

THE
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th January, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon to-day.

Present

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN. (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. J. A. LE V. WILSON, Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, L. E. SMITH, D. A. FOSTER, M. E. COX, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, C. E. TALMA, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E. and E. L. WARD.

After prayers, Messrs. D. MOTTLEY, D. D. GARNER, W. A. CRAWFORD and J. T. C. RAMSAY enter the House and take their seats.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting, held on the 17th December, 1946, having been circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:

Message No. 1/1947 from His Excellency the Governor informing the House of the recommendations of the Conference which was held in New York in October, 1946, to consider the establishment of a Caribbean Tourist Bureau.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended 30th September, 1946, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Statement showing the sums advanced by the Colonial Treasurer to the Colonial Postmaster for the payment of Money Orders to the 30th November, 1946.

Further Improvement of the Water Supply Scheme—Progress Report No. 28 for the period July to September, 1946.

PETITION

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael praying the House to pass a Bill to enable them to purchase a property adjoining the Parochial Buildings in Cheapside. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for £5,000 to supplement Resolution No. 62 of the 24th of July, 1945, for the rehabilitation of ex-service personnel.

Resolution to place the sum of £25 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay the medical fees in connection with the reporting of cases of cerebro-spinal meningitis from the date of the outbreak of the epidemic in 1944 to the date of the passing of the Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1946.

Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which I have just given notice.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. MOTTLEY: A Bill to authorize the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael to purchase a property adjoining the Parochial Buildings in Cheapside.

Mr. BRANCKER: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly begs to point out to His Excellency the Governor that the necessity exists in this island for the immediate establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal.

2. The House asks that the Governor-in-Executive Committee take early steps for the purpose of establishing such a tribunal.

Mr. GARNER: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully requests that Your Excellency will send down legislation to prohibit the expansion of chain stores and the entry of wholesale merchants into the retail trade.

Mr. HAYNES: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly note with grave concern the fact that only about one-third of the Island of Barbados is at present serviced by the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation in spite of the fact that this Corporation has been functioning for over 37 years and has enjoyed Government preference on all imported equipment throughout its existence.

2. The House therefore respectfully ask that His Excellency the Governor will take immediate steps to nationalise this corporation and thus help to remedy this serious state of affairs. (Cheers).

QUESTIONS

Dr. WILSON: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

1. Is Government aware of the scarcity of stand-pipes in several districts in the parish of Saint John?

If the answer to the above question is "yes", when does Government propose to take steps to remedy this situation, particularly in respect of certain districts such as cliff Cottage, Belmont, Venture, Edgcliffe, Moores Land, Gall Hill, Welch Village, Roebuck Street and St. Mark's Church yard.

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. Is it a fact that over £5,000 have been allotted under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the provision of a New School for the Foundation Boys' and Girls' Schools, Christ Church?

2. If the answer is "Yes"

When does the Government propose to commence the building of such school to relieve the congestion and to provide the necessary amenities so sadly lacking at both schools?

3. If the answer to (1) above is "No" Will Government send down the necessary Resolution without delay for the implementation of such a Scheme?

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

1. Is Government aware of the present plight of the Peasants of this Island, more especially in the parish of Christ Church where a very uneconomical price was paid last year for Peasants' canes?

2. If the answer to (1) above is "Yes" Would Government consider the advisability of securing the services of Professor C. Y. Shephard, Ph.D., &c. Acting Principal of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, or some other expert to investigate conditions and make such recommendations as to him shall seem fit?

LEAVE TO MR. F. L. WALCOTT

On behalf of the senior member for St. Peter (Mr. F. L. Walcott), the senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Cox) asks for three months' leave of absence from his duties as a member of the House.

The application is granted.

Mr. R. G. MAPP enters the House and takes his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. WILKINSON, a Bill to authorize the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael to purchase a property adjoining the Parochial Buildings in Cheapside is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. GARNER, a Bill to amend the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act is read a first time.

Dr. H. G. CUMMINS enters the House and takes his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

PURCHASE OF BUILDINGS FROM THE WAR OFFICE

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,— The first Resolution is for the sum of £6,134 for the purchase from the War Office of certain buildings at Seawell and Charles Fort. Now I am sure that if honourable members have perused the addendum to the Resolution they will come to the conclusion that it is not necessary for me to add very much by way of explanation. In the addendum it is set out very plainly why these buildings are offered for sale and why the Government considers it desirable to acquire them. The War Office no longer requires them and has enquired whether the Government wishes to purchase them. The Government has made an offer for the buildings, subject to the approval of the Legislature, and particulars in respect of them and the amounts offered are stated. The addendum goes on to say "Certain proposals for the use of the buildings are under examination but no final decision has yet been taken regarding their future use When a decision has been made regarding the future use of the buildings application will be made to the Legislature for authority for such expenditure as may be necessary to convert the buildings." I should like to remind the Committee that at the present moment building materials of all sorts are in very short supply. Large parts of Europe, Asia and Africa have been devastated during the recent war and it does appear that for some time there will be a shortage of construction materials in these parts as a result. Many Government Departments, as stated in the addendum, are anxious to acquire these buildings for

their own use and I think the Committee will be well advised to support this Resolution. I beg to move that it do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—I am in agreement with this Resolution but I would like something more definite from the senior member for St. Philip regarding the use to which these buildings will be put. Before the late Director of Education left Barbados he visited the parish of St. Andrew and decided in connection with two schools in that parish that one of them should be removed and the other enlarged. He told us that he had asked the Government for two of these buildings at Seawell to replace these two schools, one of which has since been considered dangerous for the accommodation of children and has been shorn up by the Public Works Department temporarily and the other is far too small. I would like the senior member for St. Philip to give me the assurance that two of these buildings will be hypothecated for that purpose, otherwise I am going to make a motion that they be bought only on the condition that we in St. Andrew get them. In fact, I think the best way for me to go about this matter is to make a motion that I agree to the passing of the Resolution on the ground that the buildings at Seawell be used in replacing two schools in the parish of St. Andrew. I make a motion to that effect.

Mr. FOSTER: I beg to second that. For years these two schools were in a dilapidated condition and I hope the Government will see its way to accede to our request (Cheers).

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman,—The senior member for St. Andrew should realize that there are parishes in the island other than St. Andrew and that the same conditions that exist in St. Andrew in respect of schools are to be found all over the island; the schools all over the island are too small. These buildings should be purchased by the Government because in my opinion they are being offered very cheaply and it should be left to the Government to decide what is to be done with them. If the honourable member is going to vote for the Resolution only on the ground he has stated I think he will be wrong; he may as well vote against it. If these buildings are to be used for schools, it should be left to the Education Board to say which part of the island is more in need of them; they should be the best judges in that respect. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the Resolution and I feel that all honourable members should support it, especially in view of the fact, as the senior member for St. Philip has said, that there is a shortage of building materials and that we are getting these buildings very cheaply.

Mr. TALMA: I too am in thorough agreement with the passing of this Resolution but when we bear in mind the fact that the majority of these buildings are situated in Christ Church (Laughter) and when we consider the point which I have made a few moments ago in the question which I asked about the erection of the Foundation Boys' and Girls' Schools we can readily realize that 50 per cent of these structures at Seawell should be utilized in that direction. In the matter of the garages, Christ Church leads the way as far as the tourist trade is concerned and if we have bathing cubicles at certain points along the coast in Christ Church, the tourist trade and the entire island will benefit as a result. So I am hoping that the honourable member who has moved the passing of this Resolution will consider those two points which I have made.

The CHAIRMAN: I must draw to the attention of the Committee that the business before them is the passing of this Resolution. I consider the remarks which certain honourable members have made in respect of the use of these buildings as being most extraneous. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew talked about these buildings being used as schools but I do not think that this is the time to discuss the use to which the buildings should be put. The question before the Committee is that this Resolution do now pass. Honourable members in favour—

Mr. GALE: Mr. Chairman,—In the addendum to the Resolution it is stated that the Hospital Board has applied for the buildings at Charles Fort to be used for increased ward accommodation. I would like to enquire from the senior member for St. Philip what ward accommodation the Board intends to increase because at present they have a building which has been in the course of construction for ward accommodation for two years and has not been occupied yet.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—As you have properly said, the motion before the Committee is that this Resolution do now pass. I quite agree to that, but I think that the senior member for St. Philip omitted to give us some information as to how these valuations have been arrived at. I can speak for the buildings at Seawell.

I went up there in June last year—the Acting Director of Public Works went also—and looked at the condition of those buildings and I am glad to say that they are in good condition. I do not know anything about the buildings at Charles Fort and whether the same procedure was adopted in connection with them but as far as those at Seawell are concerned I am satisfied that they are in good condition and are worthy of being purchased. Now, Sir, as regards the sites to which these buildings will be removed, the Executive Committee will have to send us down a Resolution later on before they can remove them and that will then be the time to discuss where they should be put. But I should like to suggest to the Executive Committee, before they come to any conclusion in the matter, the advisability of using the building known as the officers' mess and situated on the left just as you pass the entrance leading to Seawell, as an additional room for the accommodation of people leaving and arriving at Seawell by plane. Anyone who has visited Seawell must have realized that there is need for greater accommodation for people leaving and arriving by plane there and before these buildings are removed I would ask members of the Executive Committee to go up to Seawell, look at them and seriously consider using the one I have mentioned for the purpose of providing additional accommodation as a waiting room. As I have said I have very little knowledge of the buildings at Charles Fort but I have no doubt that the Acting Director of Public Works has inspected them and that it is on his recommendation that these amounts have been asked for. I, Sir, will support this Resolution and I do hope that the members of the Executive Committee will consider the suggestion I have put forward.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—As far as I can see, you have ruled against the amendment which I should like made to this Resolution but no objection has been taken to it and I would be glad if you will put it to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the notice of the senior member for St. Andrew that he ought to adopt the attitude of the junior member

for St. James in drawing to the attention of the Executive Committee his recommendation and get the assurance that it will be taken into consideration because the matter before the Committee is a Resolution for £6,134 to purchase these buildings and not the allocation of them. However, if the honourable member desires that this amendment should be put to the Committee I will do so.

Mr. HAYNES: I desire that my amendment should be put, namely, that two of these buildings be purchased and used as schools in the parish of St. Andrew.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—I am sure that honourable members will appreciate that it is purely fortuitous that these buildings are available. If the two honourable members for St. Andrew are so anxious to have the schools which they refer to improved—one of which, they say, is unfit for use—I suggest that they move the passing of an Address in this House informing the Government of the condition of the schools. It is purely the purchase of these buildings that is before us to-day. If the members for St. Andrew know that children are in schools which may collapse at any time, are they going to sit and allow those schools to collapse and not draw it to the attention of the Government? I suggest that they take some other step to bring their present need before the Government. If they read the addendum to this Resolution carefully they would have understood that no final decision has as yet been taken regarding the future use of these buildings. I appreciate the suggestions made by honourable members and I am sure that the Government will pay due attention to them but we can give no undertaking that these buildings will be allocated to any specific purpose. We are told in the Resolution that the Hospital Board wants some of them; the Police Department and the Education Board want some of them. All the applications will have to be considered and determined according to the urgency of the particular situation. With regard to the point made by the junior member for St. James I think, Sir, that he is in a position to know that the Government already has under consideration the retention of No. 3 building at Seawell for use as a Rest Room for passengers leaving and arriving by plane at Seawell; therefore, it is almost superfluous on his part to emphasize again that it is desirable or advisable that the Government should retain that particular room for that particular purpose. The junior member for St. Michael made enquiry about the additional ward accommodation at the Hospital for which these buildings will be used but as the addendum states, no decision has as yet been taken regarding the future use of the buildings. As I have said, the Hospital Board, the Education Department and the Police Department have sent in applications but no decision has as yet been taken. The application of the Hospital Board will be treated in the same way as the other applications will be treated. Now, I do not think it is practical for us to add to the Resolution the amendment suggested by the senior member for St. Andrew. As you, Sir, properly pointed out, all we have to do to-day is to vote this money to purchase these buildings that are available and I emphasize that it is imperative that we purchase them because materials are in short supply. If we read paragraph 3 of the addendum we will see that the Government says: "When a decision has been made regarding the future use of the buildings application will be made to the legislature for authority for such expenditure as may be necessary to convert the buildings". I

suggest that when we come back for the necessary money to convert the buildings, that is the proper time for honourable members to make amendments which in their view it is advisable to make regarding their future use.

Mr. WILKINSON: The honourable member has not answered my question as to how the valuations are arrived at.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the senior member for St. Philip replies to the junior member for St. James I want to make a suggestion to the senior member for St. Andrew and it is this. If he wants to amend this Resolution he will have to get the consent of the senior member for St. Philip to do so, and I suggest to him to insert after the word "Fort" the words of his amendment, providing the senior member will accept it.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it is a matter for the House.

The CHAIRMAN: If that is so, I am sorry that I shall have to rule that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. ADAMS: May I make an appeal to the senior member for St. Andrew. I realize that he is making an effort on behalf of the parish which he represents but all other honourable members may want to do likewise. I dare say the Housing Board would want these buildings too and it is likely that they may be more than wanted at Seawell itself. Surely we must see that we cannot to-day agree to any of the demands, so to speak, which are being made! I hope that the honourable member, as a senior member of the Assembly,—he has been in the House for a long time now—will see that the appeal that is being made to him is made on the ground of commonsense and for no other reason. I can assure him that the Government knows what he knows about the condition of the two schools in St. Andrew to which he has referred.

Dr. CUMMINS: Sir,—I just want to say this in regard to the Hospital Board. We all know that every ward at the Hospital is overcrowded and it is proposed that one of the buildings be used as a children's ward, so that the children can be removed from the ward which they now occupy and that ward be made available as increased accommodation for female patients. We also want increased accommodation for nurses. As a matter of fact, we are renting a building now for the accommodation of nurses and are actually on the point of renting another for the same purpose; but if we get these buildings at Charles Fort we will be able to accommodate the nurses at the Hospital instead of renting buildings outside. There is also the necessity for ward accommodation for policemen and fire brigaden at the hospital. An arrangement has been made with the Government that when the building which is now being constructed at the hospital is completed, the present Pay Ward "A" will be used for the accommodation of members of the Police Force and the Fire Brigade, and if we get these buildings we will be able to accommodate policemen and fire-brigaden in one of them and use the present Pay Ward "A" as a Maternity Ward.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I think that one of the special functions of the Legislature is the spending of money and perhaps it is right that any money resolution should be given the fullest consideration. However, I would like to say that as far as this Resolution is concerned the information which is given in the addendum should have included the

number of buildings and perhaps the sizes of them as well, so that a member with the experience of the junior member for St. James would be able to get some idea as to whether the prices are all right. I do not like to look a gift horse in the mouth but it is possible that these buildings may be purchased for too much money even though the War Office wants to dispose of them to the Government. The Government has no right to buy these buildings unless it has some use for them and it would appear that the House is pressing that we go ahead blindly and purchase these buildings with the certainty that they will be used. I am going to appeal to the senior member for St. Andrew not to press his amendment; it is the first time I see an amendment of this sort put in a Resolution. Although I do not share the view that it is entirely out of order—because the House of Assembly has to determine the way in which the money in the Treasury should be spent—I suggest to the honourable member that if he wants to secure two of these buildings, let the Vestry of St. Andrew or himself buy them from the Government. There are twelve constituencies represented in this Assembly and if we adopt the procedure suggested by the senior member for St. Andrew I do not know where it will end. I too would like some of these buildings for the City and I am sure my colleague will share the same view. There need not be any fear that these buildings will not be retained in the island because it is quite possible that if the Government does not purchase them some private individual will do so. It is true that the respective buildings in the addendum are numbered but the number of each set of buildings is not stated for the information of honourable members and I suggest to honourable members who are members of the Executive Committee that in future they see to it that in Resolutions of this nature and of which they are in charge, some idea is given as to the number and, perhaps, the sizes of the structures. As regards the question which the junior member for St. Michael has asked, I should have thought that a man of his experience would know that it is not enough to have a ward at the hospital; you have to have, as well, doctors and nurses to attend to the patients who are accommodated in that ward and these must also be accommodated.

Mr. HAYNES: I would like to say in reply to the junior member for the City that education does not concern the Vestries and that I do not see how he can expect the Vestry of St. Andrew to take up a matter of this sort. As regards the senior member for St. Joseph he too has been in the House for a good many years and would know that if you do not nail the government to certain conditions you will never get anything done. I am only making this amendment to try and urge the Government to meet this pressing need in the parish of St. Andrew, that is to say, the provision of safe buildings in which the younger generation can be taught. I do not think that you could want a better purpose for the use of these buildings. The honourable member said that the Housing Board would want them but if you do not educate the children, there will be less appreciation of the houses you provide for them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: These buildings are not being purchased blindly. The junior member for St. James pointed out that a Committee of the Executive Committee went and inspected them since

last year and the Colonial Engineer himself has also inspected them. If the junior member for the City wants the sizes of all the different blocks I can give them to him. I have the size of every block—the garages, the officers' mess and everything else—and can give them to him if he wants them.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member would give them but I would not be able to assimilate the information in such a short space of time. I suggest that he should have them printed and circulated among honourable members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The reason why they were not included is because we did not want to make the Resolution too voluminous. There is no desire on the part of the Government to withhold anything, but if we included the area of each block and the prices per square foot, it would have required two or three pages of the size which the Resolution occupies. For the information of the junior member for St. James I need only state that the valuation of the buildings at Charles Fort is assessed on the same basis as that of the buildings at Seawell.

Mr. LEWIS: Perhaps it was a bit of impertinence on my part to offer advice to a member of this House like the senior member for St. Andrew. When he says that the Vestries have nothing to do with education I would like to ask him this question: who built the St. Michael's Girls' School? Further, if he will read an Address of which notice has been given by the junior member for St. Joseph, he will discover that that honourable member asks that the money voted by the Vestries for the repair of school buildings be used for the granting of scholarships.

The CHAIRMAN: I want to bring to the notice of the senior member for St. Andrew that although I have ruled his amendment out of order, yet I have another suggestion to make. If the honourable member feels that his amendment ought to be put he should ask this Committee to report progress and ask leave to sit again, otherwise I am going to put the question. The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

The Resolution is passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for the sum of £7,500 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the service of the Colony. The explanatory notes are as full as I can possibly give them; so I am telling honourable members in advance that if they have read those notes, that is all the information that can possibly be given. I do hope that this Resolution will be passed without honourable members going down sidetracks in the course of their remarks. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of £7,500 be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the service of the Colony as set out in the Schedule hereto, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in,

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

THE SCHEDULE

Head of Estimates	Item	Amount
		£
1. VI. Customs	15 Books and Stationery — 1946-47	40
	16 Water Rates — 1946-47	30
	17 Instruments, apparatus, etc., for excise purposes 1946-47	40
	20 Drawbacks, general — 1946-47	1,900
	6 Watchmen — 1946-47.	26
	10 Temporary Clerical Assistant—1946-47	34
	11 Extra Portage — 1946-47	26
	22 War Bonus — 1946-47	9
	23 Rent of Warehouse — 1946-47	117
2. VIII. Post Office	17 Occasional labour — 1946-47	50
3. XV. Police	36 Cleaning, water and light — 1946-47	250
	46 Upkeep of bicycles — 1946-47	50
	50 Music, licences, fittings and repair of instruments — 1946-47	20
	75 Motor launch — 1946-47	50
4. XXIII. Medical Departments— (5) Board of Health	7 Expenses of Inspection Field Force — 1946-47	70
	9 Expenses in connection with and for the prevention of the spread of infectious diseases — 1946-47	450
	12 Incidentals — 1946-47	25
5. XXIX. Miscellane- ous Services	13 Telephone rentals, transfers and installations — 1946-47	13
6. XL. Waterworks	16 Plumbing expenses — 1946-47	4,000
	20 Refund of balances to depositors for new services laid — 1946-47	300
		£7,500

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am going to appeal, Mr. Chairman, to the senior member for St. Joseph to let these Heads be dealt with one by one as is customary when a Resolution of this nature comes before the House. I notice that the Government is about to provide additional accommodation for the storage of rum and I presume that that will also be mixed up with the bottling of rum. There is an increase in the water rates—on the last occasion we were told that the meters were in the Police Station on the wharf—and I presume that any increase in the consumption of water is due to the increase in the quantity of rum which has been shipped, so we need not worry particularly about that. I also understand that that water is used for the washing of the bottles and perhaps that may be regarded as being recouped from the rent which is paid. But I would like to issue a warning which I am sure, the members of the Executive Committee will take seriously to heart. It is this. If the shipping of rum before it is properly matured is due to the fact that there is no adequate accommodation for the storage of rum I think that it is in the interest of this island to provide that accommodation because the rum trade is booming. There is no knowing when it will become a flop and merchants will be willing, of course, to exploit it to the full at present, perhaps to the detriment of themselves and to the island. It is a rather good source of revenue to this colony now and perhaps it may be necessary for some Board of Control—attached perhaps to the Department of Agriculture—to see that this rum is matured. I understand that storage for a period of 8

or 12 months is sufficient to make Barbados rum a pleasantly drinking product. In respect of industries like bananas in Jamaica, grape fruit and oranges in Dominica, tomatoes in Montserrat, there are Marketing Boards and Government supervision in the respective islands and there are rejects of stuff which are not up to standard. If we leave this rum business entirely in the hands of shippers, the trade is likely to be ruined. If the rum is at present of a very good quality, there is no reason in the world why it should not be of a better quality if additional accommodation is provided so that it can be stored long enough to be matured. I am not speaking from personal experience but what I am saying is that if there is no proper storage space and this rum is allowed to go out of the island in a state of immaturity, there will not only be dissatisfaction on the part of those to whom it is shipped but the people who consume it will be getting a product that will be detrimental to their health. It is in the interest of the country that an industry like this should be watched by the Government and I suggest to the senior member for St. Joseph that the hint which I have given is well worth considering. I would like to enquire whether this additional watchman to be employed is going to watch continuously every night or if some arrangement is made to give him time off. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that this schedule will be considered Head after Head because I have a comment to make under another Head.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I also think that we should deal with this schedule, Head after Head. In regard to these watchmen, you are no doubt

aware that the Customs has a bad reputation for making them work for excessively long hours, and I trust that now the matter has been drawn to the attention of the honourable member who is in charge of Government Business affecting this Department will give us the assurance, if he cannot tell us now how many hours these watchmen work, that he will have the necessary instructions given to the Customs that this watchman does not work longer than the ordinary working hours.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested by the junior member for the City and the junior member for St. Lucy that the Heads in the Schedule be taken one by one. Does the senior member for St. Joseph accept the suggestion?

Mr. ADAMS: If it is the wish of the majority, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection. Perhaps it is easier to deal with the Schedule in that way.

Mr. WILKINSON: Before the question is put, Sir, I should like to say a few words on this rum story. I have recently returned from Canada—naturally being a Barbadian I am interested in rum—and while there I did receive complaints from several people that the quality of the rum now being shipped to Canada from this island is not as good as it was a few years ago. The junior member for the City raised an important point, namely, that the Government should provide sufficient storage accommodation so that the rum can be kept under Government control and the Government give a guarantee that it has been matured for one year or eighteen months. I do think that if we wish to encourage the rum export trade, some consideration should be given to the suggestion which the honourable member has put forward. As I have said I have recently visited Canada and many traders there put this question to me: "Can you guarantee that the rum from Barbados will be two years old?" Well, I was not in a position to give them a guarantee because I am not in the rum trade, but I think the suggestion of the junior member for the City should be investigated. At the same time I would like to say that I am not very keen on seeing rum warehouses all over this City. I suggest that they be established in places outside the City limits.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, — I thoroughly agree with the remarks of the junior member for St. James and the junior member for the City. The Government, in my opinion, is a little too lax as far as the rum trade is concerned. I know from experience that in North America as well as in Canada they are asking for aged rum. They claim that the rum should be 2½ to 3 years old and I have heard it stated that in the near future it may be that the rum exported from Barbados would be three years old. This is where I blame the Government. If an individual wants to erect his own bond to store rum the Government says to him "You can erect it but you still have to pay warehouse rent" and that is where I do not agree with the Government. If the Government cannot provide buildings in the which the different merchants can store and bottle rum and the individuals provide them I do not think that the Government should penalize those individuals, by making them still pay warehouse rent. That is the situation to-day. I know that there are many exporters of rum who would build their own bonds but it would not be an economic proposition as far as they are concerned to build their bonds and then the Government taxes them to the extent of six shillings a year on every 64 gallons of rum, irrespective of whether that rum

remains in the warehouse for a day or a year; they would be paying taxes in two ways. If the Government will not allow the exporters of rum to have their own bonds and store their rum free, the Government should erect bonds—I would not say in the City because rum is a volatile substance and if you have large quantities of it lying about, one of these days you may have a conflagration which would result in much distress to people. I feel that the Government should build bonds in open spaces and increase, if necessary, the Customs staff to supervise the bottling of the rum. The rum business is an asset to the Government at present and we should be able to have the rum matured for two or three years so that we can compete with the outside markets. I know from telegrams which have been received by the firm with which I am associated that rum which has been stored for a certain period has always been asked for and if we cannot supply rum of that maturity our export trade will fail and some other country will capture it. Puerto Rico, for example, is supplying rum three years old—other places are supplying it five years old—and we must bear in mind that the exporters in Puerto Rico ship their rum to the U.S.A. free of duty while we in the British West Indies must pay duty on the rum we ship to Canada and elsewhere; so, in my opinion, the rum trade should be given every facility to help boost the island's revenue. Another thing which must be borne in mind is this: Owing to the fact that the rum trade has increased to such a great extent it has helped the growers of canes to get something out of it. Molasses which was formerly thrown away is now being sold at eight cents a gallon and that money is passed on to the cane grower; so that it can readily be seen that if you kill the rum trade you are affecting the financial position of the cane growers. We should give it every support. I am quite sure that the merchants to-day will do anything to help the Government facilitate matters and, in my opinion, they will pay a little more if they can be given buildings in which they can store and bottle their rum. I know that this question of providing accommodation for this purpose gives the Comptroller of Customs a headache because he has to go outside and rent places, knowing that he may have to pay exorbitant rents.

Mr. ADAMS: All I should like to say is that the Government will bear in mind all that has been said. I must, however, defend the Government to this extent. The Government did not anticipate this unanimity on the part of all parties to get the Government to prolong the existence of this industry. My information has been that the merchants are so anxious to sell the rum that they cannot wait until it comes out of the still and that it is not so much a question of storage accommodation. I have heard the complaint that our rum has almost got down to the state of Trinidad rum. But the Government will bear all these suggestions in mind. I rose only to say "Do not blame the Government. Rather bring the matter before the Chamber of Commerce and ask the merchants themselves not to kill the trade." If the Government is asked to introduce the necessary legislation, of course it will introduce it but I can imagine that if the merchants say to one another "You give us a bad name through the raw rum which you are selling outside the island" that will result in greater improvement in the trade. I welcome this sort of attitude to-day. If we go on like this, we will soon be one happy family. Everybody seems willing to nationalize and make Government control every industry. I welcome it.

The question that the amounts under No. 1, Head VI Customs, stand part of the schedule is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the amount under No. 2, Head VIII Post Office, stands part of the schedule.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the amounts under No. 3, Head XV Police, stand part of the schedule.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would just like to draw the attention of the senior member for St. Joseph that it would seem as if there is a considerable increase in the cost of cleaning in this Department. I know that the item as set out in the Estimates happens to be "cleaning, water and light" but it would seem as if the reason for the supplementary vote of £250—\$100 per month—is the increase in the cost of materials for cleaning. It looks a big amount to me and I would like to get the assurance from the senior member for St. Joseph that everything in this respect is in order. The next thing I would like him to tell the Committee is whether the changed method of repairing the bicycles is giving satisfaction.

Mr. BRANCKER: With regard to the amount for cleaning, water and light I do not know if the honourable member in charge of the Resolution will be able to give details but I hope that it includes a substantial increase of the remuneration to the people who actually do the work because you know, Sir, that in these Departments the charladies and grooms are underpaid. I would like to know whether this amount of £20 is all that is asked for by the Bandmaster in connection with the band; it seems to me a rather small amount although it is a supplementary vote. We have only recently secured the services of a Bandmaster who has displayed great efficiency and dynamic energy and I hope that the Government will give him all he asks for to enable him to keep the band up to the standard of efficiency at which he is striving to keep it and not be cheese-paring in its policy towards him.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the senior member for St. Joseph replies I would like to tell him that it appears curious to me that they have a launch which has been overhauled and that a supplementary vote of £38 is asked for to pay for its insurance which was not foreseen. I would like to know whether the launch has been insured before or whether this is something entirely new. The fact that it was unforeseen that the launch should have been insured seems curious to me.

Mr. ADAMS: I cannot give the honourable members any more information than that which appears in the notes and which has been copied almost verbatim from the Minute Papers. I can only say that the amount which the Government is going to ask for in the Estimates in respect of the Band will be considerable as compared with this small amount. As regards the bicycles, honourable members will remember that Supt. Calver recommended that the repair of bicycles by a policeman should be stopped and in consequence the bicycles are being repaired outside by civilian labour and that is the cause of the increase in this item. The necessity, as the result of Supt. Calver's recommendations, of bringing people from outside to do things which policemen did before is the cause of much of this increased amount which is being asked for. Policemen have been complaining that they should not groom their horses and clean the stables and if civilian labour is brought in to do the cleaning it costs more.

The question that the amounts under Head XV, Police, stand part of the schedule is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the amounts under No. 4, Head XXIII Medical Departments, stand part of the schedule.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the amount under No. 5, Head XXIX Miscellaneous, stands part of the schedule.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the amounts under No. 6, Head XL Waterworks, stand part of the schedule.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to enquire from the senior member for St. Joseph—I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will not rule me out of order but my enquiry is in connection with the Waterworks although it is not in respect of any particular item in this schedule—whether the item which was deleted from the last Estimates regarding the construction of a building for the station foreman at the Belle Pumping Station is still under consideration by the Government or whether it has been abandoned.

Mr. ADAMS: It is for the Chairman to rule whether such an enquiry is in order.

The CHAIRMAN: Taking into consideration the exigencies of the moment I think it is in order.

Mr. ADAMS: It is not for me to question your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to make this appeal to all honourable members. In connection with matters which are brought before the House, it is reasonable, where the Government does not spring something on honourable members and asks them to deal with it the same day, that they should give the member of the Executive Committee in charge of the measure notice beforehand of any question or questions which they intend to ask, so that he can come here fortified with the answer or answers. If the junior member for the City had asked me that question earlier in the day I would have had with me all the Papers from which I could give the information. As you, Sir, have ruled that the honourable member's enquiry is in order I will tell him that the matter is under consideration or has been considered or will be considered (Laughter).

Mr. LEWIS: I can assure the honourable member that I have taken into consideration all that he has said. I am more than willing to adopt in future the course he has suggested but he will notice that if I ask a question and he has not the answer I do not press for it. I only thought that as a member of the Executive Committee for some time he would have known their policy in respect of that particular item.

Mr. SMITH: Again I want to warn the Government against sowing the seed of discontent in this Department. I have understood that workmen at headquarters who go to the country districts to work receive overtime pay and the district foremen who are supposed to be on duty until whatever time the work is completed receives no overtime pay. I think that is unfair to these district foremen. If you pay one set of workmen overtime you should also pay the other set overtime and I sincerely hope that the senior member for St. Joseph will do his best to find out if my statement is correct and if it is correct, have the state of affairs remedied.

The question that the amounts under Head XL, Waterworks, stand part of the schedule is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

REFUND OF CUSTOMS DUTY TO ST. MICHAEL'S
COMMISSIONERS OF HEALTH

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for the sum of £201. 5. 10. to be granted to the Commissioners of Health, St. Michael, as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid on five motor lorries, two tipping gears and certain tipping gear spares imported in connection with the scavenging of the City of Bridgetown and its suburbs. The scavenging of the City of Bridgetown and its suburbs is now done departmentally and the necessary equipment is imported for the purpose. This Resolution is to refund to the Commissioners of Health, St. Michael, the import duty and package tax paid on five additional motor lorries and equipment imported by them. On the 16th May, 1946, a similar Resolution was passed for the sum of £295. 2. 9 and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I am not going to oppose this Resolution but I would just like to make an enquiry from the honourable member in charge of it or from the senior member for the City who is the Churchwarden of that parish in respect of these motor lorries. Sometime ago when a similar Resolution was before this House I threw out the suggestion that the proper authority should see to it that the motor lorries which are imported in future for this purpose are so constructed that the refuse which is thrown into them is not allowed to be blown all over the streets and so get rid of the horrible nuisance which now exists. I would like to discover if these five lorries, in respect of which we are about to grant this refund of import duty, are constructed in accordance with the more modern method of hygiene and sanitation.

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

EX GRATIA GRANT TO JANE LASHLEY

The COMMITTEE granted the request of the senior member for St. Joseph that the junior member for St. John move the next Resolution which is for the sum of £77. 12. 6. to be granted as an *ex gratia* grant to Jane Lashley, mother of Joseph N. Bannister, formerly a porter at the Customs Department, in consideration of his 32 years' service in that Department.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—Joseph N. Bannister was employed as a porter at the Customs for 32 years. He died on the 9th of August, 1946, and it is customary to give an *ex gratia* grant to the nearest relative in circumstances of this sort. The nearest relative in this instance is Jane Lashley, the mother of the deceased, who is 71 years old. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—I hasten to ask the Government to revise its method of granting pensions or gratuities to persons of this type. In the highest brackets, you find people who are working for large salaries receiving large pensions and when it comes to people like this they are given little or nothing. The system is wrong and I have been

always impressing on the Government that it needs revision. I hope, Sir, that it will not be long when the Government, as constituted now, will see its way to revise this system, so that these underpaid employees in the lowest brackets will be treated alike in the granting of pensions and gratuities to enable them to maintain themselves in their old age or, if they die, their beneficiaries to get something more than what they get at present. This is not a proper way of doing business and because these people do menial work, that does not mean that they should not get better treatment when they become incapacitated. I hope the Government will move along the lines I suggest quickly.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it that this was a pensionable post. At present there is another Resolution of a similar nature before us and the years of service are pretty close—32 in one case and 26 in the other. What I would like to know is the method by which this gratuity is arrived at. I understand that there is some law by which you can give up to a year's emoluments but that may be done in the case of someone who has served for 8 or 9 or perhaps 12 years in the Service. Where a gratuity is given to a person who has left a non-pensionable job in the Service I take it that the Government has adopted the method of one month's salary for each completed year of service. What I mean is this. If this man had given 12 years' service to the Government, would it have granted a year's emoluments in the same way?

Mr. BLACKMAN: The information which has been asked for by the junior member for the City is supplied in paragraph 2 of the addendum which says:—"If an officer who is pensionable under the Pension Act, 1925, (1925-2) dies while in the Public Service of this Island after serving in the Public Service for not less than five years his legal personal representative may be granted a gratuity not exceeding one year's pensionable emoluments....."

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Perhaps I should have put my criticism in this way. The members of the Executive Committee, now that they have altered the principal of making these grants, should see to it that the law is amended. I cannot for the life of me see why any person who has served this Government for 5 years should get the equivalent of one year's emoluments and someone else who has served it for 32 years should be entitled to the same year's emoluments. I think that a graduated scale would do more justice to the employees of the Government.

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

TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE TO OLD AGE PENSION
ENQUIRY OFFICERS.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £73 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay from the 1st November, 1946, to the 31st March, 1947, a travelling allowance at the rate of £50 a year to the Old Age Pension Enquiry Officer of St. Michael and a travelling allowance at the rate of £25 a year to each of the other five Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers.

As honourable members will see from the addendum, representations have been made by the Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers for increased salaries and the grant of an allowance for travelling. The Government made a pretty extensive enquiry as to the financial implication of this and, above all, it

made enquiry from the Social Welfare Officer who, I must say, has written an excellent minute,—a minute which is so illuminating that the Government feels that the whole question should be gone into. The Pension Enquiry Officer of St. Michael receives a salary of £150 per annum; the officer of Christ Church and St. George receives £125 per annum; the officer of St. John and St. Philip receives £120 per annum; and the officers of St. Andrew, St. Joseph, St. Thomas, St. James, St. Peter and St. Lucy receive £100 each per annum. In St. Michael the number of new applications in the first six months last year was 306, while during the same period, the number in St. Andrew and St. Lucy was 26 respectively. The average per month in each of these parishes was 7.5 and 10 respectively as compared with an average of 51 per month in St. Michael. The number of meetings held in St. Michael during the same period was 13 whereas the number of meetings held in St. Andrew and St. Lucy was five respectively. Honourable members will see, therefore, that the case of the officer in St. Michael is very strong when compared with that of the others who really do not seem to have such onerous duties. In St. Philip, the number of new applications for the six months referred to was 46, the average per month being 11.83 and the number of meetings held during the period being 5. In St. John, the number was 25 with an average of 11.83 and 4 meetings were held. So that the whole question needs to be gone into and the Government has come to the conclusion that the fairest thing to do at present is to give this travelling allowance in accordance with these rates and have a complete reorganization of the whole Old Age Pension System. We may consider centralizing it, although doubtless those who are now officers would not be pushed out of their offices. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. I am not particularly influenced by newspaper arguments about what is to take place in this House but undoubtedly in this matter some points have been made of which honourable members cognisant of their responsibility should take some notice and it strikes me, Sir, that this is a Resolution which on the face of it needs to be postponed. The Government has admitted in paragraph 2 of the addendum that the whole system of old age pension enquiry requires examination and I am going to ask the senior member for St. Joseph to accept my motion if, after I have told him my reason for moving it, he agrees with me. I find that these people who have been appointed part-time officers of the Government have been given pension rights, not that that in itself is a wrong thing but the fact remains that there are other part-time officers of the Government who have not had this privilege. The next thing is that on the appointment of these officers I understand that travelling allowance was taken into account in the salaries given. If that is so, they have the further advantage over other people in the Service of getting a pension on their travelling allowance. If all that is true and the Government is going to examine this system thoroughly, perhaps with a view to its centralisation, I think that this piecemeal method will not only do harm, for instance, in not giving the fullest consideration to the demands of these people but it is likely to bring about a certain amount of dissension in the Department itself. I understand that after

a pension enquiry officer has gone around and made his enquiries in respect of the applications for old age pension, his job is finished; perhaps some revision is necessary but the paying officer has to continue to pay the pensions and we have what I regard as a ridiculous system of paying these pensions weekly. There is never a break of more than one day a week in the payment of these pensions in the parish of St. Micheal; the paying officer in this parish pays almost every day continuously and I feel that if payment was made fortnightly it would help as far as the amount which is paid out is concerned. I know that it would cause a certain amount of discomfort to people who are in need of the money but I understand that there are many pensioners who allow their pensions to accumulate with the view of drawing a lump sum; it may be that they form a small portion of the number of pensioners but that is the information which I have received. So far as I am concerned I feel that as long as we are not robbing these pensioners, it might help the paying officers if some arrangement is made to pay them fortnightly instead of weekly. I would like to discover from the senior member for St. Joseph whether any consideration has been given to the salaries which are being paid to the paying officers and whether the salaries of the enquiry officers are regarded as adequate for the services rendered. It is being said that the latter officers are given this special consideration for reasons entirely apart from the fact that they are Old Age Pension enquiry officers. I hope that is not so. I feel that my consideration in the conduct of Government's business in this Assembly should be somewhat comprehensive. I find that this Government is always creating offices like those of the Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers. It has created the offices of Registering Officers,—officers who may register two people in 18 months and then have a rush at election time. These people, I understand, have very easy jobs and we are saddling the taxpayers in this country with the payment of pensions to persons for having done practically no work. The vast majority of the people who pay taxes in this island have no security of tenure nor any hope of a pension at all; their only hope is to pay taxes and when they can no longer pay they are accommodated in a clean almshouse. The people who draw pensions should perform some duties for the money they receive. In addition to the salaries which are paid to some of these enquiry officers, they receive remuneration from other sources and, as such, they are in a position to say to applicants "Come to me" instead of their going to the applicants. Perhaps it may be better to give them travelling allowance and let them go and see whether the applicants are really qualified to receive old age pensions. If an amalgamation of these offices can be made, it should be done. This reminds me that the Department of Agriculture had some part-time officers whom they threw out and it was as a result of the efforts of the senior member for St. Thomas and myself that some of those men got employment; since then nothing has been heard of the gratuity or the pension that was promised to them for the services rendered in that Department. I feel that it is time to have this old age pension system reviewed and if the Government has promised—it does not always promise these things—to have this system reviewed with a view to its centralization, we can postpone this question until such time as that revision takes place. I sincerely hope that politics has nothing

to do with the granting of this special consideration to the pension enquiry officers. I am willing to pay adequate salaries for adequate services performed but do not let it be said that because we have a particular form of Government now, we are squandering money. I appeal to honourable members to view the matter in that light and I repeat that there is a vast army of taxpayers whose employers can employ them for two, three or forty years and then kick them out with no hope of security but the almshouse and these are the people who have to put the money in the Treasury to guarantee the Government servants security of tenure and pensions. I am moving that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed so that this matter could be reviewed and that this apparent preferential treatment will not be so apparent.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know whom the honourable member refers to when he talks about the new Government and politics—

Mr. LEWIS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I did not intend to cast any aspersion on the present Government. I understand that this matter was under consideration before the election that recently took place.

Mr. ADAMS: I am glad the honourable member has exonerated us because the pension enquiry officer in St. Joseph is one of my most ardent enemies and it does not matter to me how much he gets or how much he does not get. The petition was received from these men on the 14th July last year; they pointed out that they were appointed in 1938 at the same salaries and were never given travelling allowance or war bonus although their salaries were under £200 a year. All the honourable member has said affecting them may be true. Let us say that it is true; all that will be taken into consideration in investigating the whole system. But surely the honourable member can hardly ask us to agree with him that because officers of other Departments have to be considered, we should not take this application into consideration now. This is purely an interim award pending the investigation of the system of old age pension enquiry and having regard to the fact that these men have had no increase in salaries since 1938, no travelling allowance and no war bonus. In the case of the pension enquiry officer for St. Michael I am told that although his is a part-time job, it is, in effect, a whole-time office. You have just heard the figures in respect of new applications for the period 1st January, 1946, to the 30th June, 1946; in his case there were 306 applicants and the next highest number was 46 in the parish of St. Philip. After taking all the circumstances into consideration, the Government is merely asking for this travelling allowance for these men and I hope that honourable members will agree to this interim payment pending the enquiry which the Government intends to make as speedily as possible.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to point out that on the Order Paper there is an Address—No. 38—under Private Members' Business to be moved in relation to an increase in the remuneration of payment to Enquiry Officers.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would just like to say this. If this was an interim adjustment of salaries it would not be creating a new principle but on the honourable member's own admission this is some sort of interim adjustment creating the principle of giving travelling allowance where there was none before. If you are dealing with the question of travelling allowance, perhaps the enquiry officer of St. Michael would have a vast number of applica-

tions but what about the facilities to get to those applicants? He can get a bus to take him to nearly every part of St. Michael. Some of these officers in the country districts have two parishes to deal with and it is not always possible to get a bus to travel across the country to enquire into the circumstances of an applicant for old age pension. In such an event, that officer has to walk if he has not his own bicycle. The disparity in these amounts of travelling allowance does not appeal to me. The enquiry officer of St. Philip and St. John who has 3 or 4 applications to investigate may have to do a great deal more travelling to investigate those 3 or 4 applications than the enquiry officer of St. Michael would have to do to investigate 11 or 12 cases two or three of whom may be in Carrington Village and two or three in another place which he can easily reach by a bus.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER takes the Chair and adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—There are no replies to any Questions ready as yet, and in the circumstances I am asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the honourable member. There being no objection, the honourable member may make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended in order to resume Government Business.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment took place, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were in Committee of Supply, we were considering a Resolution to place the sum of £73 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay from the 1st November, 1946, to the 31st March, 1947, a travelling allowance at the rate of £50 a year to the Old Age Pension Enquiry Officer of St. Michael, and a travelling allowance at the rate of £25 a year to each of the other five Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers. The honourable junior member for the City was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I think that I have mentioned all the points which I intended to mention in connection with this matter. I think that we should vote for the postponement of this Resolution until the whole scheme has been gone into. It seems to me that an excellent case has been made out both in the Press and otherwise for the consideration of the Paying Officers as well, and I think that we are creating an entirely new principle by this interim adjustment. I feel that this is a matter which needs to be further considered by the Executive Committee. If honourable members feel that they cannot hold the view which I hold, that people who are working for the Government

should do adequate work for the salaries which they receive, they can keep to their own inclination. I am only doing my duty as I see it in connection with this matter.

Mr. COX: I cannot agree with the remarks of the honourable junior member for the City. First of all, the honourable member speaks about the amount which is being spent in connection with the Old Age Pension Department—

Mr. LEWIS: No such words ever crossed my lips; I do not even know the amount which is being spent.

Mr. COX: The honourable member spoke about the travelling allowance which the Government proposes to pay to the Pension Enquiry Officers. What I would like the honourable member to realise that no amount should be too great to be spent on the poor people of any country. I feel that nothing probes more deeply into the civilisation of a colony than the care that is being taken of the old people after they have given all their service to the colony. It must be realised that the Pension Enquiry Officers have to visit the various people who apply for pensions no matter where they live, and it is fair that they should be given travelling allowance. As far as the Pension Enquiry Officer of St. Michael is concerned, when the honourable junior member for the City speaks about using a 'bus for transportation, I would like to inform him that if the Officer wants to get to Carrington's Village, for instance, from another district, he has to get a 'bus to take him to Bridgetown first and then take another 'bus. Then there are many avenues into which the Officer has to make visits and he cannot travel along those avenues by means of any 'bus. I do not see why we should quibble over the payment of a few dollars by way of travelling allowance to this Officer. It must be remembered that when a person sends in his claim for a pension, the claim has to be justified by the Enquiry Officer and it must be realised that his salary is only £150 per annum. He has been receiving that salary since 1938, and since then the cost of living has risen to about 120%. How much use is that salary to a man who is occupying the position of an Enquiry Officer? Referring again to the question of travelling allowance, I feel that this Officer, just as any other Officer, should be given travelling allowance. With regard to the point raised about the Paying Officers, I feel that that can be left out of consideration because these officers do not have to do any travelling. If these Officers are being underpaid, we can always increase their salaries. I feel that we should pass this Resolution and take it upon ourselves to see that the greatest care and attention is meted out to the old people after they have given their lives to the service of the colony.

Mr. GALE: The honourable junior member for the City has stressed the point that the scheme, not only in relation to the Pension Enquiry Officers but the whole Staff connected with the Old Age Pension Department, should be gone into before any payment of travelling allowance or any change is made, and I think that he is right. If the Government is dealing with this matter, I think that it would be much better to deal with it as a whole and not in any piecemeal manner as we are now attempting to do. I quite agree that the Pension Enquiry Officers should be paid travelling allowance. I happened to be a member of the Old Age Pension Claims Committee at one time, and I know that the Pension Enquiry Officer of St. Michael has to do a fair amount of travelling. He has to look for

the people who are making representations for Old Age Pensions, and it is not always convenient for him to travel by 'bus. He has to go to the villages and he has to use a bicycle if he has not got a car. It is not very often easy to find some of the people who make claims for pensions. I repeat that I am quite in agreement that travelling allowance should be paid to these Pension Enquiry Officers, but I am also inclined to agree with the matter as has been put forward by the honourable junior member for the City. The Government has admitted that the whole system needs to be changed; in some districts the Old Age Pension Staff has very little work to do and in other districts there is a greater amount of work to be done. I feel that the Government is attempting to deal with only one side of the question. The Paying Officers are just as responsible persons as the Enquiry Officers and they are also entitled to some consideration. The salaries of the Paying Officers have been fixed since 1938; they have not been increased and we are now singling out some members of the Staff of the Department and giving them travelling allowance while the other members of the Staff are not getting any increase. For the reasons which I have given, I am supporting the motion made by the honourable junior member for the City. I think that this Resolution should be postponed and let the whole system be dealt with on a proper basis.

Dr. CUMMINS: There is an old saying that you, Mr. Chairman, and I have heard from the time when we were boys; it is that while the grass is growing the horse is starving. This Resolution is for the purpose of paying travelling allowance to the Pension Enquiry Officers. I have been told that these Officers were appointed since 1938 when the travelling allowance was incorporated in their basic salaries. Even if these Officers travelled by 'bus, it costs more to travel by 'bus to-day than in 1938. In those days you could get a 'bus to take you from Trafalgar Square to Jackson for four cents, and now you have to pay eight cents for that. Another point is that the cost of travelling has eaten into the basic salaries of these Officers; I suppose they have to spend one-third of their basic salaries in paying for their transport. With respect to the Officers who work in the country districts, it is impossible for them to travel by 'bus because there is no proper 'bus service and if they have to use bicycles their travelling will cost them more. While I agree that the Government should go into the system in respect of the entire Staff of this Department, I feel that, as an interim matter, these Pension Enquiry Officers should be given this £50 and £25 respectively which the Government has asked for, so that the cost of travelling for these Officers should not eat into such a great part of their salaries. I am quite prepared to support this Resolution as it is to-day.

Mr. LEWIS: I am very sorry that my remarks have not been intelligible to the honourable senior member for St. Michael. I have never heard a grosser misrepresentation of ordinary language by intelligent people in all my life. Not one cent of this money is going to the people who are receiving old age pensions, so this is not a case of saying that the people who have served the colony during all their lifetime should be looked after. This money is for the payment of travelling allowance to the Pension Enquiry Officers, and so I do not see how the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Michael can be applicable to what I have said. I am not against granting this travelling allowance to these Officers, but I do not see why certain people

should be picked out and considered and others should be left out. I did not say that these Officers should travel by 'buses: I compared the travelling of the Enquiry Officer of St. Michael with that of the Enquiry Officer of St. John and St. Philip. I said that the Officer of St. Michael would, at least, have a car when going into the villages and what 'bus could the Officer get to convey him from St. Philip to St. John? I never expected that anybody who was sufficiently able to appeal to the electorate of St. Michael could misunderstand just two simple, ordinary propositions. That is not the sort of way to give people the idea that you are making capital out of what has been said. The merits of what I have put forward can bear examination by any intelligent person. I do not think that we should pick out people and consider them because they have asked for something. When the qualifying age for receiving pensions was lowered and the Enquiry Officers had more travelling to do, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph did not consider them then; he has only considered them now that the matter has been drawn to his attention. Why is the honourable member only now concerned about this matter? Is it that we cannot see anything until it has been pointed out to us? I say that that is not the spirit in which Government Business should be conducted in this House. I do not believe that many honourable members know that the Enquiry Officers in the country have more than one parish to look after. If my information is correct, these Enquiry Officers have to deal with two parishes. If I offered the hon. senior member for St. Joseph one of these jobs and allowed him to choose between the country and the parish of St. Michael I would like to know which he would choose. Of course he would choose the parish of St. Michael because he would be able to get around more easily. If an Officer goes around making enquiries in the parish of St. Joseph—(A MEMBER: The postmen use bicycles)—the postmen use bicycles but they cannot ride them everywhere. The fact remains that we have to tackle this question in a salesmanlike manner: we cannot pick out people from one Department and give them preferential treatment. That would appear as if there is something being done in the dark. As regards the argument about people working all their life in the service of the colony, do I not see them paying taxes all the time and only heading for the almshouse? I say that a good case has been made out for the postponement of this Resolution, and it would come with good grace from the members of the Executive Committee if they would brush aside the weight of any of these Officers. The honourable junior member for St. Michael has been a member of the Old Age Pension Claims Committee and so he knows something about this matter; but his colleague does not know anything about it. I think that when the honourable member who has some knowledge of the matter, tells us that the whole system should be reviewed before anything is done, I think that we should agree with that. I do not see why the Enquiry Officer of the parish of St. Michael should be given a travelling allowance of £50 and the other Officers be given only £25. That does not seem right to me. If enquiries are to be made in respect of two claims for pensions, one in St. Philip and the other in St. John, one Officer has to attend to both of these claims; if, for instance, four claims have to be attended to—two at Haggatt Hall and two somewhere else—why cannot the Officer in St. Michael make two trips and attend to them all? I

know what I am talking about: I will not allow any sentiment to govern me in this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I hope to reconcile the two honourable members. The honourable junior member for the City is to be excused because his remarks were grossly misrepresented by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. In addition to that, the honourable senior member for St. Michael has opened himself to some severe criticism when he suggested that the Paying Officers were in less responsible positions than the Enquiry Officers—

Mr. COX: I have never said that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member did insinuate that the Enquiry Officers were more entitled to some further remuneration—

Mr. COX: Again, I never said that. What I pointed out was that the Paying Officers remain in the Office whereas the Enquiry Officers have to travel in order to justify the claims made for pensions.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Certainly the natural inference to be drawn is that the work of the Paying Officers is less onerous and responsible than that of the Enquiry Officers. The honourable member forgets that the moment we lowered the qualifying age for pensioners from 70 years to 68 years and increased the amount of the pension, we automatically increased the work of the Paying Officers. They have to pay out more money to more people. I am not suggesting that either the Enquiry Officers or the Paying Officers are more entitled to receive an increase of salary, but I am suggesting that both of them are in the same position. In almost every case there is this extenuating factor in respect of the Paying Officers; they are either the postmasters or postmistresses of the various districts, and they have received increases in salary with respect to their substantive jobs. In addition to that, it is highly possible that in consequence of the new re-organisation they will receive more money, I do not mean by that that those Officers should not be properly paid for the work which they are doing. I would suggest to the honourable junior member for the City that he would be well advised to respond to the application of the Enquiry Officers in the manner which has been suggested by the Government. It might be argued that the Enquiry Officers are so much concerned that they have gone to the extent of sending a petition to the Government, and if the Paying Officers are so indifferent to their conditions as to sit down under an injustice, that is a matter for them. We might look at the matter from that point of view. As has been said by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, while the grass is growing the horse is starving. There has been an increase of work due to the fact that the qualifying age for persons to be in receipt of pensions has been lowered and the amount of the pension having been increased, and there is no reason why we should fail to do what we can for this deserving section of the Staff. The Resolution asks for £73 which will pay the travelling allowance for the Enquiry Officers from the 1st of November until the end of the financial year, and I think that we may be able to give the honourable junior member for the City an undertaking that when we are considering the Colonial Estimates in the month of March, some effort will be made to see that justice is meted out to all sections of the Old Age Pension Staff.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I had hoped to stand on my feet for the first time on a more auspicious occasion; however, I am sure that that same latitude which has been extended to new members of this House will be extended to me. Quite a lot of heat

has been generated already, but I feel that consideration of this Resolution calls for cool thought. The attitude which the hon. senior member for St. Philip has shown in this matter is the correct one; the honourable junior member for the City has destroyed his own case. If the Enquiry Officers are worth the payment of a travelling allowance, then let us pay them a travelling allowance. It does not help the case to argue that if this travelling allowance is paid to the Enquiry Officers the Paying Officers will be dissatisfied. I repeat that the attitude of the honourable senior member for St. Philip towards this matter is the correct one. Let the Paying Officers also ask for an increase, or let the honourable junior member for the City or the honourable junior member for St. Michael petition the Government on their behalf. To argue that we should refuse to pay this travelling allowance to the Enquiry Officers is not the right attitude towards this matter; that would only spread dissatisfaction in the Department instead of curing it. I think that it should be the attitude of the Government to cure dissatisfaction rather than cause it to spread, and the sooner the dissatisfaction is cured, the better it will be for everybody concerned. I think that we should show the right attitude in this matter, pay these Officers what is due to them, and attend to the other matters in as short a time as possible. (Cheers).

Mr. LEWIS: I have been told that the Paying Officers have other jobs; I hear that some of these Officers are shopkeepers as well. I would like to know whether the honourable senior member for St. Philip can tell me whether the Paying Officers are whole-time Officers or not. Is it a fact that the Enquiry Officers do nothing apart from making enquiries? I would like to know whether the honourable member can supply me with any information as to these questions.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am very sorry that I have to admit that the Officers have other jobs. Of course, I am opposed to this plurality of offices. The Government is now considering the possibility of reducing the number of Officers and appointing a limited number of whole-time Officers. In the majority of cases, the Officers are also parochial employees—Poor Relief Inspectors, Cotton Inspectors and employees of that sort.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before I vote one way or the other in this matter, I would like to know from the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on what basis the payment of this travelling allowance has been arrived at. It has been set out in the Addendum to the Resolution that "Representations have been made by the Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers for increased salaries and the grant of an allowance for travelling." The payment of \$10 per month as travelling allowance to the Officers of the country parishes does seem to me to be inadequate. I am not inclined to vote for the postponement of this Resolution, but I would like to know whether this sum of money will be the amount of travelling allowance which the Government will pay these Officers after the end of March. If you establish this principle now, you will have to carry it out. The payment of \$10 per month as travelling allowance for an Officer in St. Lucy, for instance, seems inadequate to my mind.

Mr. ADAMS: I hope that what is taking place this afternoon will not be continued throughout this Session. I do not see the necessity for generating least worthy of a State trial over a simple matter. If it were possible to follow the inscrutable workings of the mind of the honourable junior member for the

City, we might reconcile his suggestion that we should not establish the principle of granting travelling allowance, and thereby tie our hands when we have done the complete investigation with his suggestion after lunch that it is iniquitous not to give travelling allowance to a man who has to travel from St. Philip to St. John. I do not see how we can exclaim that we are so anxious to help in the conduct of the business of the Government and then postpone the help. These Enquiry Officers have not sent in their applications; only now they have made applications on several occasions. Frankly, I am not aware of the particular reasons which operated in the minds of the Government in the past to ignore these applications. I rather fancy that after the initial rush which took place at the beginning of the payment of Old Age Pensions, there was a decrease in the number of applications for pensions, and it might have been considered by the Government that when the qualifying age at which persons receive pensions was lowered, although the cost of living had gone up between 1939 and 1941, the work had decreased. The salaries paid to the Pension Officers in the country were paid in consideration of the fact that the employment would be on a part-time basis, and the employees were already the holders of a job, in some cases two jobs as in the case of a shopkeeper and district auctioneer. I appeal to honourable members to consider the case of the Officer of St. Michael: Reverend Godson assures us that although he has been employed on a part-time basis, the amount of work which he has to do makes his employment a whole-time business. He has been paid £150 per annum from 1938, and no war bonus or travelling allowance. We tell honourable members that the Enquiry Officers have made representations that they have quite a lot of work to do, that the whole position will be investigated and meanwhile we have shown you a case—as far as the Officer of St. Michael is concerned at any rate—and the honourable junior member for the City has shown a clear case as far as the country Officers are concerned. What does it matter if we vote for this Resolution to-day and establish the principle of paying travelling allowance? The principle is either right or wrong; if we think that the principle is wrong, let us not vote for it at all. If we vote for this Resolution and establish the principle of paying travelling allowance, then we must provide travelling allowance for these Officers. If these Officers were policemen just before the General Elections we would not hear a lot that we are hearing to-day. We singled out the policemen and considered them just before November last year. How hard it is to say that this Officer in St. Michael does not deserve something by way of travelling allowance? Using the argument of the honourable junior member for the City, the others are entitled to the same consideration, not because they have less work to do, but on the ground that the salaries are so close that the Officer in St. Michael can provide his travelling allowance and not feel it as much as the others when he is getting an average of 50 applications per month, and the nearest number to him is 14, and he is therefore doing three, four, five and in the case of St. Joseph and St. Andrew seven times as much work. I appeal to honourable members to see that the postponement of this Resolution until other departments are dealt with will not serve any useful purpose. That is the fantastic proposition which has been put up by the honourable junior member for the City. I ask honourable members to see that we will be doing the Officer in

St. Michael a real hardship to keep him at \$60 per month in 1946 when he has asked for more on several occasions. If the shoe was pinching the Paying Officers as much as the Enquiry Officers, they also would have sent in a petition. As the honourable senior member for St. Philip has pointed out, the Paying Officers are mainly the postmasters or postmistresses of the various districts and they have received increases in respect of their substantive jobs, otherwise they might also have petitioned the Government.

Mr. LEWIS: I cannot allow the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to go unchallenged. The inscrutability of my mind is not like his childish attempt to find out what I am talking about. (Mr. ADAMS I admit that). I have told the honourable member that a new principle is being created by this interim adjustment: I did not say that I would vote against it. If it was decided that travelling allowance would be paid when the investigation is made, that would be all right. When the honourable member says that I have made out a case for the payment of travelling allowance in respect of the country Officers, he knows what is operating in the minds of certain honourable members. They dare not take up the attitude which I have taken up; they will draw red herrings across the trail. As regards the honourable member's remarks about singling out the policemen, I would like to say that it was not a case of singling out the policemen and considering them at election time. I hope that the policemen did not thank the Executive for doing that. I think of the case of the policemen whether it is election time or any other time. I do my business in this House whether it is election time or any other time. The honourable member says that the Paying Officers have not asked for any more money; how do we know that those Officers are not making more money by doing other jobs? When these Enquiry Officers were appointed in 1938, they were not given any travelling allowance; that was included in their salaries. I cannot see how people can continue with a policy for all this time and then tell you in 1946 that they did not realise it. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph was a member of the Executive Committee for all that time and did he not know what was happening? The late Director of Education was appointed without any provision being made for travelling allowance, but he soon pointed out that he was not getting any travelling allowance. These Officers were appointed since 1938 and they have only now applied for travelling allowance! (Mr. ADAMS: That is not true). I am not in disagreement with the proposal to pay this travelling allowance: if people have to do a lot of travelling, I think that they should be assisted in purchasing a vehicle. That is what should be done. I do not think that this travelling allowance should be given in any lump-sum; I do not think that we should give anybody £45, for instance, when he will spend only £2 of it. If you do not know how much a person is going to spend, you have no right to take up money and give it to him. I feel that the payment of £150 a year for the investigation of four or five applications for Old Age Pensions is adequate, and more so. Young people who are entering the Government Service have to enter it on probation and are paid £40 per annum, and here you have someone receiving \$60 a month and he has nothing to do. I ask the Government to wake up to their duties; if they have people doing a lot of travelling, let them be paid travelling allowance. I have been informed that the salaries of

the Officers were based on the fact that they had to do some travelling and when the amount for travelling was absorbed, so to speak, they petitioned the Government. The Government have asked people to do travelling, have refused to give them travelling allowance and are now arguing their point. I claim that this is a wrong principle.

Mr. TALMA: I would like to know on what basis it has been decided to pay this travelling allowance, whether it is in respect of the size of the parish, the population or what? I would like to point out that the parish of Christ Church is a big parish and has a dense population, a population next to that of St. Michael, and if in assessing the amount of travelling allowance to be paid the Enquiry Officer in that area, we are considering the size of the parish and the population, the amount of £25 could not be considered an adequate allowance. I have no power to increase this amount, but I am hoping that the members of the Executive Committee will reconsider their decision as far as the parish of Christ Church is concerned. Having regard to the size of the parish and the population, I hope that the Executive will be more liberal and grant at least £40 as travelling allowance for the Officer up there. Christ Church is not a back parish, and in this respect the parishes of St. James, St. Peter and St. Lucy are entirely out of class. It is for the purpose of making those points that I have attempted to hold up this debate for two or three minutes.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am not opposing this Resolution as it stands because it is a temporary measure. However, when this system is being reviewed, I would commend to the attention of the Executive Committee the fact that those Officers who have to look after two parishes certainly deserve no less an amount for travelling allowance than the Officer who has to look after only one parish, even although there are more calls to be made in that parish. Undoubtedly, there is the need for a similar amount, at least, if the Officers have to look after two parishes. For instance, it is difficult for one to get to certain districts between St. Peter and St. Lucy; he must have a bicycle, and sometimes the bicycle is of no use—

At this point, it being now 3.30 p.m. of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and stated that it was now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to resume Government Business. I do so with the object of completing the consideration of this Resolution.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended in order to resume Government Business.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When Government Business was being considered, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply, we were considering a Resolution to place the sum of £73 at the disposal of the

Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay from the 1st November, 1946, to the 31st March, 1947, a travelling allowance at the rate of £50 a year to the Old Age Pension Enquiry Officer of St. Michael, and a travelling allowance at the rate of £25 a year to each of the other five Old Age Pension Enquiry Officers. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy was addressing the Chair.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I was saying that the Officers who have to attend to two parishes have more travelling to do than the one who has to attend to only one parish, even although that parish is more thickly populated than either or both of the other two. It must be remembered that the Officers who have to attend to two parishes have to travel to and from the extreme ends of those two parishes. I would ask the members of the Executive when they are reviewing this matter insofar as the Estimates are concerned, to bear in mind that this amount for travelling allowance as has been proposed here, is inadequate in respect of those Officers who have to attend to two parishes. I am not regarding this money as a cost of living bonus; I am pointing out that it is necessary to make the amount for travelling allowance the same for the Officers who have to attend to two parishes as for the Officer who has to attend to only one parish, and has much shorter distances to travel in the course of making his investigation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am in agreement with what the last speaker has said, and while it is true that some of these Officers have two or more jobs, I can assure the Committee that the Officer of St. Philip and St. John has that job only. I am sure that he would welcome anything which is given him to-day either by way of travelling allowance or increased salary. I am asking my colleague not to insist on the postponement of this Resolution because I am sure that this can only be a means to an end until the Government does the proper thing. They are going to do the right thing, and it is because they have been pressed that they have arrived at this conclusion. Like the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, I feel that it is somewhat hard on those Officers who have to deal with two parishes to give them a less amount for travelling allowance than the Officer who has to deal with only one parish. I have been a member of one of the Old Age Pension Claims Committees, and I am sure that the Enquiry Officers have quite a lot of work to do. When a claim is made for a pension, the Enquiry Officer has to discover whether the claimant is working and things of that sort and report to the Committee. While it is true that the job is a part-time job, it is a big job and the Officer is required to do a lot of travelling. I am asking honourable members to see their way to vote for the passing of this Resolution because these employees are in need of this assistance.

Mr. WARD: I am in favour of granting increased salaries to the Enquiry Officers, but I feel that we are going about the matter in the wrong way. It has been pointed out that this money is for the purpose of paying travelling allowance, but in my opinion, this is a dangerous policy to follow in increasing a man's salary. I feel that if the other members of the Staff of that Department knew that these Officers would have been increased as far as their salaries are concerned, they would also have sent in their petition. They would otherwise have been timid to ask for an increase in their salaries. If it is said that the other members of the Staff

had the same opportunity to ask for an increase in their salaries, I think that you are putting them at a disadvantage. These employees have other jobs; (A MEMBER: Not all of them) well, it is their bad luck not to have other jobs. I think that these Officers should realise that when they were appointed to these posts, the travelling allowance was incorporated in the salary, and the whole Staff should have asked for an increase in salary if they wanted it. The other members of the Staff would have been glad to ask for an increase as well, and I think that they are being treated unfairly. I think that when the Government is considering the Estimates, the whole Staff will have to be considered. If these Officers have more work to do, then they should receive more money; but I think that if we are considering some members of the Staff, we should consider the whole Staff. I quite agree with the honourable junior member for the City; I feel that we should postpone consideration of this Resolution. We want the position to be consolidated; we want to consider the whole Staff and not consider the matter in any piecemeal manner. I am voting for the postponement of this Resolution.

The question that consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. LEWIS, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD and Mr. SPEAKER—7.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, SMITH, FOSTER, MAPP, COX, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, CRAWFORD and Dr. CUMMINS—13.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in the negative, seven honourable members voting "Aye", and thirteen honourable members voting "No". The question now is—

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I would like those honourable members who are in the opposition to see this matter from our point of view. It is good that we should have unanimity whenever possible. These officers have asked for increases in salary and for the grant of travelling allowance. The Government have agreed to grant them a travelling allowance, but that does not mean that the travelling allowance will be assessed on the present basis on the re-organisation. When we come to the question of centralising the system, when the necessary number of Officers are appointed, they will automatically come under the Travelling Allowance Act. It might be that the Resolution is unfortunately worded. That is all there is to it (Laughter). If the members of the opposition understand that this will not be the basis on which the travelling allowance will be assessed, then their opposition will be at an end. The Addendum to the Resolution states: "It is proposed to examine the whole system of old age pension enquiry with a view to its centralisation....." We might probably have three whole-time Officers when the enquiry is made and they will come under the Travelling Allowance Act.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the honourable senior member for St. Philip to know that I am convinced that these employees should get an increase in their substantive salaries before they get their travelling allowance, because otherwise they will lose some of the pension on their salaries. I hope that this re-organization will take place and that there will be satisfaction in this Department, because it is a vital Department in the machinery of the Government.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Chairman declaring "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

The Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

The House resumed.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADDRESS *RE* INCREASED GRANTS FOR REPAIRING TENANTRY ROADS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business. The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. George.—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to an increase in grants to the several parishes and to the appointment of a parish Engineer to be attached to the staff of the Highways and Transport Department.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the passing of the following Address to His Excellency the Governor:—

The House Of Assembly To His Excellency The Governor

The House respectfully suggest to Your Excellency that the grants to the respective Parishes be increased considerably, and that a Parish Engineer be appointed on the staff of the Director of Highways and Transport, who shall supervise the work to be done by virtue of such increased grants, and that at least 50% of such grants to be specifically used in the repair of the tenantry roads.

If we scan the present situation, we will find that year after year fewer miles of roads are being repaired, and also that each year the employees of the Highway Commissioners are thrown out of work. Speaking from physical experience, I can say that the back roads are completely neglected. That is due to several things, one of them being that the revenue derived from highway taxes is insufficient for effecting repairs to these roads. The grant which is given by the Government is also insufficient for this purpose, and the poor Highway Commissioners are thus placed in a very inevitable position—a position of having so much to do with little or nothing with which to do it. From time to time the different parishes have approached the Government, some of them with success and others without success for further grants, but there again that is an unknown quantity. Roads in the parishes of St. Lucy, St. Andrew and St. Michael have been taken over by the former Central Road Board, now the Department of Highways and Transport, and if you take the amount derived from highway taxes and the amount spent in St. Lucy, you will find that there is a difference of £2,268. That is equivalent to a grant, and it is obvious from that that the whole scheme is being run on an inequitable basis. I am hoping that by passing this Address we will be able to get the whole scheme run on a more equitable basis. I respectfully suggest that each year the Highway Commissioners should take over a certain

number of tenantry roads, and that the same number be taken over by the Department of Highways and Transport. I also suggest that an engineer be appointed on the Staff of the Department of Highways and Transport, or that one of the engineers of the Staff of that Department, assist the Highway Commissioners of the various parishes in the preparation of their estimates and in the performance of their tasks. I would also suggest that it is not only a question of producing good roads, but we should also like to have good engineers. I think that some means should be devised whereby those who are now in employment in connection with the repair of roads might be given the chance to take a course in road engineering so that they might be able to perform their duties with greater efficiency. (Cheers).

Mr. SMITH: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Address. It is a fact that the Highway Commissioners of the country parishes suffer a great deal year after year for want of funds to carry on their work. During certain months of the year the labourers employed by the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph are laid off because of the lack of money to spend in repairing the roads. When there was a scarcity of gasoline and tyres the revenue in most of the parishes went down. The roads which were never in repair went into even greater disrepair and the poor people could not get their cane crops reaped because you could not travel over the roads safely. I feel that the time has come when the Government will have to increase the grants to the Highway Commissioners, because year after year the Commissioners have to go back and ask them for money. I think that the time has come for centralization rather than have the Commissioners asking for money all the time. I think that the Government should take over the roads (Cheers). I know that the wheels of Government turn very slowly; (A MEMBER: Yes, they turn very slowly) and while they are considering the question of taking over the roads, the Commissioners will still await their little grants. If the Government will take over the roads as quickly as possible, then I do not see the need for the passing of this Address. As regards the appointment of a parish engineer, I was wondering whether the honourable junior member for St. George meant one for the parishes of St. George and St. Joseph. I feel that we want an engineer in St. Joseph to assist the present engineer in carrying on the work. I am somewhat puzzled as to the appointment of a Parish Engineer. I do not know whether the honourable member means that the engineer should be appointed in respect of one parish or not. However, I sincerely hope that whatever the Government considers should be done, it will be done as quickly as possible.

Mr. WILKINSON: When we come to this question of roads, I anticipate that there will be some discussion on it. I am sure that every honourable member will agree with the principle of all tenantry roads being taken over. It has been emphasized that when money is granted to the Highway Commissioners every year a proportion of that money should be spent on the taking over of tenantry roads. We all know that there are some very disgraceful tenantry roads in this island. These roads have come down from past generations when the law was not in force, and, in my opinion, it is the duty of the Government to see that these roads are repaired. As honourable members should know, under the

present system certain highways in each parish are under the control of the Department of Highways and Transport. The remaining roads in the parishes are under the control of the Highway Commissioners of each parish except in the case of St. Micheal, St. Lucy and St. Andrew. The amounts received by the Highway Commissioners in the past were small and about six years ago the Government sent down and asked for increased grants under the Head "Subsidies and Grants" to effect repairs to these roads. Records will be found in the Blue Book. The Government granted funds to repair the roads, the amount being equivalent to £100 per mile. That amount was increased—I cannot remember when—to £125 per mile because the Government realised that in order to maintain the roads, the sum of £100 per mile was insufficient. To-day that amount of £125 per mile is not sufficient, as has been emphasised by the honourable junior member for St. George. The honourable member has also emphasized the fact that these tenantry roads should be taken over gradually and that the work should be supervised by the Department of Highways and Transport. I quite agree with that, but I am not sure that the amount suggested by the honourable member is sufficient. He has suggested that at least 50% of such grants be specifically used in the repair of the tenantry roads. I presume that the honourable member means 50% of the increased grants. I anticipate that we shall have to discuss this matter, and I therefore beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Dr. WILSON: I beg to support the motion for the passing of this Address. I would like to say that insofar as the parish of St. John is concerned, I have seen many roads that need extensive repairs in some cases and rebuilding in others. That is not to mention those improvised tenantry roads in Sherbourne, Welch Village, Henley, Sealy Hall and Newcastle Hill, all of which are in a deplorable condition. The grant made by the Government is totally inadequate if these roads are to be done thoroughly. When you consider the number of roads which need to be repaired and to rebuilt, and further when you consider the fact that it requires £250 to build one-eighth of a mile of road according to the Government's standard, honourable members will agree with me that a substantial increase in the amount of the grant is absolutely necessary. That is my desire, and I shall be grateful if this Address is passed. (Cheers).

Mr. TALMA: Before the question is put, I should like to compliment the honourable junior member for St. George on having made his maiden speech, and for having brought before the House one of the greatest grievances suffered by the people of this island. There are some tenantry roads which have been untouched for the last ten or fifteen years. When you bear in mind the type of individuals whom we have as Highway Inspectors and the policy adopted by the Highway Commissioners, you wonder that there is a parish at all. We all know that the money granted to the Commissioners is not sufficient to be spent in repairing the roads each year or every five years. I quite agree with the suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. George that an engineer should be appointed to give advice in respect of the roads which need repairs. I think that that suggestion should go a long way.

Mr. GARNER: I am very glad that there are other honourable members of this House who can see as I have seen for a very long time. When we come to the question of roads, I have always been insisting that the Government should send down a special grant to the parishes so that the Highway Commissioners can pay attention to the roads of sufferance as I call them. I am fearful that when we use the term "tenantry roads", that might include roads in the plantation tenancies. I have no idea of considering roads in the plantation tenancies at all. I feel that there is the necessity for an amendment to this Address, because I have always spoken of roads of sufferance and that term is so general that it may include roads which I have not got in mind. I am supporting this Address this afternoon because I feel that there is a crying need for what has been asked in the Address. Throughout the length and breadth of this island you will find in the villages, roads which are almost impossible. In some cases the doctors refuse to go into these villages when they are called to attend to the poor people at night. I think that it is incumbent on the Government to see that some of the money which is granted to the Highway Commissioners is earmarked for the specific purpose of repairing the roads of sufferance. I also think that it is advisable to appoint an engineer who would give advice where the repairs of roads are concerned. In my opinion, a lot of money is wasted in repairing the roads because some of the Highway Inspectors do not know their job sufficiently well. They have not got any technical experience, and that has been asked for in this Address. I think that if an engineer such as has been suggested in the Address were appointed to assist in the repair of roads in the various parishes, the money would be well spent. With regard to the question of centralization, I have been reliably informed that in St. Philip, the parish which I have the honour to represent, we have been able to construct good roads at a far smaller cost than in the case of the former Central Road Board. When you have the men and the materials on the spot, it is certainly cheaper for the outlying parishes to do some of the work than to have centralization. It is imperative that a certain sum of money be given to the Highway Commissioners so that they can repair the roads in common as they might also be called. I feel that there are many Highway Commissioners in this island who do not interpret the law as it should be interpreted. Here again, I quote from St. Philip; one of the Highway Commissioners up there says that they could not use any of the money granted to them in repairing the roads of sufferance. It was pointed out to him that under Section 20 of the Highways Act, they could use some of that money in repairing these roads. I say that the Act is clear and some of that money should be earmarked to be expended on some of these roads. I hope that it will not be too long before some of these roads are repaired. I am sure that the Government, constituted as it is now, will give every assistance in this matter if they are asked to do so. I feel that the time has come when this matter must be dealt with.

Mr. GALE: I am not opposing the passing of this Address. I feel that when the Government is dealing with the tenantry roads, the matter should not be dealt with in any piece-meal way. We need to make a survey of all the roads which are to be repaired. There are many roads in the various par-

ishes which need to be repaired. I speak as one who has been a Highway Commissioner of the parish of St. Michael for some time. We handed over certain roads to the former Central Road Board and they repaired them. Since the new Department has been created we handed over certain other roads, but they have informed us that these roads cannot be taken over. If that law is still in existence, it will be argued that they cannot take over any of these so-called village roads. Before the Government does anything in this matter, I think that a survey should be made of all the roads in the island which need to be repaired or rebuilt. After the survey has been made, an estimate as to the cost of putting these tenantry roads or village roads in order over a period of years could be obtained, and the Government would be able to provide the money to be spent either by the Central Authority or by the parishes for doing this work. I believe that that is the only way in which we will be able to get these roads put in order. If we give the money to the Highway Commissioners, we may find that the money which has been given to them is inadequate for the purpose of repairing the roads. I think, however, that we should give the Highway Commissioners an increased grant and in respect of the village roads, I think that a proper survey should be made of the roads in the island in order to ascertain the number of roads that need to be put in proper order. On the other hand, a separate Resolution could be sent down for the expenditure on roads over a period of five or six years.

Mr. ADAMS: I am speaking for two reasons one is that I am not voting for this address, because I see some snags in it, and then I think that there should be some alteration in the Rules of the House affecting the members of the Government. We are now being asked to vote for this Address, and when we come to consider it in Executive Committee, there might be other circumstances which might weigh with us. I am going to move the suspension of Rule 144 which says that every member present in the House when the question is put will be required to vote. I do not think that members of the Executive Committee should be asked to vote for an Address which we may later have to consider. We might contradict ourselves or hold a different opinion in Executive Committee. Apart from that, I cannot vote for this Address as it stands. Honourable members must know the history of this question of repairing tenantry roads; they must remember that Sir Frank Stockdale had offered us money long ago when the Highway Commissioners were unable to repair these roads. The difficulty experienced by doctors in getting to the people was brought up and Sir Frank Stockdale thought that he would give assistance out of Colonial Development and Welfare funds. Honourable members remember that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. D. G. Leacock was appointed to deal with the matter, and the Highway Commissioners sent in a list of the roads which they thought should be repaired. (A MEMBER.) Nothing was done). The question of making a survey of the roads was raised by the Colonial Development and Welfare people. It was said that a survey would have to be made of the roads before it could be known how much money would have to be expended. All of that is under consideration, and for that reason I cannot vote for this Address. As a matter of principle, even if I were not a member of the Executive Committee, I would not vote for the Address phrased as it is—an address which

specifically sets out that 50% of any grant must be allotted to the tenantry roads. In some parishes you do not need 50% of the grant, and in others you need more than that. The Address, phrased as it is, does not make any sense. I would like to say that the Government has to consider carefully if they will spend a huge sum of money, comparatively speaking, on other people's properties unless the roads are going to be handed over as public roads. Can we spend £40,000 or £50,000 on roads and then have people saying that you dare not enter them? Can the Government spend money on these tenantry roads unless the owners of the several tenancies are willing to give them over to the public? All that has to be considered. I suggest to the honourable junior member for St. George that he should word this Address in the broadest possible way, pointing out that the grants to the respective parishes should be increased and drawing attention to the necessity for dealing quickly with the tenantry roads. We all know that there is a ten-year plan under consideration, and money is forthcoming for it. We all know that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has got to say whether he approves of the plan or not. All that is under consideration. The honourable junior member for St. James knows how difficult it has been for us to get an Assistant Engineer for the Department of Highways and Transport. This matter of appointing an engineer to assist in the parishes has been contemplated both by this Government and by previous Governments. I congratulate the honourable junior member for St. George for having brought forward the matter, but I wish to point out that the Government is well aware of it. For the reasons which I have given, I suggest that this Address be worded in a general way, pointing out that speed is necessary. At this stage, if I am in order, I would ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 144.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that it is right for the House to suspend a Rule unless it is for something of greater importance. It is all right to suspend a Rule so as to deal with Government Business. I am not dictating to the House, but if honourable members do not wish to vote they can always leave the House.

Mr. ADAMS: They might not want to do that; they might consider it more dignified to remain in the House. However, I hope that honourable members will see the necessity for leaving when the time comes.

Mr. LEWIS: I am well aware that there are in this island, some valuable roads which are in need of repairs. I have been hearing for a very long time that water and roads are needed in this island. I should like to ask the honourable junior member for St. George if this Address is not an admission that the Highway Commissioners of the various parishes are unable to repair their roads both from the point of view of the money and also of the technical engineer. If that is a fact, their plain duty to the people is to hand over the roads to the Central Government. That is as clear to me as a pikestaff. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has drawn attention to the proposed Colonial Development and Welfare plan. The honourable member might easily have said that the matter has been discussed for several afternoons in this House during the last Session, that a survey has been requested by the various Highway Commissioners in respect of roads some of which could be abandoned. If you appoint an engineer to assist in the repairs of roads

in the various parishes, how will you know when the money granted by the Government ends and that of the parish begins? The engineer has to dictate to the Commissioners as to how the money is to be spent, and some of these Commissioners might disregard the technical advice. That is not unheard of on the part of the Highway Commissioners. I do not think that we should repair these roads, let people have the benefit of them and then charge more rent for the houses. I do not think that we should supply water and good roads in the tenancies and allow the people who build the houses to get the benefit by way of increased rent. This is a serious matter. I do not know that the engineer of the Highways Department can dictate to the Highway Commissioners as to how they will spend the grant from the Central Government or any other grant. The Commissioners might not agree with the technical advice as to the construction of a modern road and it looks to me as if some of the power of these Commissioners is political power. I think that the roads which need to be repaired should be taken over, a few of them should be abandoned and the people put in a more respectable locality. I cannot vote for this Address, coming as it does after assistance has been asked from the Colonial Development and Welfare Department, although I would like to see the roads put in proper repair for the use of the people. We already have a survey as to what is to be done and I understand that there is some legal technicality in connection with repairing roads before they are handed over to the public. I would like the honourable junior member for St. George to know that I cannot support this Address for the reasons which I have given. If in the course of the honourable member's reply he can convince me that I should vote for the Address, I will do so; but it looks to me as if the Highway Commissioners are holding on to some power in having people whom they cannot pay. They do not see that the legal thing to do is to hand over the roads. Let the roads be properly repaired by the Central Government and let us see that we have good value for our money.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am in sympathy with the honourable junior member for St. George. I compliment him on the eloquent manner in which he has put his case. I want to say that we have been given grants by the Government in connection with the upkeep of the roads, but we are heading towards centralization. I notice that when the people in St. Michael found that they had too much trouble in connection with the roads, they handed them over to the Central Government. The people of St. Lucy did likewise and with the people of St. Andrew it was a question of Hobson's choice—they could not help giving them over. If I am to be induced to vote for this Address, the Highway Commissioners must hand over the roads. They must do the necessary thing; they cannot have it in half-a-dozen ways. I am not going into the legal aspect of the matter; some of the tenancies are private while others have been sold out. I remember that at the St. Michael Vestry nominations yesterday there was a discussion over the difficulty of repairing roads because some people will not give up their land. I think that the honourable junior member for St. George will bear with us in not voting for this Address because he cannot require all the people in the parishes to take the Government's money. We all know what happened in Christ Church (Laughter) and I would advise the Commissioners of the various parishes to hand over the roads to the Central Gov-

ernment and they will be adequately looked after. I am not saying this because I am not a member of the Vestry of an outlying parish. I would advise the honourable junior member for St. George to withdraw this Address; I am sorry, but I cannot vote for it.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Address, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. DOWDING: It amazes me to see that there are so many honourable members who are not voting for this Address. All that is being asked for in this Address is that the poor people should be helped—the sick and the dying people who cannot get any transport at all. It amazes me that this Address should have met with so much opposition and quibbling from the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. When a person like the honourable member, who has experience, speaks about roads not being taken over on account of the ownership of those roads, I would like to say that it is well known that the Highway Commissioners have, on many occasions, been approached by owners of roads who have sent in petitions; and as long as their petitions have been granted, the Commissioners have taken over the roads. This Address is asking that the grants to the Highway Commissioners be increased so that they can be assisted in repairing the roads in the various parishes. It is also asking that a certain percentage of the grants be used in the repair of the tenantry roads to which insufficient consideration has been given in the past. A mile of road here and there has been taken over, but there are many roads to which no consideration has been given. I recently witnessed a narrow escape from death by the driver of a lorry on one of these roads, due entirely to the condition of the road. There has been quite a lot of talk about centralization, but owing to the length of time before centralization can come about, something will have to be done in the interim. Let the Highway Commissioners have increased grants, and let them carry on their work. Do not let us quibble over the matter. (Cheers).

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not think that the honourable junior member for St. George means that one-half of the grants should be spent on the tenantry roads. I think that the honourable member means one-half of the increased grants. I respectfully suggest that the Address be amended to read as follows:—

“The House respectfully suggest to Your Excellency that the grants to the respective parishes be increased considerably and that at least 50% of such increased grant be used in the repair of tenantry roads under the supervision of the Engineer of the staff of the Department of Highways and Transport.”

I believe that that will give effect to what the honourable member is really suggesting.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am supporting this Address. I have had at least five years' experience as a Highway Commissioner of the parish of St. Michael, and in reply to all this talk about centralization I should like to say that—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member continues his speech, I should like to know whether the honourable junior member for St. George is accepting the amendment which has been moved by the honourable junior member for St.

James. If the honourable member is accepting the amendment, the proper time for doing that is now.

Mr. DOWDING: I accept that amendment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am supporting this Address and I will move a further amendment. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that my experience as a Highway Commissioner of St. Michael has taught me that when you consider certain Sections of the Highways Act relative to tenantry roads other than privately-owned tenantry roads, it is rather difficult to get anything done at all. Petitions have been sent to the Highway Commissioners of St. Michael requesting that certain roads be taken over. It is now held that unless the roads are in a good state of repair—if I understand the legal opinion given to the Department of Highways and Transport—they cannot be taken over. As far as I am concerned, I feel that that, like of some of what we have heard to-day, is just splitting hairs. How can you expect people living in tenancies to talk about putting the roads in a good state of repair before they are taken over? It is only when these roads are in charge of the various Highway Commissioners and enough attention is paid to them that they are put in a good state of repair. What seems to be confusing hon. members is the question of privately-owned tenancies or plantation tenancies and I suggest that the words "other than privately-owned tenantry roads" be added at the end of the Address. What the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said is partly correct. If we merely mention "tenantry roads" that is a very elastic term. Although it is true that there is the necessity for making a comprehensive survey of the roads, it seems to me that with the legal position as it is now, if we refuse to support this Address that would be tantamount to saying that until the law is changed we will do nothing to assist the local authorities in repairing the roads. If the honourable junior member for St. George will agree with the amendment which I have proposed, that will clarify the situation; it will be made clear that this money will not be spent on privately-owned tenantry roads. Honourable members will see the advisability of supporting an Address of this sort. I feel that an Address of this nature should be passed; it is definitely necessary although we have had a survey taken of the village roads, or roads in common or abandoned public roads throughout the island. I know what I am speaking about, and I am hoping that these tenantry roads should be separate and distinct from privately-owned tenantry roads. That was requested by the Committee which sat under the chairmanship of Mr. Leacock; the statistics given in respect of these roads were to be separate and distinct. Therefore, in dealing with an Address of this nature, we are dealing with roads other than privately-owned tenantry roads.

Mr. COX: I am in sympathy with this Address, but I cannot promise the honourable member to vote for it as it stands. I am in favour of the amendment proposed by the honourable senior member for the City, because if we were to pass this Address as it stands, the Government might be compelled to repair roads which are probably owned by the honourable senior member for St. George, the honourable junior member for St. James or anybody else. We have to stipulate the type of tenantry roads that we want to repair. We want to repair roads which are owned by people of slender means, and I say that we must define the type of roads which we want to repair. I cannot support the proposal that at least 50% of the grants must be spent in the repair of these tenantry roads. I do

not think that it is wise to make such a demand on the Government; I do not think that we should tell the Government what part of the grant should be spent on the tenantry roads. I think that we should suggest that a considerable portion of the grant should be spent on the roads because it might be necessary to spend 75%, 80% or only 40% of the grant on them. I have travelled all over the parish of St. Michael, and we all know that the tenantry roads are almost impassable in many cases. I am sure that people experience difficulty in getting doctors to visit them in cases of illness. In some of the districts the people will go down to their knees in mud. I remember that someone died in Utility Village some time ago, and the only way they could get out that person was by bringing the matter to the knowledge of the manager or owner of Hanson plantation. Do honourable members know that that gentleman told the people that if they wanted the dead person to be brought through his yard they would have to pay \$100? That is the state of affairs which exists among a large number of people in the parish of St. Michael. I will say that it is the fault of the authorities who collect taxes from the poor people to supply them with roads and Fire Brigade assistance. As the position is at present, if a fire takes place in any of these districts, the whole district will be destroyed and yet the people are paying Fire Brigade taxes! Money has been allotted by the Colonial Development and Welfare Department for the repair of these roads, but it will be long before that comes to pass and I think that some of these roads which are in a very bad state of repair should be looked after at the present time. The question of roads being privately owned can be easily dealt with under Section 31 of the Highways Act. Under this section, if you want the Government to repair these roads, you acquaint the Governor-in-Executive Committee and three months after the roads have been given over, they can embark upon the scheme of repairing these roads. You do not have any claim to the roads as long as you have given them over to the Government. I am hoping that the Government will realise what the position is so far as the roads are concerned, and what is more, the standpipes are too far from the people's homes. I am hoping that something will be done as speedily as possible in order to relieve the present situation. I beg to move that this Address be further amended by the deletion of the words and figures "at least 50%" and the substitution of the words "a considerable portion" in place thereof.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: It has been very surprising to me to see that an Address of this nature has met with so much opposition. I have always been clamouring for better tenantry roads. We have been told by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that the matter is under consideration. We do not want to hear that £60,000 is lying there; it might never be spent. Morning after morning and night after night honourable members are bombarded by those whom they represent in connection with these tenantry roads. We want to try and do something constructive—something whereby actual benefit will be derived. The honourable junior member for St. George is forcing the issue; he is bringing forward one of the major grievances of the people of this island as a whole. He is trying to get some assistance in the repair of the tenantry roads, and we have the honourable senior member for St. Joseph side-tracking us with a lot of fanciful and fictitious

things which do not exist and mean nothing to me! That is the position as I see it. I cannot go on with coalition such as this; in fact, this is not a question of coalition; this a question of poor people living under bad conditions. (Cheers). Although the honourable senior member for the City has moved a very good amendment to this Address, I do not think that he has gone far enough. I have not got the brains of the legal luminaries, but I will move an amendment which the average layman can understand. I beg to move that the words "other than tenantry roads owned and/or rented out by one individual and/or company" be added in the Address. That means that if one-half of a road belongs to a company and the other half is owned otherwise, it stands to reason that this money can be spent on roads such as that. Honourable members will appreciate the nature of this Address and the intention of the honourable Introducer of it, which, I take it, should be the intention of a Coalition Labour Government. I am sorry that the Address has not gone far enough as far as I am concerned, because there are several tenancies which are inundated when it rains. Although I cannot elaborate on this Address, I am saying that it has my whole-hearted support and that of the Labour Members of this House, and more especially the Conservatives.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to support this Address wholeheartedly. I happen to know that some of the roads in this island, more especially the tenantry roads, are in a rotten condition. However, I do not see the value of using the words "privately-owned tenantry roads." I should like to say that I do not see why, in this island of 166 square miles, we should have twelve different authorities supervising and carrying on the maintenance and repair of the roads. I think that there should be centralization in respect of the roads of the island: Some honourable members have already spoken in favour of centralization; some have opposed it, but I am in favour of centralization in respect of the roads. The authorities have been very parsimonious in their expenditure on certain social amenities, and they want to be parsimonious in their expenditure not only because they do not want to change the system of rating, but also because of certain vested interests ruling in the Vestries. The honourable senior member for Christ Church should not lose sight of the position; he is speaking as if somebody is opposed to the idea of this Address. What is being suggested is that if money is required to assist in the repair of the roads, the matter is not being dealt with in the right way. I feel that we should go about this matter in the right way, otherwise the Government might be throwing away money. While I am in favour of the Address, I take the opportunity of saying that the Vestry system certainly needs to be altered.

Mr. ADAMS: While I congratulate the honourable junior member for St. George on having made his maiden speech, nobody can congratulate him on his second speech. The honourable member should know that the Government is more than in favour of this matter of the repair of roads. They are working on the matter. The honourable member of all people should know that a few weeks ago the Colonial Secretary sent to the various parishes and asked the Highway Commissioners to come in and put their case before him for an increased grant. Of course the honourable senior member for Christ Church will learn to make a sober utterance one day. The Commissioners of Highways know that the Government is not opposed to the idea. The Commis-

sioners of St. Joseph did not attend but they sent in a letter, and other parishes sent in and specified the roads in respect of which they wanted an increased grant. Nobody can say that the Government will not give an increased grant as soon as a case has been made out. What I pointed out to the honourable member—the argument should not have to be repeated—is the absurdity of laying it down that 50% of the increased grant should be spent in the repair of the tenantry roads when, in the case of some parishes, as much as 75% might be needed and in others only 10%. Why should the honourable member accuse me of quibbling at this time of my life? Can the honourable member reasonably accuse me of quibbling? I say that the Address should have been more sensibly worded. The late Mr. Walter Reece once said of an Address then before the House that the King would not understand that sort of English. Honourable members can see that we cannot repair roads unless everybody can use them and nobody should be able to prevent any road from being repaired. I suggest to the honourable junior member for St. George that he should urge the Government to speed up the matter, and not have an Address like this passed. The Government is actively engaged in the matter, and under the ten-year development plan there is a certain amount of money allocated for expenditure on the tenantry roads and a survey has already been made. I suggest to the honourable member to urge upon the Government the necessity for hurrying up what they are doing, but not to have passed an Address in which there are snags. I suggest that the words "privately-owned" in respect of the tenantry roads be left out of the Address, and that some neutral word like "village" be used. I assure the honourable junior member for St. George that far from not getting my support, he is getting it now. I have pointed out what is being done to relieve the Highway Commissioners, and there is this added fact that funds from the Colonial Development and Welfare Department are specifically allocated for the repair of the roads. I will not copy the mistake of previous speakers and get warm. I assure honourable members that the Government is working on this matter. I do not want to be offensive, and I am not suggesting that the last General Election had anything to do with the matter. I say finally that it is of no use to allocate money for repairing a road which ought to be abandoned. The survey has showed that some of the roads should be abandoned. I repeat that the hands of the Government should be forced as much as possible, but do not let honourable members go into any details as to set out that 50% of the grants should be spent on the roads. I suggest that the words "tenantry roads" or "village roads" will be sufficient indication of what roads we have in mind.

Mr. DOWDING: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has given us the idea that the Highway Commissioners can go in and tell the Government what they want and they will get an increased grant should the case go through. I can assure honourable members that the Highway Commissioners of St. George have asked for a grant within the past few weeks and were told that they would be informed—

Mr. ADAMS: Told by whom?

Mr. DOWDING: By the Colonial Secretary. I do not see that there should be any opposition to the proposal to use 50% of the grant in the repair of the tenantry roads. As regards the question of

roads which are privately owned, I think that the matter can be left in the hands of the Highway Commissioners. Petitions can be sent in and the roads can be taken over and repaired. I do not think that there can be any argument on that point. With regard to the Engineer, he would be put in an advisory capacity and when the roads are taken over, it will be his job to see that they are properly repaired, or that they are carded in case they need to be discarded.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second the motion of the honourable senior member for Christ Church. I am not withdrawing anything that I have previously said in this House on the question of tenantry roads. These tenantry or village roads are in a deplorable condition, and some of them are impassable. (Mr. ADAMS: We all admit that). I have been fighting both in the Vestry and in the House for the repair of these tenantry roads. Some of those honourable members who are now members of the Government were asking for the same thing when they were not members of the Government, and I do not see why they should not make haste in the matter. The Highway Commissioners cannot take over roads until petitions have been sent in to them. This is a very urgent matter; it is not a matter with which you can play politics. I feel that it is the duty of the Government to give the people proper roads. Not very long ago I voted for the price of rice being fixed at six cents per pint and now I am asking for the repair of the roads. I do not understand this ten year plan; I am not waiting on this plan because I do not know when it will come about. The roads are in need of repair; it is time that they be repaired. The Government is side-tracking us and telling us that they cannot be done. I cannot stand for that; I want good roads for the people now. When you pass through the parishes you will find that the roads leading to certain places are quite in order, but in the tenancies you get the springs of your car broken. I cannot go back on what I have already said. I am quite willing to support this Address and I am appealing to the Leader of the House to agree with us because he has also been clamouring for good roads in the tenancies.

Mr. ADAMS: If the Highway Commissioners of St. Philip were as energetic over increased grants as others, they too would have sent in to the Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two amendments have been proposed to this Address, one by the honourable senior member for St. Michael and the other by

the honourable senior member for Christ Church. I will put the latter amendment first. The question is that the words "other than tenantry roads owned and/or rented out by one individual and/or company" be added in the Address. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

The question that the words and figures "at least 50%" stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—8.

Noes: Messrs. MAPP, COX, Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. SPEAKER—4.

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

The Address as amended was passed.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. WILKINSON, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Address in Committee.

The House resumed.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Address as reported from the Committee was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that His Excellency the Acting Governor had intimated his intention of receiving them at 2 p.m. on Tuesday next in order that they might present their Reply to his Speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable junior member for St. George to present the Address.

Mr. DOWDING: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 14th day of January, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 14th day of January, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House was accordingly adjourned to meet on Tuesday next, the 14th day of January, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.