then a postman and Mr. Jordan who is the Marine Mechanic of the Fisheries Department. A case was lodged in the District Court by Mr. Eversley and for some reason or the other, the case was dismissed by the Magistrate.

The case was then referred to me sometime later as Minister of Agriculture and I reviewed the case along with the Attorney General and I thought that a case had been made out for compensation. I therefore asked that the Queen's Solicitor be given an opportunity to negotiate with Mr. Eversley in order to affect a settlement. This is the settlement which has been agreed to by Mr. Eversley and his representative, and I think they are quite satisfied with this amount which we have agreed to; I think it is a fair and just one.

As regards the question proposed by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I would like to say this. I was very glad that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew took it upon himself to help Government before a member of the Government got up to reply, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter if he had looked up the law would have seen from the Act that that is the law of the land.

I must also say this. It was quite unfortunate for us that the insurance policy on this vehicle had expired just the day before. We were taking over our liabilities from the following day; so hon. members can see that on the first day of our taking over, this accident occurred. If it had occurred the day before, of course the insurance company would have had to pay but the insurance had ended the day before. I will repeat that it is Government's policy to carry its own liabilities.

As regards the bigger question of Government carrying other insurances, such as insurance on buildings, we have nothing to do with that in this matter; that is for another debate.

I think I should tell this Committee that Mr. Eversley is very happy about this settlement and I think the best thing was done to keep this matter out of court. Mr. Eversley suffered some loss and I think this amount which you see here is quite fair, and enough to repay him for any loss he sustained.

There is nothing more I can say than to make this Committee feel that we have done our best and that the aggrieved person is quite happy over the settlement.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am not concerned with the litigation case between the Government and Mr. Eversley as it would appear from what the Hon. Minister said. I do not know if he wants to infer that the Government was so magnanimous that although the case went before the courts and it was dismissed, the Government is quite willing to give an *ex gratia* payment to Mr. Eversley although the other party had no claim. If that is so, to begin to establish that this man who was injured with a Government vehicle and who came down on Government with a third party insurance claim had no claim is to say that none of us has any claim against the Crown if the Crown is prosecuted under this Act. The Hon. Minister has not answered the point I was asking, and I will like Ministers of the Government to be more precise in their language in Parliament. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture now says that an insurance policy was carried on this vehicle but it expired the day before that accident took place and he went on to say that the Government intended to carry its own insurance. What the Hon. Minister means to say is that he is prepared to pay out of the Public Treasury ---

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I rise on a point of Order. I particularly said liabilities; I did not say insurance.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you say liabilities, that is a different thing.
12.45 p.m.

If you are going to underwrite all the liabilities of your people, that is a very sensible thing to do and the accidents for which you would have to pay into the Treasury would be very few; when you are carrying your insurance schemes, it is a different matter. I hope that the Hon. Minister will consider that there are other liabilities which the Government should underwrite on a similar basis.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not like the way in which the Hon. Minister referred to my attempting to explain what the law is, even before the Government. My function is to contribute to the debates of this House, not to attack the Government. I thought that, as a matter of law, I would assist in clearing up the point.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I am sorry that the hon. member has taken the matter in that spirit. I did not do what I did in that light. I thanked the hon. member for helping the Government before I got up to reply. I do not think that the hon. member has taken me in the right spirit at all.

(Mr. F. G. SMITH: All right.)

The question that HEAD XXIX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$4,854 do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone the next Resolution and to take Resolution No. 3 next.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Communications, in whose name Resolution No. 2 stands, is now in his place and I am asking leave to withdraw my motion for the postponement.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want to have the record straight. The Premier was inaudible from this side of the Committee, but you have already granted him leave to postpone Resolution No. 2 and to proceed with Resolution No. 3. The Premier asked leave to do that and he was granted leave; he cannot, therefore, go back to Resolution No. 2, as if it were a matter of going up and down. You have to deal with Resolution No. 3, and then come back to Resolution No. 2. You cannot do things like that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: All right, Sir.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No.19

VISIT OF U.K. DELEGATION OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Resolution No. 3, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$940 in connection with the visit of a Delegation of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of the United Kingdom. I think that hon. members are pretty well acquainted with the purpose for which this money is to be voted; it is for the purpose of the entertainment of the U.K. Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Delegation which visited Barbados this year. The Secretary of State for the Colonies notified this Government that five members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association would be visiting Barbados among other Islands in the Caribbean area; the main purpose of the visit was to attend the opening of the Federation Ceremony in Trinidad and after that ceremony, they would take the opportunity of visiting these Caribbean Islands, Barbados being one of them.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies communicated with this Government and the matter was referred back to the Cabinet who said that they were willing to send down the necessary Resolution to defray the expenses of these five members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. The Speaker of this House at the time, was myself, and I, along with the President of the Other Place, collaborated and produced a programme of entertainment for these five gentlemen. I think that they were here for five days and hon. members are fully acquainted of the events which took place. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, in a general way, no one would have any objection to these things or to this Resolution, which is in connection with something which has already passed; but, on the last occasion, when it came to this Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I made the point that the time has come when, in our own Budget, we should be prepared to put aside a certain amount of money so that the members of Parliament - I do not speak for myself now but there are some young members of Parliament in Barbados who should be able to visit other parts of the Commonwealth for their own experience, and the normal courtesy should be extended to them. You should have a Delegation from the various Parties in this House which will be a Parliamentary Delegation and not a Government Delegation. I think that the time has come to have such a visit made. This is done in South Australia; it is not done annually, but in every two or three years, a Delegation from their House can go out.

I am going to take exception to something which has been done. I think that these things come within the province either of His Honour the Speaker or of the Clerk of this

House. I very well remember the last occasion when this Delegation came here; it looked to me as if the treatment meted out to some hon. members was different from that meted out to other hon. members.
12.55 p.m.

I do not regard a Minister as being any different from any other member of this House, because he becomes a Minister after being elected; and so in Parliament we should be treated with the same dignity and courtesy when it comes to meeting people from outside. A habit has grown up that when people come to meet members of the Government, ordinary members are subject to some lower treatment. I want to take objection to this, although I am not a person who is given to social climbing or eating dinners and lunches, because my stomach does not permit me to do that as frequently as I would like; but when it comes to meeting people, Parliament, as a whole, should be treated with the respect which it deserves. When these people came here I saw that the Ministers and the Premier met them at the regular places.

With all due respect to all parties concerned, a dinner was arranged for Parliament to meet this delegation at a place which I considered inappropriate, because there is no kitchen at the Drill Hall to keep the food warm. Now if it were a Tattoo, after which members went to the Drill Hall, that would be all right; but all the hotels were empty as it was not in the height of the tourist season; and if you were going to have a dinner for the delegation, although I do not scoff at the Drill Hall, it is not an appropriate place for the dinner because there are no facilities for serving dinner in an up-to-date fashion which you would expect members of Parliament to have. I do not think that we should have anything but the best, because if we want to do other than that, I have plenty of friends whom I can call by the legion where we can go and have a drink. When it comes to this I do not think the Speaker or the Clerk, who is also Clerk of the Parliamentary Association, should allow this to take place again. When a Parliamentary Delegation comes here you should not invite them to go to the Drill Hall where there are no facilities for serving dinners.

What is the use of having the hotel industry when there is something with which they can deal and you do not ask them to deal with it? You did not ask the hotels to serve the Parliamentary Delegation, but you took them to the Drill Hall as if you were holding a Tattoo! I want to say this in Parliament to whoever is the caterer; I am not in here to make friends; I have made plenty of enemies since I have been in here and I am prepared to make more by speaking what appears to me to be right. If I had a friend as a caterer and he could not meet the demands, even if it were my brother I would tell him that he could not meet the demands. There is the Marine Hotel, the Royal or the Ocean View and I see that the Ministers entertained these people at Hotel Royal; they did not go for lunch at their friends. Some of them went to Sam Lords Castle, but I do not like travelling so far because I feel that to go from Bridgetown to Sam Lords Castle is too much for my stomach that aches when it is hungry.

I have been to other places and have been entertained, and I believe that Parliament deserves better treatment than the off-hand way in which you served dinner to the Parliamentary Delegation. It is true that we do not have a luxurious dining hall, but if it were served here, that would be the best which we could offer. I hope this will be the last occasion on which a Parliamentary Delegation will be asked to a dinner or to any function at such places if they are inappropriate and inconvenient for the occasion, because I understand that the person who had to cater had to cook maybe five or six miles away and then get it to the Drill Hall. In many cases the soup would be cold and when you got down to the last course you would be getting frozen food as if you were in the Antarctic. That is not good enough, and I hope that when the occasion arises appropriate attention will be paid to such matters.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before you put the motion, Mr. Chairman, I think it is my duty to lend support to what the hon. member said. Hon. members might say that I should be the last person to lend support, because my

physical condition does not permit me to partake of this hospitality, but there are certain things which I think we should do. I myself was somewhat shocked at this matter. As a matter of fact, I have raised this question on several occasions in this House. We have so often been talking here about discrimination and what not at these various places, and it is so easy for strangers of a different political and other complexion coming to this country to come to the conclusion - as I have seen in a book already, where a man said that Premier Grantley Adams could not take him anywhere to have a drink because no hotel would accept him, and after Goddards was closed he had to go into a cheap place in Baxters Road. We know it was not true at the time because those of us who want to entertain people provide some place to meet on the same social level. It is so easy for people to come to the conclusion that it is impossible to take them to either of these places where the surroundings would be more congenial. For a long time I have objected to Government giving parties at Harrison College for more than one reason. If you are giving a party in the Legislative Chamber or in the dining-room, that is all right provided it is a party for someone who has done twenty years' service, but can you imagine a Parliamentary Delegation coming to Barbados and those who are responsible arranging a dinner at the Drill Hall? Why not go to Baxters Road and arrange it at Eva's or at Horace Barker's? If you are going to cater you should certainly get surroundings and circumstances different from those at the Drill Hall.

As a member has said, those of us who read the newspaper observe that Ministers entertain these people at other places, but when it comes to ordinary members of the House, they seem to think that Ministers are different from ordinary members. I am not pleading for any lunches; you can keep them and you know what you can do with the invitations. Happiness is where you find it. Hon. members need not shelter behind their boxes and think that I am talking about any invitation for myself, because I do not want to get into any social life. I feel that is not a right thing to arrange a dinner for a Parliamentary Delegation at the Drill Hall when one sees that the Ministers have lunches for them at other places. 1.05 p.m.

You did express the view and I do join with the hon. senior member for St. Peter in his suggestion that we hope a thing like this would not happen again. Why is it not possible for you to take them to the best places? After all, it is the Government of Barbados who would be responsible. You have the majority; therefore you can have the money voted.

Sir, I am not pleading anything for anybody but I believe if you have a private club, you should keep out all whom you want to keep out. Let me say that there are a lot of white people whom I would keep out of my club. But I am not worrying about that; as a matter of fact, I do think it is better for you if you keep some of them out. However, I am saying this. I have always said that whenever it comes to public funds and a general principle like this, I am at one with it. Whoever was responsible for these arrangements was wrong. You have a parliamentary delegation visiting this country. You are having a dinner for them in 1958 and the only place to which you could take them is at an out-of-the-way place like the Drill Hall, and then you had to cook some food at some other place and transport it up there for them to eat. It is not right and I am sure that there are hon. members on the other side who would agree with me that it is not right. Of course, there are some people like myself who when we go to certain places on certain occasions enjoy ourselves in our own way. When I go out to dine with other members, I go to discuss things with them; but Your Honour knows as well as I do that to invite these people to a place like the Drill Hall to have dinner was a thing which was out of the question. You are saying that you are not begging the other people to take you in but why take a parliamentary delegation there? If you have reached the stage where you could not find any other place despite all the laws you have passed as regards discrimination and even despite the Hon. Premier's challenge to the Archbishop of the West Indies, you have done nothing. Why could you not find any other place but the hall of Combermere? As you know, these things

also depend on the atmosphere and the surroundings. You were not having a singing; you were having a dinner. The Government of Barbados was having a dinner for these distinguished people. Why have it in the atmosphere of the Drill Hall? Were you taking them to a boxing match? I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I hope this opportunity would not be given to the Opposition again. I feel strongly on the matter. I do not know if the Clerk or the Speaker was responsible for the arrangements, but I do hope this opportunity will not be given to the Opposition again.

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

LEAVE TO TAKE ITEM 2

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revert to Item 2.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59, No.18

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as regards Head VII, Communications - Airport, Item 9 (New) Fire Station, the note to that is fully explanatory. I beg to move that Head VIII stand part.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD IX - MISCELLANEOUS

Head IX, Miscellaneous was called

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As hon. members will see, under the Capital Estimates for 1957-58, the sum of \$33,000 was provided for the construction of a Post Office and Branch Library in St. George. There was some delay in the acquisition of the land and work could not start during that financial year and as a result the fund lapsed at the end of the financial year. In the current Capital Estimated we only revoted \$18,000 because we expected that by the time the Estimates were prepared a start would have been made; but there was a further delay. We are therefore asking that the sum of \$15,000 be revoted to complete this project. I may say that the project was started sometime ago and it is a very worthwhile one. I am sure hon. members will agree with it. I beg to move that Head IX, Miscellaneous, stand part.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Sir, with this Resolution I have no quarrel. I want the Hon. Minister to appreciate that just as St. George is getting a Post Office and Branch Library, St. Andrew needs the same thing. Sir, if you see the Post Office in St. Andrew it will shock you to think that in this year of 1958 you allow mails to be dealt with in that little two-by-three building. Sir, just as St. George which is represented by the Hon. Minister of Social Services is getting a Post Office and Branch Library, so too the people in St. Andrew who are no less illiterate need the same thing; therefore, I hope to see in a very short time a Resolution coming down to the House to give the people of St. Andrew a proper Post Office and Branch Library.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I too have no objection to the Resolution, but I would like to draw this to the Government's attention. The mere fact that you are building more District Post Offices proves that your volume of mails has increased; therefore the general work under Post Office administration has increased likewise.

I understand that sufficient attention is not paid to the needs of the postmen who carry mail from these District Post Offices. There is no doubt that the volume of mails at these District Post Offices has increased a great deal, but at these post offices a corresponding in-

crease has not been made in the increase of postmen. In Barbados you have the old snobbish idea that if a man joins the service as a postman, he must die as a postman. It seems as if he will never be able to rise any higher than that and no matter what may be your reorganisation, there is nothing done in your recruitment method in order to give a postman some sort of promotion. There was a recent debate in this House as regards a change in the administration of the Post Office and I do hope that those in authority will see to it that this general work in Post Offices should be reorganised, and in such a manner as to give some better system and incentive to Postmen in the rural areas. They are now required to carry more mails than before.

1.15 p.m.

The other bit of stupidity is that we are so English that we are even further back than the Victoriana; we are in the era of Elizabeth. You have a Mr. "John Brown" living in Salters; a new Postman has to look for this Mr. "John Brown" as if he is looking through the proverbial haystack in order to find a needle. Let us get down to the question of numbering houses.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. member is now going into administrative details. This matter deals with the construction of a sub-Post Office in St. George, and I am asking the hon. member to stick to this Resolution and leave the details to the administration.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is under the Head "Miscellaneous" and the Item with which we are dealing is Item 2, "Post Office". The Post Office has the function of distributing mails to people. I could even talk about the Branch Library, but I am not interested in that during this debate. I am saying that the function of this Post Office is to distribute mails to the people in St. George and one of the defects in the postal arrangements is the matter of providing assistance for the Postmen. The volume of mails has increased, people are becoming more literate, more letters are coming in from outside and also going outside of Barbados, and therefore, there is the problem of a Postman finding "John Brown" or "Sarah" who is living in Salters at the back of the gully. People cannot read very well, and I am making the point that the time has come when we should number the houses.

I am not debating that question; I am just pointing out that this is a necessary part of your postal arrangements; and this will give the Government something to do; it will give the Minister something to do in his whole-time job. I am just pointing out a difficulty under which some of the Postmen have to labour and pointing out the matter to the administrative and postal authorities.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the last speaker has referred to the point about the numbering of houses. I should like to point out to him that this is a matter in connection with which we have set up a Committee since Hurricane "Janet" - a Committee to go into the question of numbering houses throughout the Island so as to facilitate the Postmen in finding people; that Committee is still sitting. (Laughter). This is a matter into which you have to go throughout the Island; it is not an easy matter, but the problem is being worked upon.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank you.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: I would like the hon. member to know that the Post Office in St. Joseph was to be a Post Office and a Library too. As to the present Post Office, I was never in agreement with the site; when the money was passed for the erection of that Post Office, I was not in agreement with it, because the site is not a central one, and it does not serve any useful purpose to the people from the lower end of the parish. At the time when I spoke of the matter, my then colleague said that we could also put a Post Office at the lower end of the parish. We could do with a second Post Office; a Post Office situated at the lower end of the parish could serve the above part of St. Andrew and also St. Thomas, and it would be in a more central place. You have the residents in the Fisher pond area having to go to the St. Thomas Station for their pack-

ages, whereas, if the Post Office was at the lower end of St. Joseph, it would be much nearer for them just to come from Lammings and find the Post Office there. Definitely, a case can be made out for a second Post Office in St. Joseph and a Library as well.

In St. Andrew you have people bordering St. Sylvans; they could also come up and it would relieve the people who have to use the Post Office, because it is nearer and much easier for these people to come to the Post Office in Bridgetown for their parcels than to go to the St. Joseph's Post Office from Fisherpond to St. Thomas Station or from the above part of St. Andrew down to Belleplaine. If you are going to think of helping the people, then you should make a central Post Office in Bridgetown, because people could pay a bus and come to Bridgetown for their parcels. There is an old lady who has to hire a car to go to the Post Office in St. Joseph in order to draw her little money which is sent to her from America or England. I feel that the Minister should consider this question more seriously and think not only of St. Joseph, but of all the parishes where people have to go too far in order to obtain the services of the Post Office.

In St. Andrew and St. Joseph there are some very mountainous parts; some nights you go to sleep and when you awake on the next morning, you do not see the road. In such cases, we will have to be able to help these people who cannot afford to own a motor car to take them to do their business. I hope that the Minister will take this matter seriously; let us see a Resolution down here for the erection of a Post Office and Library at the lower end of St. Joseph.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph might be surprised to know that on the 22nd February, 1955, there were tabled here the following questions:-

To enquire of the Minister of Social Services at the next meeting of the House:-

1. Will the Minister state whether the Government is willing to provide a Branch Library in the parish of St. George?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative:-

How soon will the residents of that parish be able to enjoy the benefit of such a service?

Those questions were tabled on 22nd February, 1955, and some six months later the gentleman who now enjoys the position of Premier of this Island tabled a reply to those questions in the following terms:-

The provision of a Branch Library for the parish of St. George has been under consideration with the claims of other parishes for similar facilities. The whole question of the expansion of Library facilities throughout the island is under active consideration and the claims of St. George are being borne in mind.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph must be surprised to learn that his parish is still under active consideration; because after three and a half years the parish of St. George is only now getting this Library, although its requirements were even considered at the time to be transcending the claims of other parishes of this Island. In other words, the inhabitants of this Island, it would appear to us on this side of the House, have to wait until a Minister decides to do them a favour.

1.25 p.m.
If it took three and a half years to spend the small amount of \$33,000 on the erection of a Post Office and Library after I had asked these questions, one can only come to the conclusion that this Government did not want to do anything about providing these facilities as long as I was a representative of that parish. I do not think that any Government that has the welfare of the people of this island at heart should regard the provision of social and welfare services as something which they are bestowing on their constituents. I think that any member who gets up on a platform and claims that he has done

so and so for the people when he is a Minister spending the taxpayers' money should have his head examined or his morals scrutinized. We are going along well so far as Post Offices are concerned in many parishes of this island, and St. George is one of the last with this idea of a Government service being established in the private residence of a Postmaster, residences which in many instances have not been designed to accommodate such services. In the instance of St. George, the Post Office there, so far as I can see, is a converted garage. I remember the one at Benthams in St. Lucy in the old days which used to be part of somebody's pantry. That sort of thing is not good enough in Barbados in these days. If we can have a tiled bathroom at the Ministerial Buildings, do you mean to tell me that the sixteen or seventeen thousand inhabitants of St. George should have to wait for a measly sum of \$33,000 to be spent on a Post Office and Library?

I heartily agree with the hon. member for St. Joseph. These are the days when we should be talking about Post Offices in every major village. In the United Kingdom you get some kind of sub-post Office providing also Savings Bank facilities on nearly every street corner, in every district and certainly in every village throughout the length and breadth of the United Kingdom. When you get to parishes like St. Joseph and St. Lucy, I see no reason why people should have to travel four or five miles either to collect a parcel or to post a parcel to their relatives either in this island or abroad. Such conditions are inhuman: but the driving motive behind the expenditure of public funds in this island seems to be based on the individual charity of the members on the Ministerial benches; we give somebody a standpipe; we give you a Post Office in God's good time, which is 3 1/2 years after I asked the question. St. Joseph, apparently, was under active consideration in June, 1955 and it is time it became deactivated as far as I can see, because if you deactivate the consideration which was then impelling the hon. Premier who was then Minister of Social Services, you would get a lot further than by the kind of active and mature consideration which he has been bestowing upon us. That is the general picture throughout this island.

On what principle of mathematics or logical computation can you say that a parish like St. George with 18,000 people should have one Post Office, situated, as this one is going to be in some instances, three or four miles away from the major centres of population in that parish? When you take St. Joseph, little children have to travel two or three miles up - hill and down dale to post a four-cent letter or to get a postage stamp. Even if they made stamps available in some of the grocery shops or general stores as they do in other countries, they should extend the facilities for post-boxes all over the place which would relieve the burden; but you must wait until the Minister gives you a library - and I suppose they want to go there with a big pair of gold scissors, blue tape and red ribbon and have a cocktail party and invite all their friends and stooges, hold a big function in opening a branch library in St. George as if they were giving it to the people out of their pockets! It is a most ridiculous approach to the responsibility of Government, especially when the people of this island have to suffer in silence because of some motive or spite on the part of the Government benches and because they do not want somebody else to get the credit; they prefer to crucify 18,000 people than to see one person get the benefit for something.

Anytime I get up in this Chamber to talk, I am talking for the masses of people whom I have the honour to represent and who put me in this Chamber. I do not want any laurels or wreaths; all the wreaths I expect, I will get when I die. We do not want any halo that "conquering Harry" is coming to open a Branch Library; that is something which the people are entitled to because they pay taxes and these are services which any civilised country should be prepared to give. Although I do not represent that parish, - and we cannot be parochial in matters of this kind - I hope that the people in St. Joseph will have not one of these at the top of the hill and one at the bottom, but five or six sub-Post Offices and eight or nine Libraries. If they have that in St. Joseph, then naturally they will have to move over to St. John and do the same thing; and

since it has been under consideration for so long, I would ask members of the Government Benches to wake up and realise that it is not their money they are spending.

What is the point, Mr. Chairman, of the British Government sending down here and erecting monuments which are torn down within five years of their construction - monuments like the part of the public market or like the terminal building at Seawell?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. John has gone from the Resolution and is talking about the British Government erecting monuments.

Mr. BARROW: I asked what is the point of the British Government doing these things when we do not spend our own funds on the welfare of the people? What is the point of having a mahogany plaque in a building at Seawell which is going to be torn down in twelve weeks, when we do not provide elementary services for the inhabitants of this colony?

1.35 p.m.

It is not fair to our own people. I will ask the Minister a question. Is it fair to your constituents that the people of Bush Hall should have to come all the way down Black Rock for packets?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John. This Resolution is dealing with the erection of a Post Office.

Mr. BARROW: If the Hon. Minister says it is fair, I will stop.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has gone far outside of the scope of this Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: Let us take Bibby's Lane, St. Michael. The people from there have to come all the way down to Black Rock. As a matter of fact, you have one Library in the whole of St. Michael and that Library was given to us through the munificence of Mr. Carnegie, a Scottish benefactor, and we got it largely through the efforts of a former Governor of Barbados. It was built on the site of the magazine which was then on Magazine Road about fifty years ago. The whole parish of St. Michael, comprising about 93,000 people, has only one Public Library and about three or four post offices. Are we looking after the needs of the people? Should the people go to the services or should the services be taken to the people? I say that the services should be taken to the people of Bibby's Lane. If you say that they should go to the services, I would have to bow to you. The services should be taken to the people wherever they are, whether they are in Rendezvous Hill. Of course, that is not in the parish of St. Michael. The services should be taken to all the four corners of the island. We spent and we lavished \$8,000 or \$9,000 on something like air conditioning of the Other Place.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John. Again, that is outside of the scope of this Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I hope that the Post Offices will be air conditioned too. In other words, far from this being a generous vote, it is not enough. If you can do all that for people in the Other Place, you can do it also for the inhabitants of the parish of St. Michael.

Another thing is this. Your Post Offices should be opened at night as well as your libraries. If you are catering to the working-class people, I insist that your Post Offices should be opened until 8 o'clock or 9 o'clock at night.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, before the Hon. Minister replies, perhaps he will be kind enough to tell us how far the position has progressed with regard to the Petition forwarded by postmen asking for increase in travelling allowance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with travelling allowances; we are dealing with a resolution to revoke a sum of money for the erection of a Post Office.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My answer to that is this. From my earliest time in this Chamber I have always been told that on the discussion of a Money Resolution, members are given a certain amount of latitude to discuss other financial matters as regards the Department under review. And so far as I know, every predecessor of yours in that Chair has permitted discussion along those lines. If in discussing a revote for the erection of a Post Office, we cannot ask a single question about the increase of the travelling allowance to postmen, what are we here for? In other words, according to your suggestion, all we can do is to get up and talk about the four walls of that Post Office. That is not good enough. I am not going to allow the Hon. Minister to refrain from replying to this Question purely on a vague and technical suggestion like that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, speaking on this proposed Branch Library for the parish of St. George, I wish to re-emphasise my annual contribution during the consideration of the Annual Estimates in connection with the opening of all libraries at night. Between normal working hours the average person has no opportunity to make use of the reading room of that library. It is therefore incumbent not only in respect of this proposed library but in respect of every library that it be opened until at least 10 o'clock at night for people to avail themselves of the amenities of this and other libraries so that they will be able to go into a library, after they have completed their daily labours and probably have gone home and have their supper, from around 7 o'clock to 10 o'clock, if not until 11 o'clock.

If this money is passed - undoubtedly it will be - I hope proper arrangements will be made for this Branch Library and other libraries to be opened at night. We have on hand a lot of unemployed people who are capable of filling posts in libraries by working a system of shifts to ensure that these libraries are properly staffed at night.
1.45 p.m.

As you know, Sir, it was only last week when I reminded the Government, as I have been reminding them, of the need and of their promise to remove the Post Office in St. Lucy to a central site somewhere near Nestfield or Trents Area. We have been promised that, under the new Rules, we will get answers to questions in quick time. If my answers are not ready today, they should be ready by next Tuesday before the House goes into recess. Those are the submissions from this side of the House as regards the erection of these buildings. If we want to get the benefit of the services of the Postmen, they must be adequately paid and they must have transportation if necessary. As to the Branch Library, it must be opened at such periods of leisure when people most need these facilities and when they will be best able to avail themselves of them; that is, after normal working hours. It is only in that way that we can get the most out of the Library.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, as far as the hon. junior member for St. John is concerned, we are accustomed to hear the type of post-graduate speeches which he occasionally makes; but he has just made a *post mortem* speech at a time when the people of St. John have resurrected him for the time being. One would hardly expect him to go back to St. George, when he should have convinced the people in that parish at the last Elections that we were denying them that service; but because he was the person, he says, who asked a question about this matter, we did not provide the people in St. George with this service. He should have convinced the people of St. George about that when he went to them. Why did he not do that instead of coming in here now and making these *post mortem* speeches? I would just like to inform hon. members that in the first Five Year Plan 1955-60 so far as Post Offices and Branch Libraries are concerned, it is noted under the Head "Miscellaneous" as follows:-

"Total expenditure in 1955/56 on accommodation for Government offices, Bridgetown Fire Station, Post Offices, Police Stations and other minor projects amounted to \$863,460. Further expenditure during the period 1955-1960 has been estimated at approximately \$1,000,000 on the following projects:-

Additional Office Accommodation, Fire Stations in Rural Areas, New District Post Offices, Extensions to the Public Library, Establishment of a Government Printery and the Development of Minor Handicrafts.

It is expected that the major portion of this expenditure will be incurred during the periods 1956/57 and 1957/58."

We are now going forward in St. George and I can assure those hon. members who have put in their claims in respect of other parishes, that we will be coming around to them. The parish of St. Thomas is also in need of a Post Office. We are giving the matter due attention and we are hoping to satisfy the needs of the public in the very near future. It is not correct - as a matter of fact, it is far from being correct when the evidence is here as to what extent for the past number of years we have been carrying these services to the people - it is far from correct to say that we are not doing anything. All the evidence points to the contrary. I do not think that the speeches coming from the Opposition should be taken any notice of.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Minister has ignored my request for information with regard to the demands of the Postmen for increased travelling allowance. It seems to me that his silence indicates ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said just now that I was of the opinion that what the hon. member is saying seems to be a matter for another debate. A Petition has been forwarded by the Postmen to the Government and that is a matter for another debate. I am therefore asking the hon. member to desist from making this point and to deal with the matter on another occasion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am of the opinion - I may be mistaken - that this is the same House of Assembly as the one in which I have sat for the past number of years. If in the future we are not going to be given the normal latitude in discussing money Resolutions, well then, the Ministers can come prepared for a lot of activity during Question Time. Normally, I know that from your own experience, you yourself have taken advantage of the normal procedure during the discussion of money Resolutions ---

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It strikes me that the hon. member is now arguing as to whether my opinion is relevant or otherwise. This is my final ruling. On page 73 of May's Parliamentary Practice, this is what is stated:-

"Debate on supplementary and excess grants is restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates on which those grants are sought, and to the application of the items which compose those grants; and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned, on other heads, by the estimate on which the original grant was obtained, except so far as such policy or expenditure is brought before the committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates."

I understand that to mean that the question as to whether there would be an increase in the travelling allowance for postmen would be under the Estimates, under a different Head and not under the Supplementary Estimates which deal with the construction of the Post Office. I am therefore ruling that the Hon. member is out of order in making that point.

The question that Head 9 "Miscellaneous" stand part of the Schedule was put in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$15,750 do now pass.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. F. E. MILLER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

1.55 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890.

GOVERNOR'S (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1958

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order deals with an amendment to the Governor's Act. The Objects and Reasons read as follows:

"The object of this Bill is to amend the Governor's Act, 1890, in order to provide that when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, the latter person shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to the office of Governor including emoluments."

In other words, Sir, the present practice is that when the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave, whether it be for four, five or six months as the case may be, somebody else is appointed to act in his place. This Bill seeks to bring it into line with present day practice, and even with our recent practice in the local Civil Service. When the Head of a Department goes on pre-retirement leave, his successor who is appointed subsequently takes up that office very soon, and is granted all the emoluments of that office. Similarly, when the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave, somebody is appointed to act who gets the emoluments of the office, and it is thought desirable now that the successor to the Governor should take up office immediately and thereby get the emoluments of the office, instead of having the interim arrangements while very often the Governor has to mark time and cool his heels off until his leave expires.

Members may be thinking about the additional expense, but that should not be any great barrier to the acceptance of this, because even if the acting appointee assumes the office of Governor, he gets half of the difference between his office and the office of the Governor plus the other emoluments. As I said, this is an attempt to bring this practice into line with present day practice not only in the Caribbean but, I think, in the Colonial Empire.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am really not a colonial and I do not believe in the system whereby colonial Governors are appointed. Far from that, I have grown to the idea which is growing up in the West Indies that Governorships are gradually becoming sinecures and only take away a lot of money, because the Ministers say they are the bosses, and therefore you have 'glorified' people for ceremonial occasions to take a lot of money away when from the active working point of view nothing is being done. I am not in favour of these colonial trappings and I do not believe that the Premier was clear, because it seemed very difficult for him to explain lucidly so that we could understand what this means. He got mixed up with an acting appointment and a substantive appointment. We are not dealing with an acting appointment, because this Bill says that the object is to amend the Governor's Act, 1890, in order to provide that when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, the latter person shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to the office of Governor including emoluments.

Let me bring a hypothetical case. The Governor is on pre-retirement leave now; he goes on leave from the 1st September and the Colonial Office appoints a Governor in the United Kingdom from the 1st September, but

he does not take up office until 1st January. If the people of Barbados must pay a Governor on pre-retirement leave a salary until his leave expires, pay a salary to a Governor that is to come and then pay a man who is acting as Governor, then they are paying 2 1/2 Governors, because there is nothing in the Act which says that he must be in Barbados when he is appointed, because you cannot get two Governors in Barbados at the same time. Now what the Colonial Office wants to do - and if the Ministers do not want to tell you I will tell you - is this: Her Majesty's Government still wants to maintain the Colonial system of appointing Governors. If you want then to draw salaries at that rate, you can pay them during the hiatus; but you cannot tell me that there is anything logical that we must pay the substantive holder of the Governorship before he sets foot in Barbados and has done any work. Which of us would pay any ordinary working man before he starts to work? Why should we pay the substantive holder of Governor a salary before he comes to Barbados? If you want to amend it, there should be some amendment on the basis of paying him when he assumes duties.

I have not been through the Governor's Act, Mr. Speaker, but what I realise is this: In Ghana, in Malaya and in all the places where British Officers have been turned out and people are appointing their own people, there is a system in the Colonial Office of making it watertight for the others who remain by giving them these securities. We have another Civil Establishment Order of this type of Colonial Office character which we must stop. This is something stemming from the Colonial Office and not from Barbados. Would this apply to a Minister? If you decide that you are going to have a Minister of Education, can he draw a salary if you appoint him from a certain date without his having done any work in his office?

2.05 p.m.

Why, Mr. Speaker, should we amend the Act for this purpose? I think some time ago it was mooted that Barbados had difficulty when it came to the Office of Chief Secretary and we amended the Act so that when the Chief Secretary goes on pre-retirement leave, we will have the power to appoint some person who would be able to take up duty right away. You can appoint someone for this purpose just as you do for the Chief Secretary when he goes on pre-retirement leave. It is all right to do that. I do not want to quibble about that. If a man is entitled to pre-retirement leave, surely you should be able to appoint someone to take up the job right away. The whole idea when you passed that Act for the Chief Secretary was that the Office of Chief Secretary was not vacant; therefore, no one could have been appointed to an office not vacant because the holder of that office is on pre-retirement leave and as such the Government can still call him back to work because he has not severed his connections. If in modern times you say it is necessary to have a Governor or Chief Secretary appointed during the interim period, why should not there be an amendment that he draws the salary only when he assumes office and not when he is appointed? Why should we pay him before? Surely, there can be no grounds for you to say that we have to pay the incumbent before he comes to Barbados.

I want to say this quite seriously. It seems to me as if Colonial Office intends to take all the remaining colonies for one grand ride now that the British Commonwealth is breaking up. That is the reason why we have been saddled with a lot of trappings of a colonial nature such as Leave Passages and all of that sort of thing. You do not go to a metropolitan territory and find this type of employment practised as we have in these colonies. Barbados has a nice climate. What is wrong with Barbados? What has forced you to come to this decision? I know of no service in which this thing obtains. I say this because I know that the type of employment which we are now getting in our service has militated against our own development and our financial resources. Here it is: Government is asking us to pay people to take up a post. The time has come when we should revolutionise our thinking. If the office of Governor is more important than the five or six Ministers, then the Ministers should resign. If it is not, why come down with this? We have people still with this old idea that when they shake the hands of the Head of the Administration they should not wash their hands; they should

put them in a museum. You also have this old idea that if you go to something at which the Governor is present, you went to a top-notch something. We have to do away with that idea. We should educate our people along lines which are more suitable to modern trends.

Now, you have in this Act this paragraph:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act or of any subsidiary legislation, when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, then such person shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments), notwithstanding, and without prejudice to, any rights or privileges which such person on such leave of absence may have in respect of emoluments."

Years ago, we agreed that even with an acting appointment, the person holding the acting appointment should get the salary. Mr. Speaker, I think you will remember that we have the instance here where an officer in an acting appointment was getting more money than the Premier at the time. It is a fact that as soon as these people come from England and you put them in an acting appointment, they look out for some loophole in your Act where they can get more money.

Sir, we in this country do not work for money so easily. The majority of us work for small amounts and therefore, we who are controlling the people's money should be very careful about how we are paying it out. We have already amended the Governor's Act so that the person acting for the Governor can get certain privileges which he never got before. What you are asking us now to do is to pay the person from the day he is appointed Governor. Do not tell us that from the day you appoint him, you have to pay him this money.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member is repeating that. I particularly said that instead of his successor remaining somewhere and cooling off his heels, he should come and take up office right away, and that is the reason for this.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, you did say that, but do you remember the reason for your doing that at the time? When the Government passed that Act, it was not the intention of the Government that the person doing a job and acting in another capacity should be regarded as two persons. As it was then, the man in that position appeared as if he were holding two jobs.

I agree with the Hon. Premier that it is just what we did for the office of Chief Secretary, but what I am afraid about is that this Bill says that from the time a person is appointed substantively to the office, he is entitled to all rights and privileges; that is to say, whether he arrives in Barbados or not. I am worried about that. If he does not arrive in Barbados during the hiatus, what is the position? Are we called upon to pay him? I have no objection to the matter being in a similar position as that of the office of Chief Secretary where you can appoint someone during the interim. I feel that you should be able to appoint somebody.

My remarks are concerned with the point which I have just mentioned. Ministers of the Government seem not to be aware that there seems to be a club among certain officials. Some can get an interpretation of the law to the fullest extent in which they get all the benefits from it; and then there is the position where others might not even know that there is a law governing the matter in question. What worries me is that the Government may be advised that the Act says so and so; therefore, you must pay the Governor from the time he is appointed. If what the Hon. Premier says is correct and it is their intention to act in accordance with what he has said, I would not worry about it. I would however ask him to get a legal opinion from the Attorney General on the matter and find out if what he says would be carried out.

I think Your Honour will remember that soon after we made provision to pay members of the House, there

was a dissolution of the General Assembly and they wanted to say that the Speaker was not entitled to any payment during that time although it was the custom of the United Kingdom Parliament. I would like the Hon. Premier to say how would we be safeguarded from what the amendment says:-

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act or of any subsidiary legislation, when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, then such person shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments), notwithstanding, and without prejudice to, any rights or privileges which such persons or such leave of absence may have in respect of emoluments." 2.15 p.m.

That means that it does not in any way interfere with the holder of the post getting these emoluments and privileges; therefore, this new person will be entitled to all of these things. If the Premier is satisfied that this is just like the Chief Secretary, it means that you can appoint him - and the hon. member will bear in mind that this person will not get these privileges until he has been sworn in as Governor. There is no grouse in that case; if it means that this person is entitled to draw these emoluments before he is sworn in, that is another matter.

Mr. BRANCKER: In section 2 of this Bill, it is a matter of what is the meaning of the word "appointed." I may say that we view this Bill with disfavour. It seems to me that we may be called upon to pay two and a half salaries at one and the same time. We may be paying the salary of the holder of the office of Governor who is on leave of absence for six months; we may be paying him the full salary on pre-retirement leave. In a month after the Governor goes on leave, an announcement is made that someone has been appointed to the substantive office of the Governor of this colony; does that mean, as it seems to me to mean and it may be interpreted to mean, that the person who is appointed subsequently, will, as from the date of his appointment as distinct from the assumption of office - when we read that Mr. So-and-So is appointed Governor of Barbados, is that such person now appointed to be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to the office of Governor including emoluments? That either means that we may have to pay two and a half Governors at the same time by way of salaries or the matter is so ambiguous as to mean that some amendment would have to be made to the one important section to make it clear as not to allow any latitude in respect of its interpretation.

During the time that the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence, and after the appointment substantively to the office of another person who does not come to the Island right away, because he may decide to be away for three months or for some other period of time, all the procedure is that he has to take a certain period of leave during which he has the opportunity of acquainting himself with the place to which he is going; but during the period when the holder of the office is on leave of absence, and when we are waiting for the appointment of the substantive holder of the office, the Governor's Deputy will be carrying on. That is why I referred to the two and a half Governors in respect of salaries. It seems to me that the matter may be interpreted that we will be paying out two full salaries for the post of Governor and one-half the salary of the Governor at one and the same time. If it is not so intended, I would suggest to the hon. member that he get the matter clarified in the wording of the section.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of explanation. The present practice is that not only the Governor, but any Civil Servant who is coming from abroad, from the time that he sets foot on the boat or the plane, he gets one-half of the salary until he arrives here. When he arrives, then the payment of the full salary begins. I am sure that that practice will be carried on.

Mr. BRANCKER: I thank the Hon. Premier for his explanation, but the section as it stands is capable of at

least two interpretations. I think that the one which I have suggested is the one which is more likely to find favour in strict legal circles. Another point is as to the date of appointment; is that the date when the appointment is intended, or is that to be taken as the date when the officer arrives here and is sworn in? As soon as the officer is appointed, he is entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to the office of Governor, including emoluments. One further point is this; when the new man is appointed to the substantive office, if he is a new appointee to the service altogether - that will seldom happen, if it ever happens - will he at the same time be receiving the salary or any portion of the salary attached to the office which he has been holding and which he will be holding until his leave expires? We may appoint somebody who is the Governor of "XYZ"; will he carry on drawing that salary until then? Will he be the favoured recipient of the salary which he is now receiving while he is on vacation leave and at the same time, if he is appointed to the Governorship of Barbados, will he be drawing the salary of the office of the Governor of Barbados?

Mr. Speaker, we are a very poor country and there are many things, we are told, we cannot afford to do; therefore, we cannot afford to pay one cent more for the office of Governor than it is absolutely essential to pay. We have a Cabinet which is running the country and all the Governor needs to be is an attractive, ceremonial figure. It is rarely that he has to make any decision. The Cabinet is there to make decisions for him, and all he has to do is to approve and sanction those decisions. There is no situation that is likely to arise where the Governor has to make any decision of his own, and therefore, there is no reason why we should do anything so as to cause any increase in the cost to this Island by way of the salary of the Governor. The Governor is nothing more than an officer occupying the status of a mere figurehead; he does not control policy - at least he should not control policy - and he does not run the country. He merely attends at important functions and lends grace unlimited to these functions, and personally represents Her Majesty the Queen on ceremonial occasions. We cannot afford to pay for these things; in a poverty-stricken community like this, we cannot afford to pay one cent more for the office of Governor especially when he has become, politically speaking, a relatively unimportant personage in the community and certainly second to the Cabinet.

2.25 p.m.

I am wondering, Sir, whether this Bill has been brought on this occasion because it is anticipated that there might be undue delay in the appointment of a successor to the present Governor? This might suggest that we may have to wait some time before the Secretary of State for the Colonies announces the Queen's approval of someone to fill this office, and they want to make it possible for him to receive the salary when he is subsequently appointed.

I think, Sir, that I have said enough to indicate the point of view on this side that we cannot do otherwise than view this Bill with disfavour, because we anticipate an increase in the expenses of the office of Governor, when the office of Governor is much less important than it has ever been.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's point with regard to the likelihood of increased cost is well taken, and therefore, Sir, the position in the Bill itself should be made completely clear and beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt in interpretation or we should refuse to vote for the Bill as it now stands.

It seems to me, Sir, that this Government is always peculiarly willing to increase the cost of the Governorship of the colony. They accept with unholy haste any proposal or any suggestion to improve or increase the emoluments of the Governor regardless of whether it places an additional burden on the Treasury. One only has to observe that in ten years during which this regime has been in power, the cost of the colony's Governorship has increased from around \$26,000 a year to \$54,000 a year, which is more than double. I believe, Sir, that with our

present constitutional position providing for full internal self Government with Cabinet status and what not, Barbados is in the singular position of being able to approach the Colonial Office with a view to the abolition of the post of Governor. If you have your Federation, Sir, with its present Colonial Constitution and the units still suffering under a completely Colonial Constitution, there could be some excuse for the maintenance of the present system of Governors and Governor Generals; but in these units like Jamaica and ourselves.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.30 p.m., I now declare this Sitting suspended until 3 o'clock p.m.

2.30 p.m.

On re-assembling.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no oral questions in as yet.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Next on the time table is Private Members' Business, but there is none.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: We will now revert to Government Business, and on the Suspension the hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On the Suspension, Sir, I was commenting on the apparent eagerness of the Government unduly and unreasonably to increase the cost of the Governorship of the Colony at all and sundry times, and I said that during the ten years or so during which the Party opposite has been responsible for conducting the colony's business, the capital cost of the Governorship has more than doubled; it has increased from \$26,000 to \$54,000, and I said that this attitude on the part of the Government was entirely out of consonance with the colony's present Constitutional position.

We are said to be enjoying internal self-Government; we have Cabinet Status, and therefore we are entirely different from almost any other West Indian island with the possible exception of Jamaica. We find ourselves in the peculiar position to be able, if we so desire, to move in the matter of the abolition of colony Governorships. Normally with the present Constitution being what it is, the Crown Colonies which are part of the Constitution would naturally have to retain their colonial Governorships.

3.10 p.m.

But in the case of Barbados and Jamaica, with Cabinet Government obtaining, and with the Ministers completely responsible for the internal conduct of Government Departments, it seems to me that under the umbrella of Federation there is hardly any room for Governor and we can very well do with a Lieut-Governor. Therefore, it should be the duty of the Government rather than increasing the cost of Governorship, to take steps to inform Colonial Office of its desire to economise on the post by the abolition of Governorship and the substitution of an official less costly to the colony. Sir, there is no reason why the Chief Secretary should not combine in his one office that of Lieut-Governor.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The question of Lieut.-Governor does not come up at all. We are dealing with an amendment to the Governor's Act.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Minister does not understand what I am saying. If he were alive to his responsibility and if he understood the position which he enjoys, he would not have introduced this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Hon. Premier introduced the Bill and I am not voting for it and I am saying why I am not voting for it. It is because I think it is a retrograde step. They themselves are saying that they are responsible for the conduct of the colony's finances and the Governor is merely a figurehead to give assent, and still they are about

to increase the cost of the Governorship. Sir, you will find that hardly a Session goes by in which that part of the Government Party does not take steps to increase the emoluments of the Governorship of the colony. It is totally unjustified, totally immoral on constitutional grounds. If he boasts that he is Premier of Barbados as he has done in this House on more than one occasion.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, I have not boasted that I am Premier either in this House or out of it. As a matter of fact, I do not boast of anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not mean that he got up and boasted, but Your Honour will recall that the Government Bench took most strenuous objection to some member of the Opposition Bench saying that they went somewhere to a conference meeting. They said that they did not go anywhere. If there is a meeting, the people would have to come to them.

All I am saying is this. The position which he occupies is to the effect that the Premier of the country with Cabinet status occupies an entirely different constitutional position from, say, the Leader of the Majority Party in a colony still retaining some colonial status, like British Guiana, the Windwards or the Leewards Islands. Here in Barbados this year when we adopted a Cabinet System of Government, we relegated the Governor, in spite of his high-sounding official position, to a position in which he has no important say whatsoever in the conduct of our internal affairs; therefore, since bound up with the retention of a Governor is the expenditure involved in the office, if we want to economise and save the taxpayers of the country from a burden, we should abolish the post. Constitutionally, we are on good grounds if we say to Whitehall that there is no reason why we should spend \$64,000 a year on an Officer called the Governor. We have six Ministers and each Minister has a Permanent Secretary.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is out of the question. That has nothing to do with the Bill before us or where the emoluments of the Governor are concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I must confess that I find it impossible to obviate the Governor's emoluments when discussing the Bill because what the Bill proposes to do is to make the Governor's emoluments available on appointment to the new holder of the post. The view of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is that the country under the provisions of this Bill would find itself obligated to pay an Acting Governor, an incoming Governor on appointment and the outgoing Governor, apart from the other financial rights attached to the position of Governor and I say, Sir, that rather than doing anything which even by appearance would add to the cost of Governorship, we should be taking a step in the opposite direction.

I should like to say on this matter, Sir, that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that this proposal may have been submitted to the Government by the Colonial Office. 3.20 p.m.

As you are aware, Sir, many of these proposals which have been resisted successfully in the past by former Governments have not been resisted by this Government. If you look at the Estimates, you will recall that there are a number of items attached to the office of Governor on which we now spend money - you will be able to realise that ten years ago we did not spend any money on these items; so that, in my opinion, this Bill represents another agreement by the Government Party to an unnecessary, financial burden proposed by the Colonial Office in connection with the office of Governor. I say that not only should this proposal be resisted, but they should take positive and direct steps to tell the Colonial Office that at the stage at which we now are, we no longer propose to burden the Treasury even with the present emoluments of the office of Governor, much more to add to them.

In so far as we are in a position to spend, the Government must view with alarm the financial position of the colony; in the matter of certain commitments like the Deep Water Harbour and the new Hospital, to us the position is not yet quite clear. Therefore, that is so much the more reason for resisting proposals like this one which in itself

will - and the Government has not claimed to the contrary - and is going to impose extra demands on the public purse.

The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition has referred in some detail to the apparently ambiguous wording of the main section of the Bill and nothing which has been said by the Hon. Introducer has clarified this beyond the slightest shadow of doubt. Since that is the case, and since the natural consequence will be that the colony's estimates of expenditure will be burdened periodically in this particular connection, I do not see my way to support this Bill. I have on occasions in the past pointed out that many colonial Governors, including the Governor of Barbados, are remunerated on a far more satisfactory and higher basis than the Governors of important American States, some of them having thirty and forty times the population of Barbados.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I should like to see Barbados taking the lead on the entire question of the emoluments of West Indian Colonial Governors. We are in the constitutional position to be able to take the lead. We balance our own budget, we run our own affairs and there is no need for this subservience on the part of the Government whenever the Colonial Office sees fit to suggest some additional imposition on the already burdened finances of the colony. The Government must realise that refusal to accept Colonial Office proposals in this manner does not mean that they cannot get a loan for the construction of the Deep Water Harbour or for the erection of the new Hospital. As a matter of fact, in my considered opinion, that may assist them in getting a loan. When they say: "We cannot get on unless we borrow money from you", they will be putting themselves in a better position; but if they accept blindly whatever they are told - give the Governor another year and so on - implicit in their attitude is the suggestion that they should be the more readily able to find the money for effecting needed improvements in the colony. They do not spend money on the things which we need; if with our political stature and prestige, they were rational in matters like this, they should forget that O.B.E.s and C.B.E.s are to be handed out, and that sort of thing, and they should tell the Colonial Office outright: "We can hardly find money to provide the barest possible living standards for the masses of the people of this Colony." If you spend more than \$54,000 in one year on the Governorship, it will mean that in the year in which the Governor retires and a new Governor is appointed, you must spend more than the normal estimate on the Governorship. If Barbados has existed for 300 odd years during which it has had Colonial Governors without the provisions of this Bill, why is it that in this year of grace with a Cabinet system and with internal self-government, we have to submit to it today? When we were a rank colony and we could not breathe unless the Governor said we could breathe, and when the officials formulated policy, we never had anything like this; but now the Governor has all the time in the world to bask on our balmy beaches and to sebathe and to enjoy himself, when he has less responsibility and less of everything, we are now going to submit additional expenditure for this office! If it is a matter of two additional dollars involved, I think that the matter should be given further consideration.

I am submitting that not one single cent more should be spent on the Governorship of the colony. If they can justify their claim for self-government in the eyes of the world, they are simply making themselves the biggest fools in the world if, while calling for things on the one hand and getting the Colonial Office to accede to their demands, on the other hand, by extending the emoluments attached to the office of Governor, they push him into an even more financially important and excellent position than that in which he now is. 3.30 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this measure which we are now considering serves to illustrate how the fortunes, if I may so put it, of persons in this island are shaped and moulded by persons who live far away from them and by events over which they have no control.

It is not merely a question of our giving the customary opposition to a Bill which has to do with the Governor. The issue is so far wider than that. Even the mere introduction of a measure of this kind in the Barbados House of Assem-

bly at this time is a grave affront to the aspirations of our people and makes a mockery of all our striving for self-government. That point has been argued already, and furthermore it raises the question whether the people of this island ought to be made to pay to provide for something or the upkeep of some person before they have actually seen him.

If we understand this Bill correctly, the following situation will be evident; a Governor who retires on leave will be drawing his salary up to the time his leave expires; the Governor who is to succeed him, from the time he is appointed until he gets here, he is entitled to the salary as well, and the person who remains here and administers the Government between the leaving of the one and the arrival of the other is also entitled to his salary as Acting Governor. That is the situation which will be created by this Bill.

Now I was very interested to hear the Premier say that we need not make such a song and dance about that, because the new man will be influenced to come quickly to take up his post; that may be a hope. It may even be the desire of the Barbados Government that it be so, but in this Bill there is no further incentive for him to do so. Why should a man who is to become Governor of Barbados hurry to get to Barbados before his own leave from his previous post expires for which he is drawing his salary before he is actually required to be in Barbados? The whole point of the new Governor having pre-retirement leave in his last post is that he should take his time about getting to his new one, and he cannot - I speak under correction here - except under a grave emergency be required to proceed to his new post merely because he is being paid a new salary before he has actually started to work here. I was under the impression - and I am sure most hon. members have been under that impression - that a Governor taking up a new appointment, while he may have already received the Sovereign's Commission, does not actually begin to fulfil his functions as Governor until he takes the oath when he arrives. That does not affect the salary, of course, but he is not, strictly speaking, Governor of the Colony until the oath is administered and taken. If in a constitutional point of such great importance you do not permit him to perform his functions until the oath is taken, it seems difficult to understand why you should pay him several months before that.

We have had in recent months a very striking example of the right and proper way in which these things can be done, and that example was given by the present Governor General of our Federation. Now he was appointed Governor General some time towards the end of September last year; he received the Queen's Commission.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of Order. Under Rule 29, pp. 5 which we have passed only last Tuesday, it is stated "Members shall not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents, except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate."

I notice, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. John is reading a newspaper, and I know that he may not be fully acquainted with the Rules, so I take this opportunity to bring it to his attention.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not think the Hon. Premier understands the Rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has drawn attention to the Rule which I must now look up.

Mr. BARROW: I want to point out that the Rule means that this cannot be done during the course of addressing the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I imagine your interpretation is right. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy may proceed.

Mr. TUDOR: I thank Your Honour. As I was saying when I was interrupted, we had a set example of the point which is in opposition to the Government's view when the Governor General himself refused the salary to which he

was entitled until he had assumed office and took up the reins of Government on January 3rd.

Mr. SPEAKER: Relative to Rule 29, pp. 5, "Members shall not read newspapers, books, letters or other documents, except such matter therein as may be directly connected with the business under debate." That has nothing at all to do with a member who is sitting or doing anything at all.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order when I have ruled.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of privilege. The hon. member should indicate that I am reading something unconnected with the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is for my judgment, too.

Mr. TUDOR: I was saying that we already have an example of the opposite point of view when the Chief Executive, so to speak, of the Federation was entitled to receive his emoluments long before he set foot on West Indian soil, but preferred not to do so until he had actually taken the Oath of Allegiance. If in the case of the Governor General he had insisted on having his salary and it was decided to give it to him, I think there could have been no objection to it, because he holds a post of greater dignity and greater responsibility; and what is more, in his case, it would be a new post which would not be the case with the Governors of the unit territories.

What we are doing now is this: we are saying that in a routine change over of Governorships in this unit of the Federation, with something which has been going on from time immemorial, at any rate for the last three centuries, we should make a new departure and pay the Governor that is coming as soon as we hear that he is to be our new Governor. I cannot see what the justice of that could be. You have got to have a very strong argument to show why the taxpayers of this island should be burdened with three salaries pertaining to the same office for perhaps the period of four or six months. A man who is coming is entitled to leave from the place he has left for which he will draw a salary; the man who is leaving us is entitled to leave from Barbados during which period he draws his salary; and the man who is acting for him until the new one comes will be drawing whatever he is entitled to as Officer administering the Government.

3.40 p.m.

Therefore, in the space of three months if this Bill is passed, the Treasury of this island will be saddled with the responsibility of finding three distinct salaries pertaining to the same office. There must be something wrong somewhere. We do not have to be emotional about this and I give the Government this much credit. I do not think they have thought out this matter very carefully from this standpoint. What they should have done, if this were handed out by Colonial Office, if it were recommended to them, was to ask the Colonial Office why is it necessary and how would it affect Barbados. Does it mean that without this provision, it is not likely to get a Governor? The Colonial Office cannot argue that. The British Empire is shrinking and is becoming compressed and we should not let ourselves be put in a position where we solve the problems of Her Majesty's Overseas Service. If one of these people is appointed to succeed our present Governor, let it be so and let him arrive and start drawing his salary from the time he sets out on his journey. What is wrong, moving in this particular direction? Why take upon yourself the further burden of paying him even before he sets out on his journey? There must be something radically wrong. Sir, not only would he receive his salary but according to this Bill, he is entitled if we pass it to all rights and privileges and amenities. That means exemption from customs duties and other allowances. I take it that the Government feels that the duty allowance and all the other things pertaining to the Governor are his privileges; therefore, they may be thinking of deciding to pay him \$600 a month as duty allowance before he sets out starting to entertain people. (Laughter) It is alright for the Ministers to laugh. I do not know if it is not true. It is for the person introducing the

Bill to explain it. If you say in this Bill that the person is to receive the salary and all rights and privileges, I must take it that it means everything which the Governor now gets. If that is not so, the Minister should make that clear. If the Ministers do not do their work well, how must you know if the person appointed is not to receive the duty allowance? The point about the salary is not in any way put on one side; it is not in any way weakened and I am certain that the lukewarmness with which the Hon. Premier introduced this measure shows that he himself is not convinced of its necessity or desirability. He did not argue as if it were vital to the carrying out of their policy that they should increase the emoluments of the Governorship. The Hon. Premier cannot claim that this is a party issue in the sense that the future of his party programme is bound up with it or that this is a following on of what they have done.

We have passed only the other day legislation to give an increase to the person who is occupying the same position as we are dealing with today. We always get legislation which is recommended to us from outside but which has no bearing on the Barbados situation and which is not necessary from the Barbadian point of view but which legislation by the mere passing of it reflects adversely on this colony. The very fact that legislation of this kind can be brought to the House means that the people of this Island are really asleep. When so much needs to be done to the other persons entitled to more emoluments, the bringing of this Bill here this afternoon is evidence that we are still finding it necessary to create more privileges for fewer people.

Sir, I do not think it is any great honour to Barbados that a particular Englishman should come under the present circumstances to be Governor. If the British Overseas Colonial Service is so organised and if our development is such that we must have a Governor, let it be so; but there is no reason why we should pay through our nose for that doubtful privilege; therefore, the Government of Barbados should always be on the lookout to strike a blow towards greater independence. This Bill would be quite in order sixty years ago when the competition for good Governors was rather great and then it was a difficult thing for this colony to get the type of man that suited it. If somebody then had hinted that we should pay the new man long before he assumed the office of Governor, that may have been a good thing to get a good Governor. Now in 1958 when all over the place which used to be the old Colonial Empire, those members are marching onward to nationhood and by their own course are changing their system, it seems as if the Barbados Government is not aware of that but is conniving with the Colonial Office in what it is doing. It is no use for us to flatter the United Kingdom. We ought to be able to speak to them very strongly and to say to them that we are not prepared to be exploited by them any more and that we do not need these people now. If we have to wait until a new phase of development is reached, albeit; but let us have such people as cheaply as possible until the time comes when the next stage in our constitutional development is reached. If we speak to them in that way, we should frighten them off and what we could not beat out of them, we would frighten them out of.

A Governor's Deputy is provided in the constitution of the Island to administer the office of Governor in the absence of the Governor and I have never known it to happen in the absence of the Governor that matters went to such a crisis that something extraordinary had to be done. The absence of the Governor is treated as a matter of routine not only here in Barbados but all over the British Empire. If the Hon. Premier or any other Hon. Minister would tell me if there is any other colony which has a similar provision as what we are doing now, it would be interesting to know of it. If this is the practice in other parts of the Colonial Empire to pay new Governors long before you see them, there must be something wrong with the administration of these territories. But if, as I suspect, the Colonial Office feels that anything which you push down the throats of the Barbados Government as distinct from other colonies would be accepted, or because the Colonial Office says so the Barbados Government will accept it, then, obviously, we have been again led up the garden path. This is what I suspect; it is for them to say that is not the case.

3.50 p.m.

I know that hon. members opposite take the view of this matter that it is what they would call an urgent matter; and some of them will argue that it is not a controversial matter merely because it does not come into the strict confines of Party politics. Some of them, perhaps all of them, might feel that since the Government Party has introduced this Measure, it is their bounden duty to support it and to add more burden to the taxpayers. I cannot quarrel with them if they take that attitude, but this is what I am saying; whether members of this House are Ministers, backbenchers or members of the Opposition, all of us including Your Honour have been elected here by the people's vote. Some of them have been elected perhaps in some cases under a misapprehension as to what they could do for the people, and in other cases, the people elected us because they like us better than our rivals; but none of us has ever been sent to this House to create privileges for fewer and fewer people. I do not think that any voter whether he voted for them, for us, or for the Independents, would support this Measure on the ground which was given for it by the Premier. We do not need to hurry Governors here; when the office is vacant the Government is administered and there are documents - the Royal Instructions and the Letters Patent - which set out clearly what are the functions of the Governor and whoever acts for him. There is no hurry to use any financial inducement or there is no need to lower the Treasury in order to get somebody to come here as Governor. We are not short of Governors, and that is the only argument you could use as to whether you want to saddle the Treasury with three distinct salaries at the same period. That is an argument that you do not have, that officers are not likely to come here; it cannot be argued that we are not having them. Who could ever justify this? We are opposing it, because we find that it is unnecessary and we are also opposing it, because we disagree profoundly that the time of this House should be taken up in creating this privilege for one or two persons every now and again.

The House of Assembly in Barbados in successive Sessions has been very generous to the office of Governor in all that the House has provided; on both sides of the House there is the recognition that the very best has been done both for the upkeep of the office and the person, whoever it happens to be; there is nothing in our opinion which we can do more for the office. We are not of the opinion that the office is in any jeopardy, and that it must be bolstered up by the extra salary to be paid to the appointed person before he takes up office. When he lands here and the Chief Justice administers the oath, from then, in so far as the citizens of Barbados are concerned, he becomes the Governor of the Colony. We are aware of the fact that certain administrative arrangements make it possible for him to draw his salary before the time and we, on this side of the House, do not feel that we should go beyond those arrangements.

For those reasons we cannot give our consent to this Measure.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when I first received my copy of this Bill, I scanned it and after giving it some thought and consideration, I had an open mind on this Measure. Today, I have not heard a single argument from the Government as to why I should support this Measure; I am not supporting the amendment to this Bill, whatever that is worth. I had come in here expecting to be told that it was very difficult to get Governors or to get Governors of a suitable calibre for Barbados, but no such suggestion has been made by the Government at all. I expected to hear that when the Governor was on leave of absence, his successor experienced financial difficulty during the interim. If that were so, I should be the last person to vote against a Measure which would impose any hardship on a successor to the Governor. Whenever a Governor is appointed by Her Majesty the Queen on the instruction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, during the period while he is in England, whatever he is doing or whether it is his first appointment - no argument has been put forward to show that he suffers any financial difficulties. If that were so, I would give my support to this Bill. No argument has been put forward to show that Governors who come here are at a disadvantage - no such argument has been put forward.

What is the argument put forward to justify this amendment? - None whatsoever. We do not know the source of the Measure; but this could not have come from the Government, because they would be in a position to bring forward an argument in support of it. We have had an explanation by the Premier as to how it would work. I am a lawyer and different lawyers interpret things in different ways; the Judge decides who is right and comes down on one side or the other. If you are dissatisfied with the decision of the Judge, then you try another Court. I accept the Premier's explanation as to how this measure would work and what are the schemes and regulations; but if I were asked to interpret this Section as a lawyer, I would use the simplest method of interpretation, that is, that words have their meanings and here we have a simple meaning. What does the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill say? This is what is stated:-

"The object of this Bill is to amend the Governor's Act, 1890, in order to provide that when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, the latter person shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to the office of Governor, including emoluments."

This is a person who is leaving somewhere to assume duties, and he is appointed by Her Majesty the Queen to the office of Governor on the advice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and he is going to be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to the office of Governor, including emoluments.
4.00 p.m.

If the Secretary of State appoints Sir John Brown as Governor of this Colony, he has a case to argue that from the day he is handed his warrant he is entitled to his money, and the Laws of Barbados say he is. And not by any Regulations made in the Colonial Office. The Attorney General of Barbados in duty bound will have to tell him that he is entitled to it too. He is entitled to it from the date of his appointment even if he remains in England for three months or two days. That is no incentive to get a Governor. As it is worded, this would keep him in England and he can get his money because it says here, if the Governor is on leave then the man who is substantively appointed shall be entitled to it; he does not have to assume office. I am going by the interpretation of Statute which Lawyers learn in their first days.

The Premier does not intend that this should operate for a Governor to be in England and draw his money; none of the Ministers intend it; but if the Governor came and he was a poor man reaching retiring age and wanted to collect as much as he possibly could before he left, he could ask the Attorney General to give him an interpretation of this particular Section, and he could say that from the date of his appointment he is entitled according to Section 3 of this amending Act to his salary and to the emoluments and privileges. To tell him otherwise would be a joke because the Laws of Barbados say he is entitled. If therefore we do not want to have any hitches, let us make the Law more specific; let the Government tell the Attorney General what they want done and not leave it to Lawyers. Suppose the Attorney General goes because he may be responsible for drafting this, another Attorney General could give a contrary opinion. You do not want the Law to be uncertain. Whatever the Government intend in their own minds, whatever plans they have or however they would suggest it would work, when you read "when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed", there is nothing stated about coming to the island, swearing in and assuming office. You will read one morning in the paper that Her Majesty the Queen on the advice of the Secretary of State has appointed Sir So-and-So. He is appointed as soon as he gets his Instructions and Warrant. The Act says that he is appointed not when he lands in Barbados or sets sail, but he is appointed Governor long before he comes to the territory; therefore when you interpret this - and a layman can interpret it - it can only mean that as soon as he is appointed he is entitled to his salary. You do not have to be a Lawyer to read ordinary English words. There is an example of what they intended one way with the Public

Utilities Bill and something else was interpreted, because the Court is going by what is written here. If the words are clear, you do not have to refer to anything else. If these words are clear and understandable to the Court, it means they are nothing to do with what the Legislature intended. I am therefore suggesting to Government to correct this bit of legislation. I do not want to accuse any Governor of being a money grabber or accuse any Government of intending to put money in any Englishman's way, but I am saying that the piece of legislation which we are asked today to pass amending the Governor's Act leaves too much which the Government claim they intend to pass unmentioned.

A Governor can be in England cooling his heels, and of course if he is getting his money and if this interpretation is correct, it would not bring him to Barbados earlier; he would stay in England longer because according to this, he can get his money the moment he is appointed by this Section. Why should he come to Barbados unless he is forced to do it and unless his health is bad and he wants a warm climate?

I cannot support this Legislation for the reasons mentioned by members of the Opposition. We cannot afford to pay a Governor who is on leave, a Governor who is appointed and his acting *Locum Tenens* in Barbados; we have too many irons in the fire, and there are too many things for which we cannot get money. Ask the Minister when we are going to get the new Hospital.

Let us have legislation definite and certain. I would not accuse them of giving away money, but they should let the Attorney General go over this again, because it does not say what the Premier intends it to say or how it should work. When you pass this, it is Law; not what is in your mind or on white paper in a file. The Law of Barbados will be that when a man is appointed he is entitled to the privileges. You may mean when he gets on the boat, but it does not say so here. This does not say that when the holder of the office is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively, such person on boarding the ship to sail to Barbados shall be entitled to these privileges; it says when he is appointed whether it is three months before he sails. It does not say "on assuming office which for these purposes shall be from the day he sails;" it just says "on appointment". Therefore I cannot support that, because to me the Law does not express what I know the Premier intends it to express, and for those reasons I am opposed to the Bill. In addition, I have not been told of any financial hardships of governors. I have not been told that there is similar provision in other territories, nor have I been told that it is difficult to get Governors of a suitable calibre; therefore, I cannot support it as a Lawyer with this particular drafting and for those reasons I oppose it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, one hon. member, I think the hon. member for St. Lucy, wanted to know if this passed whether it would be peculiar to Barbados. My information, Sir, is that this is done in the area. It is practised in the area and throughout the Colonial Empire, and if this is passed, Barbados will fall in line.

A point was made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. There are certain conventions which when accepted have the force of Law. I said a little while ago that the present practice with an officer assuming a post in any colony is that when he gets on board the ship, he gets half the salary; when he gets to the colony of his destination, then he gets his whole salary. I will take up the point again and make sure that that is what is intended.

Now there was a lot of talk about paying 2 1/2 salaries to the office of Governor. When the Governor goes on leave, the Officer administering the Government, who is usually the Chief Secretary, gets half his salary. That is done in certain other Departments. When the Head of a Department retires, the person acting in that place gets the full salary after the first month. I do not think that it is so in the case of the Governor, so that when the Governor is on pre-retirement leave he gets his whole salary, and the Officer acting in his place gets half his salary.

4.10 p.m.

If there is no Governor coming on immediately, well then,

that half salary goes up. But, Sir, as I was about to say, when the Governor goes, it starts a general line of acting appointments right down throughout the Service which dislocates the work. You may have a Permanent Secretary acting here and you may have another man acting there, and as a result, certain things which should be done, certain Bills which should be brought down, are held up. From my short experience in the Government, when one Permanent Secretary goes off and someone comes to act for him, that person takes some time before he becomes acquainted with the subjects with which he has to deal. If this Bill is passed, it will help to eliminate that difficulty with which we are faced at the moment and when the Governor goes on leave. As I was saying just now, for the short time I have been in the office of Premier, I have seen a lot of obstruction because of these acting appointments. We are at present faced with an epidemic of acting appointments and if we can reduce these, then we are quite sure that the work of the Government would be done more rapidly.

An hon. member has asked how this provision can reduce it. Well, if the Governor comes quickly, the Chief Secretary would resume his substantive office and the other acting appointments down the line would be reduced. They would be able to go back to their substantive posts.

In the long run, you do not save anything by having these acting appointments. The work is held up. I am hoping that hon. members will see, as I try to express to them, that the passing of this Bill will facilitate the work of the Government. We are not, as someone tried to show forth, subject to the whims and fancies of everything thrown on us by the Colonial Office. We accept what we think is good for us and we reject what we do not think is good for us. I repeat, from my personal experience as Premier, short as it is, plus the experience of my predecessor - and this is what other Ministers have experienced too and I think it should be obvious to anybody else - when a man takes up office in an acting appointment, it takes him about two months trying to familiarise himself with the work of that office before he can get on with the job, more especially when that person is acting as a Permanent Secretary. Hon. members should know how much that would affect the working of the Government.

I want to say this relative to the question of West Indian Governors. There is nobody in this Chamber who is more ardent to have West Indian Governors than we on this side of the Table, but they would come in the fullness of time; and if I am on this team - and I expect to be on this team - with Federation that must come. We are anxious; we are looking forward to that day. However, I repeat, I hope I have been able to get hon. members to see the wisdom of passing this Bill. I repeat, you really do not save anything by keeping the Governor in England five or six months. In addition, the work of the Government is held up by the long line of acting appointments.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that whenever anything comes before the House relative to the Governor or the Governor's office that hon. members take the opportunity to criticise the measure, feeling that it is a good political weapon against anybody, but what we are doing here today is similar to what we did here some time ago in the case of the Chief Secretary. You will remember, Sir, that I pointed out then when I introduced the Bill, that when the Chief Secretary went on leave prior to his retirement, another Chief Secretary could not be appointed until that retirement period had expired. Now, this is a similar case. All that we are asking the House to agree to is a Bill giving the power to appoint a Governor of this country when the substantive holder of the office goes on preretirement leave. I have heard it said by various hon. members that as a result we are going to pay three persons in that particular office. That is misleading in that, in the first place, if this Bill is passed, and no doubt it will be passed, when the Governor goes on leave prior to his retirement, an acting Governor is appointed; but that Acting Governor does not get the salary of the Governor. I heard the hon. member for St. Andrew quoting the law and giving his interpretation about it. As he said, lawyers differ, judges differ, and they have been differing for long years and I

believe they will continue to differ as long as the world lasts.

4.20 p.m.

As far as we know under the Colonial Regulations which govern *(ASIDES)* - the law only makes provision for the appointment of the individual, but attached to that appointment are strings - - -

Mr. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I should like to say that the law does not make any provision for the appointment of any Governor. Her Majesty the Queen appoints the Governor on the advice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies; we cannot pass any law for the appointment of any Governor.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is quibbling now. We are asked to pass a Bill whereby, when a Governor goes on pre-retirement leave, his successor shall be appointed immediately. (Mr. WALCOTT: And who shall be paid) It does not say that he shall be paid at all. (Mr. F. G. SMITH: What does it say?) It says "notwithstanding the provisions of any Act or of any legislation, when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, then such person shall be entitled (Mr. WALCOTT: To what?) to all rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments)."

It says such person shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments). What I am trying to point out to hon. members is that under the Colonial Regulations, a Governor who is appointed cannot draw any emoluments if he is not in the Island; that is commonsense even to any member of this House. How is he going to draw emoluments? - How is he going to occupy Government House and have all these privileges if he is not in the Island? *(Laughter)* How is he going to get these privileges unless and until he comes here and takes the Oath of Allegiance and goes into residence? The Section says that the Governor is entitled to these things, but it does not necessarily mean that as soon as a Governor is appointed, automatically, he will get these things. (Mr. WALCOTT: He cannot get the servants, because you cannot post them to him.) The Regulations provide that as soon as a Governor embarks - they do not know what the Regulations are.

Mr. WALCOTT: How can Regulations overrule the laws of Barbados? How ridiculous are we getting? Can Colonial Regulations overrule the Law?

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a point of order; the hon. member can speak later on. The Regulations provide that as soon as a Governor embarks on a boat or on a plane he is paid one half of his salary until he reaches his destination. When they talk about a Governor staying in England and make a few gullible people think that a Governor can sit down for a year in England and draw his salary and all the other emoluments attached to the office, they are only trying to make the public believe that we are so gullible, so subservient, obsequious and silly as a member said some time ago, that the Colonial Office is going to say: "Carry this thing to the House, do this and twist them around like marionettes" They would like the public to believe this nonsense, the public not realising what the position is. As an hon. member puts it, they are looking back at the gallery all the time. They are saying that the Governor can remain for six months - - well, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was dealing with the legal side of the matter as he saw it, but they have made it appear as if the Governor can sit down for three months, six months or a year in England or wherever he is, and he will still get this salary which is provided here.

I want to make it clear to this House that it is either that they do not know the Conventions as such or the Constitution, or they have attempted wilfully to mislead the House or the few people who listen to them. *(ASIDES)* I would say that if he, by accident, had carried somebody's lunch to a Secondary School, Barbados could not hold him. I refer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: When you get an ignoramus like him who does not know the plural of Addendum - he talks about if somebody had carried somebody's lunch -

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not addressing the Chair. If he rises on a point of order -

Mr. WALCOTT: A scamp like him; he has got to go and look for sailors.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want the hon. senior member for St. Peter to realise that if he thinks that he has been offended by any other member's remarks, he still has to realise that he must contain himself in making things understood, and he must be kept within the full range which is open to him. He is trying on his own to even up but that cannot be permitted in Parliament. There is absolutely no point in any hon. member trying to even up in Parliament with another member. He may have the full range to even up, but outside of Parliament; if it is done in Parliament, the hon. member must realise that he must be obedient to the Chair. He will have to be directed by the Chair and be protected by the Chair if he wants no protection from the Chair, that is quite a different matter.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, for your benefit, I apologise, but the reason why I said so is because the hon. member has a habit of using these vulgar remarks and then boasts that he said them already, and I am not going to sit here under any vulgarity. If he were outside I would give him a slap in his face.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am accustomed to abuse from the hon. member because abuse is a fool's only weapon. He cannot help it. I was going on to say.....

Mr. WALCOTT: He is not going on to say anything. He is talking about somebody being silly and calling him names. He is the first person that used abusive remarks, and it is in your place, Mr. Speaker, to make him withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The debate cannot continue unless there is quiet, or perhaps there is no desire to continue. If hon. members show signs that they do not want the debate to continue, it would be a simple matter for me; I have a very easy way out; but if members want to continue, it is a matter for them to decide; but it must be carried on in the kind of atmosphere which permits it to be carried on.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was pointing out, Sir, the manner in which members were misleading this House, as I said, for political reasons. When the Officer administering the Government goes on leave, as was already pointed out by the Hon. Premier, the Officer who administers the Government gets in addition to his emoluments or salary, half the difference between his salary and the Governor's salary. I have worked it out in figures because these sort of misleading statements get into the heads of people who have not got the facts, and they go out and attack the Government without understanding what they are attacking the Government for, following people who make Gallery speeches. Suppose for example an Officer is acting for a Governor, if the Governor was getting \$1,200 a month and the Chief Secretary who normally acts for the Governor gets \$500, he would get half the difference between the Governor's salary, and therefore he would draw \$850 while he is acting. If a Governor was appointed instead of the Chief Secretary acting, that Governor would receive \$1,200 which would be only a difference of \$350 per month in excess to the acting appointment by the Chief Secretary, and as I pointed out already that Officer would only draw that amount when he puts foot on a ship bound for Barbados.

All this talk against the Bill is the usual criticism that you get whenever we come to the House with any motion for the Governor or for Government House. When the hon. senior member for St. Philip talks about how expensive Government House is, it is still fresh in the minds of some of us here in this House that the member came here asking this House to agree to providing the Governor with a seaside house where he could go and cool out whenever he liked. The upkeep of that alone if we had

agreed to it would have been far more than the few dollars which we may have to pay whenever a Governor goes on retirement leave and we have to appoint another; but they would say anything, whether it be truth or lies, so long as they think there are people who are listening to them and who cannot follow because they have not got the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I tell the hon. member not to say anything which makes it appear that he is attracting strangers' attention to the House?

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as we are concerned, we do not do that, but as you know, with the Other side they gesticulate and look back in the Gallery to attract the visitors. More often than not, if that were not so, they would not make the type of speeches they make.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; and Mr. STRAUGHN - 11.

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 3.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

4.40 p.m.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when you look at Clause 2, you will see that we would have to recapitulate. We heard a lot about the regulations governing this, and as you ought to know, Colonial Office Regulations are numerous. You have heard the argument that a Governor starts to govern when he is on a boat coming. You have also heard it stated that I was speaking to the gallery. I will continue to speak to the gallery. If we want to lose the substance of what is Parliament, let us close the gallery. But the gallery cannot vote.

What is the position? It has been stated here by the Hon. Minister what the words in this Clause mean, and we have heard from the lawyers what they mean. It has been said that we should ignore what the lawyers say and the Minister has given his interpretation. Who is he to give an interpretation on a legal matter? He can say that what he stated is supposed to be the advice of the Attorney General. Now, Sir, what do you mean by the word "entitled" in this Clause? It says: "then such person shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office," and from that, you hear the ignorant comparison by the Hon. Minister about the Officer on pre-retirement leave is also entitled to all of the servants at Government House. Do you send the servants to him? Do you send the State Car to him? Do you send the Chauffeur-Policeman to him?

The Hon. Minister has also given the interpretation that when the man who is appointed Governor gets on the boat or when he gets on the aeroplane to come here, he gets his salary. The present incumbent came to this Island by aeroplane. Did he get half salary for half a night when he was on the plane? He then started reading something pertaining to Civil Servants. There is not one single word in that pertaining to Governor. The Governor is not appointed like anybody else. Tell me of any Civil Servant who has to

go to the Queen and kiss her hands! They are talking as if you can appoint the Governor tonight and tomorrow he will be in Barbados. It is customary when a Governor is appointed that he is holding another office somewhere. Let us say that he is in Tanganyika. Before he comes here, he must go to Her Majesty and get all the official paraphernalia that is necessary before he comes here. He must get all the Royal Instructions; so when you appoint a Governor, a lapse in the office must take place.

The Hon. Minister said that this is just like what we did for the Chief Secretary. That is not the case at all. The position as regards the Chief Secretary is different. The whole idea when we amended an Act for the Chief Secretary was when any officer, not only the Chief Secretary, is on pre-retirement leave, therefore, the post is not vacant and you cannot appoint anybody to an office which is not vacant; by that amendment you would have the authority to appoint somebody to the post. You amended it for the Chief Secretary because there was somebody in Barbados whom you wanted to appoint as Chief Secretary before the time had expired of the person who held the office.

You also have heard the argument that there is an epidemic of acting appointments. How can you get an epidemic of acting appointments when your whole Civil Service structure is based on that? Only a crass idiot will tell you of acting appointments. A Civil Servant is there to act. What is wrong about that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I am warning you not to use any offensive terms.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said 'only a crass idiot'. That is not an offensive term.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not to use an offensive term in making reference to an hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said 'only a crass idiot'. Would you say that is an offensive term?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mine is just a warning.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I was saying that the structure of your whole Civil Service is based on acting appointments. The minute you give a man leave, it means that somebody must act for him. All your Civil Servants who get a salary over a certain figure are entitled to leave passage. Are you going to say that as soon as a man has gone on leave you are going to get rid of him? Can you prevent the Chief Secretary from going on leave? Are you going to prevent him from going on leave? When he goes on leave and comes back and one of the Assistant Secretaries that was acting for him wants to go on leave, are you going to prevent him? This is only based on a matter of arithmetic. If a man must have so much leave every three years and there are so many men who are eligible for that leave, an idiot would be able to work that out to see how it would affect your Service. If those hon. members in here who had the privilege had absorbed what elementary education had been taught them, they would have known what could be done by an ordinary unitary method. In so many years you have so many men eligible for leave of six months, therefore, in one year you would have so many vacancies which would be bound to occur. That is a matter of arithmetic; it is not a question of talking to the Gallery. It means when you get up to speak you must be able to master your logic.

When you have a substantive holder of an office going on leave, what are you going to do now? Are you going to appoint somebody in his place as a substantive holder of the office? You can only appoint someone to act. I have said already in this Chamber when it comes to any remarks being used by any hon. member to me that I am going to reply to them forcibly. When the hon. senior member for St. Michael talked in the manner in which he talked, I defy him to get up in this Committee and make the same remarks he made then now. What is the position with respect to the Chief Secretary *vis-a-vis* the Governor? He can act as Governor of Barbados according to the Act. It is nothing which any Government has to pass. There is no question of a hiatus occurring. That is the basis on which your Service

is created. You have a Governor-General of the West Indies and in case he goes on leave the Chief Secretary of the West Indies must act for him. That is part of your whole structure.

I will say in passing that the laws of this Island are in such a bad shape that we cannot find the time when this Assembly passed a Bill or an amendment to the Civil Establishment giving the Chief Secretary when he acts as Governor the full rights and privileges of Governor as well as the full emoluments. As far as I know, there is no question of a Chief Secretary acting as Governor and getting half salary. Ordinarily, if a Civil Servant acts for another one over a period, he gets the full salary of the person for whom he is acting. I am not talking of anybody acting as Governor now; I am talking of somebody far beneath Governor.

4.50 p.m.

I am of the strong opinion that we passed an amendment in here, an amendment which was brought down by the former Premier, to the effect that when the Chief Secretary is acting as Governor he gets all the emoluments of the Governor. There is no question about any half salary; they tried to put an end to that. We have already established the position whereby you can appoint somebody as Governor. In this respect in Barbados, we are not in any difficulty; the reason for appointing this Governor is that this hiatus would be stopped. Do you know how that hiatus will be stopped? Sometimes when you appoint a Governor, he cannot take up the appointment immediately; when the term of office of the present incumbent is coming to an end, if this is being done for that purpose, what we are protesting against is this Section which says that where another person is appointed substantively to that office, then such person shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office including emoluments.

The person who is going out has a right to these things and the person who is coming in has the same right. You, therefore, have two people in the same post enjoying the same privileges, which was not the case before. The hon. senior member for St. Michael talked about the Colonial Regulations, but this is an Act and Colonial Regulations are Colonial Regulations where there is a colony; they are just as when you put certain conditions of employment on people. The conditions of employment here are that you say how much money a person is to get whether he is coming here by boat or by plane. You have Colonial Regulations for Governors; a Governor is not appointed on the same basis on which you would appoint a Civil Servant or anybody else to a post. You have a Civil Establishment Order; you do not deal with the Governor under a Civil Establishment Order, because the Governor does not come under that. The Governor comes under an Act by himself. When a Governor relinquishes the office you can appoint another Governor; you give the Secretary of State for the Colonies the right to advise Her Majesty the Queen that you want to appoint another Governor, because the present Governor is on pre-retirement leave.

Sir Alfred Savage has been appointed Governor of British Guiana, but when he was appointed to that post - you have the circumstance where the Governor of Barbados is appointed somewhere else, and you do not know who is going to be appointed as Governor here. The hon. senior member for St. Michael read out something which he said is the Convention but the Convention deals with things like Ministerial Status and things like that. If it were a question of a Convention then you would not want any amendment to the Act. Why are we amending the Governor's Act? The Governor of Trinidad is in the United Kingdom and the Chief Secretary is acting for him; the Governor of Barbados was out of the island and the Chief Secretary was acting for him and somebody is acting for the Chief Secretary now. You cannot stop that state of affairs; you are saying that you are passing this Bill in order to appoint somebody to the post of Governor so as to prevent the appointment from being too long in being made. There is nothing which has been said by any Minister to the effect that it is on legal authority that when this man is appointed and is entitled to these things - this is the first time I have heard that the fact that you are appointed to something nullifies you from receiving it.

I should like to say this: If the gallery is going to be an offensive place for people to look at, then I will look at it more; the members on that side of the House are facing the gallery but we have to look back at the gallery. Sometimes it is a good thing to look back. It is the gallery which has sent us here and I am not afraid to look at the gallery; that is not the source of any worry to me. What is the source of worry to me is that we have legislation to be passed here, and those who have introduced it do not know what to say about it. You get vulgarity from people who deal with these things and I would say that other members are not as vulgar as they are. As soon as a man is entitled to emoluments, you have to show under what circumstances he has to get them, so that the hon. senior member for St. Michael was merely talking through his hat. The Premier himself was not clear on this matter. I do not know if it is that he is suffering from something, but the Deputy Premiership has not satisfied the hon. senior member for St. Michael and he wants to be Premier himself. If the Premier cannot put him in his place, I can do that. He says: "the explanation given by the Premier cannot satisfy me, I will go for those fellows now". When he makes the vulgar remark about somebody not going to a secondary school, if he is suffering from that, I want to tell him that he is now too late. I do not suffer from anything like that.

Let us see what the word "entitled" means; if the Governor is entitled to these emoluments, under what circumstances will he not receive the money? They say that he can only receive the money when he assumes office in Barbados; we say if that is so, they have not stated that in the Bill. All they have stated in the Bill is that you give them the right to appoint a successor and he shall receive these things.
5.00 p.m.

If a Lawyer comes and gives the interpretation that this Officer is entitled, what are they going to tell us? Are they going to tell us that we know it did not mean that, because it was not stated in the Bill? The mere fact that the hon. member said that before the man assumes office he can get a certain amount on the boat, shows that the question of the assumption of office is not a prerequisite to getting his emoluments. I was asking the Clerk to find out if I am wrong, because the Premier was not sure, but it is the business of the Secretariat to find out. I would ask the Premier to make a statement if I am wrong, as I am speaking under correction, that we have not passed legislation giving the Chief Secretary or whoever is the incumbent all of the rights of the Governor when he is acting for and on behalf of the Governor.

I was under the firm feeling that prior to the Chief Secretary's Bill, there was this question of the person acting for the Governor and not receiving all the facilities of the Governor, because it was felt that it was not fair to that Officer not to receive what the Governor was receiving when he was acting. If that is not so, I was of the opinion that not more than six or seven months ago we passed a Bill so that, say, an Assistant Secretary acting for a Permanent Secretary can draw the full salary if the period exceeded six months. When you speak about Regulations it is your duty to read the Regulations and not to tell us that we should know them. Does the hon. member know how many Colonial Regulations there are? Ask the Clerk if he has ever seen the Colonial Regulations yet, or ask any member if he has seen one. Colonial Regulations are nothing distributed in this House. When the member says that this applies to a person when he steps on a boat, that is something which he has heard in a general way, but he cannot say anything specific on it. No one has said what is the position with a Governor coming to a territory except to mention his getting half salary when he gets on the boat. Do the Colonial Regulations make distinction when it comes to Governors?

The hon. member said that whenever it comes to dealing with the Governor, the Opposition is always ready to object, but he should be the last to say so; he, too, has his reservations when we are dealing with the Governor, because we are dealing with salaries at the top.

When a member talks about making a speech to the Gallery, sometimes the gallery and the public cannot hear

our criticisms. Attempts have been made to increase the Governor's salary, and all of them on that side have their reservations about doing so. He is only now trying to ape somebody. Did anybody say that his salary should not be what it is? All we are saying is that in this method of appointment we do not want to find ourselves in the position of having to pay three Governors simultaneously. Of course, I have to pardon the hon. member for accusing members of wilfully misleading somebody. Do you believe that any member of this Chamber can wilfully mislead somebody in a Bill as simple as this, unless he was dealing with people who could not read or write? You can only use that term when you are dealing with people of unequal ability. When you talk about the gallery, the gallery cannot pass a Bill, because it is nothing which you throw in the air and ask them to vote for. You mislead people when you get on a platform and say things about people that are not true, and then you pay the consequence for so doing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Peter has gone far from the subject of the Bill and is now talking about people getting on public platforms, and I should like to take this opportunity of asking him not to attract the attention of the Gallery.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I made it quite clear already that I do not have to make any compromise, because I am not bargaining for anything. I am a Trade Unionist and as such I have to sit around a table and compromise; but in this House of Assembly I do not have to compromise, because there is nothing for which I am bargaining. When the hon. member talks about wilfully misleading somebody, you cannot come to this Chamber and wilfully mislead the members, because they are equal to each other, and even if there is a difference, it is not our fault. In a general way, we are equal as human beings and not in every way, because our capacities are not always equal. When the hon. member says that members make misleading statements, apart from it being unparliamentary, it should not be done in here, because it is a serious thing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have just spoken to the hon. member and I again want to ask him to keep to the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: The statement which I am making is in reply to a statement made in here. I do not want to challenge your Ruling, Mr. Chairman, but you must rule in accordance with the Rules of the Debates. I am saying that I cannot make a wilfully misleading statement in here. A platform is the place to make that, because I am not dealing with equals then in the sense that they do not have these Bills before them; so the hon. member should be the last to say that. (A VOICE: Come out!) I shall come out when it is time to do so; I shall come out when it is a *fait accompli*. When the die is cast you can afford to come out, but before the die is cast you should see what colours would come forth. He should be the last person to accuse somebody of making wilfully misleading statements, because he has a record for making them in here and elsewhere.
5.10 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, reference was made in here to the word "entitled" which appears in this section. The phrase in which it occurs reads thus: "then such person shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office." As to the meaning of the word "entitled", according to "Words and Phrases" which is the authoritative phrase book of the Judiciary - and I quote *verbatim*:- It is as follows according to an Australian judge:-

"In my opinion 'entitled' usually means 'entitled in possession.' 'entitled to have the thing,' not merely that you will be entitled or may be entitled to get something at some future time."

In the absence of any legal definition of a particular word, we ordinarily refer the judge to the ordinary meaning. Now, it means, that to which you are entitled, that which you may feel is yours. Sir, if you are entitled to the use of that gavel, you can use it as freely as you like and if you are entitled to any article, that means that you can go and use that article. If the person appointed substantively is entitled to all rights and privileges attached to that office (including emoluments) notwithstanding, and without

prejudice to, any rights or privileges which such persons on such leave of absence may have in respect of emoluments, it is clear that he is entitled to emoluments, and if he is entitled to them, can anyone imagine in these days anybody appointed as Governor of Barbados who is entitled to certain emoluments and not drawing them? Because that is what it means.

We are passing something which if the Other Place concurs in and it receives the assent of the Governor, it would become the law of the land. It may be that you can disregard Colonial Regulations; but so far as the law is concerned, so long as this thing becomes the law of Barbados, it will override everything. Certainly, Colonial Regulations would have no effect at all to counteract the law of the Island. Therefore, there can be no doubt about it, if this becomes law, we would be putting on the Statute Book a law which says "that when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, that person is entitled to the emoluments." He would also be entitled to all rights and privileges. As a sound and practical business man, Sir, can you imagine a man who is appointed Governor not drawing the emoluments which he is entitled to draw at an office in London until he comes in Barbados and then draw them from the Treasury here? We are giving him all "rights and privileges (including emoluments)" if we pass this; so, Sir, as I have said earlier - and I am merely underlining it now - we would be establishing as a matter of law, when a Governor goes on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office that his salary will go on until his leave expires. Then the person who is appointed substantively to that office, as soon as he is appointed, his salary starts and then the person who would be here acting as the Governor's Deputy would be also drawing the salary of Acting Governor, that salary to which he is entitled is law.

The question is this. Can this Island afford to pay out that amount? Would we find it possible to do all that? Can we afford to pay those three salaries? The Hon. Minister said that no Governor who was subsequently appointed would dream of drawing money until he is sworn in because of Colonial Regulations and because his future being bound up in the Colonial Service demands his adherence to those Regulations. Sir, we are not adhering to that at all. We know that if we do not adhere to this, if it becomes law, we would be breaking the law of the land. The point which I made earlier was that the office of Governor is not worth this increased expenditure. It is politically unimportant to have that office today now that you have Cabinet system.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, for the benefit of the Hon. Premier, I have now in my hands the Act which substantiates my point. On the 17th July, 1957, we passed this Act to amend the Governor's Act of 1890. This is what it says: "Section two of the principal Act is hereby amended in the following respects -

(iii) in subsection (3) thereof by the deletion of the words "a salary at the rate per annum of one half the difference between the emoluments of his substantive office and the salary of the Governor" and the substitution thereof of the words "an acting allowance calculated at such rate and subject to such conditions as apply to public officers generally."

What I was pointing out to the Hon. Premier was that I was of the opinion that we had passed legislation removing the idea of giving the Chief Secretary one-half of his emoluments and one-half of the emoluments of the Governor when he was acting as Governor. I have asked the Clerk to search that up for me.

I have risen to point out that I am satisfied that we have passed legislation removing the idea of paying the Chief Secretary one-half of his salary and one-half that of the Governor. We have put him in the position that he is better off than before because as it was before, it seemed as if he was not entitled to all the perquisites attached to that office but now it is felt that he should get all the things that come to the Governor. You can therefore see the point that I was raising which is that when the Governor goes on leave, that in no way causes a hiatus.

5.20 p.m.

We have given here locally someone the right to assume office, someone with the status which we required, and not lose anything by it, so that when the point is made about new money being paid, it would be paid to the person who is acting. I hope that the Hon. Premier sees the point I am making. The point under which the Hon. Minister of Trade was labouring was wrong. Like everything else the Hon. Minister is always pontifical whether he is right or wrong and he is not subject to any correction.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, earlier today I commented on the fact in connection with this Bill that the cost of the Governorship of Barbados has been increased from \$26,000 to \$54,000 during the ten years of office of the present Government. Since then, the hon. senior member for St. Michael has said that if the Government had adopted a suggestion of mine, the cost of the Governorship of this colony would have been more. This is about the third time that he has repeated like a parrot the jibe which he used to hear from the former senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with Section 2 of this Bill, and the hon. member is now dealing with speeches made during the second reading of the Bill. I am asking him to refrain from replying to remarks which have been made during the second reading of this Bill; let him deal with this Section.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am at a loss to understand what you have said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no fault of mine; the fault is yours.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It does not make any sense to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am saying that we are now dealing with Section 2 of this Bill in Committee and a reply to what has transpired during the second reading of the Bill will not be allowed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Am I to understand that in Parliament remarks which have been made during the second reading of a Bill are not to be referred to in the Committee stage? I believe that people in the African colonies, the Hottentots, are allowed to reply to speeches made during the second reading of a Bill, otherwise Parliament would be a farce; because anybody could say anything which he likes to say during the second reading of a Bill and nobody would have the right to reply to it at all. I say that that would be reducing parliamentary debate to an absolute farce. I am saying that in so far as increasing the cost of the Governorship of this colony is concerned, that is a particular weakness of the Government Party in Barbados. Any cheap jibe on their part about suggestions which I made formerly to increase the emoluments of the Governor will not be allowed to pass without reply. When those remarks were made, conditions in Barbados were different from what they are now. There is not a single Island in the West Indies where there is not a rest house for the Governor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is now doing exactly what I asked him not to do.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What am I doing?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are replying to a second reading speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that the proposal of mine to provide a rest house for the Governor was the normal practice in the area from St. Kitts back to Jamaica. The idea was that if the Governor had his own rest house he would not have to go to the rest houses of private people and since there was no question of adult suffrage.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I have looked through this Section and I really do not see anything about any rest house for the Governor. May I be enlightened as to where that is?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already drawn to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Philip that the remarks which he is making are in reply to a second reading speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not making any reply to any second reading speech. If you want it in this way, I am saying that I disagree with adding more cost to the Governorship of this colony. I go further and say this: if in 1942, we had increased the cost of the Governorship of the colony by providing a rest house for the Governor, we would have been doing what every other Island was doing, that is, keeping the Governor apart from the oligarchy which was ruling the Island, when we had 7,000 voters on the Voters' List.

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has risen on a point of order. Well, I am very glad to see that he has a very good understanding of the Rules which he did not have when he was occupying the Speaker's Chair. *(Laughter)* Everybody wants to be the Speaker now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To the hon. senior member for St. Philip. This is what I find in May's at page 527:-

"In committee the details of a measure are the primary object of consideration, and alterations in its provisions are proposed. But amendments must be compatible with the principle of the Bill which the House is taken to have affirmed on second reading. Hence an amendment which destroys the principle of a bill, for instance, is out of order."

I have drawn to the hon. member's attention that he is now attempting to make a second reading speech in order to reply to what transpired during the second reading of the Bill. This is the third time that I am asking the hon. member to stick to Clause 2 of this Bill which we are now considering.
5.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that apparently in so far as my remarks are concerned, you are labouring under a misapprehension. The primary object of my remarks is to oppose Clause 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not by reference to the second reading speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am the better judge of all the references I must make in making my speech. So long as I am saying that I am opposed to the Bill, the remarks which I use in support of my contention are to be selected by me and not by anybody on the other side of the House. If they do not like what I am saying, they need not listen. I have not said that I would agree with Clause 2, and even an infant in his mother's arms should understand from the remarks of the Opposition that we are all opposed to Clause 2 primarily on the grounds of expenditure; and that has been the burden of every speech from the Opposition today. Only people with absolutely no ability who cannot understand simple expressions could construe our position into anything else but objection to Clause 2. I am saying, Sir, that it is the height of stupidity. Is it not more than passing strange that the only argument which the Government can use is this? We are saying that in ten years they have added about \$26,000 to the expenses of the Governor. All he can say in refutation is that somebody wanted to give the Governor a rest house twelve years ago. It is sheer ignorance and it is high time the member tried to be original; he should try and say something which he did not hear Adams say. On every single occasion when he comes in here to talk, he quotes something which Adams said ten or twenty years ago. Let them stand in their own shoes and give us something new. No parrot-like repetition is going to prevent me from opposing the principle of throwing more and more money on the occupant at Government House. If the Premier is to be a Knight, he would get it even if he opposes the Colonial Office in this attempt. If the members hope to get an O.B.E. or M.B.E., there are other qualifications required for that than merely giving a Governor money.

What they must understand is that it is their duty to come here and logically explain the reason for this Section but they do not have to support it by abuse or by playing smart or even by nonsensical giggling; that does not carry us anywhere. Their duty is to come here and say why for the first time in 300 odd years we must take this step. Governors have been coming and going and new Governors

have been in the process of appointment, and we have not had to do that before, and as I said earlier, in the context of our constitutional position, this is a retrograde step. There has been too much kow-towing to the Colonial Office and that is what they have been guilty of in matters of this kind. They cannot find money to pay cantoniers more than \$13 a week, and now they are going to add the considerable amount of \$2,000 a month to the cost of the Governor in the area, when the Governor's term of office has expired and a new Governor is to be appointed. It is sheer stupidity and an absolute waste of public funds.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw to the hon. member's attention that the second reading of a Bill denotes that the principle of a Bill has been accepted. When you get to the Committee stage, you speak on the Clauses and offer any amendments which you are prepared to make, but certainly not to discuss the principle of the Bill as you are attempting to do. You are giving your reasons for opposing Clause 2; therefore, you should proceed to make any amendment and not attempt to go back on the second reading which has accepted the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, by the merest coincidence, it so happens that Clause 2 is the Bill; so therefore, in opposing Clause 2 whether or not you like to say so, you are opposing the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has been done in the second reading.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We could not oppose the passing of Clause 2 in Committee when we were in the House. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you were here when we were opposing in the House and you may remember that I spoke at length on it in the House. All I am doing now is continuing my opposition in Committee, which is the right of any Parliamentarian. As a matter of fact, it is common Parliamentary practice for members to talk and talk in Committee on a Section they do not like, unless the Rules of the House do not permit them, to stop the passing of a Bill with which they do not agree. That is common Parliamentary practice known to any second standard boy. If you cannot oppose the principle of the Clause, why go into Committee at all? You could just have the second reading speech and pass it. We do not agree with Clause 2, which is the Bill, and we are entitled to speak a million times on the principle of Clause 2, so long as Clause 2 happens to be the main principle of the Bill.
5.40 p.m.

The only thing that can stop us would be an abuse of the Rules of the House. I am saying, Sir, in passing that this Section -

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to draw your attention to Rule 36:

"The Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or of the Committee to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech".

You have that authority. (A VOICE: You had better not use it.) There is also the order dealing with the 'Closure of Debates'. There is no point having a Committee sitting over a period of time to make amendments to the Rules of this House and now that the Rules have been amended you have them being flouted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On what is the Hon. Premier speaking?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You will recall that I said the only way that you can stop a member from opposing the underlying principle contained in this Section of the Bill is by an abuse of the Rules of this House. What the Hon. Premier just said is exactly what I had in mind. I suspected that he would want to resort to the new Rules and abuse them. Is he seriously accusing me of repetition? (A VOICE: Yes: it was repetition) After all, Mr. Chair-

man, I am not yet like the hon. member who really understands what the subject is; therefore no member can suggest any matter of a tedious argument as regards that hon. member because he does not make a speech at all. (Laughter).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: By introducing that, they are more or less trying to get me off Clause 2. Anyhow, Sir, the Opposition contends that no argument has been advanced at all in support of this proposal. The Opposition contends further that it is totally unfair to impose this burden on the country, and the Opposition contends further still that they will rue the day that they can do it. I offer that challenge here today because there is no justification at all for this Bill as is contained in Clause 2.

I say finally, Sir, if the position of Governor is still so constitutionally important that we have to take this abnormal step to compensate the outgoing Governor and the incoming Governor, well then, the entire Cabinet is redundant. The Ministers are redundant; therefore the money which we are paying them is an absolute waste. You cannot have it both ways. If you are going to pay the Governor these fancy prices, chase the Ministers out.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As regards Clause 2, Sir, I understand the Hon. Minister in charge - the Minister of Trade - has assured the Committee that the word "entitled" although it was in the Act, did not necessarily mean that the Governor will draw the emoluments. It reads thus: "Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act or of any subsidiary legislation when the holder of the office of Governor, is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, then such person shall be entitled to all rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments), notwithstanding, and without prejudice to, any rights or privileges which such person on such leave of absence may have in respect of emoluments."

I was not in here when the Hon. Minister made his speech on this matter. I, myself, think that this is a bit peculiar and I want some information on it. As I have said, I was told that the Hon. Minister assured this House that because the word "entitled" was put in the Section, it does not necessarily mean that the Governor would draw it. I do not quite understand it. I am not making any accusations against anybody; I just want enlightenment.

I understand it in this way. Do not let us say the Governor, because I think that this is being done for other persons holding Government offices; in other words, this is something which you have throughout the entire service; therefore, it does not apply to the Governor alone. I hope that it is not for the Governor alone, that is to say, if the Chief Secretary or the Chief Justice for that matter goes on pre-retirement leave for six months, he gets his salary, say, as from the first of July to the end of December.

Sir, this is no second reading speech. I am entitled to ask something. When particular persons like a Governor are to be appointed it devolved on the Colonial Office or the Appointments Committee, whoever it may be, to find a man. Let us say it is a Chief Justice. When such a man is to be appointed, generally he comes from the post of a Puisne Judge in another place, and in respect of his salary, he will be getting here \$1,000 a month - which is the salary of the Chief Justice - while when he was a Puisne Judge, he may be getting a salary of \$500. Therefore if he is appointed during the period when the Chief Justice is on pre-retirement leave, say, four months before the Chief Justice's pre-retirement leave expires he will get the salary of the Chief Justice. It looks to me as if he would be entitled to the full salary of the office as long as he assumes the office. That part of it seems quite reasonable to me and I will tell you why. If a man was working in the Service for twenty years and he takes his pre-retirement leave, that is leave which was owed to him. Therefore there is nothing wrong in appointing somebody before that leave expired. As I have said, I was told that the Minister said that although

the word "entitled" appears on this Clause, it does not mean that the Governor can get that salary.
5.50 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. That is not correct. I was merely trying to point out that with all the Governor is entitled to.... it would be a physical impossibility if the Governor was in England, for him to obtain all of these things that are set out in this Bill. Having regard to what the Opposition was saying, I was trying to point out that the way in which the members of the Opposition were putting the matter was not the correct one.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, it is either that the members of the Opposition are the biggest bunch of fools in the world, or they do not understand. How could a man, who was the Colonial Secretary of some territory, come to the office of Governor here, and draw the emoluments as are set out here before he gets here.

Hon. M. E. COX: It was the hon. senior member for St. Lucy who said that.

Mr. TUDOR: It was not. (Hon. M. E. COX: He cannot speak the truth.)

Mr. MOTTLEY: As I see it now, what I am worried about is this: I am quite satisfied that the Governor who is appointed here could not draw all these emoluments as set out in the Bill in the circumstances, but I see nothing wrong in his drawing the salary if he is appointed to the post. Pre-retirement leave is hardly granted to a person if he is not entitled to it; if a man is going to retire, he gets six months pre-retirement leave as something to which he is entitled. If you are appointing a man to an office, I would say that he should be entitled to such privileges including emoluments. I take it that "emoluments" must mean salary; I do not see that there is anything wrong with that. However, what I want to know is this - of course I was not here when the Ministers made their explanation and I must apologise for that - but for all the years, if a Governor went on pre-retirement leave, the Governor's Deputy - and before the particular Act was on the Statute Book, the Colonial Secretary - would act as Governor. There was a certain amount of acting done in the past to give a person certain conditions to be listed among his papers in respect of promotion and so on. Before you passed the Act to make provision for the Governor's Deputy to act as Governor - at one time it went down to the Auditor General of this colony acting as Governor, all dependent upon the number of persons who were on leave. An Officer was given the opportunity to occupy Government House and be entitled to these allowances - entertainment allowances and all the privileges, but not the salary. The opportunity was given to a youngster to have in his private files that he acted as Governor and administered the colony and so on; he was given the opportunity of being placed high up on the list of Civil Servants. Today we are saying that if the Governor goes on leave, we should pay immediately the full salary to the person who is appointed. My argument against that is this: when you brought in your new system of Government - the Cabinet System - the former Premier said that it was their policy to run the Government, nothing to do with the Governor. If you have gone away from the Governor dominating policy and you now have your Cabinet System of Government, I do not see the necessity for increasing the salary of the Governor. The argument for having a good Governor was that you must have a first-rate Governor and unless he was provided a proper salary you could not get a first-rate man; but now the responsibility rests with the Cabinet which has been elected by the people of this colony according to the Constitution. I take it that is not the business of the Cabinet, but, as in other colonies, certain suggestions coming from the Colonial Office must be respected; however, you do not accept everything lock, stock and barrel.

If those remarks are correct, how can you justify this proposal when somebody with less responsibility is put in an office to be the symbol of a democratic Government? How can you justify saying that with your system of having a Governor's Deputy to act and be given an opportunity to show his merit - how can you say that this proposal is well

and good? Suppose, for instance, in June the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave and you appoint a man from the Straits Settlements as his successor; that person is entitled to this salary; he cannot get these privileges, but he can get the salary.

6.00 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, he does not get the salary payable by Barbados until he sets foot on board the ship or plane.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has enlightened me; so therefore you can tear this up and throw it through the window, because he is entitled to it now. I challenge the hon. member that I will resign my seat if that is not so. From the time the officer is appointed and he steps on board a ship, he is entitled to the salary of his office; and if what the hon. member says is true, he can tear this Bill up and throw it through the window. I am perfectly reasonable in my argument, and if what the hon. member says is correct, this Section is not necessary, and those of us who realise what is happening must view it with suspicion. If the Governor who is appointed is not entitled to the salary until he gets aboard the ship, you do not want this; but the hon. member must convince me now that this does not mean that as soon as you appoint a man to occupy the office of Governor, he is entitled to draw his salary.

This reads "when the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, the latter person shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to the office of Governor, including emoluments."

Mr. Chairman, before you stop me. I am going to make a little reference on this matter. If the Government can explain it satisfactorily, I would support this section; but what the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has said does not make sense at all. Tell me in truth and in fact what is behind this? What he says is nonsense, but if it is a fact that you do not want the office of Governor to stand vacant for any length of time. . . (A VOICE: That is right) I heard a budding Minister say in a *sotto voce*: "that is right", so if that is right, then that is one of the reasons why I would not support it, and I will tell you why. It seems to me that the position in Barbados before long will be that you will be bound to have a Barbadian like Mr. Hochoy in Trinidad, because as you go down the ladder you will have to appoint a Barbadian to act in the capacity of Acting Governor. The idea of not having the office vacant for any length of time means that you do not want any local people to act as Governor.

This Section is really the Bill and that is why it would appear that when members speak on this particular Section, they are speaking on the Bill. There seems to be some catch in it. (A VOICE: You suspect everything.) The member who said I suspect everything knows me well enough that no matter how many people over here talk against something and I agree to it, I say I agree with it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I want to see if I can enlighten hon. members. The hon. member said a while ago that this Bill is a question of salary. This is for the purpose, as has been repeated, of making the appointment of a Governor who will come and take up office rather than wait for six months while the other Governor is on leave, so that he can get the emoluments of his office. In 1955 a similar thing was done for the rest of the Civil Service. If a Head of a Department goes on pre-retirement leave, the person acting in his office gets the full salary after acting for a month. That is happening in the Civil Service today, including the Chief Secretary, and this Bill is to bring the office of Governor in line with the rest of the Service. I was very glad when the hon. senior member for St. Peter found the Act which was passed last year; at the back of my mind I felt it was so, but I could not put my hand on it. In the previous amendment to the 1941 Act, subsection 3 reads as follows:-

"An Officer administering the Government of this Island during the absence or incapacity of the Governor, or during vacancy in the office of Governor shall, in addition to the emoluments of his substantive office and to the

duty allowance mentioned in subsection 2 of this Section, receive from the Public Treasury in equal monthly instalments a salary at the rate per annum of one half the difference between the emoluments of his substantive office and the salary of the Governor".

As a matter of fact, this Bill before us will save money.

Subsection (3) of Section 2 of the Principal Act was amended by the deletion of the words "a salary at the rate per annum of one half the difference between the emoluments of his substantive office and the salary of the Governor" and the substitution therefor of the words "an acting allowance calculated at such rate and subject to such conditions as apply to public officers generally". In other words the Chief Secretary or whoever acts as Deputy Governor can get the Governor's full salary with this 1957 amendment, and therefore if the Governor is away for six months, the officer is entitled to these facilities. If you appoint a Governor, instead of his hanging around some place and cooling off while waiting to come to Barbados, he can come now and get his salary and emoluments and save all this acting. That is all this Bill seeks to do. Instead of waiting around for a few months before taking up office, he can come now and take up office, and the Chief Secretary who will be acting will go back to his substantive job, and the Governor will get his salary and emoluments.

6.10 p.m.

This Bill gives permission to pay to the Governor the salary. That is all it is. I think I have made myself clear.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the Hon. Premier very much. He has been very forcible in his reasoning. What he is saying is this. Heretofore, when a Governor went on pre-retirement leave, you could not appoint a Governor before the pre-retirement leave of the substantive holder of the office expired.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I rise on a point of explanation. You could appoint him but he could not take up his office.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I remember very well that the Act was amended in order to make it clear that a man could be appointed, but I cannot agree with the Hon. Premier saying that it is going to save money, for the simple reason that as soon as the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave, during that period, somebody must act as Governor. You cannot save money by what you are doing because during that period, whether it be one day, three months or five months that a man is appointed Governor, as from the first day of his appointment, that man can be paid.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: From the day he comes to Barbados or gets aboard the ship or plane to come here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope the Hon. Premier will admit that you do not have to do this to pay a man as soon as he gets aboard a ship or plane.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: You have to do this for the Governor-Designate. Under the present Act, you cannot pay him when the Governor is on pre-retirement leave, not even when he is coming and gets aboard a ship or plane. All that this means is instead of the Governor-Designate waiting wherever he is; we say, "come on now and take up your office."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think what is happening is that you are failing to admit that I am right. Let us say that the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave on the 1st July and that leave goes down to the end of December. Whether you appoint anybody or not, you have to appoint a Deputy to act and he draws the salary of Governor. The law provides that.

On the other hand, you say that the object of this Bill is to enable you to appoint a man during the period the Governor is on pre-retirement leave. But you must appoint somebody to do the work as soon as the Governor goes; therefore, that person draws salary for that and the

Governor who is retiring is also drawing his salary; therefore you are paying two people. You are right; I see nothing wrong about it. Is it not therefore a fact that the object of this Bill is to speed up the appointment of the new man or to give opportunity to make the appointment? They state that the answer to that is "no," but I say that it is "yes." The main reason for this Bill is to give them the opportunity to appoint a Governor when the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave. That must be the object because what you do now is this. As soon as the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave, you appoint a Deputy to act and he draws the full salary of Governor.

The present holder of the office of Governor is due to retire at the end of December. Suppose he goes on pre-retirement leave before you cannot appoint a man until the end of December. You are therefore bringing in this Bill to give you the opportunity to appoint a man. Do not say that it is saving. The actual truth is that it is not a saving at all. However convenient this may be to the system, let us admit this one fact that it is more costly. It is bound to be. The Hon. Premier in good faith said that it would be a saving. But it would not be a saving because as soon as the Governor goes, you have to appoint a Deputy and he gets the salary of Governor. If it makes it more convenient to do so, say so.

What I am worried about is this. Usually, a man who is appointed Governor comes from holding another office in some other colony. The minute he sets off on the boat to take up the appointment, he begins to draw the salary. At the same time, we would have the retiring Governor drawing the salary and we would be also paying the Governor's Deputy because we must have somebody to administer the office. You are paying a retired man - and I do not argue against that because he is entitled to pre-retirement leave just as anybody else in the service. 6.20 p.m.

(Loud Asides) That is nonsense. He could not have it, because you must have your Deputy now and he would be entitled to these emoluments. You must have parties, you must have a car and gasoline, emoluments and all the imported things which the Governor must use free of duty. What is worrying us is this: a man is entitled to these emoluments when he lands in Barbados, not the salary. That is where the Minister made a *faux pas*, pushing his body where his head failed to get through. I do not pretend that since I have become a member of the House I understand all the legal phraseology, draftsmanship and so on; I am always subject and willing to learn. This is what is confusing me. Right now, the Governor-Designate is entitled to his salary as soon as he boards the ship or plane. Let the Premier convince me to the contrary and I will sit down.

The Governor is entitled to these emoluments; this Bill makes it possible to appoint a man so that he can take up office. This is what I am asking; will the appointee be entitled to draw the salary of the Governor of Barbados before the accepted principle that he sets foot on a boat or a plane to come to Barbados? If the Governor goes on pre-retirement leave, it is right that you should pay him his salary; if it is that as soon as the successor to the Governor puts his foot on the boat to come here you pay him his salary, that is nothing wrong; but I feel that, according to this Bill, he does not have to worry to put his foot on the boat or plane. When the Governor goes on leave, he gets his pre-retirement salary; the Governor's Deputy gets his salary too. If what I am saying is so, then I object to that.

Before I sit down, I will accept what the Premier says, and I will pin him down to it. At one time in this country, there was an Act which was not easily interpreted by laymen, and a Secretary was paid the salaries of two offices. In another Department - the case which I refrained from raising here at the time - a man drew the salary of his junior and his own salary too. An officer near to a Minister drew two salaries because the Act could not be easily understood; the salaries were paid and everybody folded his hands. That took place and if the Hon. Minister says that that is not true, then I will sit down. Do not let the Minister say that it is not true, because I investi-

gated the matter. I am not accusing any Minister for that; let us be honest. The Minister would not know about that; possibly, he would only know about it when somebody raised the matter on the floor of the House. However, it is our duty to tell the Ministers that there are Acts which are difficult to be understood by laymen, and I can tell you that one Secretary - I may say he was an Englishman - did draw the salaries of two offices at the same time. (Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Bolton.) I say that another officer not only drew his salary, but also a part of the salary of the man under him. If a man is acting for the Harbour Master, he will draw one-half of the salary; but you do not hear of the Harbour Master drawing one-half of the salary of the Clerk when he goes on leave.

Finally, I sit down by saying this: let the Premier who is responsible for this matter tell me that it is not true to say - if I go into any Department and I am refused anything, I know where I can go and get it. I am entitled to information; I was not elected here by dogs. No appointed Governor can draw any salary while the retiring Governor is drawing his, unless he sets his foot on the boat or plane as an appointed person to come to Barbados. As the position stands now, I feel he can draw the salary. If the Colonial Office appoints John "Kalushi" from Hong Kong...

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. When a Governor is appointed, he is only the Governor-Designate. He is not the Governor until he comes to Barbados and takes the Oath. When he takes the Oath, then he draws his salary.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I want to get clear is that he will not be drawing that salary while the Governor's Deputy is drawing it, until he sets foot on the boat or plane.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like the hon. member to have this distinction. The Governor-Designate is nothing to do with the salary. That is only the term which is used to distinguish the Governor before he is sworn in, just as the Governor-General was only the Governor-Designate of the West Indies, before he was sworn in. It did not mean, however, that the salary did not come into operation before he was sworn in. 6.30 p.m.

It did not mean that the salary had to operate when he was sworn in, because you will remember that the Governor General said that he would not accept the salary which was offered to him until he got to the West Indies, though he was entitled to it from the time he was appointed. In this Act, the Governor is entitled to his salary on appointment, and I do not want the Premier to get the idea that "Designate" means something different in so far as salary is concerned.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I just want to tell the hon. member that I can give him that assurance, and I will make it abundantly clear to the Colonial Office.

Mr. BARROW: That is the biggest bunch of ignorance which I have heard here coming from a man old enough to be my father.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to an hon. member?

Mr. BARROW: I said it is ignorance; I am not calling him an ignorant man. What he has said is ignorance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot refer to an hon member in that fashion.

Mr. BARROW: I see now why you take exception. I should have said "from an hon. member old enough to be my father". You are absolutely correct. It pains me as a Barbadian who had the good fortune to go to the same school as the hon. member; it pains me as a member who has known the hon. member from the time I was eight years old, to hear him get up and say that he will tell the Colonial Office something, when we have a statute allowing them to ride a coach and four horses through the Public Treasury of this island. What is more alarming is that the hon. member should be so unconscious of the provisions of the Constitution of this island, and that they do not realise that they are passing an Act which is contrary to the Letters

Patent and the Royal Instructions, because the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions start out by saying that there shall be a Governor for the island of Barbados, and not two Governors and an Acting Governor for the island of Barbados. You cannot have more than one Governor at any time. We cannot create a Governor by Statute in this Chamber; all we can do is to vote the necessary funds to Her Majesty for the Governor to be paid.

The post of Governor was created by the Royal Instructions and the Letters Patent by the Privy Council in England and Her Majesty in Council, so we cannot now create two posts of Governor in this Island. This is a short and simple Bill, but it is simple and complicated at the same time. It is complicated by the ineptitude of the members who have had the task of introducing and explaining it not only to the members of this Chamber, but to the public in general.

I now understand the stand being taken by the Ministerial Benches on this. The Officer administering the Government of this colony is expected to go on pre-retirement leave shortly; he is entitled to six months' vacation during which time he will be drawing his full salary. We do not deny him that as the hon. senior member for the City has said. His *Locum Tenens* would be the Acting Chief Secretary or the Chief Secretary as the case may be, who will draw the full salary of Governor of Barbados and will also draw the entertainment, chauffeur and other allowances which go along with the office of Governor. You will therefore have two people drawing full salaries from the Treasury of this island and one of those drawing all the emoluments attendant to that office.

This is a very short Bill with really one substantial Clause and that is Clause 2, the one under discussion. In that Clause, no matter what undertakings the Hon. Premier may give to the senior member for the City, the debates in the Legislative Chamber are not recognised for the purpose of interpreting the Statute in the Law Courts. I want you to understand that clearly, Mr. Chairman, and you will appreciate what I am driving at. I can give any undertaking now as to my future course of conduct in matters relating to the Public Treasury of this island and to the members of this House, but it means nothing at all because you have to look at the Statutory enactments regulating the duties and responsibilities of the Public Officers; we cannot act on the promise of Government Ministers, the Premier, the Minister of Finance or any other hon. member. We are already saddled with the responsibilities of paying full salaries to two persons, that is, the departed Officer and the acting Officer, his *Locum Tenens*. In the 1949 Act, it was decided to put the Chief Secretary on the Civil Establishment; so he is not now mentioned in the Governor's Act at all, and we are saying by this Bill that we are going to pay a third salary to a person appointed substantively to the office of Governor. In other words it does not refer to the *Locum Tenens*, the Chief Secretary or whoever may be fulfilling the post; it refers to a third person who, Mr. Chairman, is appointed not by the people of Barbados but by the Secretary of State for the Colonies advising Her Majesty in Council, and that can be done right at the beginning of the leave term of the officer who is retiring.

The person who is appointed to fill the post of Governor of Barbados cannot come for six months, although he is appointed at the beginning of the period. If he comes to Barbados he is not Governor, because you cannot have two persons fulfilling the post of Governor of the colony at the same time; the man on leave is still Governor of Barbados. Let me give you an analogy. It is now the practice in the Civil Service in Barbados when a Civil Servant goes on pre-retirement leave to have him return to the Civil Service, if it is only for one week or a day. I understand that the normal period, speaking under correction, is about a month. A man who has reached the age of 60 gets six months' pre-retirement leave and has to come back. In my case, if I may be personal, I had three years' leave from the Air Force and had to return at the end of that three years for ten days to establish the fact that I was still a staff member of Her Majesty's Forces. I had to return to the Air Ministry for ten days although I was merely awaiting a boat to return to this island, so nobody could fill my post substantively while I was on three years' leave, because you can only have one substantive holder to a post.

There is no such office in the Letters Patent as the Governor Designate of the colony of Barbados. All the Letters Patent say is that there shall be a Governor. How then can you say that there is a man appointed substantively for the post. His substantive appointment can only take effect on the day after the last day of leave of the Governor who has departed. He could not be a substantive officer, so the Bill means absolutely nothing.

6.40 p.m.

If they want to get a Governor into the Island without any interval of time between the departure of one and the arrival of the other, they would have to go to Her Majesty the Queen-in-Council and get the Letters Patent altered. I have here a copy of the Letters Patent. Under the Letters Patent of 4th June, 1914, which cited the Letters Patent of 18th March, 1885 and which revoked the Letters Patent of 18th March 1885, it says this in Article Two:-

"There shall be a Governor and Commander-in-Chief (herein-after called the Governor) in and over Our Island of Barbados and its Dependencies (herein-after called the Island), and appointments to the said office shall be made under the Royal Sign Manual and Signet."

Therefore, my argument is this. Before a person becomes Governor of Barbados, he would have to be appointed by a command under the Royal Sign Manual and Signet. Taking the oath of office is merely an incident to this Service. This is a prerequisite of his carrying out the service, but he can draw the salary before taking up the office. What happened before was a very good practice, because to cool off and breathe a little fresh air is a very good thing, not only for the Island but for the people at the top of the Civil Service who get acting appointments in a higher position during the period to show their ability and quality. There is nothing wrong in the Chief Secretary acting for six months as Governor because it has always been so and there is no other constitutional way out of it. Why should there not be an *inter regnum* between the departure of one Governor and the arrival of another. When the Governor goes on his well deserved leave, it gives the officer under him a chance of administering the office of Governor, and at the end of his period they will be able to see from the records of his office what he had displayed during his acting as Governor. How can you now say that there should be no *inter regnum*? You do not have any embarrassing hiatus. The whole structure of the Service is built on acting appointments and matters of that kind, and I submit that it is a good thing for the Civil Service. It gives the Colony time to breathe.

I do not care who drafted this amendment. Until they go to the extent of petitioning Her Majesty the Queen-in-Council to alter the Letters Patent where every single contingency is provided for - and the only thing which we have to do here is to make provision for the salary - we are doing nothing. If we want to pay three people as Governor of Barbados, this would not make it constitutionally right for them to draw that salary.

I do not accept the interpretations given by the Hon. Minister. He sort of acquainted himself with the subject matter as he went on and he grew wiser as he went on and as he grew older. Sir, even if it were constitutionally possible to do this, I want to make it clear that I am not voting to have three Governors of Barbados. I am not going to vote one cent of the taxpayers' money to be frittered away legally or illegally. I am not saying that it is legal now. As long as we remain a colony under the guiding hand of the Colonial Office, we have to abide by the constitution of the Letters Patent. I want you to get that absolutely clear. We have to recognise the legality of that constitution.

Sir, I do not see the necessity for this amendment. It is stifling those Civil Servants, including the Chief Secretary, who would have the opportunity of getting acquainted with the administering of a colony like this and which would entitle him by dint of his experience to promotion to other places or even to be elevated to the topmost job which we give them. I think, Sir, that even that should be sufficient inducement to the Government of this Island to re-consider the introduction of this Bill and forcing the passing of a Bill of this nature at this particular time when we are moving forward from a static position to a position of contracting our relationship with the Mother Country and

with the Colonial Office. Our social relationships are contracting; therefore, we should be thinking of the day when we should not pay out the Governor's salary at all if we are talking about independence and Dominion Status. We have Federation; yet we have all these Lieut.-Governors running around the place with nothing to do. How can we in these enlightened days, in these days of the working class emancipation, talk about paying three Governors? Apart from the Hon. Premier's undertaking that three people would not draw the salary, I know that the whole idea behind this is to give them the privilege of drawing the three salaries for a period of six months and they probably have their eyes on some persons. Sir, I am not talking of the Government as regards that, but of the people in the exalted positions. This is only making provision to help three people. It will help the outgoing Governor in that he would be able to go to some place to rest, or to the Riviera, or to Rome, to have an extended holiday, or to fool about while drawing the salary of Governor. Then for the person who is taking up the job to also enjoy a little rest before coming and for the occupant whom we have here to be able to enjoy the laxity and luxuries of that office.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I do not want to repeat the strictures which have already been voiced against the Hon. introducer of this Bill but it is really inconceivable to us how anybody on the floor of this House fully clothed and in his right mind could suggest that this Bill would save the country money. I find it impossible to reconcile the statement of the Hon. Premier with regard to the provision of the Bill and with what the Bill itself says. His submissions and the context of the Bill are so far apart that I think, Sir, the Committee is entitled to some further explanation from him.

What the Clause says is that when the Governor is on pre-retirement leave, the man who has been appointed in his stead shall be entitled to all the emoluments, etc., attached to the office."
6.50 p.m.

The Section says this: "When the holder of the office of Governor is on leave of absence pending relinquishment of his office and another person is appointed substantively to that office, then such person shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges attached to such office (including emoluments)....."

As has been patiently and carefully explained by previous speakers, the Government has already brought down legislation to give the Governor all these emoluments. A Governor who is on leave, is, by law, entitled to these emoluments and today, we are creating another person who is also to be entitled to these emoluments. As a matter of fact, I will go so far as to say this; under this Bill the newly-appointed Governor, before he comes down here, can have any of the emoluments attached to the office although he was not in the Island, because he is entitled to them by law. If you are creating three Governors, how, in the world, can that be saving money? We should really not go on labouring this point. As I said very much earlier, the West Indies are over-burdened with Governors. In the Islands comprising the Federation, we have five Governors, we have six Administrators and we have got about 50 Ministers, and a Governor-General. With a population of 3,000,000 people in the West Indies, we have five Governors.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is now going outside the scope of this Clause.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not out of order; I am discussing the Section as a whole.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What do the appointments in the West Indies have to do with this Clause?

Mr. CRAWFORD: They have this to do with it, that we do not want any Governor at all. Far from increasing the emoluments of the office, we should abolish the office altogether, and it is time that somebody said so. We have in the West Indies a Governor-General, five Governors.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To the hon. senior member for St. Philip.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: You would not allow me to develop the point which I am making.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Governor-General and the West Indian Ministers have nothing to do with this Clause.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not saying that they have anything to do with it; I am making my remarks in opposition to this Section.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you are bringing in something which is not in here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have to substantiate what I am saying. If you will follow your own judgment and listen less to unenlightened opinion, you would not have all of this trouble. I am saying that, according to this Section, in a year like this you have a Governor costing \$54,000 a year, a retiring Governor and you are agreeing to give all the emoluments of the Governor to a man who may be resting his heels somewhere for six months. That is my contention. In view of the fact that the area is already paying all of these people, a Governor-General, five Governors, six Administrators and 50 Ministers.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I say that that is out of order and it has nothing to do with this Clause.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is out of order? I do not understand what you are saying. I am making a speech and I am supporting my contention. That is all I am doing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to allow the hon. member to go on with that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You cannot stop me, because that would not be fair. I am submitting that we are going to spend more money on the administration of this colony than what we are now spending by the introduction of this Measure. If the Government Party, the majority Party, had the interests of the colony at heart, they would not have brought down just recently legislation giving all the emoluments to the Governor and now they are giving these emoluments to the man who is appointed as Governor and who is in England. The Opposition is entitled to go further and say that far from increasing the cost of the Governorship as this Bill proposes to do, we should go on record as saying that we do not want any Governor at all. All we need is a Commissioner or a Lieutenant-Governor who would also combine the post of Chief Secretary perhaps, and that is the end of it. We cannot afford to do what is proposed here. There is no reason why 3,000,000 people in the West Indies should pay for this top-heavy administration. The State of New York with a greater number of people than we have, with a population of over 10,000,000 and a revenue of over \$1 billion annually pays the Governor less than the total emoluments which are paid to the Governor of Barbados.
7.00 p.m.

In 1951, the New York State paid the Governor \$25,000 a year; I am not discussing the American Federation, but I am merely trying to point out in support of my contention that if ten million people with an annual revenue of \$1 billion could only pay \$25,000, we cannot afford in this island with a quarter of a million people and a revenue of \$21 million to pay \$54,000 for a Governor, and go further and have three Governors, as we plan to do today. I really have never in all my life heard more nonsense in a Legislature from the Government Benches as I have heard today from that side of the Table. Not one single word of what the Premier has said can be supported by Section 2, and then he is farcical enough to tell us that he is going to tell the Colonial Office something! He has brought this Bill here obviously without reading it. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that all they want to do is to appoint a new Governor and give him all the emoluments attached to the office from the time he is appointed. Now I will tell you something, Mr. Chairman; if they do not know it they had better understand that the Colonial Office would not be above running this island further into debt and making it harder for them to pay their own way, because if you go and increase the administrative cost, higher than you can pay, it means that you will have to go asking them for help; and you cannot get self-Government that way. Therefore, Sir, we are going to vote against the Section.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 9

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 7

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of a Bill in Committee.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. The rules of the House say that at 7 o'clock the House should adjourn. We are infringing the Rules now.

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

AYES: Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 9.

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 7.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this matter I should like to ask if the Chairman of Committees has authority to continue a Sitting of the House after what the new Rule says. I want to get that clear because 7 o'clock has now gone, and I want to know if the Chairman has authority as distinct from the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rule reads as follows:-

"At 2.30 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall suspend the Sitting until 3 p.m., and at 7 p.m. he shall again suspend the Sitting until 7.45 p.m. provided that if, in his opinion, the business of the House could be concluded by a short extension of the Sitting, he may suspend the Sitting at 2.40 p.m. or 7.10 p.m. respectively."

Obviously, Mr. Speaker has the authority.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you look at Standing Order 4, Your Honour will see that the Chairman has no other alternative but to report immediately to you. The Rule says: If the House is in Committee, the Chairman shall interrupt and report forthwith and ask leave to sit again. He has no other alternative; he must report immediately to you.

A VOICE: That is at 8.30 o'clock. (Other asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: Both sides of the House are in disorder.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That Rule refers to 8.30 p.m. If at 8.30 p.m. the Chairman has no authority to go on, he has no authority to go on at 7 p.m. The Chairman has absolutely no authority under these Rules to continue sitting further than the time set out here.

I draw it to Your Honour that under these new Rules, someone is likely to make a slip up and it is Your Honour's right to have them interpreted in their right manner. I am submitting that in none of these Rules the Chairman has any authority to go beyond the specified time.

A VOICE: It is the duty of the Committee to point that out to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I overheard. I never witness these things. In my opinion, the Committee should have collaborated with the Chairman. You should have called it to the attention of the Chairman of Committees.

I will not break the Rules. It now being 7.10 p.m., this Sitting is now suspended until 7.45 p.m.

The sitting was suspended accordingly.

7.10 p.m.

On re-assembling,

HOUSE RESUMES ON BILL TO AMEND GOVERNOR'S ACT, 1890

The question that the Bill be now read a third time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 11

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 3

The question that the Bill do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 11

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 3

RESOLUTION APPROVING COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BAY STREET

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries; Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a certain area of land in Bay Street adjoining certain areas which happen to be the property of the Government.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to approve the compulsory acquisition of a certain area of land in Bay Street which happens to adjoin certain areas which are the property of the Government.

As you will know, it is the intention of the Government to erect a Fish Market along Bay Street on an area which has been used for selling fish over a very long period. The Government has come to the conclusion that since by long usage, perhaps custom, tradition, the people have become accustomed to buying their fish there, it may as well turn that spot into a Fish Market and give the people proper market facilities. If that is done, the people would be able to keep that place much cleaner and they would be able to sell their wares there in better comfort. Also, the Market would enhance the neighbourhood rather than have an ugly site and having automobiles blocking the roadway. I may say that Government has decided to have a car park along the area.

8.00 p.m.

Negotiations have been going on for a long period with two of the property owners on the side adjacent to the Government property and only one of the parties has seen fit to talk business. The other party perhaps feels that since the Governor is going to acquire this property, the Government should pay for it much more

than what it is really worth. In these circumstances, Sir, a lot of correspondence has been going on from one side to the other and we cannot wait any longer. We have been waiting for quite a while hoping that reason would prevail, but that has not happened.

Now, this Resolution is before us, in order to enable the Government to go ahead with this plan of building a fish market just on that site. I think that everybody will be happy, especially the fishermen and the fish vendors, when this market is erected; all we need now, is the acquisition of this land, because the plans have been made over a long period of time.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF SALARY TO THE HOLDER OF THE POST OF CHEMIST

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the payment of salary to the present holder of the post of Chemist, Department of Science and Agriculture, in accordance with the salary scale applicable to Scientific Officers of the Research Branch of H.M. Overseas Civil Service as set out in the Schedule hereto.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries take charge of this Resolution in-as-much as this matter concerns his Ministry.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Schedule, as it is set out here, states in no uncertain terms what are the various grades of salaries for people such as those with which we are contemplating dealing with this afternoon. In the first place, I should like to say that this matter has arisen, because Mr. Bolton, who was formerly employed at the Department of Science and Agriculture as Chemist, has returned to London and he is now a member of the Research Branch of Her Majesty's Overseas Service. When Mr. Bolton left here, we were not quite sure whether he would be returning to us or not. It would appear that from all we know of him, he is a very good man who knows his work. He is young and energetic and he also has ability. Apparently, the Colonial Research Service feels that this young man merits what he has asked for; therefore, they have asked us whether or not we would be willing to re-employ him under these conditions as set out in the Addendum to this Resolution.

I may add here that we are also aware of the fact that this gentleman has been offered a post in Nigeria at a much higher salary attached to it - than we are paying him, but for some reason or other, he decided that he likes Barbados and he would gladly return here. Of course, he is in a different category now, having been made a member of this important Branch of Her Majesty's Overseas Service, and there are certain things which we are asked to do in order to equate this salary.

As hon. members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, "The Secretary of State for the Colonies proposes to appoint the present holder of the post of Chemist as a member of the Research Branch of Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service and in order to retain his services it will be necessary to remunerate him in accordance with the scales provided for Scientific Officers of the Research Branch and not on the scale provided for under the Civil Establishment (General) Order."

It means that there will be an incremental difference. Heretofore, he got an increment of \$192; now he goes up

to \$240 and so on, but he will not reach his maximum under the new system until 1965. There is, therefore, no real increase in remuneration until that time, because the salary goes up by increments and by stages. I may add that, what I know of the matter, is this. What we are undertaking in the Agricultural Department now, calls for the services of a Chemist. Only today, I introduced a Resolution asking for a certain amount of money for the development of grass lands and there are many others to follow; therefore, we need a Scientist of this man's knowledge and ability in Barbados. We are very sorry, it is true, but nevertheless, it remains a fact that you cannot just put your hands on a Chemist, at least, not an Agricultural Chemist, very readily; and since this young man is ready to come back to Barbados, we are only too happy to meet the requirements of the Colonial Office and appoint him under these conditions. I do not think that there is anything more which I can add; I think I have stated the case as fully as I may.
8.10 p.m.

What I know of Mr. Bolton personally is that he is a very intelligent man, and I shall be very happy to have him back in the Ministry, at least during the time I am in office.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the face of it and from what the Minister has said, it would appear that this is a very simple matter and we can even pass it without any comment. I was glad to hear the Minister speak about the personal experience he had with this gentleman. He will have to answer some questions. Is he aware that this Mr. Bolton is an officer who was appointed by this Government fresh from the University, and was given another course to remain in England for some time? When Mr. Bolton came here, he was carrying out his functions as a Chemist and he was drawing the same salary as Mr. Knowles who was a junior officer and when he returned to England, they abolished the post of Mr. Knowles and the situation was that this gentleman could no longer draw his salary. That is the sort of case which you heard earlier today from the hon. senior member for the City, and he should be in his place when these things come up, so that he can deal with them.

I am going to speak against this Bill on the basis of personality legislation being passed interfering with the salary structure in which you are doing it. Mr. Bolton is a very nice fellow, but he is not half as well qualified as other people in the Agricultural Department who cannot be rooted into the Colonial Service because they are West Indians. If you look at the qualifications of the man whom you have as Analyst, you will see that he is Master of Science, an excellent qualification which would secure him employment anywhere. You are getting a Chemist in the salary structure G 3 to G 1A, which is \$4,560 by \$192-G 1A \$7,200 per annum, which is the same post as the Analyst. Now that you are getting a man from the Colonial Office, you are making the scale \$4,560 x 240 and not 192. The hon. member should make it clear why the incremental increase is more because at the next stage, he will get \$240 and not \$192; therefore you are giving one officer in your Department who is not as highly qualified as the others more money on the basis that he was offered an appointment in Nigeria. Anyone can be offered an appointment in Nigeria, but you should compare the qualifications of Mr. Bolton with those of Mr. Carmichael. You are now coming down with this legislation because Mr. Bolton went back to the United Kingdom and could go to the Colonial Office, and you are now placed in this position.

Sir John Saint was one of the excellent Chemists we had, and you can look over his work in Barbados and get all the information you require. Although you have the Godsall Report which gives you your salary structure, you are now going to deal with Mr. Bolton separately. I do not want the Government to have a service of senior officers, but are you not fooling yourselves that Mr. Bolton is a young man and that you can retain his services ad infinitum and that he is going to die in Barbados? A man likes money and he is not a Barbadian; so all your talk is moonshine. "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said, this is my own, my

native land." This is not Mr. Bolton's native land; he likes it for what he can get out of it. How many Englishmen do you find remaining in Barbados after the age of retirement? What you should do is to revamp your idea of employing people and train them to stop this amount of money being paid out.

If the Government does not see what I really mean, it is not my fault. This gentleman's salary will go to \$8,900 a year; the salary of the Deputy Director is \$8,160; so you are giving a man in the third position more money than the Deputy Director, thus making his post a junior one. Now you have Mr. Frampton whom you said you were lucky to get. Mr. Frampton likes to live in Barbados and money is no factor with him, because God has smiled on him in a different way. Your Senior Veterinary Officer is from G.1 to G. 1A. Why is it that Mr. Bolton is being selected for this treatment? Is it because he is an Englishman and can go to the Colonial Office and tell you that he can get an appointment somewhere else, forgetting that Mr. Bolton was not drawing this salary? It is just like a dog which has tasted blood. He was not drawing this salary attached to the post of Chemist, and when you have people in acting appointments holding two jobs - that is, a man drawing \$1,000 instead of \$700 from his substantive post - he begins to gauge his life on that much more, and to go back to his substantive post is always difficult. Mr. Bolton would have to fall back to his substantive position because there is the post which Mr. Knowles held while he was acting.

My serious development is this: the Analyst is on the same scale as the Chemist, that is G. 3 to G. 1A, and that starts at \$4,560 x 192 to G. 1A which finishes at \$7,200. In the 1958-59 Estimates on an incremental basis the Analyst starts at \$6,000 and the Chemist at \$5,520. Fortunately for Barbados, the Analyst is a Barbadian with the highest qualifications; in fact his qualifications are higher than those of Mr. Bolton.

8.20 p.m.

What is going to be the position if Mr. Carmichael sees that an Englishman can come here and wangle something by which he can go to Colonial Office and say that he is part of this line of officers which the Colonial Office is creating?

According to the Addendum, the Secretary of State for the Colonies proposes to appoint the present holder of the post of Chemist as a member of the Research Branch of Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service, and in order to retain his services it will be necessary to remunerate him in accordance with the scales provided for Scientific Officers of the Research Branch and not on the scale provided for under the Civil Establishment (General) Order. I know that Mr. Carmichael has as high a qualification in that field as anybody else. Fortunately for Barbados, you did not pay for his overseas education; he qualified for Barbados. Are you telling him that because of these special circumstances which you are creating in your superstructure you are ignoring other people with higher qualifications? You are saying to him that somebody from outside can enter your Service and get all these things; but you have your own heath and hearth here. Sir, when are you going to stop this Colonial Office mentality? One of the things Barbadian Ministers must get to understand is that if a man wants to get a job here as that in a certain area, you cannot pay him a salary in the highest position. Can Barbados compete with Nigeria which is a country with thirty-three million people and the type of economy which they have there? You are competing with such a country when the land of Barbados is just only a village of Nigeria. I am not a scientist: I am just a layman, but I am not going to see this territory pushed around all the time.

You see in this year's Estimates that they want the post of Chemist, and the next moment you see that they do not want it any more. I had the experience of seeing that this post was abolished. At one time they said that you needed the post of Chemist and on another occasion they said that the post of Chemist was not necessary. On one occasion they said that Sir John Saint had done so much work in chemistry that the ground had been fully covered. Now, they are saying that you need the post. I am not saying what they should have or what they should not have. It is not within my province to say that.

Sir, when you look in the Estimates, you will see that the post of Agronomist has been dropped out. You realise what was happening here. Apparently, there is no incumbent and I think an amendment was passed to the Civil Establishment Act so as not to worry any longer about the post of Agronomist. I think this was the post which Mr. Knowles held once. I understand that it went to such a stage at one time that the present Chemist was also Chemist and Agronomist and he was drawing his salary as Chemist and half of the salary of Agronomist. By this, you will see, if his salary was \$5,520 and he was also drawing half of the salary of the other post, which as the hon. senior member for the City said, was the junior post, and which was on a scale of \$4,560 and you divided that by two, you will see that his emoluments were something like \$7,200 per annum; therefore, he was working for this Government for more money than some of his senior officers. I think you will remember the hon. senior member for the City saying the other day that he was drawing the salary of the higher post and some of that of the lower post. I would expect that you have got some Civil Servants who are manoeuvring in this sort of thing and saying that it is not a question of your being a senior and a junior but that you are working in two posts, and therefore, you are entitled to the emoluments of the two posts.

Sir, why should I vote for this Resolution which gives Mr. Bolton special treatment after only a couple of months in the Service? If we get doctors at the General Hospital saying that a new system has been created in the United Kingdom in which all doctors who are members of the British Medical Association are entitled to certain fees, and that therefore, automatically, those who belong to that Association are entitled to them, would we have to do it? What I think is disgraceful is for you to create a structure in your Department on the basis of personality and one which places a man with lower qualifications on a higher plane than the man with the high qualifications.

The post of Scientific Officer now goes from \$4,560 x 240 to \$6,000, Senior Scientific officer from \$6,240 x 240 to \$7,440 and the Principal Scientific Officer from \$7,560 x 240 to \$8,900. Then you say that the Secretary of State for the Colonies proposes to appoint the present holder of the post of Chemist as a member of the Research Branch of Her Majesty's Overseas Civil Service and in order to retain his services it will be necessary to remunerate him in accordance with the scales provided for Scientific Officers of the Research Branch and not on the scale provided for under the Civil Establishment (General) Order. That means that in regard to this gentleman's case, the scale in the Civil Establishment (General) Order is no longer applicable to him. He will be treated differently.

What are you really telling me? You say that the established scale is \$4,560 x 192 - \$5,520; \$5,760 x 240 - \$6,720; \$6,720 x 480 - \$7,200 and varies in maximum and incremental rates from those of the Research Branch as shown in the Schedule above. Then you say that no increase in remuneration will occur before October 1965. What are you telling me? This is 1958 and you say that no increase in remuneration will occur to this officer until 1965? Surely, Sir, this salary scale is not going to operate until 1965? The mere fact that you are changing it now is so that you would be able to give this officer an increase. The whole idea today is to increase the salary scale of this post to give this man an increase.

What I think is unfair and dangerous, and would always be dangerous in Barbados, is that you nibble at these salary structures of yours to suit some people and, on the other hand, you say to some people that you cannot change it for them. When you dealt with some people who were affected by the Godsall Report, you said that you could not change it for them. Now, you are changing it for Mr. Bolton. What would happen if, say, Trinidad offered Mr. Carmichael a similar post as that which he now holds here and gives him more money? What encouragement is this to Barbadians and West Indians who have higher and more qualifications than their counterparts and then to find out that they get this unfavourable treatment?

Sir, this Resolution is not as simple as it seems. What is dangerous in Barbados today is to see that hon. members of this Chamber would sit down and pass something, and then they would say they are not in favour with the principle. They would sit and let something like this go into legislation. I have no axe to grind for anybody. As a matter of fact, nobody would need to grind any axe for Mr. Carmichael because his qualifications qualify him for a job in any part of the world.
8.30 p.m.

But when you come as a West Indian, to think you can come in here with this bogus Resolution and tell me that you will create a structure with more qualifications for this man - you have Mr. Carmichael, who is an M.Sc., and you are telling that he is going to hibernate in the Agricultural Department in a lower status than this man, and you are telling us that this man is a nice man! This matter will raise my blood pressure, and I feel that I have a more important task to perform in this community than to blow out too early; but I cannot support this Resolution, and I have given some of the reasons for not supporting it. You look at the Senior Veterinary Officer, you are putting this man above that; people must be able to go to the Colonial Office in order to get pushed somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, this thing seems to be fishy; you are drawing a salary already and what is getting to be a dangerous thing is that some Englishman is sitting and drawing a salary and living in a certain atmosphere and feeling that either by fair means or by foul means, we will give him what he wants. If we are going to be blackmailed because of the lack of scientific officers, then, let us reshuffle the whole thing.

The Hon. Minister has said that Mr. Bolton has been offered an appointment in Nigeria; well, any scientific man ordinarily can get an appointment anywhere. I feel that if you go far enough in the sky, you can look over into the University and see what is happening just as if you look over somebody's piling. You bring in something here and say that Mr. So-and-So must apply.

(At this stage, it being now 8.30 p.m. of the clock.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter under discussion being of a controversial nature, it may be no longer proceeded with at this sitting.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I propose at this stage to fix the Order Paper.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next, 28th instant. I should like to say that I have been in contact with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on this question and he would prefer to come back here on Thursday at 3 o'clock p.m. instead of 12 o'clock noon. However, in view of the fact that the consideration of Private Members' Business starts at 3.45 p.m. and it may drag on until 5 p.m., that will not give the Government sufficient time to deal with these

Orders with which the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing wants to deal - the question of loans to public officers and the transfer of the matters created under the Public Officers' Housing Loans Act to the Housing Authority. In view of that, we cannot accede to the request of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I beg to move, therefore, that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 28th instant, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to move that the words "12 o'clock noon" be deleted in order to substitute the words "3 o'clock p.m.". We have not had any intimation earlier that the Government proposed to invite the House to meet again on Thursday, and so we have already committed ourselves to other engagements and appointments. Our position is entirely different from that of hon. members over there; we have to work hard and very hard for our living. I am prepared on behalf of my colleagues to give an undertaking that we will not attempt or seek to do any Private Members' Business on Thursday if the Hon. Leader of the House will agree to meeting at 3 o'clock p.m. For that reason, I beg to move the substitution of "3.00 p.m." in lieu of 12 o'clock noon.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until 3 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, 28th August, was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 7.

NOES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 12.

The question that this House do now adjourn until 12 noon on Thursday, 28th August, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 12.

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 7.

Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

8.50 p.m.