

## THE

## House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 27th April, 1948.*

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

*Present:*

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (Speaker), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, C. E. TALMA, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, and V. C. GALE.

Prayers are read.

## MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 20th April, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

## DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Highway Commissioners for the parish of St. James for the half year ended 31st March, 1948.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

## PAPERS LAID.

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

Post offices advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 31st March, 1948.

Annual Report of the Department of Science and Agriculture for the year 1946-47.

Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the Year 1948-49.

Report of the Committee set up by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to consider the Report submitted by the Social Welfare Officer on the Old Age Pension system and its administration.

## NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of £520 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of alterations to the offices at present occupied by the Colonial Secretary, the Department of Education and the Public Works Department, and of the office hitherto occupied by the Labour Department.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to place the sum of £1,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to obtain expert advice regarding the establishment of a cotton spinning and knitting industry in Barbados.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of £380 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay full salary, cost of living and other allowances, and travelling expenses to a male and female public officer during a six-month period of training in probation work with the local probation officers.

Messrs. MOTTLEY and CRAWFORD enter the House and take their seats.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1947 (1947-28).

Mr. TALMA: Bill to amend and consolidate the law of this Island relating to the Registration of Marks on Merchandise and for the protection of the same.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to make provision for the welfare and the safety of the community in cases of hurricanes and earthquakes.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1898 (1898-2).

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has been given earlier to-day.

## BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1947 (1947-28) is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to amend and consolidate the laws of the Island relating to the registration of marks on merchandise and for the protection of the same is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, a Bill to make provision for the welfare and safety of the community in cases of hurricanes and earthquakes is read a first time.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1898 (1898-2) is read a first time.

#### CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. MAPP) is appointed Chairman of Committees for the day's sitting.

#### 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. MAPP being in the Chair.

#### RESOLUTION TO MEET COST OF INQUIRY INTO THE SYSTEM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. ADAMS: I propose to take Resolution No. 2 first, that is, to resume the debate on the passing of a Resolution to place the sum of £2,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of an enquiry into the system of local Government in Barbados.

The CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when this matter was being discussed, the senior member for St. Philip was speaking when the interruption took place but the honourable member is not in his place.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—On the last occasion you allowed the junior member for St. Andrew a certain amount of latitude in the course of his speech which, I hope, you will allow me in the course of my reply. In his remarks he said that the few small shopkeepers in St. Andrew paid trade tax but on the licensed lorries at Bruce Vale Factory none is paid. I was surprised to hear him say that because he knows that that matter has been threshed out by the lawyers. As long as lorries are attached to Factories which keep books, they are not rated separately and I thought that he would have been that. He also said that he was amazed at my remarks on this Resolution and I presume that he was referring to remarks which I made about the breaking up of cliques at these Vestries and their subsidiary Boards. That is certainly something which I would like to see take place. The other day a very unfortunate thing happened in St. Andrew. The junior member for St. Andrew and his son are members of the Sanitary Board in that parish and the honourable member went so far as to propose increases of salaries for the Chief Inspector, the Assistant Inspector and the two sub-inspectors in sums of \$10, \$5, \$10 and \$2 respectively and he was successful in getting them agreed to. Those are the sort of things which as I have said, I would like to see come to an end. I thank you, Sir, for allowing me the latitude to make that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution:—

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman!

The CHAIRMAN: I hope honourable members will not wait until I get midway in putting the question and then rise to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am supporting this Resolution because I think it will serve a very useful purpose. To my mind it is long overdue. Our system of local Government is very old and there is much to be desired in respect of changes. There are those of us who agree that it does not necessarily mean that any change from the present set-up to a Mayor and Corporation or Borough Council or Town Council will be any more perfect than the present system but in view of the fact that it gives greater opportunities to members of local bodies to improve the social amenities which are so necessary in the several parishes, it is obvious to those of us who serve on Vestries that such an enquiry is necessary and, therefore, we will support this Resolution wholeheartedly. As I said, as old as Barbados is, so is the Vestry system; it has served its purpose and I suppose that until it is changed it will continue to serve its purpose. I feel that when this enquiry is made, together with the various amendments to the local Statute relative to health and things of that nature, a lot could be done to improve existing conditions. I do not think I should say any more than to let it be known that I am not supporting this Resolution purely with the idea that if an enquiry of this sort should result in the scrapping of the present system and the bringing into being of a new up-to-date system, that that new system will necessarily be a perfect one, because we appreciate what happens from time to time in the neighbouring colonies where there is this modern set-up, so to speak.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am going to support this Resolution because I think it is just as well that we have somebody from outside on this occasion with, perhaps, fresher ideas about local government than most of us have and who would be able to look at our local government from a fresh and unbiased angle. We do not have to worry about the policy of the Vestries if we are not in favour of their policy because anything can be done by means of legislation. We do not know what the expert is going to recommend in this instance but that does not matter because he is not in power to change the law. It would be interesting to have the idea of the expert in regard to the financial phase of local government. As you know, employers of local government institutions—Vestries and so on—are paid not so much on account of the services they render but they are paid in accordance with the financial ability of the particular parish. You may have persons working in two different parishes, a wealthy parish like St. Michael and a poor parish like St. Lucy, and they may be working equally as hard but it is impossible for the poor parish to pay its employees adequate salaries because of its limited finances. Although the employees of the poor parish may be doing first-class work, yet their remuneration is limited to the slender pocket of that poor parish. I feel that a recommendation in connection with the system of financing the parochial institutions is something which we would welcome from this expert and which may be useful for us to act upon, so as to get rid of this anomaly of an individual who is working in a well-to-do parish and who, perhaps, is not working as hard as another individual in a poor parish, being paid a higher salary. Any recommendation he might make in regard to the financing of local government should be more than welcome to all of us, Vestrymen.

Mr. COX: Before you put the question, Sir, I would like to say that I am indeed glad to see that the Government has taken a step such as this because

needs to be drastically antiquated Vestry system in this country. There are many things which we have mentioned to justify the step that the Government has taken when this question was before the House. Honorable members were thoroughly conversant with the system of local Government and I like to say that if those members tell me and if they know that they have not—although some people's best is better than nothing at all—if they know they are honest in their dealings and if they know the Vestries are run in the interest of the community rather than in the interest of a few individuals, I am definitely sure that they will welcome the change like an enquiry. One of the things that strikes me most is the question of taxation. Take, for instance, the question of taxing land. For years land has been taxed so much per acre. The peasant's small plot, it is admitted by the same vestrymen, does not give the same yield as the large plantation and, as a result, he does not receive the same price per ton of canes as the large plantation owner receives, yet the same tax is laid on that peasant's plot as is laid on the large plantation owner's land. If it is admitted that the peasant's plot does not give the same yield as the plantation owner's land gives, then in fairness to the peasant there should be a graded system of taxation because you tax a property according to yield or return. That is one of the questions which need going into and I hope that it will be the first and foremost question which the expert will go into when he comes. The method of paying out sums of money by these Vestries and their subsidiary Boards also needs going into. I do not want to be offensive but anybody who knows the history of the various Boards connected with the Vestries know the malpractices that go on at them and I feel that it is time that something should be done to put a stop to such malpractices. Another question is that of giving relief to certain destitute people. Only last week I was in the parish of St. Peter and I was struck when in the course of a conversation with a woman she told me that she was the mother of ten children; that her husband died two years ago and that the Board of Guardians of that parish gave her 12 cents per week for those children for two weeks and stopped! That woman remains with her ten children and gets nothing from the parish. All those acts are serious injustices to these unfortunate people and, therefore, I feel that an enquiry should result in strong and drastic changes if we are to keep abreast of modern times. I feel, like some of us who are supporting this Resolution, that the time has long passed when a change in our local set-up is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SYMONDS entered the House while Mr. Cox was speaking and took his seat.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £2,099 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the service of the colony as set out in the schedule. Honourable members will see from the schedule that there are six Departments for which this money is required. The amounts of £400 and £7,500 which were provided in the Estimates for 1947-48 for Incidentals and Drawbacks (General) respectively under Head, Cus-

toms, have proved to be insufficient and additional amounts of £60 and £1,200 respectively are required. As regards the Head, Legislature, more has been spent for refreshments and incidentals than was provided and additional sums of £105 and £30 respectively are required. The cost of some of the new motor vehicles for the Police exceeds the estimated cost quoted at the time the orders were placed and a further sum of £300 is required for motor transport. Travelling expenses in connection with the Government Industrial Schools have been increased owing to the increased rates of travelling allowance authorised by the Travelling Allowance (Amendment) Regulations, 1948, and a further sum of £14 is required to meet these expenses to the 31st March, 1948, and finally an additional £210 is needed to meet expenses in the form of allowance in lieu of rations to the staff of the Lunatic Asylum when on leave. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I should like to draw attention to Head, Police, and to enquire whether policemen who drive these motor vans are transferred from the Land Police to the Harbour Police to do duty in the latter capacity and vice versa. I understand that that is being done and I should like to know whether it makes for efficiency because if these policemen who drive these vans are transferred to the Harbour Police you may in process of time have people driving them who do not have the necessary experience to deal with them.

Mr. ADAMS: I promise the honourable member that I will make the necessary enquiry from the Commissioner of Police and pass on the information to him or to the Committee.

Mr. COX: I should like to make a few brief remarks on Head, Legal Departments (b) Other Charges, and Head, Medical Departments (3) Lunatic Asylum. I will take the former first. This additional sum of £130 is to be paid to jurors and marshals at Grand Sessions, etc. and I would like to know whether in view of the fact that these rates were fixed in the 19th century, let us say, the Government intends to increase them and when does the Government propose to do so. As regards the allowance to the staff of the Lunatic Asylum in lieu of rations when on leave I think that all other honourable members will agree that an allowance of 2/- per day is not sufficient to-day for this purpose. I think that this rate was fixed in 1944 and this is 1948 and everyday the cost of living is going up and up. I think all of us know how far 2/- would go. Honourable members must admit that 2/- is totally insufficient to keep an individual for a day when he is on leave. I believe that this rate of allowance is based upon what the Department estimates it would cost per day to feed an attendant but it should be realised by the Government that when these attendants are off-duty they have to provide for themselves and I am sure that it would take a greater amount to provide for them individually than if they were provided for collectively. I remember that late last year when I was a member of the Hospital Board, that Board decided to increase the ration allowance for nurses from 2/- to 2/6 per day. That, Sir, I think should be applicable to the attendants at the Lunatic Asylum and I am hoping that the Government will realize that 2/- per day is insufficient and will increase it, if not to 3/-; at least to 2/6.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am wondering about this item, motor transport, for the Police Department.

The estimate of £4,400 which was provided for the purpose has been exceeded and I am wondering if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can give us more information than he was able to give us when we were discussing the mileage which these motor vans give. (Mr. Adams: It is worse, if anything). I hear the *sotto voce* remark that the position is worse. If that is so, I should like to know whether these new vans are of the same type as the others which have proved so expensive as far as their upkeep is concerned. Of course, as far as the item, jurors and marshals at Grand Sessions, etc., is concerned, I am waiting to see if the senior member for St. Michael will receive a reply to his enquiry as to the remuneration of jurors and marshals at Grand Sessions because as you know, Sir, I have been asking questions for the last six years as to whether the Government is aware of the present scale of fees to jurors. The replies have been that the Government is aware of the scale of fees but apparently it does not see the advisability of increasing these fees. As I said, I would be glad to hear the reply to the enquiry of the senior member for St. Michael because it may enable me to relieve the Government of finding a reply to my question which has been put since last October.

Mr. ADAMS: As regards the last remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down, my recollection is that a reply has been sent down, or is on its way, to the question about the remuneration to jurors and marshals at Grand Sessions. I am relying on my memory—I am not speaking officially—which sometimes for one reason or another is not always accurate but my recollection is that attention is going to be drawn to a former reply of the Government to this question and the Government is probably likely to remind honourable members that just as in the case of voting at election time, this should be an honorary occupation and that if some allowance for the inconvenience and the necessity of finding refreshment in Bridgetown is made, jurors should not look upon it as a paying proposition to be a juror; they should not be out of pocket for travelling to town and having to buy refreshment in town. Honourable members must remember that however difficult it may be to satisfy or advise jurors on this point, they should be told bluntly and plainly “just as you should go and give your vote without expecting money, so you should go and serve your country as a juror in the Law Court without having to be paid,—except of course, a travelling allowance.” Some honourable members in the past have been somewhat afraid to tell their constituents plainly and bluntly “if you are citizens, you must expect to give something for nothing and two of those things are to give jury service and to go and vote”. But I frankly cannot remember the reply which is drawing attention to the Government’s previous policy on the point. As regards the question of the mileage which these motor vans give, I must apologize for not having obtained the necessary information but I have not had the time to go and see Colonel Duke in the matter. The explanatory note is, perhaps, not as extensive as it might be because as far as I have been made to understand, the sum of £4,400 which was provided in the Estimates is inadequate for two reasons (1) the actual cost of some of the new vehicles far exceeded the estimated cost which was quoted at the time the orders were placed and (2) some of the recently purchased vans do not give more than 10 miles to the gallon of petrol. It is for those reasons that this additional £300 is required to meet ex-

penditure under this item, end of the financial year 1947-48. We try to get over this difficulty. We try to get cles to give more mileage but we have to wait and after waiting to buy American vehicles and to the with comparatively poor mileage. I have in told unofficially that the Department has to obtain a few of the old type of vehicles but that the first lot of new vans were of the same type as the old ones. They were or less experimenting. Those were the only ones they could get at that time and they were trying them out to see what mileage they would give. As regards the ration allowance, that is one of the things on which we are expecting Commissioner Adams to report in a couple of weeks’ time at the latest. We were told, a month ago, that he was expecting to have his Report ready in three weeks’ time but we are expecting that within a week or so, it will be ready and allowance in lieu of rations is one of the things on which he is expected to advise us. I may remind honourable members that this is not, as far as my recollection goes, a general ration allowance added to salaries but it is a ration allowance which is given when the attendant cannot be actually at the institution; if he were on holiday he would still get a ration allowance as if he were on duty.

Mr. COX: I do not appreciate the remark of the senior member for St. Joseph about giving jurors satisfaction. I do not look at the matter as a question of giving jurors satisfaction. What I am saying is that a carpenter or a mason who may be working for \$2.40, per day may be summoned to attend the Court as a juror. The fee, I believe, which has been laid down since 1891 is 6/- per day and I am saying that that carpenter or mason who has to leave working for \$2.40 a day to attend the Court as a juror should be paid in addition to the 6/- the difference between that amount and the 10/- which he would have normally earned. After all, economics to-day are such that a man could not afford to lose 4/- a day. That has nothing to do with the pleasing of jurors or voters; it is simply common-sense. And we know some of the disadvantages to which these men are put when they are summoned to attend the Court. Very often they have to sleep away from their homes and in such cases they work day and night for the same fee. Give them, in addition, the difference between the amount of the fee and what they would normally earn. If they earn 10/- a day, pay them a fee of 10/- per day—I am not asking that they be paid \$3.00 a day, if they are earning 10/- a day, when they are summoned to attend the Court; but pay them 10/- a day otherwise they will be out of pocket and they can ill afford it.

Mr. BRANCKER: If one is to look at the matter from the standpoint which the honourable and learned member for St. Joseph has mentioned, that is, that jurors should regard it as an honour to assist the Crown in the administration of justice, one wonders why Judges should not be allowed to look at it from that point of view also because jurors are just as essential as Judges in the administration of justice. But perhaps the Judges are not imbued with such noble sentiments as the jurors are supposed to have. If you look at it from the standpoint that jurors should not be out of pocket, in respect of travelling and food, then perhaps the Government would agree that food and transportation cost more to-day than what they cost in 1891. If the fee of 6/8 a day which was allowed for food and travel was

considered to be adequate in 1891, then in my submission it cannot be regarded as adequate to-day and it should be increased, having regard to the increased cost of these items. I think the honourable member is carrying his suggestion too far, however loftily imbued one may be theoretically. And who is more deeply imbued and impregnated with lofty sentiments than the Ministers of the Gospel, the members of the Established Church, from the lowest to the highest? But they do not render their services for practically nothing; they are more eager than you, Sir, or I when it comes to monetary matters. A sitting of the Court of Grand Sessions in 1947 lasted six weeks and those men who served as jurors were taken away from their work for six weeks and were given remuneration at a rate which was regarded by the Legislature in 1891 as adequate. I agree with the senior member for St. Joseph when he said that we do not want service on the jury to be a paying proposition,—something whereby everybody would like to get the opportunity to serve on the jury because the remuneration is supposed to be handsome,—but it should be something which would be a normal compensation for the loss of time which they may have sustained. Sometimes if some of these jurors should miss the last bus which goes in the direction of their homes in remote parts of the island, they have to hire a car to take them to their homes and things such as that should be taken into consideration. The Jurors Act should be so amended that provision is made for cases like that. I hope that the reply which is now on its way gives the indication that the Government is alive to its responsibility to people who serve the Country to the great detriment to their domestic economy as they do now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Long before I had the opportunity of coming to this House, the junior member for St. Lucy was asking questions about the remuneration to jurors and lest it be thought that he is singing a solo I should like to join in the chorus. I listened very carefully to the senior member for St. Joseph who said that we should be at pains to remind our constituents that it is an honour to sit and hear that one of their brethren has wounded somebody else or had carried away something from somebody else and then to say whether that person is guilty or not. To my way of looking at it, it seems to me a greater honour to be elected by the people to sit at this table and make laws; to me it is the greatest honour to be elected to serve the people but I have never heard the honourable senior member for St. Joseph say that that is an honour. Any man who fights an election and loses it feels it. You cannot argue in one breath that service to your country as a representative of the people, which is the greatest honour, must be paid for and in the same breath argue that gentlemen who can ill afford it must be out of pocket as the result of being required to sit and hear a murder trial and must regard it as an honour to do so. I cannot agree to that. All of us will agree that conditions have changed so considerably since the Act was passed in 1891, that the remuneration to jurors should be increased. I understand from the senior member for St. Joseph that the Government has under consideration the question of increasing it and we should be at pains to point out that it should be increased. I have been continually arguing that it is an honour to come in here as a member of this House and that members should not be paid for services of this nature.

Mr. ADAMS: The senior member for the City made one or two fallacious remarks in the course of his speech. A man may be a juror and be summoned

to attend the Court in that capacity once in 5 or 6 years. Even if honourable members do not meet often enough, they meet normally once a week; so that there is no comparison between attendance at the Court as a juror and attendance in this House as a member of it. I repeat that the whole idea of jury service and of voting is a duty which every citizen should perform. I myself think that there should be compulsory voting, that a man should be compelled to go and vote because he should take part in the government of his country and, similarly, a juror should go and give service sometimes, even though he may be out of pocket as a result. If you say that a carpenter who earns \$2.40 a day should be paid a fee at the rate 10/- per day when he attends the Court as a juror, where are you going to draw the line? Suppose Mr. H. O. Emtage or the senior member for St. Andrew were called upon to serve as jurors are you going to pay them at the rate of \$500 a day? You have to be rational and fix some figure which would not hit somebody in the lower bracket too hard but as soon as you are going to fix the remuneration on the basis of what the juror earns per day, you have to draw the line. Some people's day's pay is such that there would not be sufficient money in the Treasury to pay them for their services as jurors. The junior member for St. Thomas, the present Chairman of Committees, asked whether the Government would consider the advisability of revising the scale of compensation to witnesses at the Court of Grand Sessions and the answer is "Yes." The same honourable member also asked whether the Government will take steps to give effect to the revised scale and the answer is also "Yes"; so that the Government is not averse to increasing the scale of compensation because what was good enough in 1891 is not good enough to-day. But do not let us overdo it by compensating people on the basis of their day's pay. If we do that, we should have to obtain a loan from the U.S.A. to pay some of these jurors. Questions have been asked by the junior member for St. Lucy about conditions regarding the attendance of jurors at the Court of Grand Sessions; at a recent sitting of the Court of Grand Sessions a petition was presented to the Acting Chief Judge from jurors and the Government is considering that petition too. Let us bear in mind that there are certain things we have to do as a matter of duty otherwise we are parasites and not citizens. We must not expect the poorer element to be out of pocket but a line has to be drawn somewhere and it is not a question of compensating a juror for what he might have earned on the particular day.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want to add a few words to those which have been expressed by some honourable members who feel that the scale of fees for jurors is very inadequate. As I see it, it is not a question at all of the poor man. I think those who have been serving for many years, and will continue to serve, as jurors are looking forward to some relief—substantial relief—in this matter. It is not a question of meeting them one-quarter of the way and then asking them, as the senior member for St. Joseph is now asking them, to make a further sacrifice towards the working of this country when so many of them, year in and year out, have been sacrificing their lives through lack of opportunity for steady and continuous employment; it has been a source of bewilderment and dismay to the bulk of the members of this community who serve as jurymen. Therefore, when you take a man away from his home for five weeks, as is very often done, to sit as a juror at Grand Sessions—perhaps during the crop season, the very period in which he may be privileged to work steadily and to

which he is looking forward because during nine months of the year he has been unemployed—you get complaints all the time. A petition has quite recently been presented by jurors, and some of them have spoken to me, in respect of loss of time which they sustain. Why should the poorest men in the State be called upon always to make the greatest sacrifice? It is true that you cannot pay, as the senior member for St. Joseph has told us, \$500.00 a day to any juror but certainly there is no reason why the working man in this country, when called away from his employment during the crop season or any other season, should be paid less than 10/- per day and, therefore, when this matter is gone into and recommendations are made I intend to criticize the system if any cheeseparing method is adopted in the payment of hardworking men who are called away from their homes to serve the State for 5 or 6 weeks at a time. To compare these with men going to vote is no comparison because a man may leave his home, go to another parish and vote and return home in two or three hours' time. There is no comparison between giving up time to go and vote and giving up time week after week in order to serve as a juror. As regards the ration allowance for the staff of the Lunatic Asylum when on leave I am aware of the fact that there is dissatisfaction at the Lunatic Asylum over this allowance. I am a member of the Advisory Committee down there and I am aware that there is dissatisfaction over this allowance and it is because of the fact that many of the attendants who used to sleep at the Mental Hospital now under the new arrangements, have been required to sleep out. The 2/- is absolutely inadequate to provide meals for each of those attendants when they sleep out and a further point is that this allowance is included in the computation of their pensions. An injustice is being done to them, not only as far as the daily allowance is concerned but also as regards the pensions which they hope to receive when they retire. I hope that something is going to be done in the matter of this ration allowance and that my little contribution to this discussion will help to bring about an equitable settlement when a settlement is made.

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not want to delay the passing of this Resolution but I should like to say that I agree with the senior member for St. Joseph that we should do everything possible to prevent jury service from becoming a professional job. I think it is the duty of a citizen to serve on the jury if called upon to do so. Of course, he should be compensated with sufficient money to enable him to buy sufficient lunch but on no account should this be made a job. Some honourable members seem to regard this as a means of relieving unemployment and I have even heard a remark about making it pensionable. Do not let us make this a job. I do not think that it is asking a person too much to serve on the jury in Barbados.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Chairman reports the passing of two Resolutions, and the postponement of one, in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the two Resolutions which were passed in Committee of Supply are read a first and second time and are agreed to.

## PUBLIC OFFICERS LOAN AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to advance loans and pay travelling allowances to public officers required to travel for the due performance of their duties. When this Bill was being debated on the last occasion, the senior member for St. Philip moved, seconded by the junior member for St. Philip, that the further consideration of it be postponed and the senior member for St. Joseph was speaking when the interruption took place.

Mr. ADAMS: The point I was making was that, as the Government has been informed, there was some sort of fund from which loans could be made by the Colonial Postmaster to postmen to secure means of travelling for the performance of their duties and that inasmuch as the postmen were represented on the Whitley Council, the Government could hardly have imagined that their case had not been considered by the Council. But I supported the motion for the postponement in order that the Government might have the chance of communicating with the Whitley Council again in the matter of loans to postmen. As the honourable member in charge of the Bill will tell the House the Government has done that and the Whitley Council has stated that if there is any need to revise its recommendation it will so inform the Government and in that case it will be the easiest thing to include postmen in the schedule after it has been passed. The honourable member in charge will ask the House to pass the Bill as it is, although there may be other branches of the civil Service who ought to be included in the schedule and who may remind some member of the Whitley Council to draw the attention of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to the fact that they have been left out. That has happened since this Bill was brought down to this House. The Government forgot to include the Public Librarian who has to do a certain amount of work in the country districts and the Deputy Commissioner of Police and if any honourable member knows of any grievance on the part of a Civil Servant who should be included but has been left out, that officer can be added to the schedule subsequently without the passage of the Bill being held up indefinitely.

Mr. WILKINSON: With reference to the remarks of the senior member for St. Joseph, that point is covered, I think, by sub-paragraph (a) of Clause 4 of the Bill which states that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may make regulations to amend the first schedule to the Act by adding to or removing from the list of officers contained therein any officer. As regards the Regulations which are to be made I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to charge interest on these loans and, if so, at what rate. If not, it may be dangerous and rather unusual to lend money without charging any rate of interest whatsoever. In my opinion, it would be wise to charge a small rate of interest on loans made under this Act.

Mr. SYMMONDS: It has been suggested that the Government should follow the Whitley Council but I think that in this matter the Government should not wait on the Whitley Council's recommendations but as a wise parent looking out for its children, it should consider the needs of the employees of the various branches of the Service.

I see no reason why the cantoneers and lorry drivers, and roller drivers of the Department of Highways and Transport, the clerks of Police Courts in the country districts and other members of the Civil Service who come readily to my mind should not be provided for now instead of waiting on suggestions from the Whitley Council.

Mr. GALE: I should like to ask the Honourable member in charge of this Bill to explain what is meant by these words in sub-paragraph (d) of clause 4:—"prescribing and regulating the rates and conditions of payment of travelling allowances to officers under this Act" because only a short while ago we passed an Order increasing the travelling allowance rates for officers.

Mr. SPEAKER: That can be dealt with in the Committee stage. It has nothing to do with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: Relative to the point raised by the junior member for St. George I should like to ask this: Who can be the most competent authority to deal with the conditions of service, as far as government employees are concerned, than the Whitley Council? I would like to draw to the attention of the honourable member that the Whitley Council represents all government employees and deals with wages and everything else that affect their interests day in and day out. I refer not only to Civil Servants but to all grades whether they be in the top bracket or in the bottom bracket,—policemen and all other government servants, not those in any one particular branch of the Service; so that when that organization enquires into the needs and aspirations of government servants as a whole and does not see fit to include postmen in the schedule to this Bill, how can the members of the Governor-in-Executive Committee see fit to supersede the organization which is framed for the benefit of that group as well? That is the answer. Postmen and policemen are represented by that Whitley Council and if in the eyes of the Whitley Council they are not to be included, it is not left to us to see that they are included. But the schedule is subject to amendment from time to time and as far as postmen are concerned, they can be added if it becomes necessary to do so. We know that the six shillings per week which they get as travelling allowance is inadequate. We have been fighting for an increase of that amount for years and I think that the time has come when postmen should be supplied with bicycles by the Government. It would be absurd to suggest that a postman should have a motor car to deliver mails; in no part of the world does that happen but postmen should be supplied with bicycles by the Government and each postman should be given a reasonable amount to keep his bicycle in order. Everyone who has to travel to do government work should get travelling allowance and postmen have to travel day in and day out. They will be provided with bicycles in the not too distant future and will receive an amount to keep their bicycles in order.

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

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 are read and are agreed to.

Clause 3. Whenever it shall appear to the Governor-in-Executive Committee that the amount of travelling required for the due performance of his duties by an officer is such as would make necessary provision by such officer of adequate means of trans-

port, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may direct—

- (a) that any officer, who shall make application under this Act for an advance upon loan for the purpose of meeting the purchase cost of a motor vehicle, shall receive from the Public Treasury of the Island by way of advance upon loan such sum or sums of money not exceeding the maximum amount and subject to the conditions prescribed in Regulations made under this Act, as to the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall seem fit; and
- (b) that any officer shall receive in respect of travelling required for the due performance of his duties an allowance at the rates and subject to the conditions prescribed in Regulations made under this Act;

and the Colonial Treasurer shall and is hereby authorised to pay to any such officer any such sum or sums of money so directed to be paid on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to move that that be Clause 3 of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: This clause states: "Whenever it shall appear to the Governor-in-Executive Committee that the amount of travelling required for the due performance of his duties by an officer . . ." I should like the words "due performance of his duties" defined. Is it part of an officer's duties to get from his home to his office? Suppose an officer on his way to his work gets off a bus on which he is travelling and says, "I cannot walk to my office. I want a car." Would that be regarded as being in the course of the due performance of his duties?

Mr. BRANCKER: In regard to this clause I suggested on a previous occasion that a Bill of this sort should take in not only officers whose duties require them to travel by motor vehicles but also officers whose duties require them to travel by bicycles and I am going to suggest that the word "motor" in line 4 of sub-paragraph (a) be deleted, so that provision can be made for officers who use bicycles. There are many employees to whom \$75, the cost of a bicycle, does not matter much but it matters a great deal to employees such as cantoneers, supervisors, roller and lorry drivers. I beg to move that the word "motor" in line 4 of sub-paragraph (a) be deleted.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want to second that motion because I definitely feel that while the Government should give due consideration to the recommendations of the Whitley Council, wherever the Government has sufficient vision to see the need for the introduction of some measure of relief to hardworking Civil Servants, it should be done without waiting for a recommendation from the Whitley Council or any other body.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that it does appear to me that the use of the word "motor" suggests that the Whitley Council does not contemplate giving assistance to any employees in the Civil Service except those who have to travel by motor vehicles and, therefore, if we are suggesting now that all employees who have to travel should be given this assistance we would be well advised to delete the word "motor" as is suggested by the junior member for St. Lucy. It appears to me that although it has been claimed by the senior member for Christ Church that the Whitley Council represents all government employees yet the mere fact that there are so many omissions

shows that the Whitley Council does not display the interest it should in those employees in the lower branch of the Service. I am amazed to hear that it is not left to the Government to see that all its employees are included but that the Government is guided by the Whitley Council. That is interesting to me and I am sure it will be interesting to many other people to hear that the Government is guided by the Whitley Council which is not representative of all the members of the Civil Service, and which has shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that it does not give to the employees in the lower brackets the consideration and attention to which they are entitled. If we are now expressing the conviction that employees such as postmen and cantoneers of the Department of Highways and Transport and other lower paid employees should be assisted in this manner, it is our duty to make our desires unmistakably clear in the Bill before us, regardless of whether or not the Whitley Council has paid attention to it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not believe that a matter such as this needs so much ventilation. I do not believe that any one body, whether it be the Whitley Council or the Executive Committee or the House of Assembly, could see everything when it comes to deal with a particular matter. No one can claim infallibility. If the word "motor" was deleted, it would not preclude people from purchasing motor vehicles but would bring in those people who cannot afford even to buy a bicycle and have no money with which they can make a deposit. There can be no justification for assisting an officer who does transportation by means of a bicycle because the clause makes it clear that it is intended by this Bill to give help to those officers who have to use motor transport in the performance of their duties and, therefore, if the word "motor" was deleted it would interfere with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Surely honourable members should give the Government credit for as much a desire to help the poor employee who can buy only a bicycle; but can honourable members not see that to do that it will necessitate the drafting of a fresh Bill? Who is going to give third party insurance to the postman who uses a donkey cart for travelling? Nobody is forgetting the postmen and other employees in the lower bracket but this Bill ought to be passed as it is. I am submitting that it would be out of order to delete the word "motor" because it may possibly increase the spending which the Government may have to do and, therefore, would become a charge on the Treasury.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, — I do not know what will be your ruling on that point but if you should rule that the deletion of the word "motor" will, of necessity, create a charge on the Treasury, then I shall move that this Bill be referred back to the Executive Committee for them to reconsider this matter and send down an amendment which will include other employees who have not been included in the schedule, but who have been mentioned by certain honourable members. If you rule that my motion for the deletion of the word "motor" is out of order, then I shall move that you report progress and ask leave to sit again, in the hope that next week a Bill will come down in which provision is made for comprehensive assistance in transport. As regards the point about third party insurance, that comes under the second schedule to this Bill and when we are considering the schedules we will naturally make the consequential amendments. I admit that there is the possibility that the deletion of the word "motor" may create a charge on the Treasury and I had that in mind when I was making my motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking honourable members not to believe what the honourable member who has just sat down has said. The omission of employees in the lower bracket has not escaped the attention of the Government. The matter has been drawn to the attention of the President of the Civil Service Association and it may be necessary to draft and introduce another Bill for that purpose. It would be infinitely better to let those employees who travel by donkey and horse carts keep them than to give them bicycles but you cannot include them in this Bill. I give the honourable member the assurance that as quickly as possible a new Bill will be sent down to meet the case of an employee who may want to purchase a mule or a horse and cart to do his travelling. In the meantime I will ask honourable members to pass this Bill as it is.

Mr. WILKINSON: I seem to be supporting the Government to-day. I agree with the senior member for St. Joseph that this Bill was being awaited for years by some of the Civil Servants and we should not do anything to delay the passing of it. I believe it is a similar Bill to the one which has been passed in Trinidad and I am asking honourable members not to postpone it.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion which has been made by the junior member for St. Lucy is unconstitutional and I, therefore, rule it out of order.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—The Whitley Council is an admirable institution but it is top heavy. The more highly placed Civil Servants dominate the more lowly placed ones. One finds in the recommendations that this Whitley Council has paid much attention to those who are higher up and better off but very little attention has been paid to those who are lower down the ladder. Even if it were not as top heavy as it seems to be, we must not assume that it is infallible. One would rather get the impression that if any recommendation comes from the Whitley Council, the Government would say, "This has come from the Whitley Council", and thereby would give it infallibility which it does not deserve. The senior member for St. Joseph has suggested that inasmuch as attention has been drawn to this phase of the matter, the Government will introduce another Bill and I should like the honourable member to give the further assurance that that Bill would be sent down next week. I have been in this House too long not to know how Governments sit down on promises which they make. I shall not make the motion which I contemplated making, namely, that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again, simply because the assurance has been given that the Government is going to do something quickly in connection with those persons who are whole time employees in the Public Service and whose duties require them to have means of transport, whether it be a bicycle or a donkey cart. Everybody should be helped or none at all. It is always bad when we start off with the Labour Commissioner or the Commissioner of Income Tax or the Director of Education and make no provision for the officers in the lowest paid class.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I am pleased to hear the Government give us the assurance that it is going to pay some heed to this aspect of the matter to which we have drawn its attention and I am hoping that in future when Bills of this kind are prepared and sent to this House, it will not be necessary for members to make criticisms such as have been made in connection with this Bill. Continuously we find the Government sending Bills to this House forgetting altogether that the poor men in its employ who outnumber the others 100 to 1 require—I know somebody is going to tell me about land in Carrington Village

when I am doing my duty. I am surprised at the Leader of the House trying to silence me by telling me about Carrington Village when I am doing my duty—just as fair treatment as is given to the men in the highest paid class. There is always discrimination whenever the question of paying the lower class arises; they are left out and then you have to bring in a second Bill in their interest. I hope that this second Bill will be satisfactory and that next time the underprivileged will never be forgotten. I shall never fail to raise my voice in protest when they are omitted (Cheers).

Mr. TALMA: I would like to inform the honourable member who has just sat down and the junior member for St. Lucy that as far as the postmen and other employees in the lower bracket are concerned

the present Government feels as deeply about them as they feel and that they need have no apprehension as far as the lower paid employees are concerned.

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

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).

#### NO QUORUM—THE ADJOURNMENT.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: There not being a quorum present, this House stands adjourned until Tuesday next in accordance with the Rules.