THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th June, 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*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LEV. WILSON, Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, W. A. CRAWFORD, D. D. GARNER, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES.

Prayers are read and the Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 10th June, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Colonial Treasurer his Financial Report for the month of May, 1947.

PAPERS LAID

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

Report of the Committee appointed to advise on the utilization of the Pine Estate for housing and slum clearance.

Report on the Barbados General Hospital for the year 1945-46.

NOTICE.

Mr. GARNER gives notice of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House is of opinion that recreational centres or playing fields are absolutely essential throughout the island in order that centres for relaxation and exercise may be provided for both children and adults.

2. The House is of the further opinion that funds collected from this year's output of sugar for the Labour Welfare Fund should be allocated for the establishment of such a centre or playing field in every parish in which, so far, none exists, and respectfully requests that Your Excellency will take the necessary steps to implement the recommendation contained in this Resolution.

QUESTIONS.

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

1. Whether a letter over the signature of Mr Hugh Blackman which appeared in the Advocate Daily Newspaper of June 3rd, 1947, has been drawn to the attention of His Excellency the Governor, particularly with reference to the following sentence:—"I have seen two Invoices for the same goods, one to be used for Customs purposes bearing one price, and the other to be used for departmental purposes carrying a much higher price"?

2. If the answer is in the negative, will His Excellency obtain a copy of this letter for his information, and possible further action, as it is a matter of extreme public importance?

3. If in the affirmative, will His Excellency have the necessary steps taken in order to protect the Revenue of the Island?

4. If no action is to be taken, will the Government please say why?

Mr. SMITH 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 Colony.

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

EX GRATIA GRANT TO CASHIER IN THE G.P.O.

The CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply on the last occasion, the Committee was considering the Resolution for £78. 2. 6. as an *ex gratia* grant to the Cashier in the General Post Office and the further consideration of it was postponed.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—There is one statement, in connection with this matter, that strikes me very forcibly. It appears in paragraph 2 of the addendum and is to the effect that the Police have made thorough investigation and are satisfied that the money was stolen by some person not employed in the Post Office. That strikes me as a very strong state-

ment and I am wondering what is the information that backs it up. Obviously the Police feel fairly certain that they know who stole this money. I heard that mention was made on the last occasion—I was not present at the time—about someone serving a sentence of imprisonment since this robbery was committed and it has been suggested that that is the person who stole this money. If that is so, has any charge been laid against that person and if a charge has been laid, what is the result? The whole matter is very mysterious. Sometime ago £100 worth of stamps and money vanished, and sometime after one saw in the *Official Gazette* that a member of the Post Office staff had been, what we in the vernacular describe as "fired". In this particular case, it is only on *ex gratia* payment which is proposed but if it is felt that the cashier is entirely blameless in the matter and that the Government failed to give her the protection to which any cashier is entitled in the performance of her duties, the Government should say so and ask us to vote the whole amount. If it is the Government's fault, let the Government say "We are entirely at fault. The cashier is completely blameless"; so that this cashier should not be out of pocket even to the extent of half the amount of this money if she is completely void of blame and absolutely innocent in the matter. I have heard mentioned outside by a certain well-known local sleuth the idea that a wire may have been projected over the cage and these bank notes removed in that way; but I really would like to know what makes the Police so satisfied as to who the person is because they must be satisfied in their minds as to who committed the theft that they are able to say that it was not done by somebody employed in the Post Office. Is it that they suspect in some vague way somebody who happened to be around there but that there is not sufficient evidence on which they feel they can proceed in the hope of getting a conviction ? I should like to know.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—This matter was postponed on the last occasion for a reason and I would like to know whether the member in charge of the Resolution has any further information to give us.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—On the last occasion when we were debating this Resolution, some honourable member asked whether the file had been sent to the Attorney General. I have since had the file sent to him and his Minute is to the effect that at the time when the Colonial Postmaster discussed the matter with him he told him that he had not found any marks on the counter or anywhere in the cashier's cage which would suggest that someone had jumped over the cage; the Attorney General also says that he is not the legal adviser to the House of Assembly. That Minute would suggest that the money was carried away from inside. Well, the matter was referred to the Criminal Investigation Department who are the experts on matters of this sort. We are not experts on it and this is what the officer in charge of that Department says:—"As you will see, we have covered all the ground we can think of but we have had no success. I am convinced that it was an external affair." The policeman who is an expert on the matter says that it is an external affair and if we have referred the matter to the expert we have to take what that expert says as against what a person who knows nothing about it says. The Police feel that this is an external affair. The matter was referred to them; they investigated it; they took statements from clerks in the Post Office and as a result of their investigation, the officer in charge says "I am satisfied that it was an external affair." I am, therefore, standing by that. The Criminal Investigation Department tell us that it was done by somebody outside and I am prepared to accept that. I said already that after this theft was committed, the Government covered the cage, which is tantamount to saying that it was a mistake for the cage not to have been covered. All cages in Banks are covered and it is to prevent happenings such as this, I take it, that they are covered. If, therefore, anything happened owing to this cashier's cage not having been covered, it could not possibly be regarded as the fault of the cashier. I will go further and say that these people who are doing these things know their job thoroughly. It would have been quite an easy matter for this suspected person to have rubbed out any marks he may have made on the counter when climbing over the cage. These things have been deliberately taught to that class of persons in this island by means of cinema shows; things of that description are shown in the theatres and people are taught how to do this sort of thing. The Government does not prevent pictures of this nature from being shown and if people learn to do these things in an expert way and if the expert tells us that this theft was committed from outside I fail to see how this poor, unfortunate cashier whose job is to stay in the cage that the Government has provided to do her work could be made to suffer the loss. There is a drawer under the counter in which Money and Postal Order cash sales is put. The money that is to be sent to the country post offices is not mixed up with the Money and the Postal Order Money. The cashier goes to the safe, takes out this money, and puts it in a tray on a table in her cage which has been given to her for that purpose. That table has been there for years and inasmuch as the cashier has done everything that she could have done with the protection that is given to her by the Government I do not see why she should be made to pay this money. I feel that it is a government matter and that the Government is responsible for it. I should also like to say that sometime ago, some tools were lost in another Department and the value of those tools was written off. If I were the cashier in this instance I would have refused to pay this money and then it would have been a much easier matter to have this amount written off just as the value of the tools that were stolen from another Department were written off. What I have before me is that the Captain in charge of the Criminal Investigation Department says that this was done by somebody outside. I am saying that if that is so—and I believe it because the expert says so—the cashier should not be made to pay this money. The Government should be satisfied to write it off in the same way as the value of the tools that were stolen was written off. I do not think there is anything I can add to what I have said.

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. TALMA: Before you put the question, Mr Chairman, I would like to say that not only in the Post Office alone but in several other Government Departments I consider the equipment—fittings and fixtures—rather inadequate and should be brought into line with present-day conditions. I feel, Sir, that the Government should spend a reasonable amount whereby the fittings and fixtures and general office equipment will be brought into line with present-day conditions and will serve as a means whereby the staffs will be able to carry out their work more efficiently and more satisfactorily. There is some negligence on the part of the lady in question in leaving money openly to attract the eye of the passer-by, whether it be inside or outside. I appreciate the

remarks of the junior member for St. John relative to the expert but I am not at all satisfied that a theft of this nature could have been committed from outside and not inside. I feel, Sir, that there is somebody inside who has had either a false key or some thing of that sort. At the same time I blame the Government for not granting their clerks all the facilities and amenities which they deserve because, in this case, I understand that the cage was not covered at the top. Some years ago, certain changes were made in the fixtures in the Post Office, through the instrumentality of Mr. Sharp, but although he did something to assist the public yet it was a half-and-half job. In my opinion, it is very unlikely that someone would have climbed over this cage at that time of the day and carried away this money. The job was done from inside and that is why I asked the junior member for St. John on the last occasion how many keys there are, because after all, if there are two keys, unless the cashier had both keys at the time of the theft, it stands to reason that the other key could have been utilized to good or bad advantage—the advantage in this instance being to the bad. I have great sympathy with the lady in question. She is not the type of individual that would steal anything at all and despite the fact that a precedent may be created to-day I shall show by my vote that I am in sympathy with her. This lady will not steal; she has background attached to her.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I am sorry that I cannot vote for this Resolution and I think the line taken by the last honourable member is the wrong line. He has no right to bring personalities into this matter. We have no right to create a precedent in this matter. I am very sorry for the lady but I consider that there has been gross negligence on her part and this House would be wrong to pass this Resolution.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—Some honourable members feel very much inclined, it seems to me, not to fix blame one way or the other. My feeling in the matter is that we seem to be at loggerheads as to where to fix the blame. All we have gathered to-day is that if the Police should manage to fix blame in one direction, the defence lawyers—if there are any defence lawyers—will be provided with a very good defence in view of the Attorney General's Minute. We are told, on the one hand, that there were no footprints or fingerprints outside the cage; on the other hand there are some members who following the advice given by the expert detective—and rightly so—feel that it was done from the outside and I consider that it would be a slap to the integrity of the Civil Service to believe otherwise. We asked that this matter be postponed until to-day to get the opinion of the Attorney General and now that that opinion has been given, we are no further on the point; in fact, he has left us more bewildered than before. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary for me to repeat that this is a very sad affair inasmuch as other members of this Committee have already voiced that opinion. We all feel sorry for the clerk in question and that, it seems to me, is as far as we are prepared to go. I know this: if I were the clerk concerned I would not be able to pay this money and I would feel hard paying it if I were able to do so. They tell me that this would create a precedent but I say this: where big sums of money are concerned, all precautions should be taken by employers to see that those sums of money are safeguarded and I as an employee would feel very very aggrieved to have to pay for something for which I was not responsible. If I were in this clerk's shoes I would not have paid one cent at all yet; but the difficulty now in this case is who should pay or who should refund the money? I really feel that the clerk in question should not pay this money. It is all right for honourable members to talk about sympathy but why should we call upon this employee to pay for something that was not due to her fault? We have every reason to believe that this theft was committed by somebody outside and as I said, it would be a slap to the integrity of the Civil Service to suggest otherwise. We should not go out of our way as responsible members of this community and lay blame where we cannot definitely place it. I feel that the Government should be fully aware of our feelings in this matter and should take all the necessary steps to safeguard money not only in the Post Office but in all other Departments where money has to pass from hand to hand. I used to work in a Government office where money has to pass from hand to hand and I used to be always afraid that anybody could stretch over and take up the money from my desk. There was nothing to have prevented a person on the outside stretching over and taking up the money if my back was turned; and if any of it had been stolen in that way, should I have been called upon to pay it? It is very hard on this clerk. I do not want to be sentimental in this matter. If the Government is to be blamed, it should stand the loss. If this money had been stolen from a private firm, would it be the creation of a precedent if that firm stood the loss? I am going to vote for the Resolution because I feel that it is very tough on this lady to make her pay for carelessness on the part of the Government.

Mr. WILKINSON: It seems to me, Mr, Chairman, that certain honourable members are allowing their hearts to carry away their heads as far as this matter is concerned. I do not think that there is a single person sitting around this table who is not in sympathy with this lady but this is a matter of principle. An *ex gratia* payment of half the amount is asked for and, therefore, there can be no question that she is liable. I agree that the evidence we have is very conflicting. I heard the junior member for St. John read a statement to the effect that no marks were found on the counter; therefore, the job must have been done from inside. On the other hand the officer in charge of the Criminal Investigation Department says that it is distinctly an outside job and the addendum states that the money could not have been taken without entering the cage. So, Sir, we are between the devil and the deep sea. I do think that there must have been some negligence on the part of this cashier and for us to agree to contribute to it by putting up half of the amount of money would be creating a precedent. I, therefore, Sir, cannot vote for this Resolution.

Dr. WILSON: Mr. Chairman,—I am supporting this Resolution as it is but after reading the addendum to the Resolution I am wondering why the Executive Committee did not see its way to reimburse the clerk to the full extent of the loss incurred. I can see no negligence on the part of this clerk. To my mind, the Government having covered the top of the cage since the loss, shows conclusively that all was not well with the cage in question. It is my opinion that no precedent can be established in a matter of this kind, since the Resolution calls for an *ex gratia* grant.

Mr. BRANCKER: I listened carefully to the junior member for St. John and I particularly noted his remark that it could not possibly be the fault of the cashier,—a statement which I accept. He refers, of course, to the finding of the local Scotland Yard and I take it that he adopts its view of the matter. If that is so, that is, it could not possibly be the fault of the cashier I feel the Government should accept the full responsibility for what has taken place. If it is the cashier's fault we should say "We are very sorry that this thing has happened. You can have

our sympathy and nothing else." If it could not possibly be the fault of the cashier, it is, therefore, the fault of somebody else and in those circumstances I feel that she should not have to stand the loss. To ask the taxpayers to stand half of the amount and the cashier to stand the other half does look like the Government agrees that it could not be the fault of the cashier and if it is not her fault then it would be hard on her to ask her to stand 50 per cent of the considerable sum of $750. The junior member for St. John says that it was a mistake on the part of the Government that the top of the cage was not covered. I understand that a question was asked at the last meeting and I am wondering if the answer is available yet. That question. is this: Before this theft took place, had any request been made by the cashier or cashiers or by the Colonial Postmaster to the Government to have these cages covered? If such a request was made to the Government, then I assume it would be the fault of the government in not having the cages covered and, for the first time, locking the stable door after, at least, one horse is gone. I really would like to find out if application had been made for these cages to be covered before this particular loss took place. In view of the statement of the junior member for St. John which I have already said I accept, that is, that it could not possibly be the fault of the cashier, I wonder whether the Government would be disposed, if it felt that the House was willing, to send down a Resolution to refund the full amount and withdraw the Resolution that is now before the Committee.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As I said on the last occasion, Mr. Chairman, we must decide in our minds whether the cashier is at fault or not and on that principle we can decide the issue. I listened carefully to the two honourable members for St. James. One spoke about principle and the other spoke in very superlative language about gross negligence but neither of them attempted to show the gross negligence or the principle which makes this cashier liable. As regards gross negligence, this lady has always worked in a cage without a cover at the top; the regular practice is to lock the door when she leaves the cage and not to take up the money and put it in a locker or in her pockets for safety. Suppose this lady had put the money in her pockets for safety and lost it when she went to the dressing room, would you say that she had no right to have taken it with her? But she acted in the normal manner and there is no proof of negligence on her part nor is there any suspicion on the lady's part. It is not a matter who the lady is; this is a serious matter. If any honourable member is suggesting that this money has been stolen inside the Post Office, then an inquiry is needed because this is a large sum of money and the House, feeling that something wrong has taken place in this Department cannot tacitly pass this Resolution without asking the Government to investigate the loss of this $750. The only way you can attach blame to this lady is if you can prove beyond any shadow of doubt that she was careless right through and that it could not have happened except through her carelessness. Even in the private Banks, cashiers lock the doors of their cages and go outside leaving money all around in the cages. If you go down to Barclays Bank now, you may see thousands of dollars in a cage and no cashier in it; so that when this lady locked the door and left her cage she acted in the normal way in which she acted from the time she was a cashier in the Post Office. It is unfortunate that she has to pay any of this money at all. If you can prove that it is her fault, then it should not be a matter of paying back the money alone; she should be dismissed because you do not want to put such large sums of money in charge of people who can be so careless with them. If I employed a person who could be careless with an amount of money in the vicinity of $1,000 I would be very loath to keep that person any longer in my employ. It is not a matter of sympathy. I feel that it would be a travesty of justice to ask this cashier, in the circumstances, to pay any part of this money at all when you can bring no proof that she is guilty but that she acted in the normal manner. If you say that the Government is at fault how can the servant be responsible for the negligence of his master? If she acted in the normal way right through, how can any person talk about sympathy? To my mind, sympathy does not come in at all; it is a matter of justice and if any person is going to mistake the meaning of justice for that of sympathy then a different translation of the English language is necessary.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I made the statement that I consider it is gross negligence and I will try to bear out that argument. This lady has a drawer with a lock and key in which she could have placed this money; she did not do that. The cage has a door that can be locked. We have nothing to prove that anybody went over the counter because there were no footprints nor fingerprints and when it is argued that somebody climbed over the top of the cage I do not believe that. My belief is that the door of the cage was left open with the money on the table, so that anybody could have taken it away and I consider that is gross negligence on the part of this employee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not voting for this Resolution for the following reasons. The Post Office is a government Department and it is admitted, on the wording of the Resolution that the cashier is at fault. I agree in part with the sentiments expressed by the senior member for St. Peter. If the present Government is at fault it should be courageous enough to admit its fault and come to this House and say "We are at fault, pay this £156. 5s." But to come and ask us for part of this money by way of an *ex gratia* grant is an entirely different matter. The Government is saying that it is the fault of the cashier and that she should pay half of the amount but I do not think I can subscribe to that idea. It is either the fault of the cashier or the fault of the Government. The junior member for St. John tells us that the Postmaster, in discussing the theft with the legal adviser to the Government, said at the time that he did not discover any external marks which would have indicated that this money was stolen from the outside. On the other hand, suddenly there has sprung up in Barbados this expert criminologist of whom I have never heard. Whence he came I do not know. How on earth has Captain Duke become an expert criminologist to say definitely how his money was carried away? But what I am worried about is this. I take it that this matter was sifted by the Government before it was brought here and I take it that the present Government by a majority acted, on the face of it, with some sympathy, some intelligence, some reasoning and if it admits that this is the fault of the cashier how can its members come to the House and say it is not her fault? The Government's spokesman in this matter says that it is not the fault of the cashier but as she was allowed to carry out her normal duties in this uncovered cage and through no fault of hers the sum of £156. 5. 0 has been stolen, she

should be allowed to pay half of the money; now the Government comes and asks this honourable House to pay the other half. (Members: She has paid all). I am told that she has paid it all; that makes it worse. If she has paid all, would it not be better for the Government to come here and say "This is the fault of the Government. This Clerk should be paid back £156. 5"? On the face of it the Government is saying "It is not the Government's fault, but we will give you back half". I am not going to support it.

Mr. BRANCKER: I must confess that I had a very open mind on this question when I came into this House and having been given the unqualified and unconditional assurance by the junior member for St. John that it could not possibly be the fault of the cashier I do not see how I could be a party to making her pay half of this money which has been stolen. She has paid the whole amount and the Government proposes to reimburse her half of it. If it could not possibly be her fault she is entitled to be reimbursed the full amount and that is why I am going to suggest to the honourable member in charge of this Resolution that he accept my motion that the further consideration of this Resolution be postpond to enable him to return to the Executive Committee and persuade them to withdraw this and substitute one for the full amount. If it is not her fault—and I accept the honourable member's assurance that it is not—then by no stretch of the imagination should she be required to pay this money. It would seem as though someone is trying to hold back something. It may be that the Government was asked to cover this cage. At any rate, if it is not the cashier's fault I move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed and that it be referred back to the Executive Committee. Either the Government, in the circumstances, pays all or none.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPRINGER: I do not think it will be in order or wise for the honourable mover of this Resolution to accept a motion of that nature. I think it is absolutely essential that the feeling of the Committee be taken on the merits of the proposal of the junior member for St. Lucy. I take it that those members who are in favour of an approach being made to the Government to defray the amount of the Resolution will vote for the postponement and those members who are not in favour of increasing the amount will vote against the postponement and let the merits of the Resolution be settled here and now. If the junior member for St. John accepts the proposal of the junior member for St. Lucy, it is still in doubt what will happen to that Resolution for the increased amount when it comes down and we may find ourselves in the position of having a Resolution for the increased amount rejected whereas one for the small amount would be passed. I may add that I am one of those who still believe that the Resolution should be for $375 because I do not accept the argument so lucidly put forward that there is either total blame or no blame. I take the half way procedure because there are extenuating circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I put the question I would like the junior member for St. Lucy to state exactly what is his motion. If I mistake not, I think the honourable member said that the Committee should reconsider the payment of the full amount. We cannot do that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I appreciate that we cannot do that. My motion is that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. I was only giving the reason for the postponement.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the senior member for St. Michael is seconding the motion in its amended form.

Mr. COX: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: It seems to me that if we go on discussing this matter much longer, we are going to sympathize with the person who has this money because there is not sufficient—

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the honourable member that he cannot speak unless he speaks for or against the postponement.

Mr. LEWIS: I am speaking against the postponement. It seems to me that this thing boils itself down to this: if the cashier is not responsible for the replacement of the money in the circumstances, a Resolution should come to this House to refund money that has been wrongfully paid into the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is the postponement of this Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that I am not voting for the postponement and I am telling you why. I believe all that the junior member for St. John has told me but in my humble opinion this is a matter which this House cannot go into at all unless it is to refund money that has been wrongfully paid into the Treasury. The circumstances that show sympathy for a particular cashier can be manufactured, as I have said on a previous occasion, to show more sympathy with another cashier. People in these positions should accept their responsibilities and they should not be afraid to ask for protection that is necessary. If they go to their Association, the Association should see to it that they are properly protected and if any loss occurs through negligence on their part, they should pay the money. My humble opinion is that on no condition, except this cashier was forced through civil comotion or something of that kind to flee for her life from her cage, should this House vote this money. I am, therefore, moving as an amendment that this Resolution be rejected. If this Resolution is rejected, it shows that this House is not going to create a precedent of this sort; it would be a dangerous precedent. If the Resolution is rejected I see absolutely nothing to prevent a Resolution for double this amount to refund money that has been wrongfully paid into the Treasury coming before this House. If conditions of employment with the Government do not make a person responsile for money that is stolen from his cage, well the Government has no right to receive that money — that is as far as I am willing to go— then the Government will have to take steps to make whoever is receiving money on its behalf responsible for that money. I think we have debated this matter as long as we should and I feel that if we go on debating it much longer we are going to do people harm that should not be done in this House. I beg to move that this Resolution be rejected so that it can be taken off the Order Paper.

Mr. TALMA: I would like to ask a question—

The CHAIRMAN: The motion before the House is for the postponement of this Resolution and the Chair rules that the honourable member can only speak on the postponement.

Mr. TALMA: The question which I am about to ask bears on the postponement.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the honourable member will make it prefectly clear.

Mr. TALMA: Is there a safe in that Department and how many safes are there?

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second the motion of the junior member of the City that this Resolution be rejected and for very similar reasons. I am not going to make a long speech again but I would like to say that if this Resolution is rejected that is an end of the matter.

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, BLACKMAN, BRANCKER, TALMA, and MOTTLEY.—10.

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, SPRINGER, GARNER, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and Mr. SPEAKER —8.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. SPRINGER asks for and is granted leave to take charge of the next Resolution which stands in the name of the senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SPRINGER: The next Resolution, Sir, is for the sum of £3,142 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the service of the colony as set out in the schedule. I do not think there is anything remarkable about this Resolution. It is the ordinary routine Resolution for money to supplement votes in the Estimates. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is going to be any discussion on this Resolution, I will ask honourable members to discuss the items in the order in which they are placed in the schedule.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the senior member for St. George will follow the custom and move the passing of the items one by one.

The CHAIRMAN: The items have been read all together by the Clerk but it is a matter for the Committee to decide whether they will take them one by one. If there is going to be any discussion honourable members may proceed along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. BRANCKER: I was waiting to see if any honourable member had anything to say in respect of Nos. 1, 2, and 3 because I have nothing to say on them. But as regards No. 4, Head XXIX Miscellaneous Services, Item 5, Government binding and printing, 1946-47, £1,400, I will, as usual, draw attention to it. This amount of £1,400 is to supplement the amount of £4,600 provided in the Estimates for 1946-47 and the explanatory note states that the increase is due to the increase in prices under the new contract which came into force in July 1946. We have to pay all this money to a private firm instead of its going into the Treasury. This is the only colony in the West Indies which does not have a Government Printery and you see how we suffer from the lack of it. All this money goes into the coffers of private capitalists. In respect of item 16, Expenses under the Cinematograph Film Censorship Act, 1940, £5, I wonder if, in the light of the revelation we had earlier to-day as to the type of films which are coming into this island and which are said to be putting such vicious notions in people's heads as to enable them to rob the post office cage without detection, the senior member for St. George can tell us who are the present cinematograph censors.

Mr. LEWIS: The junior member for St. Lucy got up and said that he was waiting to see if anybody has anything to say in respect of Nos. 1, 2, and 3 and he went on. There is some difficulty in dealing with this Resolution in this manner. However, I am calling attention to No. 3, Head XX, Education, iii First Grade Education, item 22, Grant-in-Aid (3) Queen's College, 1947-48, £40. The explanatory note states that it is proposed to increase the salary of the Commercial part-time Mistress at Queen's College from £60 to £100 per annum from the 1st April, 1947, owing to the need for extending her duties from three to four afternoons weekly. What I would like to know is whether this runs contrary to the Scheme relating to government employment at the school. I do not know if this is a part-time salary. I was told that those schemes which we passed have become law and I would like to know whether, by this, I am in any way rescinding or acting contrary to the Scheme relating to the Government of Queen's College.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am shocked at the honourable member's suggestion that the Government would be asking this House, in this hole-in-the-corner manner, to alter the salaries laid down in the Schemes of Government. As he rightly guesses, this lady is a part-time employee who conducts classes weekly; the number of classes has increased owing to the increase in the number of pupils and it is only reasonable that she should be given more money. The increase took place since the Estimates were prepared and the lady cannot be expected to do the work for less than she is entitled to. She has asked for more money and the Government has sent down this supplementary vote.

Mr. LEWIS: I thank the honourable member for his explanation. When he is answering some of the questions asked by the junior member or St. Lucy I would like him to give some reason why the contracts cannot be made to run somewhat along the legislative years because I find that we are really and truly giving somebody power—perhaps it is necessary in the working of this arrangement—in the month of July to enter into an Agreement to take money out of the Treasury when we ourselves, as members of the House, cannot do it. I would just like it explained because it seems a bit funny to me that in the month of July when there are no elections you can go and make a contract that will run past the financial year, the elections and everything else and then the House is asked to stand by you in what you have done.

Mr. SPRINGER: All sorts of contracts have to be made for the convenience of the Administration or for other purposes and it is assumed that reasonable men in legislative assemblies will see the necessity for ratifying them. I entirely agree with the junior member for St. Lucy that this Government can well afford, economically, to do its own printing and I have no doubt that proposals along those lines will eventually come forth. As regards the other question about the personnel of the cinematograph censors I have no information as to who they are.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: With regard to No. 1, Head VIII, Post Office, the Parcel Post department especially suffers from inadequacy as far as the staff is concerned. I have visited it on more than one occasion and I observed that more parcels are coming through the Parcel Post to-day owing to the heavy freight charges. It seems an impossible task for the number of clerks in the parcel post department to get through with their work. It is a common thing for any person who goes to that department to have to spend practically a half-day before he can get away with his parcel, not that the clerks are unwilling to attend to persons but owing to the volume of work to be done. Clerks from the Department Stores like "The Ideal" often take up most of the time when they go to the Parcel Post to receive parcels and I think the Government will be well

advised, having regard to the fact that it is a money making department, to increase the staff so as to give greater satisfaction to the public.

Mr. SPRINGER: The number of parcels in the Post Office to-day is absolutely phenomenal. What has happened is that merchants import their goods through the Post Office instead of in the normal way. It is not a permanent feature and I do not know how long it will continue. The matter is being looked into.

Mr. LEWIS: With regard to the explanation given in respect of item 12, Government Advertisements, under Head XXIX, sometime ago we were told that they were arranging the advertisements in such a way that the cost would be considerably less. If that is so, I find it strange that in spite of that, you have to jack the estimate up as high as 50%. I do not know if there is a campaign to support every newspaper that is started. If the Government has gone in for economy and finds that it still spends 50 per cent. more than the estimate, there is something wrong somewhere.

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

RESOLUTION TO PAY FULL SALARY TO MISS E. MILLINGTON

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for £117 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay full salary to Miss E. Millington, Assistant Mistress, St. Michael's Girls' School, during her absence from the island to attend a six-month Social Welfare Training Course in Jamaica. I think the Resolution states everything that is to be said in this matter. There is a six-month Social Welfare Training Course to take place in Jamaica shortly. Candidates are being sent by the Boy Scouts' and Girl Guides' Associations and the Government proposes to send Miss Millington. During the time she is abroad she is not entitled to any salary and the object of this Resolution is to pay her her salary while she is taking the Course. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that. I would like to add that I hope honourable members will view this Resolution sympathetically because the parties who are supposed to know are satisfied that the candidate in question is an excellent choice and that her potential services to this country after her training are enormous. (Cheers).

Mr. LEWIS: I commend the Government for assisting people to qualify if it is nothing more than sending them abroad. However, I think the lady is capable of assimilating something to bring back for the benefit of the people with whom she comes into contact but the wording of this Resolution has got me upset and I sincerely hope that the honourable member will be able to help me. This is a Resolution asking us to vote money to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay full salary. Now, I take it that if this lady was not going on this Course, the salary would be there. That is how I look at it. If this lady was not going to Jamaica to attend this Course her salary would be there because it has already been voted to this school to pay her. Is the lady not entitled to any salary if she goes away in these circumstances?

Mr. SPRINGER: Not in the circumstances of her case; she had leave last year.

Mr. LEWIS: If it is a case of the money going to somebody who is acting for her and she wants to compensate her *locum tenens* as well, I think the Resolution might be one just to authorize the school authorities to pay it out. I want to be sure that this money is going to be paid out and that if it is paid out in this way, the lady is going to get her pension. I would like also to know whether there are persons similarly placed but do not get pay because I understand that a teacher left here on one occasion and went to Trinidad to play cricket. The Governor himself attended the cricket match but the teacher was not paid his salary. I am not viewing the matter in the light of favouritism. I want the system of appointment changed if it is wrong.

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

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. F.L. WALCOTT, the Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of supply and the postponement of one.

The House resumes.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that those two Resolutions be read a first time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—The junior member for the City asked, in my opinion, a very reasonable question just now when the House was in Committee of Supply in respect of one of these Resolutions and I do think that it should have been answered. Our Chairman was very anxious to get through the work but, perhaps, the member in charge of the particular Resolution will answer the question asked by the junior member for the City.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to ally myself with the sentiments expressed by the junior member for St James. I, Sir, attempted to address the Chair a few moments ago and it seems to me as though certain members of this Chamber are not granted the right which the House of Assembly affords to each and every member, that right, Sir, being to speak on behalf of their constituents on any matter of interest to the people as a whole. I happen to be here not through the efforts of the Chairman of Committees but mainly by my Party's effort and my good sense and if I attempt to speak at any time I see no reason why the Chairman should act in a manner like that. I see no reason why all culture, all training, all intelligence and everything that matters to humanity as a whole should be ignored. And, Sir, I had this to say long ago and I believe that it is a sorry day we are approaching—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must confine his remarks to the motion that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

Mr. TALMA: I say that some little refinement and culture, some little courtesy are necessary if this House of Assembly is to remain a House of Assembly at all. (Cheers).

The question that these two Resolutions be read a first time is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that these two Resolutions be read a second time. In doing so, Sir, I would like to answer the question asked by the honourable member who is not present. The reply is actually in the addendum to the Resolution. It is very difficult to help honourable members when they will not read their addenda. The third paragraph of the addendum to the particular Resolution says that the lady is not eligible for salary from the school funds. This will not affect her pension rights because if she did not get a cent, she is entitled to a pension.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. WILKINSON: I want to thank the honourable member for replying. I think it is courteous for him to do so.

The question that these two Resolutions be now read a second time is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the two Resolutions are agreed to.

BARBADOS GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume Committee on a Bill to make provision in relation to the Barbados General Hospital.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee on this Bill, we were discussing Clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I have a suggestion to put to this House to-day,—a suggestion which, I sincerely hope, this Committee will adopt That suggestion, Sir, is this. This Hospital Bill is, to my mind, one of the most serious matters that has had to be considered by this House for a long time. It is a Bill which, for reasons which are most obvious, should have been referred to a Select Committee. There are many features of this Bill which deals, among other things, with medical attention to sick persons, which might have been discussed in Select Committee and I carry that suggestion a bit further and say by a joint Select Committee of this House and the Other Place. In the Other Place there are members who actually serve on the medical staff of the Hospital and will be able to give honourable members the benefit of their experience in the actual working of that institution. I know that honourable members have it vaguely in their minds that with the Governor appointing the Medical Superintendent this will become a Colonial Hospital in the sense in which other islands have colonial hospitals. I have reason to believe that honourable members, whatever the merits or demerits of an institution of that kind are, may be disappointed and it will be well that they are. There is just another point and it is this. I think that there will be arriving here to-morrow the Chief Medical Officers and the Senior Medical Officers of the colonies, islands and dependencies in the Caribbean area, and I feel that if proper representation is made to Sir John Macpherson, the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies the joint Select Committee if it acts promptly—and I have no reason to believe that it will not—may be able, some afternoon, to get the expert assistance of these Medical Officers who will be gathering in this island for conference.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member going to move for the appointment of a Select Committee?

Mr. LEWIS: I am going to move that this Committee report the passing of five Clauses of this Bill in Committee and recommend that the remaining Clauses be referred to a Select Committee. I know there are many things about this Bill and about this Service that relate to the attention of the sick and the running of the Hospital and it will be well for honourable members to discuss it in detail in a Select Committee, so as to make clear what they want and to find out exactly what the institution is going to be turned into, if and when they pass this Bill. There is a further point. I understand that the Other Place has held up the Bill to amend the Education Act because the officers to be appointed are not named in the Bill and their salaries are not set out as has been the custom in Barbados before the creation of the Department of Highways and Transport. I think that honourable members should take this opportunity to find out what are the feelings of the Other Place in a matter of that sort and discuss its merits with them. The Other Place has taken the initiative and asked us to confer with them on a Bill. There are officers of this institution in the Other Place and I counsel honourable members, for numerous reasons which I do not think it necessary to mention, to send the remaining Clauses of this Bill to the Select Committee for a period of, at least, two weeks so that they will get expert assistance with it. I beg, Sir, to move that you do now report the consideration of five Clauses of this Bill in Committee and that the Committee recommends that the remaining Clauses be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The question that the Chairman report the consideration of five Clauses of the Bill and that the Committee recommends that the remaining Clauses be referred to a Select Committee is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, MOTTLEY, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—7.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, TALMA, HAYNES, GALE and Mr. SPEAKER.—12.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Since that motion is lost, can I ask the honourable member in charge of this Bill a straight question? I should like him to answer the question that I will put this way. Is it the intention of the Government when this Bill is passed to make the Hospital a Colonial Hospital in the sense, let us say, of the Trinidad Hospital or not?

Mr. BLACKMAN: I do not know anything at all about the Trinidad Hospital. I do know we want to put all the medical services and the institutions in this island under the control of a Director of Medical Services and a Medical Superintendent will be in charge of the Hospital who will be responsible to the Director of Medical Services.

Mr. LEWIS: Perhaps I was wrong in asking the honourable member to tell me whether it would approximate an institution somewhere else. I will put the question now more direct. Is it the intention of the Government, on the passing of this Bill, to retain the system of Visiting Surgeons as at present obtains at the Barbados General Hospital?

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—A decision on the point raised by the junior member for the City has not yet been taken by the Executive Committee

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—There you are! We are here turning this institution into what we know not of. The Executive Committee does not know yet what it is going to do with the Barbados General Hospital and honourable members of this House, representing the people at a stage in their existence when they want medical attention, do not know what it is they are doing and refuse to accept a motion to postpone——

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not speak derogatorily of any motion that this Committee has already passed.

Mr. LEWIS: I am merely saying that it is wrong for them not to know what is being done and not to take the opportunity to discover, in the interest of the people they represent, what is taking place. I do not speak now as to whether the Government appointing these officers or the Board is right or wrong in the interest of the people but the peo-

ple's representatives should know something about the Bill which they are passing, otherwise they are not representatives of the people. Here are honourable members of this House asking His Excellency the Governor to appoint a Commission to investigate something and then behind the Board's back abolishing the Board! That is what is in this Bill; it is not decent behaviour. I have given them an opportunity and if it is left to me I will give it again. The Senior Medical Officers of the Caribbean area will assemble in Barbados during this week or next week. You have this glorious opportunity and I tell honourable members of this House that there are Senior Medical Officers in this area who will warn them not to do what they are doing in this Bill. The inhabitants of colonies that have hospitals like what the Barbados General Hospital may be turned into are asking, for God s sake, to be relieved of them. The inhabitants of Antigua are saying "For God's sake, appoint a Board to run our hospital." You are merely doing something that somebody else wants you to do. You are placing it in the hands of people to appoint people to these posts because they have nowhere else to send them. The Indian Civil Service may be closed to them and they would like to send them out here and you will be in the greatest difficulty to get rid of them, if and when they come. When people in a community become ill or sceptical, they are difficult to deal with. Even in an institution which people enter not bodily ill, you are having the greatest trouble in this country to-day and you have to appoint all sorts of Committees from outside to deal with the situation. You are merely stating in this Bill that the Governor shall appoint a Medical Superintendent and there are to-day that need attention and a Select Committee of this House would be able to enquire into them. It is wrong to force an honourable member of this House to say in the course of a public debate what can be remedied without public exposure. There is one thing and it is that if the honourable members of this House force me to say things I am going to say them. Here are four responsible persons elected by the people, asked from this Chamber to represent the people on the Executive Committee and they come here and say that the platforms on which they have been elected have been forgotten by them; the Housing Bill and all other Bills have been forgotten by them and the Hospital Bill has been brought in because somebody else wants it. You have not had the Report of the Commission of Enquiry and you are about to abolish the Board because it is in your power to do so. What surprises me is that the Hospital Board is made up of a number of persons that are in this House representing the people to-day and they cannot see that this is wrong. If this Bill is passed in its present form, you do not know what the Other Place is going to do with it, so far salaries are concerned. They have a Bill before them now and I have seen in public print that they want to continue the old system of putting the names of officers and their salaries in Bills. I do not know if this House agrees to the principle of not putting officers' names and salaries in Bills. When the Highways and Transport Bill was before this House I was told "Create the Department and then we will fill in the blanks." The blanks have never been filled in that Bill; they are filled in the Estimates every year but they have not been filled in the Bill. By the stroke of the pen last time we raised one salary by £50. I am counselling honourable members that they owe it to themselves—those who are on the Board—and to the merits of the Bill to know what they are doing when they pass this Bill. I defy any of them to tell me to-day, if they pass this Bill, that they know what they are doing. They might get anything as a result. They have it in their minds that something might happen and it might happen like something else has happened. You are going to turn this hospital into a colonial hospital or anything else. No honourable member of his House knows what is going to happen and before you take an institution that caters to the sick of this country and leave it to somebody else to decide what is to be done with it I think the people's representatives should be the ones to say what is to be done with it. The honourable member in charge of this Bill says that he does not know if the Executive Committee has taken any decision in the matter. They do not know why they brought this Bill or they are ashamed to say it. That is how I intrepret this action. I say that you are dealing with a very important matter. Whatever may be the defects of the Board you nevertheless have to bear in mind that you are dealing with a body of professional men and, believe me, Mr. Chairman, the jealousy that can go on among professional men will surprise this community if they knew about it. This institution has to be a training centre for the people who attend to sick persons. Do you know how they are going to be taken on? Do you know if they are going to become Civil Servants when they are taken on? Does any honourable member know what he is doing at all when he has voted for this Bill? No; he does not. The Hospital Board is the one Board in this colony that has some of its employees sitting in judgment on it in the Legislature; it has always had; so that if there is anything wrong on the medical side you would have heard it ever since. Let us find out the cause for this change. Let us find out what they are going to give the people. Not one of the members of this House knows and if he does know, it is strange that he would not say it. I counsel honourable members to accept the motion and let the House decide what it will do. This is a glorious opportunity to get expert advice in this matter. There are many people who want to abolish the Board, though I see nothing wrong in abolishing it; but if this is to be a part of the medical services, will the honourable member in charge of the Bill tell me why it was not included in the Medical Services Bill. If this is an attempt to regulate the medical services of this colony, why was the Hospital left out of the Medical Services Bill? When the Highways and Transport Bill was passed honourable members of this House readily accepted the statement that we were going to discover what the Department was going to look like when they voted the money for it. You remember appointing a Select Committee to consider the Head in the Estimates relating to that Department and that showed that you had some sense of your responsibility. In this matter you are displaying absolutely none and I counsel you to reconsider your decision, let a joint Select Committee of this and the other Place confer on this Bill and let them ask Sir John Macpherson to give them the benefit, at some stage of their deliberations, of the experiences of the medical officers who will be arriving in this colony shortly from other West Indian Colonies. Some honourable member is mumbling something.

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

REPORT PRESENTED.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present the Report of the Joint Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to impose a levy on Sugar and Fancy Molasses.

REPLIES LAID.

Mr. SPRINGER: I also beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to question No. 38.

DELAY OF REPORT *Re* PRICE OF SUGAR CANES.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to deal with a matter of grave importance, a matter relative to the price of sugar canes. This matter affects the sugar industry and it affects mainly the peasants of this island, but all cane growers will be affected. I am now referring to Professor Shephard's report which has been long overdue. You will remember, Sir, that Professor Shephard rendered yeoman service relative to the sugar industry. He arrived here in March this year and enquired into the price to be paid for sugar canes but up to this moment the report has not been submitted. The position is that the average peasant does not know exactly how he stands or whether it will be possible for him to consider growing canes on an unprofitable basis. At all the factories of this island the price of canes varies according to the efficiency of the factory and things of that nature. We have attempted in the past to pass a Bill to fix a minimum price for canes but that Bill has never seen the light of day; the most material Clauses were not accepted by the Other Place. The plight of the peasant today is undoubtedly very grave; it must be borne in mind that the peasant has to pay an equally high price as the plantation owner in order to get his crop reaped, and then we have to consider the cost of transportation. There are very few peasants in this island who can afford to own lorries and so supply their own form of transportation of canes to the factories. Then there is the high cost of living which affects the island. The peasants therefore have to face the high rate of wages, transportation difficulties and the high cost of living—they have to encounter three difficulties—and what is worrying them is the fact that the price of sugar has been increased, and they want to know what proportion will come to them so as to alleviate their distresses and burdens in these troublous times in which very few of them can find the means of keeping life and limb together. I do not care to elaborate on this issue but the peasants want to know in the not too distant future what price they will receive for their canes. At one factory there is one price paid, at another factory there is another price paid, and all over the island the prices fluctuate according to the recovery and efficiency of the factory. I think that there should be some minimum price whereby the peasants can feel that they can continue to plant canes. It is not now beneficial to them to do so. Despite the fact that the price of sugar has been increased, the price of canes is still at a very low ebb. The peasants in this island are not organised and the price of their canes is very low. If they could lump their canes together and sell them in bulk, then they would receive the price which the plantation owners receive for their canes. I want to bring to the attention of this House the fact that a different price is paid for plantation canes from that which is paid for peasants' canes. If the peasants could see fit to group themselves together and sell their canes in bulk, they would receive the same price which the plantation owner receives for his canes. Unless and until that day arrives, the peasants will not receive a proper price for their canes; unless and until such an expert as Professor Shephard, who has already helped the cane-cutters, does something constructive to assist the peasants, unless and until this report is presented, the peasants will not receive a fair and equitable price for their canes. We are here to assist that group of workers; we are hoping that Professor Shephard will not sit on that report any longer but will submit the report whereby the peasants will receive an equitable price for their crop from now onwards.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second the motion. It is true that the peasants are bewildered at this time of the year to find out what has gone wrong with this report. In the first instance, we had hoped that Professor Shephard would have done this work which he is now doing at an earlier stage; but it seems as if he did not find it quite convenient—I say convenient with a note of interrogation behind it—to do it because it affects a certain class of people.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member should make such a suggestion. You can make your criticisms, but I do not think that you should suggest such motives in connection with the work which Professor Shephard has been asked to do.

Mr. GARNER: I feel that anything which can be done to relieve this situation should be done quickly. Professor Shephard came here with certain terms of reference. I heard the Attorney General say that it was not necessary to stipulate certain things because with the terms of reference it was necessary for Professor Shephard to quote the price to be paid for peasants' canes. Having heard that, it does make one think that something other than what is right goes on. That is my opinion because I happen to be an interested person. I feel that the time has come when this report should be handed in. It is long overdue. It is not only with respect to this session; we were waiting for it during the last session. At the beginning of this session or soon afterwards, Professor Shephard was asked to make this report and the canes have been made into sugar, the sugar is being shipped, the money has been paid for the canes and up to now nothing has been heard from Professor Shephard. The people are asking what is happening and I am unable to say. I cannot say what has become of the report because I have not heard anything official about it. I think that it is about time that the Government find out what is happening with respect to this report. This report must affect the peasants first of all because everyone knows that the agricultural labourer has been given an increase in his wages, and rightly so; but you cannot pay the agricultural worker more money and leave out the peasant when he does not share in the big loop. If the peasants knew where they would get more money from, it would be all well and good for them to work their land; but most of them have abandoned their land because they cannot get an adequate price for their canes. It is true that we have received £4. 15s. per ton for sugar for the 1947 crop; but the prices this year as compared with last year's crop are very little different. Some of this money has been allocated to certain funds and of what has been allocated to the price of canes and labour

the peasants have not seen any part of it and they are asking for it. I hope that this Government will urge upon Professor Shephard to send in his report, and what is more, that they will make whatever his findings are retrospective as from this year's crop because the money has been allocated by the British Government. Whatever Professor Shephard's findings are, they should be made retrospective as from the last crop. I hope that from this meeting Professor Shephard will be notified that there are thousands of people who are awaiting his report because the sugar industry employs quite a number of people, and apart from the employees the peasants depend on the industry for their livelihood.

Mr. SPRINGER: It is perfectly true, as the honourable junior member for St. Philip has remarked, that the peasants and the cane growers all over the island have been considerably worried over the delay of the report from Professor Shephard. As we all know, that report was expected at the end of last month. All sorts of wild rumours have been current, certainly in my parish, as to the reasons why this report has not been published, and I have had a great deal of difficulty in explaining to the people concerned why the report has not come to hand. Naturally, on receiving these enquiries, I always ask at the principal Government Office as to whether anything has been heard from Professor Shephard, and I went so far as to request that a letter be written to the College to which he is attached asking for some definite word as to the whereabouts and cause of the delay of this report. Honourable members will recall that Professor Shephard was to go on leave at the end of May; he left his report at the end of the month to be typed and forwarded to us, and I am happy to say that on making one further enquiry this morning, I elicited the fact that the report arrived yesterday. None of us has had the opportunity of reading the report; I believe it is before His Excellency the Governor and it will soon be sent to the printers and by this time next week a copy should be laid on the Table of the House so that the anxiety of honourable members will be relieved. It is, shall I say, a happy coincidence that this question has been raised this afternoon. I am very delighted to be able to give this information this afternoon. If the question had been raised last Tuesday I would have had to say that I was asking from Trinidad as to what was happening about the report; but to-day I am glad to be able to say that the report has arrived. It is not possible to lay it on the Table of the House to-day; the report is being perused by His Excellency the Governor, it will go to the Executive Committee and then be laid on the Table of this House. It is merely for us to consider the contents of the report and then take whatever action is appropriate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had no intention of entering the discussion, but considering that the honourable member who raised the question is my close associate, I should like to make it clear that I had no knowledge whatsoever that the report came to hand yesterday. As the honourable senior member for St. George has pointd out, the report is now before His Excellency the Governor and has not yet been sent to members of the Executive Committee. It is particularly fortuitous that the honourable senior member for St. George has been apprised of the fact that the report is in the island to-day. I endorse the statement that this report is long overdue; as a matter of fact, I should like to correct the hon ourable senior member for St. George, we were promised that we would have this report at the end of April and not at the end of May; so that, strictly speaking, it is almost two months overdue. What has aggravated the situation is the fact that the crop has come to an end and the peasants, quite justifiably, are apprehensive that unless very prompt action is taken, they may not receive the benefit of the report in respect of the crop which has just passed. It was with the specific intention of ensuring an equitable price for peasants' canes for the past crop that this House asked His Excellency the Governor to engage the services of Professor Shephard in order to conduct the enquiry which is under reference. It is a matter for satisfaction that the enquiry has been completed and the report is available. I sincerely hope that those of us who look forward to the publication of this report will have cause for more than satisfaction with the recommendations it contains.

Mr. TALMA: I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. RAMSAY: Before the motion is withdrawn, I want to express a sincere hope. I say this with a full sense of responsibility. I hope that the Government will do everything in its power to make it possible for the benefits that may accrue to the cane growers to be given to them not only in the way of the money but in respect of other things which are not quite nice to be explained here.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

Mr. SPRINGER: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business. I do not propose to go on with the Hospital Bill unless honourable members desire to do so because that seems to be controversial. There are other measures on the Order Paper which are non-controversial such as Order No. 4 dealing with increasing the emoluments of copyists attached to the Registration Office, and I am asking leave to move for the suspension of the Rule so as to resume Government Business.

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

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

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

REGISTRATION OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. MAPP, Order No. 4 was taken as the next Order of Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Registration Office Act 1903 (1903-6).

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. The purpose of the Bill is to amend the rates payable to the copyists in the Registration Office for the copying of documents. As is stated in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill, the work of this nature is performed by copyists who are paid from the Public Treasury at the rate of three pence per folio of ninety words. This rate is fixed by subsection (4) of section 2 of the Registration Office Act, 1903. The Registrar recommends that in view of the increased cost of living and of the fact that these copyists do not receive a cost of living allowance, the rate of three pence per folio should be increased to five pence per folio of ninety words. I will anticipate a point or an objection that may be taken in connection with these copyists. The question of having clerks in the Civil Service employed for this purpose and paid salaries has been raised more

than once within recent years. The Government has had the matter investigated and they have had reports from three Registrars who have stated that it would be impracticable to depart from the practice of payment by results. While there are two copyists who are more or less regularly employed, the amount of work fluctuates. When persons order documents they have to pay for them and at times there is a greater rush than at other times. At election time when the coyping of the Voters' Lists has to be done, you have to employ a great amount of assistance for this purpose. It would be impossible to maintain permanently a staff which would be adequate to deal with the burden of work which arises from time to time, such as the preparation for the elections. It therefore seems but reasonable that at some time or other you have to provide for the employment of the extra part-time assistance. At any rate, the Government has gone into the question thoroughly, not only this Government but the last Government, and has satisfied itself that the system ought to be allowed to go on. It is purely a question of doing justice to these people. I think it is obvious to honourable members that if the rate of three pence per folio of ninety words was reasonable in 1903, then the rate of five pence per folio is reasonable in 1947. I hope that this Bill will find favour with the House.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: There is just one little bit of information which I would like to get in connection with this Bill. The recommendation for this increase for these copyists is based upon two things—the increased cost of living and the fact that no cost of living allowance has been granted them. It would seem to me that the Registrar is not clear in his mind as to whether it is right to increase the basic salary rather than grant a cost of living allowance. As that affects the principle of the Bill, I would just like the honourable mover of the second reading to assure me that five pence per folio is a reasonable amount to pay for this work. I do not know anything about it. It is only in reading paragraph 2 of the "Objects and Reasons" that it strikes me that the Registrar has not come definitely to the conclusion that five pence per folio is the rate which should be laid down for all time. I would like to be clear on the point. If the honourable member can asure me that five pence per folio is the correct rate to be paid under the law, I am quite willing to vote for that. If there is any doubt in his mind, if the rate is put at four pence per folio and one penny as a cost of living allowance, perhaps we can do it in that way. We are being asked to increase the basic salary because you have not given a cost of living allowance.

Mr. SPRINGER: The answer to that question is that this is a definite recommendation of the Registrar. He has discussed the matter with the copyists, made up his mind and has recommended this figure to the Government.

Mr. TALMA: This is a matter of which I have some intimate knowledge and I firmly believe that the time has definitely come when these copyists should be incorporated in the Government Service. Despite what may have been said earlier the work has increased immensely; almost everyone who does any legal work realises the necessity for having documents proved and recorded. If that is so, and I know that it is so, it stands to reason that the Department will be more efficiently carried on if these copyists were incorporated in the Service. I am not trying to level any criticism at the present coypists, but I honestly feel that if they were Government employees the work would be done more efficiently and quickly. To ask that the old system should be continued is to ask too much. How is it that in other Government Departments like the Courts you have the regular clerks copying all the proceedings but the Registrar has to employ people from outside as copyists? Is it that these people are specially qualified for this work? Insofar as the proposed increase is concerned, the cost of living has increased greatly and an 80% increase or thereabouts has been proposed here. However, I feel that the day has definitely come when these copyists should be incorporated in the Service and made Government servants in every respect, being granted pension rights and things of that sort, and that this old method which is just a sort of patronage should not be continued. This is just a question of assisting one or two people in a certain way and there is little or no efficiency. I feel that these copyists should be incorporated as Third Grade clerks or whatever the Government feels fit and let the work be laid out rather than having people employed from outside, people who just come in and copy documents and the work is not controlled by the Government at all. This is due to the half-way method of doing things in certain offices. I shall make a motion for the reduction of the amount at a later stage because this will create a certain amount of hardship upon the poor people, those who try to avoid unnecessary legal work through not having their documents proved and recorded.

Mr. RAMSAY: The honourable senior member for Christ Church has struck a note which, if you will remember, Mr. SPEAKER, I have consistently struck in this House. I remember the time when a certain amount was to be voted in a certain year, and I calculated how many people the amount would have employed. At that time they used to give this copying of documents to various people who were already employed in the Civil Service at high salaries. I do not know how much of this work will be done in the course of a year. I should like to tell the honourable senior member for Christ Church that the cost of living is naturally going up for everybody, and I am wondering whether he is seriously contemplating not paying this increase. I do not think that people from outside should be employed to do this work; I myself would like to see these people drafted into the Civil Service provided that the amount to be expended per annum would go into certain figures. The honourable senior member for Christ Church has argued that you must have certain people of trust and I agree with that. It is not because an individual is capable of writing that he is a copyist. It is a very dangerous thing to bring in irresponsible people and put them to copy documents in an office of this sort, because the Government's business must not go to the people in the street. We must not allow the business of the Government to become the business of the public. Things of vital importance are done in the Registration Office; it is not merely the copying of the Voters' Lists. I am asking the honourable senior member for Christ Church not to press for any reduction of the rate because we cannot tread on holy ground. I would like to say this to the Government. I hope that the practice to-day is not what it was before when it was the family of the family of the family who did all this work and got the money. (Laughter). I know what I am talking about, at one time the family of the family of the family did this work. I want to ask honourable members to allow this measure to be passed. I say this with a full sense of responsibility; when the Registrar recommends something for us to do, we ought to do it without a blush. I am sure that things will go right

and we can count on the Registrar to have them going right. I say to honourable members : please do not ask for a reduction of the rate. We have just been asking for an increase for the cane growers and, lest honourable members perambulate, I am asking that this rate be not reduced.

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

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

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

ADDRESS RE CONTRIBUTION TO CARIBBEAN TOURIST ASSOCIATION

Mr. SPRINGER: In the time remaining I think that we might deal with Order No. 16. I beg to move that this Order be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. RAMSAY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER: I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

The next Order of the day was called:—To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 1/1947 relating to Barbados contributing to the Caribbean Tourist Association.

Mr. SPRINGER: The Select Committee considered His Excellency's Message and embodied the following Address in their Report:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 1/1947 dated 3rd January on the subject of the establishment of a Caribbean Tourist Bureau.

The House agree that Barbados should join the proposed Association but that the annual contribution should not exceed the sum of $8,000.00 United States currency.

The House are of the opinion that the activities of the Barbados Publicity Committee should be continued as heretofore.

This is a question of the annual contribution which should be made to the Caribbean Tourist Association. It is suggested that our contribution should not exceed the sum of $8,000 United States currency. Honourable members have discussed the matter, decided on their policy and I feel sure that they will pass this Address without any further comments. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

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

The Address was passed.

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

Mr. SPRINGER: As Your Honour pleases.

LEAVE FOR AUDITOR OF SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. He has to go to England on leave on medical grounds and he is asking that Mr. Noel W. Clarke, a qualified Accountant in his employ, be appointed to act as Auditor during his absence. The Act requires that when an Officer goes on leave, he has to appoint to act for him someone who has been approved by the House. The Auditor is asking for six months' leave.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that the Auditor be granted the leave asked for and that Mr. Noel Clarke be appointed to act for him.

Mr. WILKINSON seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being half past three, the time has come for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ADDRESS RE LARGE-SCALE PROJECTS TO RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT.

The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was called:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to large-scale projects to relieve unemployment.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—The Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House views with considerable apprehension the increase in the number of unemployed and the regrettable absence of greater opportunities abroad for work for our workers.

2 The House is of opinion that it is essential that large-scale projects to relieve unemployment be started at once and urge that Government undertake with all possible expeditiousness, the following:—

(a) Canalization of the Constitution River.
(b) Earthing, grading and levelling the side strips to the Runway at Seawell Airport, extension of the Runway to the Government boundary and the construction of a road around the end of the extension.
(c) Reconstruction of tenantry roads throughout the island: The Department of Highways and Transport to commence work at the earliest possible date on priority roads in St. Michael, St. Andrew and St. Lucy. In the other parishes, the Highways Commissioners to send in their lists of roads at once, in order that operations can be started.
(d) A complete survey of the area, with a view to the construction of the projected East Coast road—Bathsheba to Belleplaine road.
(e) Construction of the Pine Estate Roads.

3. The House is convinced that work on the above, if undertaken, as far as possible, simultaneously, would provide employment, for some time, for upwards of 3,500 workers from every parish in

the island, would place upwards of a million dollars in circulation throughout the island, and, in addition to the economic advantages which would accrue would also provide improvements which are needed vitally in the island.

Sir, it is beyond the shadow of any doubt that the number of unemployed in this island is growing daily: perhaps if I said hourly that would be in order. As one walks through the City of Bridgetown and its suburbs, one can see groups of people talking or engaging themselves somehow and when you ask a question you are told that there is no employment. If you were to go to the country districts perhaps in the afternoon, you will see another set of people—all able-bodied men—standing by the side of the road sometimes very near to places of business or places where there is nothing being done. You will find them talking—just frivolity perhaps—and when you ask the same question you are told that there is no work to be done. As representatives of the people, it is incumbent upon us to find work for each and every person who lives in this island. We cannot afford to sit idly by and say that it is enough for us to ask the American or Venezuelan or some other Government to take our people in their care for a short time while we stay at home and do nothing. During the War years this Government amassed a little wealth, and it cannot be called a poverty-stricken Government. We have accumulated a little money in the Treasury and while it is not to be squandered, it is to be utilized for the employment and for the good and well-being of our citizens. If that is not done we fail to be civilised creatures. It is a fact that Barbados should have been beautified and brought up to standard a very long time ago. If we accepted the excuse before that we are too poor to start on a large-scale programme, that excuse is no good to-day because we have a little cash in our hands to-day. If I take these items one by one, you will see that this programme is fool-proof. We have a very ugly structure here—the Constitution River; it smells from earth to heaven. How the people who live in that vicinity make out, I do not know. When I pass there I have to get away as soon as I can. I do not see that any Government which has any self-respect could allow that spectacle to remain and not seek to remedy the fault. The canalization of this River is a great item in this scheme; not only would it beautify our City, but it would reclaim land which could be used for some other purpose. Perhaps Queen's College could be extended when the land is reclaimed. The stench from this River would be removed, a more healthy condition obtained and work would be provided for the people in Bridgetown. Now we come to the Seawell aerodrome. Flying is the last word when it comes to the question of transportation; now that we have the funds at our disposal we can start about 300 or 400 people to work at once in preparing the ground for our communication lines at Seawell. If we were to start on such a project, people from the parish which I have the honour to represent would find some work as well as people from the parishes of St. George and St. John. I think that that would relieve quite a number of unemployed people. It is nothing extravagant to employ three or four hundred people to carry on this work; it would relieve congestion and would allow more money to be put in circulation from week to week. As regards the reconstruction of tenantry roads throughout the island, Sir, everyone knows the state of these roads. It is true that this Government has done a little more than the previous Government in that they have given the Commissioners of Highways a little more money so as to put the main roads in a proper condition, but they are still awaiting the reports from the Commissioners as to which roads are most urgently wanted. Sir, I happen to be a vestryman myself and I do not want to say any unpleasant things about vestrymen; but everybody here knows that if you were to wait until vestrymen send in their reports, it would be another two years before some of them report on what roads they want done. Some of these vestrymen are recalcitrant and irresponsible and some of them are too much of the old school; they do not know anything about progress. If some of them really had to face election they would not be in office to-day. We are asking that the Department of Highways and Transport go on with more work in the parishes. It may be said in certain quarters that they have not got the rolling-stock to go on with this work, but I would like to suggest that we may be able to rent, lease or borrow some rollers from Trinidad or some of the neighbouring colonies so that this work can be done. This work is very urgent. As regards the East Coast road, everybody knows that it is clearly a necessity to have this road built. Somebody told me not long ago that some people are saying that the Government should not spend any money there because that would raise the value of people's property in that vicinity. What could be more mean than that? Must we deprive the people of the road because it will increase the value of people's property? That is selfishness to the core. The Parochial Authorities will take care of that; if the value of the property increases, that will bring in more taxation. I repeat that this talk of people's property being increased in value if this road is constructed is only due to a selfish outlook. Whatever you do to beautify the island will be an asset to its inhabitants. We do not look to see how much land anybody has in that area; we look at the good which people will derive from the project. It does not mean that other people of the island cannot cross the road. With regard to the Pine Estate, everybody thought that that was a white elephant. I, too, thought so; but I now see that it can be utilized. Since I am convinced that this is so, I am saying that work on the construction of the roads there should be carried on so as to provide employment for some of our unemployed people at this time. Now as to the number of people which these schemes would employ, I have given a very mild estimate of 3,000 or 4,000 persons. However, that will only be touching the border of the unemployed people in this colony. One thing that helps to swell the unemployment list is the introduction of machinery into the sugar industry, and while I am not questioning that point to-day because I want to be quite fair and reasonable, I am saying that if the sugar industry finds that it cannot keep up with the price of sugar and it introduces machinery, it is a matter for our legislators to find out how far the machinery is affecting the workers of this island. After all, they had 300 years in which to make money and if they made that money and are now taking the reserve to bring in machinery to put the unfortunate people out of work without any sympathy, then it is a matter for the legislators of this island. I give that as a hint to show legislators that people are put out of work and the sugar industry is still making the same profit as before. The only thing is the outlay on the machinery and when one piece of machinery can plough——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is going outside the scope of his Address.

Mr. GARNER: I am only giving some of the causes why we have such a large amount of unemployment. However, I will not enlarge on it but when you take these things into account, it is more incumbent upon this Government, since it will not curtail the activities of the sugar industry, to find ways and means of giving proper employment to these people who have been thrown out of work by this machinery. If we devise no ways and means to give these people some sort of employment, we are not worth our salt. After all, these people have pinned their hopes in us and they expect us to do something to relieve them economically, if not otherwise. I feel that this question of unemployment is a vexed question and this Government should find work for the people. I think that it was in 1929 that the American Government had to embark upon a scheme for the relief of their unemployed and the W.P.A. found work for their people and then prosperity came. When you get a lot of money collected by the Government and it is spent in this way, the Government gets back some of the money in the long run. If we do nothing to benefit these people or give them employment, not only do we acquiesce in crime but we are perpetrators of crime. When you find people sitting down carelessly and not planning for the welfare of these people, they are not a fit Government. If we ask the people of this island to send us to the House so that we can remedy past wrongs and see them through to a certain extent and we just pass Resolution after Resolution, Government measure after Government measure and we do not try to initiate things for their welfare, I think it is time that the people censure us. I am not enlarging on that because I feel that this scheme is a good one. It comes at a time when thousands of able-bodied men are out of work through no fault of their own and I am sure that if this Government is really serious or means to help the workers of this colony, it will at once embark upon this scheme so that those of our unemployed people who really want to work will find an honest day's work. I hope that this Address will find sympathy in the quarters where it will be sent and I hope that the House will pass it without delay because it is very urgent and people are willing to work so that they can feed their families. I am sure that there is nothing fantastic about this scheme. It is just a commonsense project to give a few unfortunate people a little work so that they can earn their daily bread. I beg to move that this Address do now pass. (Cheers).

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Address. (Cheers). This is really an emergency Address. The Government is aware of the unemployment in this island; emigration is practically dead and I consider that this Government should find some employment for the number of people who are unemployed here. I will not deal with the proposals as thoroughly as the honourable member has done, but let us take the tenantry roads. A few months ago the Government sent to the various Highway Commissioners and asked for the number of roads to be repaired. Several parishes, including my parish, sent in the number of roads to be repaired and we have not heard anything more about the matter. I would like to impress upon the Government today that this matter is not one which should be put off; it should be dealt with at once. Let the parishes deal with the tenantry roads. With regard to the EastCoast road, the Government may say that they have not got the materials or the staff to do it. If they cannot do it with the present staff the correct thing for them to do is to approach Trinidad and see if they cannot get an engineer to come over and supervise this work. They could go to the Public Works Department and get surveyors; they should view this matter as an emergency and deal with it at once. The Government have no right to put off this question at all. If this Address is passed, as I believe it will be passed, and the Government do not show any results within two weeks from now we should ask why they are delaying the matter for so long. I repeat, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Address. (Cheers).

Mr. SPEAKER: Before any other honourable member speaks, I should like to ask honourable members who are not speaking to leave it to the honourable member who is speaking to address me without interruption. I am finding it very difficult to hear honourable members.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: An Address of such importance is one on which every honourable member of this House can speak with a certain amount of seriousness. I am glad to hear a person like the honourable senior member for St. James support an Address such as this. Historically speaking, this island has been in a perpetual state of unemployment and more or less, it was the people in the category of the honourable senior member for St. James who never made any serious attempt to relieve the unemployment situation. Unemployment is an evil not merely something to look at in passing, but it is one of those evils that can create very serious repercussions in process of time. I feel that the more honourable members view this question in its true perspective, the more they will see the necessity not only of tackling it temporarily but at all times. No matter at what stage of partial prosperity we reach, I feel that employment should always be made possible and that unemployment will always be an evil. It is for that reason that I will call attention to certain aspects of this Address. This Address in the main calls for public undertakings. So far as the reconstruction of roads is concerned. I can envisage certain supposed difficulties and I am making certain suggestions. I feel that as a member of this House, it is my duty not only to point out and let you know what is wrong but also to make suggestions. I feel that this is a national issue and it is the duty of the Government to take in all the experts available from outside. I know myself the magnitude of this problem; it will not merely be a question for the Government Department because they will tell you that the Road Board has more work than they can do. I think that you should take in private people who have the ability and who know something of the various projects to be dealt with. That has been done in the case of the W.P.A. and the T.V.A; there has been rehabilitation in other parts of the world but they had to look after it other than by the Government Departments. This had to be done in order to rehabilitate thousands of people because you cannot rehabilitate them in Govrenment Departments which are not up to date. We have reached a stage where it is impossible to say that you should look to one industry to sprain their brains so as to make it glorious for the people to get a living out of it. There are other means in this community to which you have to look for employment. I am moving an amendment to this Address and I hope that the honourable junior member for St. Philip will not look upon it as a discredit to him. It does not appear to me that this Address is complete without the addition of the building of schools. I say that for this reason; this whole project entails manual labour but you

should bring in all types of people for employment. I feel that in such a project there is the necessity for the erection of more schools. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy and I can speak with assurance on this question since both of us happen to be members of the Governing Bodies of two schools. It is deplorable how children have to be educated in these two schools. There has been the suggestion of the amalgamation of these schools. I feel that now we are undertaking a project such as this, we have to think of every possible means of helping the community generally. I say that because sometimes you get the narrow viewpoint that if something is added to something else, it is your intention to discredit somebody; but this question of employment must affect everybody in the community. I hear somebody say that the building of schools is in the ten-year Plan, but it is ludicrous to say that you should postpone something for the ten-year Plan if you can do it now. Lots of things are in the ten-year Plan but you want to do something that will provide work now. Why should you put something in the ten-year Plan if you can do it now? There is nothing insurmountable here so that you have to wait for the ten-year Plan, but you have to use your brains. Because you have a ten-year Plan it does not mean that you have to wait for that; there is the old familiar saying that while the grass is growing the horse is starving. The ten-year Plan does not bind this House; because you put the building of schools in the ten-year Plan that does not mean that you cannot build schools.. You put the construction of roads in the ten-year Plan but does that mean that you cannot build roads? I beg to move that paragraph 2 of the Address be amended by the addition of the following Item after Item (e): "(f). The building of schools." I feel that I have already given my reasons for this amendment. There is one other thing that has been drawn to my attention: some time ago the building of a new Fire Brigade Station had been suggested and I feel that any amount of building that can be done now will be necessary to be done, because we cannot stop short of doing anything that will provide employment. I view the whole situation seriously because there is a unmber of people coming back from the various Forces and it is necessary that we start work on these schemes now. Before I sit down, I must recapitulate and say that I feel that the Government must go outside and get experts so as to undertake a task as gigantic as this is. Even if this Address is passed, if the Government is to get through with the large scale work involved, I think that they will have to take a broad view as other places have done so that they will get through more quickly.

Mr. TALMA: It is only to-day that we see something tangible or apparently tangible being produced from the floor of this House whereby unemployment will be relieved to some extent, something whereby the island as a whole will benefit to some extent. What has been passing through my mind is this fact; is it because the Leader of the House is not here or because somebody else is handling Government Business that only to-day this Coalition Labour Government has brought about anything tangible to assist the people, something which has been long overdue and of which there is ample evidence? As far as I understand, the prospects of emigration to the United States of America have failed, but I hope that as the Leader of the House is in America at the present time, the emigration question will be solved and that 3,000 instead of 300 people will be emigrated despite who will get the credit for it. Although this Coalition Labour Government has been in existence for six months nothing tangible has been brought on the floor of this House to provide employment for the people, and now although the Leader of the House is absent, you find that a private member of the same Coalition has brought forward a measure which will relieve unemployment and benefit the island as a whole! Any keen observer will realise that conditions are moving on wrong lines if I should say so. Conditions have become intolerable among the working-classes owing to the disappointment of the emigration scheme; the man in the street feels that the emigration scheme will go on for ever, but that is only a temporary relief. Now that there is no more emigration on a big scale, it is incumbent on the Government to find ways and means of providing employment for the people. The various points in this Address are undoubtedly fool-proof; I doubt that there is one honourable member of this Chamber who will have the courage to oppose any point in this Address. I think that not only is it fool-proof but courage to oppose any point in this Address. es have been passed by this House within recent months, and one would have thought that some of the things asked for would have been included in this Address. Here it is that long ago this House passed an Address asking that a Fish Market be provided for Oistins. Where is that Market today? (Laughter). Long ago the policy of the Government was to build new Foundation Schools and that is also a means whereby carpenters and masons will get employment for some time. It is my intention to move an amendment to this Address to include a Clause whereby work of such an essential nature will be undertaken and it will affect the parish which the honourable mover has the honour to represent. I beg to move that the Address be amended by the addition of the following Item after Item (e): "(f) And any other projects that might immediately relieve unemployment." I was saying that the time has come when America does not appear to need as many of our employees as before, and it is incumbent on this Government to provide employment for them and not fritter away the money which has been saved. Now that we have reached the stage where rehabiltation is taking place, where everything is so uncertain in world affairs, we must necessarily do something to assist our own people otherwise unrest or something of that kind will take place. We should avert any such possible danger by devising ways and means to assist those who are hungry and in great need. This is the only way in which the tenantry roads will be repaired. We have to thank the honourable junior member for St. George who tabled an Address dealing with the repair of these tenantry roads and whose Address is being implemented in this way. I was thinking therefore, that the Address which was passed through my effort might also be implemented in this way. I should like to say that the passing of Addresses is one thing but getting results is another; nothing has yet been done as regards the erection of the Fish Market at Oistins or the building of the Foundation Schools. I hope that the Government will bear in mind the points which I have made so that some benefit will be derived for the people. There are some twenty bad roads of which Christ Church can boast, roads which have been untouched for the past twenty years. The Highway Commissioners cannot repair them, even the principle of rotation cannot work so that this is the only way in which those tenantry roads will be repaired. I must commend the honourable junior member for St.

Philip in that the type of work suggested here is not particularly skilled work; anybody who does not want to be a hanger-on can earn an honest living in being employed on any one of these schemes.

Mr. MAPP: An Address of this sort coming before this House gives honourable members an opportunity to consider a matter of very great importance. No responsible member of this community can view the present situation with complacency. There is a vast number of people who are unemployed and any schemes upon which we can embark should be of a long-range rather than of a short-range nature. It is of no use nibbling at this problem; it is a big problem and there is no use denying that. Those who are aware of the situation must view it seriously and in a big way.

Mr. SPEAKER: If members of the public want to leave I think they should leave at once.

Mr. MAPP: I think that the amendment proposed by the honourable senior member for St. Peter should read: "The building of secondary schools." From the long-range point of view, we have to change our system of education in this island. I think that our system of administration only adds to our problem of unemployment. We have people who can be technically trained for technical posts and there is a great need for technicians and skilled workers in other parts of the world. There is no use depending upon people to ask us to send them labourers; we have to train people here so that they can find an outlet in those places where there is the need for them. In the near future the United States of America may send to Abyssinia for trained people Nigeria may do the same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that has anything to do with the terms of this Address.

Mr. MAPP: I should just like to repeat that we want to deal with the problem from a long-range point of view. There is the need for more schools and we should embark upon projects which will bring much-needed relief to our unemployment problem. I beg to second the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. GALE: I should like to know if there is any opposition to the passing of this Address. Every honourable member seems to be making points and pressing them and it appears as if some of us think that this Address will not be passed. I do not know whence the opposition is coming. (A MEMBER: From honourable members on the right). I feel that this is a matter in which every member of this House of every shade of opinion is interested, and every honourable member would like to see something done to relieve unemployment. I am asking honourable members to pass this Address as soon as possible so that something can be done. (Cheers).

Mr. MOTTLEY: Despite what the honourable junior member for St. Michael has said about opposition, he should appreciate the fact that members of this House are not all dummies and that it is necessary to express your point of view upon matters of this sort, more especially when you sit and listen carefully and wonder at times if this is merely a political sop at this time or if honourable members are really serious. To my mind, this Address is a very important one. I should like to remind honourable members that, as far as the canalization of the Constitution River is concerned, the public of Barbados will be mindful of the fact that that is nothing new. If we merely pass an Address here and no action is taken to put it into operation immediately, that would just be holding out a sop to the people. I recall that the suggestion of canalizing the Constitution River was made some three years ago and I understood that the scheme would have been embarked upon in the very near future. Most of us will recall that nearly all the suggestions made in this Address are embodied in the ten-year Plan in some way or other. That is not good enough: they will be started I suppose in 1955. (A MEMBER: In 1980.) The situation is tense; those of us who really come in contact with the people day in and day out must appreciate the fact that wherever you turn you hear that there is unemployment and the people are willing to work. The crop season is at an end and it is very difficult for people to get employment; in some cases it cannot be obtained. There are many able-bodied men who are unemployed and who are therefore unable to give their families the necessities of life. I hope that when this Address is passed the Government will appreciate the fact that it has been passed not as a sop to the people but because this House would like them to take immediate action. I beg to second the amendment moved by the honourable senior member for Christ Church. Like that honourable senior member for St. Peter, I feel that you should get the assistance of departments, whether within or without this island, other than Government Departments. I say that for this reason; I happened to be a member of the Select Committee which was appointed to consider the Head of the Estimates in connection with the Department of Highways and Transport, and I was surprised to hear the Director admit to me that he had not seen the condition of the roads which have been already taken over. I refer to the roads which have been repaired and which were allowed to go into a state of disrepair. I feel that unless the Government views this situation as it has been viewed by the honourable senior member for St. Peter and get the necessary assistance from outside the Government Department, as it has been set up, so as to carry out these projects, nothing will be done. One half of this year is almost gone and the unemployed people of this colony will not be contented to wait until this time next year for these projects to be started. Something must be started immediately; the canalization of the Constitution River should be started within the next three weeks. People are not going to accept anything about any fancy, high-falutin expert is to be brought down and so forth. This is a question of relieving unemployment and at the same time it is something that will be of lasting benefit to this community. Whatever might be said about the building of schools, I take it that the amendment suggested by the honourable senior member for Christ Church will cover that. I should not like to support any specific mention of the schools because I know, and honourable members will know, that if you talk about building schools immediately you will be told that there is no material, but you can canalize the Constitution River next week. As regards the question of roads, this comprehensive road scheme could be started within a month or two if you could get the necessary qualified engineer, not necessarily the equipment. We have the labour and we have the stone. It seems very strange to me that Barbados of all places cannot get some qualified engineer to give the necessary assistance to the Head of the Department of Highways and Transport. I say this quite seriously; I am not voting for this Address merely as a political sop; this Address is more serious than honourable members who vote for it may think. It is not a question of just voting for the Address and saying that something is being done; this is the most serious Address

which will have been passed by this House for this session. (Cheers). Day after day men and women are asking you to give them work and it is the duty of the Government to provide the necessary work for these people. Before I sit down, I repeat that it is not a question of merely passing this Address and sitting on all sorts of committees; the people expect the Government to start work immediately because you can start to canalize the Constitution River. Nobody can fool anybody else that you cannot start this work immediately. That is to be dry-packed. When the Resolution came before this House asking for money to be granted to the Rehabilitation Committee, I sounded this note but honourable members did not seem to appreciate that this work could be done immediately. I have much pleasure in supporting this Address with the amendment as proposed by the honourable senior member for Christ Church, that will cover the building of schools, churches, laying of water mains or anything that can be started upon immediately to provide employment for the people of this island.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable junior member for St. Philip accepting this amendment?

Mr. GARNER: I accept the amendment of the honourable senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member accepting the amendment of the honourable senior member for St. Peter?

Mr. GARNER: No Sir.

Mr. BLACKMAN: It has been said during the course of this debate that the work of canalizing the Constitution River should be done immediately. I happen to be one of those who do not think that this work should be started at once for these reasons. I think that a letter has been received stating that a harbour engineer can be obtained in a very short space of time and the Constitution River is one of the places—in fact, there is in the island now an engineer who prefers the Constitution River to any of the other places chosen for the harbour scheme. I am feeling that if this is one of the three places chosen for the harbour scheme and a qualified engineer is of that opinion, we should not start to canalize this River at once. I think that we should wait until we have a definite opinion as to whether we should put the Harbour here or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that would be a matter for the Government to deal with when they are considering the Address.

Mr. RAMSAY: I was just reading this Address as laid on the Table of the House and it seems to me that an overwhelming amount of stress is put on casual labour. However, quite a lot of good can be done—artisans, carpenters, masons, and others would find work in the building of schools. I was wondering if the amendment of the honourable senior member for Christ Church could not be amplified. It is somewhat vague. We are laying stress on casual labourers and I see no harm in including masons and carpenters of whom I am a part. (Laughter). Carpenters, masons and blacksmiths also have a right to live. I admonish the honourable junior member for St. Philip to accept the amendment of the honourable senior member for St. Peter and not to leave the matter vague. There is no one so blind as he who would not see. One can see where the wind is blowing. What harm is there in including carpenters and masons in this scheme? I am asking the honourable member to accept the amendment of the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. GARNER: I happen to be a man of action and not sentiment. When this Address was brought on the floor of this House, no rain had fallen and people were in dire need of work as they are to-day. I am not going in for any long-term policy which is the policy of the Education Department. As regards the building of schools, the Education Department would have to tell the Government how many schools they want and by the time that plans are sent down, the people would have died for starvation. This is a matter of action; there is no honourable member who can play politics better than I can; but this is not a question of playing politics because the people are hungry and they want work. I accept the amendment of the honourable senior member for Christ Church because he has suggested the addition of "any other projects that might immediately relieve unemployment" and does not mention anything specifically; but when you talk about building schools, it takes time to prepare plans and that hinges on the policy of the Education Department. I meant business when I brought in this Address because there are those who are depending on me to see them through and this Address is to carry out my promise to these people.

At this point the visitors to the House cheered and Mr. SPEAKER asked them to leave the House.

After a pause,

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to make an appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that this appeal will not fall on deaf ears. You might not have been aware of this, but there are many visitors to this gallery, people who were more or less led to believe that a matter of importance to them would be discussed to-day. It is therefore only human to expect that they would be present and that they would show some emotion. Visitors to this House must understand that they are here on sufferance and they must not show their feelings. I am therefore appealing to you, Mr. Speaker, to rescind the decision which you have taken earlier and instruct the Marshal or such other officers who are present to preserve order, to let the visitors in the gallery know that if they remain silent they are more than welcome to the debates. I am appealing to you, Sir, on behalf of the people and on behalf of this House to rescind you decision and I am sure from what I know of you that this appeal will not fall on deaf ears.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am glad to be in a position to say that your Honour has been kind enough to accede to the request almost in anticipation of its being made by the honourbale junior member for the City.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to let honourable members know that the Rules of the House are what they are and I will have to carry them out. The business of this House has been interrupted all through the afternoon but at the request of honourable members I will not carry the matter any further. However, in future I must find it possible to carry on the business of the House without the interruption which has been taking place.

Mr. COX: I am in complete agreement with the Address sponsored by the honourable junior member for St. Philip. I would like to say authoritatively that, much to the disappiontment of our visitors, there is not a single member of this House with any interest whatsoever in the working classes of this island, who would oppose anything which is in the interest of those people. The visitors were misled into thinking that this Address would have met with opposition. When the honourable senior member

for St. Philip asked at the last meeting of this House that this Address be made the first Order of the day, that was unanimously agreed to. That showed the willingness of honourable members to have the Address passed. I will not go all over this Address because I am in agreement with it wholeheartedly ever since, not only now. I want to deal specifically with the question of roads. I notice that in spite of the fact that so much has been said about the ten-year Plan, no provision whatsoever has been made in this Plan for the repair of the tenantry roads. No allocation, so far as funds are concerned, has been made in connection with the repair of these roads. Why I speak so strongly on this question of roads is on account of the fact that, as honourable members will remember, since 1944 I have been trying to get the Government to realise that the people who live in areas where the roads are privately-owned are a part of the community and they contribute to the taxation of the colony. The Government should not say: "This is your private property and if I repair these roads I will increase the value of your property." I say that these people pay taxes and it is disgraceful to see that the local bodies which collect these taxes have allowed these roads to remain in such a dilapidated condition. The Central Government therefore has to be forced to repair these roads. I can assure you that now it has been raining there are many people who have to go through mud and water in order to get to and from their homes. That state of affairs should not exist. On many occasions I have spoken with the late Governor in connection with these roads and he has told me that he was more than sympathetic with the people but he could not find people to carry on the work. However, in speaking with the Colonial Secretary and the Assistant Colonial Secretary I found out that the Government feels that it is in the interest of these people to repair their own roads and they claim that they do not collect any *ad valorem* taxes from these people. That is not right because even if they do not collect direct taxation from these people, it cannot be said that they do not collect any taxation because the majority of the people pay *ad valorem* taxes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not opposing the Address.

Mr. COX: Not at all. I am dealing with what has been said in the ten-year Plan.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not dealing with the ten-year Plan.

Mr. COX: I am dealing with the question of roads and forcing the Government to do somehing immediately because no provision has been made with regard to these roads in the ten-year Plan. As far as the canalization of the Constitution River is concerned, I remember bringing that to the notice of the Government since 1944. Anyone who knows anything about this River will realize that the avenue is too small to accommodate the flow of water which passes through it and when it rains the people are washed away, so to speak. I feel that the Government must take immediate steps so as to relieve the situation. It has been said, and it is true, that unemployment is rampant and since we have been disappointed with regard to the quota of workers for employment in the United States of America, we know how serious the position is. The crop has been a short one and that makes the labour question more difficult. I feel that the Head of the administration is willing to do anything that lies in his power to assist in improving the conditions existing among the people of this colony. I feel that when this Address is passed with all this unanimity this afternoon, the Government will do all that lies in their power to relieve the situation because we all know how critical it is. I would like in conclusion, to express the hope that members of this House will try to lead the people right rather than lead them wrong.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should just like to make a few observations. Apparently the honourable junior member for St. Philip has, at long last, hit upon a method — I am not saying what it is — of getting measures which he introduces passed by this House. I can only say that it is regrettable that he did not hit upon this method before, because one or two other measures might also have been passed. There has been so much remarkable unanimity on the passing of this Address to-day that I shall not be surprised to hear in the near future that everyone who supports the Address had actually brought it on the floor of the House. This Address should have been passed in half an hour; there is nothing of a controversial nature in it. As a matter of fact, many, if not all of the schemes proposed here have been proposed or accepted in principle by the Government and it is only a question of when they would be put into operation. When I was a boy at school going over the railway bridge at River Road they were talking about canalizing the Constitution River, and successive Governments have been talking about it and agreeing that it should be done. Even the St. Michael's Vestry have agreed that it should be done, but if we had not thought of this method of getting it done immediately, probably my children will be going to school and we would still hear promises being made to have it done. There are a number of things projected in this Address. The suggestion has been put forward that the building of schools should be added to the list of projects contained here and on the face of it, there should not be any objection to that; but, as the honourable junior member for St. Philip has pointed out, all these schemes could be put into operation immediately. When it comes to the erection of schools, however, that is bound up with the educational policy of the island as to where we will put more schools and the type of schools to be erected. In our view, the erection of schools cannot be made a matter of any Address and I think that we would be well advised to support the amendment made by the honourable senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER: That amendment has been accepted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is no reason why we should attempt to insert in this Address anything which might tend to hold up the putting into operation of the schemes proposed here, and I think that the amendment moved by the honourable senior member for Christ Church is general enough to cover any suggestions which might be advanced by any other member of this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: An amendment has been moved that the following be added after Item (e)—

Mr. LEWIS: Before the question is put, I should just like to say that this problem of unemployment is a very pressing one and I know that it is agitating the mind of every thoughtful member of this community. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has got together some items which he assures us can be entered upon immediately and my only concern is whether, strictly speaking, that is so. I sincerely hope that it is so; but the honourable senior member for St. Michael has said that sometime in 1944 he suggested the canalization of the Constiution River and in his Address at the opening of the Legislature on the 30th of November, 1944, no less a person than the Head of the administration made mention of it. I find it strange that nothing has been done about it and I sincerely hope that the work can be commenced immediately. Mention has also been made about the repair of the Wharf walls; well, money has been voted for a long time to repair these walls and nothing

has been done about it. (Mr. CRAWFORD : The Government has said that it cannot be done before November). The honourable senior member for St. Philip seems to think that this is opposition to this Address but I am merely pointing out that these things have been talked about and nothing has been done about them.

Mr. CRAWFORD : All I was saying is that the Government has sent a notice to the Press explaining that the work cannot be started before November.

Mr. LEWIS : The Government has sent down plans for putting down a particular kind of Wharf walls and since then the Director of Public Works has gone to England and he must have done something about it. As far back as the 22nd May, 1944, there was an Address dealing with the construction of the East Coast road and they have plans, sketches and everything they want in connection with that. I hope that this work can be started because the 22nd May, 1944, is a long time ago and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has been asking that something be done about this matter but nothing has been done about it. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Philip knows what he is saying when he says that these projects can be started immediately. It is a fact that the Department of Highways and Transport cannot undertake this road-making and if it is felt that road-making is essential for the relief of unemployment, the giving of this work to people who can do it on contract must be considered; because if the honourable junior member for St. Philip takes this Address to Government House and lets the Head of the Administration know that you are depending upon the Government Department to do this work, it will never be done. I am supporting wholeheartedly such a project as the erection of a fish market at Oistin. Nothing has been done about that and I would not like to be a party to-day to lead the unemployed into feeling that these things can be done or that if this Address is passed something will be done immediately. If the plans are not going to be pigeonholed and this work is going to be put into operation, I pass this Address wholeheartedly and give it my blessing; but these things have been talked about for too long. I feel that when the honourable junior member for St. Philip takes this Address up to Government House, he has to augment it with all the enthusiasm he possesses; he has to point out that while some of these things are not new they are very urgent and we are not going to tolerate the delay under which we have had to sit down before. The erection of district markets in Bridgetown was another matter which was mentioned in the same Address to the Legislature on the 30th of November, 1944. I hope that I am doing today something which is going to bring relief immediately to the unemployed, but, unfortunately, I am not fully convinced that this Address is going to do that. I feel that we will have to back up this Address with something else.

Mr. SPEAKER : I will put the question that the words "The building of Schools" be added at the beginning of paragraph (f). Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows :—

Ayes : DR. WILSON, MESSRS LEWIS, BRANCKER, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, F. L. WALCOTT, BLACKMAN, TALMA, and DR. CUMMINS —11.

Noes: MESSRS. CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES and S. A. WALCOTT — 5.

Mr. SPEAKER : The question has been decided in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye", and five honourable members voting "No". The question now is that this Address as amended do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The Address as amended was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER : I will ask the honourable junior member for St. Philip, the honourable senior member for St. James and the honourable senior member for St. Peter to present this Address.

Mr. GARNER : As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. SPRINGER : I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 24th day of June, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House until Tuesday next, the 24th day of June, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.