

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th September, 1951.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), R. G. MAPP, O. T. ALLDER and L. E. R. GILL.

Prayers were read.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 7th, 14th and 21st August, respectively, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Mr ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, —I am commanded to lay the following Papers:—

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order 1951.

Post Office advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st July, 1951.

Mr. MILLER entered the House and took his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order, 1951" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 30th day of August, 1951, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS (for Mr. F. L. WALCOTT) Resolution to make it lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to the Vestry of the parish of St. George a parcel of land formerly part of Carmichael Plantation, situate at Ellerton in the parish of St. George and containing by admeasurement five acres, two roods for the purpose of establishing a playing field.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$40,020 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 23, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act, 1937, be now read a first time.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Messrs E. K. WALCOTT and HAYNES entered the House and took their seats.

RESOLUTION POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to postpone the first Resolution, a Resolution for the sum of \$480 in respect of a loan to Mr. A. L. King, as there is some doubt as to whether the money is needed.

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

PURCHASE OF MOTOR CAR FOR THE GOVERNOR'S USE

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is one to place the sum of \$7,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951—52, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951—52, No. 16, which form the schedule to this Resolution. As honourable members will see, this is a Resolution to carry into effect the wish of the House that, in addition to what we

did when considering the Governor's emoluments, we should purchase a car to be placed at the disposal of the Officer administering the Government. The Government enquired of local firms as to what would be the price of a suitable car and we were confronted with the prices of two types of cars : one was a "Humber" which happened to be cheaper than the other type and we decided that we would purchase this car. Conditions have changed considerably since we were given the prices of these cars; the price of the other type of car—the "Austin" was \$7,524, and the price of the "Humber" was \$7,200. Since then the prices of these cars have gone up and it is computed that the cheaper of these two cars will cost the sum of \$7,800, allowance having been made for contingencies including a possible increase in landed cost over the present quotation. If it should turn out that the other make of car can be obtained for less than the "Humber", naturally the Government will purchase that make of car. These are the only two types which would produce a car which is suitable for this purpose. Naturally, on state occasions the Governor would be wearing his hat and plumes, and so on, and the sum of \$12,000 has been mentioned as the cost of a car which would have to be specially high so as to accommodate the Governor's hat and plumes. The Government has decided not to ask for that great sum of money, and it is hoped that we would be able to make use of this "Humber" car without any inconvenience to the Officer administering the Government. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: I am quite in agreement with the principle of the Governor having this car, but my position is this; we have been told that it is the policy of the present Government that no expenditure is to be undertaken until the fiscal survey of the colony has been carried out. I feel that if that is their policy it should be maintained.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but he will go on that premise and go wrong. This Resolution is in the nature of emoluments; what the Government sticks to is that no new capital expenditure of a major kind is going to be undertaken until the fiscal survey is ready. As a matter of fact, the fiscal survey is ready and is under consideration in the sense that a report has been made. I wish the honourable member who is quite fairly putting his case, to remember that the principle of providing this car has been accepted, a token vote is there and it is only a question of finding out what that token vote of a dollar represents. I do not blame the honourable member for saying what he has said because he was not in the House when that token vote was passed.

Mr. HAYNES: I quite appreciate that a token vote in respect of this matter was passed, but my point is that whether it is a sum of \$7,800 or \$78,000 the principle is the same. I consider that this Resolution should be postponed until priorities are established, as we have been told in a Message which was sent to us from the Governor a few meetings ago. For that reason I cannot agree to the passing of this Resolution to-day.

Mr. GODDARD came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. ALLDER: On the last occasion when we discussed a Resolution of this kind I strongly opposed it and now the matter is before us again. On that occasion the Resolution was for \$7,200; a majority of this House reduced it by \$600 and now this Resolution still asks for \$7,800 which is \$1,200 more than what a majority of this House agreed to. It is a fact that the House is bound by any agree-

ment which it might make in respect of any matter, but the Resolution as agreed to by a majority of this House previously has been changed by the Administration, and since that is so I feel that we are not bound by this Resolution. I feel that this Committee should be free to discard this Resolution not only on the basis of its having been changed, but because the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has suggested that conditions have been considerably changed since we last discussed this matter. Not only have conditions changed as regards the prices of cars, but also as regards the various necessities of life; I feel therefore that we should control the purse strings of the colony to an even greater extent than on the last occasion when we discussed this Resolution. It is only yesterday when I saw in the Press that the prices of food have been increased and the question is whether we, as a House comprised as we are, should vote this money to purchase this car for the Head of the Administration. It is especially noticeable that the Head of the Administration already has two cars which he has purchased to his own taste and I cannot see where, in this economic crisis through which this island is passing, you should ask the Head of the Administration to discard the two cars which he already has—cars which one would consider as two of the best which could be found in the island. It is also noticeable that some items which have been asked for by members of this House—items which would have benefited the masses to a great extent by way of a higher standard of living—have not been granted. The Administration headed by the Governor have often told us that they cannot find any money with which to carry out schemes which have been brought forward, and there are a few items in point. The members of the Unestablished Staff of the Government have been forced to work for a paltry 6/- a day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member not to stray from this Resolution. This Resolution is for the purchase of this car and do not let us go to anything else.

Mr. ALLDER: I am only referring to the needs of the various Government servants and questioning whether we should embark on expenditure of this sort.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the honourable member stick to this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I am considering whether I should lend my support to the passing of this Resolution or whether I should register my objection to it.

Mr. ADAMS: This is merely a question of how much money should be voted for the purchase of this car; there is no difference between this matter and what we have passed in the Estimates when we put down a token vote until the amount has been decided upon. But it is unthinkable for a Legislature to pass something in principle and then discuss it again.

Mr. ALLDER: My contention is that we did not agree to the acceptance of this Resolution in particular and I feel that I am entitled to consider the possibilities of my being able to agree to this increase. As I was saying, those employees of the Government have been working for 6/- a day—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing the honourable member to stray from this Resolution: he must speak on this Resolution whether he votes for or against it.

Mr. ALLDER: I have noticed from the Estimates about 2½ years ago that the cost of running Government House is something like \$27,000 a year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again that does not concern this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: On what am I entitled to speak?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On this Resolution for the purchase of this car.

Mr. ALLDER: I am speaking on this Resolution. If a Resolution affects any Department at all you have the right to discuss the running of the whole Department. I beg to suggest that I am within my right to draw attention to the cost of running Government House 2½ years ago.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am quite willing to sit and hear the honourable member speak on this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I cannot stick exclusively to this particular Resolution unless I take into consideration the whole Department in which this money is going to be spent.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. This Resolution is going to increase the running expenses of Government House at least for this year by \$7,800, and then in future years there will be the question of maintaining a State car. Are we not therefore entitled to refer to the general cost of running Government House? All we are doing today is adding to the cost of running Government House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member making a speech?

Mr. CRAWFORD: You were a little slow in answering my question so I thought I would elucidate the point.

Mr. ALLDER: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that 2½ years ago the cost of running Government House was in the vicinity of \$27,000 per year, and at that time the present Party in power did not have a majority in this House. Since the present Party in power has a majority in this House the cost of running Government House has increased to \$40,000. I want to say that the increases given to Government employees in the lower brackets have not been commensurate with the high cost of living: it was only about two years ago when a small cost of living bonus was added to the wages of the members of the Unestablished Staff, the Police, School Teachers, Nurses and so on. Since then the price of essential commodities have been increased several times and no consideration has yet been given to these employees by way of another additional bonus allowance. There have been several occasions during this year when Resolutions were brought down asking for money to be spent on Government House: provision was requested for curtains, cutlery, furniture, servants' wages and so on, and it was given. It is a burning shame for us to sit here and increase the cost of running Government House which one Officer of the Government enjoys, and at the same time we refuse to consider the demands made on behalf of other Government servants. Besides that, we are facing conditions which, if allowed to go on, might bring about some catastrophe as regards the stability of this colony. We have a condition where men walk about daily actually begging.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not in this Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I am giving some consideration to the question as to whether the means of this colony can afford this expenditure; I cannot close my eyes to the apparent fact of big men having to be reduced to a state of living on charity because of the unemployment situation. Even those who are employed and who have been able to obtain increased wages cannot keep body and soul together due to the fact that increases in prices have been allowed to soar; therefore I feel it is very expedient for us to refrain from spending money in unnecessary channels for the benefit of a few, and see if you cannot finance projects from which dozens of our able-bodied men would be able to get work so as to provide them-

selves with necessities. I have read about two weeks ago that the President of Brazil was to be given a car, but you cannot compare a place like Brazil which has its timber forests and its large manufacturing concerns, with a small colony like Barbados where scarcely 30% of the population is permanently employed and where you have a lot of parasites—people reducing themselves to beggars. I do not think that the car which we want to import for the Head of the Administration will be of the class of the \$11,000 car which the President of Brazil will have, but it will cost a few thousand dollars less than that.

I cannot help observing the situation which is in existence at the Hospital where you have 53 children ill and 23 cots in which to put them. I am sure that this \$7,800 would go far towards reducing the congestion which exists at the Hospital. If one child has marasmus and another has T.B. and both have to be placed in the same cradle, that is because the Government has said that they have not got the money with which to embark on the scheme to improve the accommodation at the Hospital, but they can find \$7,800 for the purchase of a car for an Officer of the Government to drive about in, although he already has two of the best cars: At the same time the poor people are crying out for bread and for protection. The honourable members who comprise the Government are already going to the country districts and telling the people: "Nobody can carry you to the promised land but we; destroy him." While they are asking for this \$7,800 for purchasing this car for an Officer of the Government, people are sleeping on the floor at the General Hospital of which Board the honourable senior member for St. Thomas is Chairman. People have to be chased out of the Hospital before they have fully recovered from their illness and still money can be found to be spent on a luxury. Honourable members are standing by to give their acquiescence to the passing of this Resolution although they know that the people who voted for them and whom they will be asking to vote for them within a couple of weeks, have to sleep on wet floors, on the naked ground, in small rooms, and so on. I would like to ask this question: who is going to save the situation in this colony as it is? Are men of culture, sympathy and refinement of which they boast, going to sit back and see wrongs being perpetrated all the time? Where is their charity, that charity which they are preaching on platforms and which they are marshalling their forces to put into display within the next couple of days? They tell people to destroy those who have become fearlessly independent in order to protect their interest.

I brought forward an Address some time ago asking the Administration to purchase some land so as to protect a body of hard-working people who did not have the means of purchasing that land, and who would have the inconvenience of having to remove their houses. While the Head of the Administration agreed with me, he was bound by his advisers who are members of the present Government in power. He said that they could not purchase this land until they had a fiscal survey of the resources of the colony; but since then expenditure which can be considered as being in the nature of capital expenditure has been gone into by the same Government on schemes which could not have been as beneficial to the community generally as the acquisition of Rosegate tenantry. This land is still in the market and the land grabbers because of their power to buy, might buy this land. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Will buy). The honourable senior member for the City says that they will buy this land and those people who have been living there for about 40 years will have to go begging.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am begging the honourable member to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: The members of the Government have even refused to honour the pledges made to certain Government servants during the War. The Government committed itself to supplying uniforms to men who are working at the Pumping Stations and although these men pleaded for the uniforms and even threatened a disturbance at the works, the Government would not budge. These men serve us night and day and many of them go into retirement prematurely due to the fact that the occupation which they carry on is a dangerous one, they having to go several thousand feet below the earth for the purpose of cleaning wells. These same people are going to be preached to and asked for votes. If we are conscious of our responsibility to the people who have sent us here to represent their interests, I think we should agree to the postponement of this Resolution until some future date when the colony has fully recovered itself economically. While that might bring down the indignation or disappointment of the sponsors of this Resolution and those who will benefit directly from it, yet it will give satisfaction to thousands of other people; it will also show that we not only refused to spend this money in this particular respect, but that it is our wish that this money be kept in the Treasury to be spent in the interest of as many people as possible. I cannot help remembering the accusations and abuse made against the honourable junior member for St. Andrew during the last by-election; I am impressed by the objection to the passing of this Resolution that the Resolution is for something which can only be considered as a luxury which the island can ill afford at this time. I hope that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew will not only utter words of disapproval but he will vote against the Resolution at the appropriate time even if he votes alone; thousands of people in the honourable member's constituency will praise him if he opposes this Resolution. At one time or other the people should be served; many times during this session they have not been served. I am suggesting that this \$7,800 be utilised for the purpose of buying a couple more hospital beds so as to take the people off the floor, and Government servants who have retired on small pensions should be given a little more money. I am going to make a motion which I hope some honourable member will be fair-minded enough to second; I beg to move that the consideration of this Resolution be postponed for five years. I make that motion because I cannot see that within the immediate future this colony will be able to recover itself from its economic position so as to be able to spend \$7,800 on a car for the Head of the Administration.

MESSRS. CRAWFORD, BETHELL and MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. ALLDER was speaking.

Mr. HAYNES: I would like to second the motion for the postponement of this Resolution if the honourable senior member for St. John would modify his motion. As I have already said, we should have this fiscal survey before any further expenditure is undertaken.

Mr. ALLDER: I ask leave to amend my motion by deleting the words "five years" and inserting in place thereof the words "six months."

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

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: When a principle has been decided upon, the matter cannot be discussed again unless the discussion is for the removal of the principle. We have to accept the principle in this case and, apparently, we have agreed to furnish this

motor car. It is surprising to me to find that English cars are costing us all this money and we have to realise that there is no duty in this amount. At the time when the token vote was passed, the honourable junior member for St. James did agree to a sum not exceeding \$6,000. I have tried to get the debate in that connection but I understand that we are in such a deplorable condition where debates are concerned that that debate cannot be obtained. Whether somebody on the staff is too lazy to find the debate or what, I do not know; but I am told that we cannot get the debate on that Resolution. However, I understand that we did agree to the amount of \$6,000, but if I were here I would not have agreed to that. I deplore the fact that the salary of the Governor goes up and is becoming very high having regard to the fact that he pays no taxes and gets everything free. In connection with this car, we will have to find the necessary money for repairs, gasoline and other incidental expenses, and I would prefer to give an allowance for travelling. The principle of giving a travelling allowance to Government officers has been adopted rather than buying cars; and I may say that our experience has been a bitter one as to what happens where a person knows that there is no quarrel with his master where the upkeep of a car is concerned. I think that we are in a very unhappy position and I am surprised to find that this car will be so expensive. Another point is this; if you give this car to the present Governor, the next Governor will regard it as being so many years old. We have agreed to the principle of providing this car, we are bound by that principle, but we can postpone the consideration of this Resolution and consider buying something a little cheaper. I would suggest to the honourable Leader of the House that, in view of the fact that the next Governor is not going to be satisfied to use an old car, we should provide a car which will cost less than this \$7,800. I understand from those who know the "Humber" that it is too low and not sufficiently high to accommodate the wearing of a proper head-dress on official occasions. I feel that we must give the Governor this car because we have pledged ourselves to do so; but I feel that the members of the Executive Committee, in view of the points I have made, might be able to suggest a car which will cost us less money. I would like the consideration of this Resolution to be postponed for a short time just to see if it is not possible to obtain a car which will not cost us as much money as what is suggested here.

Mr. DOWDING came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am prepared to accept that motion. I would like to say that when we came down with the Estimates we brought down a figure on the basis of what we were told we would get a suitable car for.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The honourable senior member for St. Philip and myself rose to speak almost simultaneously, and I took it for granted that the question would have been put; but I am continuing my speech if the debate is going on. Unless the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is rising on a point of order, I am entitled to have the floor.

Mr. ADAMS: There is no such Rule; sometimes honourable members rise and then give way to others. Sometimes three or four honourable members rise and the Chair accepts one of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to enquire whether I can speak or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what motion are you speaking?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am asking for a ruling, as to whether I can speak or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you going to speak on the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Is it your ruling that the only motion on which I can speak is the motion for the postponement?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. If the honourable member is not speaking on the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Philip he is out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has to speak on that same motion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that he is speaking on the motion for postponement.

Mr. ADAMS: I was under the impression that the honourable member did not think I could speak at all. I am willing to accept the motion for postponement and in doing so I wish to say why I am accepting it. At the time of the Estimates a Resolution for the sum of \$7,200 was sent down to the House because that is what we were told the price of the car would be; the honourable Leader of the Opposition thought that we had not made sufficient enquiry in the matter and suggested that instead of passing this amount a token vote of \$1 should be put down and more enquiry made as to the price of the car. As a result of that enquiry these figures quoted to-day were brought forward. We were told that the cost of the cheapest car is \$1,400.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not debating the motion; I am accepting the motion and saying why I am accepting it. It is the feeling of the majority of honourable members that the price of \$7,800 may be too high. I was saying that as a result of the debate on the Estimates the Government made greater enquiries and we cannot get a suitable car for less than this amount. It has been reported to me that the honourable Leader of the Opposition met his Party and they think that a suitable car can be obtained for less than this amount. I should like to say that when the honourable Leader of the Opposition was about to leave this island he assured me that the members of his Party were not opposed to the provision of this car because they had agreed in principle to it, but he wanted an enquiry made as to obtaining a cheaper car. These enquiries have been made and in respect of the price of \$7,200 we have added an amount for contingencies; we have endeavoured to bring down the figure to the cheapest possible one. I make that explanation in order to show why I am agreeing to the postponement so that further enquiries might be made. As a result of informal conferences with the honourable Leader of the Opposition this figure was brought down; the principle has been accepted by honourable members with the exception of the honourable senior member for St. John, and we are perfectly prepared to report progress; but to suggest a postponement for six months when the principle has been accepted and a token vote is there, is wrong whatever the honourable senior member for St. John has said. If the manufacturers tell us that we can have a suitable car for \$1,000 we will bring down a Resolution for \$1,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I regard the fact of this Resolution for \$7,800 being before us to-day as illustrative of a very important point. In view of the entire history of this matter down through the years, I was very surprised at certain phases of the speech made by the honourable senior member for St. James, and certain things which he has said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member speaking on the motion which has been made by his colleague?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am opposing the motion for reporting progress and I propose to give my reasons for doing so. I was surprised at some of the points made by the honourable senior member for St. James and I regard this matter as illustrative of the evils of colonialism. When the hon. member and the people whom he represents were running this country, they refused every suggestion of giving the Governor of this colony a State car: now to-day they are agreeing with a little quibble to vote this money, not because they have accepted the principle of giving the Governor a State car, but because they want to curry favour with the Head of the Administration. (Laughter). The position is this; honourable members on my left, when they were running this country, never agreed to give the Governor this State car. On the occasion when the members on my left agreed to take over more of the running expenses of Government House, they openly said: "We are no longer on the Executive, let us therefore not antagonize the Governor; let us get on the right side." That is their attitude to-day; that is all there is to it. That is one of the evils of colonialism; the honourable members on my left could not advance any reason for such a fundamental change other than that which I have advanced. Added to that, at the last General Election the British officials in this colony from the Acting Head of the Administration down, were in mortal fear of defeat by the Labour Party, and they threw their weight unreservedly on the side of the Labour Party in order to ensure its return. That is first-hand information; I have evidence to substantiate that statement when I am ready to use it. For the reasons I have given, honourable members on my left are not prepared to adopt the same antagonistic attitude towards the incumbent at Government House as they have pursued for countless generations; that is why we find this remarkable unanimity between honourable members on my right and those on my left with regard to the provision of this State car for \$7,800 for the Governor. How easy it is for the Imperialist power to defeat people and rule them! The fact that we are still a colony is something which even hon. members on my left should apply their energies in endeavouring to bring to an end with all possible speed. Let us conduct our own affairs and nobody has to curry favour with the Head of the Administration.

In 1947 the Secretary of State for the Colonies sent a directive to the Administration asking that the Governor be provided with a State car; the most they would do was to give the Governor a chauffeur and he bought a car out of his own money. To-day, because the colony is still being run by imported officials, hon. members are sitting here and agreeing to this criminal waste of public funds. Only last week we read in the Press that no elementary school children in St. James could reach Exhibition standard for entering any Second Grade School and one of the reasons for that is that there is an insufficient number of Elementary Teachers in the schools in this island. At the beginning of this financial year when the Estimates were being prepared, the Department of Education asked for 60 more teachers; the Director of Education—another imported official—told the Government that there is this deplorable inadequacy in the number of Elementary Teachers in the colony and it must be reflected in the general educational system, and hon. members on my right told the Education Department: "We have not got the money to give the Department these Teachers"; but they have this \$7,800 to give

the Official at Government House a State car! That money would pay 75 teachers the first year's salary. There is no justification — there is absolutely no reason for the introduction of this Resolution other than that those who have introduced it are willing to go to any length to please imported officials here, merely to satisfy the Colonial Office. When other Governments refused to give the Governor a State car, the Colonial Office never talked about taking away our Constitution for not doing that. The Colonial Office is not responsible for Barbados as they are responsible for other colonies; that is the reason why it is possible for the Governor of Trinidad or the Governor of any of the Crown Colonies to have a State car for \$15,000; but in this little place are we justified in adding to the already high emoluments of the incumbent of Government House the cost of \$7,800 for a car? The hon. senior member for St. John has referred to the fact that a car has recently been acquired for the President of Brazil or Argentina for \$11,000; Argentina is one of the oldest countries in the world, and if that country can only afford to spend \$11,000 on a car for the President, this colony cannot afford to give the Governor a donkey cart. If you were to compare the total emoluments of the Head of the Administration of this colony with those paid to Governors of the big American states, you would be disgusted; we pay the Governor a salary of \$14,440 a year, and a few months ago we increased his Duty Allowance from \$2,400 to \$4,800. We took over the domestic staff the Governor only paying a certain amount of this expenditure, and we have assumed the responsibility for the fuel and light. The Governor does not pay any customs duties and his annual emoluments are worth over \$20,000. Imagine a little poverty stricken West Indian colony with a single crop on which to depend, a mere dot in the world, paying a Governor over \$20,000 a year in total emoluments! Let us take an American state like Illinois; that State has an annual revenue of several million dollars and pays the Governor \$12,000 a year; we have a revenue of twelve million dollars a year and we pay the Governor nearly twice the emoluments paid the Governor of Illinois! The Governor of New York only gets a salary of \$25,000 a year and the total annual revenue of New York runs into several millions.

We are to-day deciding to expend \$7,800 for the purpose of providing a State car for the use of the Governor who already has two cars. This is not a country where you have to do a lot of travelling; this is not a place like Jamaica where, when the Governor leaves the town he has to sleep at a rest house before he gets back to the town. The travelling which the Governor of this colony does could well be done by horse and buggy; what do you really think are the duties of the Head of the Administration to necessitate a State car for \$7,800? Cannot the Governor attend a Speech Day or the opening of the Legislature and provide the travelling expenses himself without the colony being called upon to spend this \$7,800? This is sheer nonsense; as the constitutional position of the colony now stands, the Head of the Administration is little more than a rubber stamp. When the position of the Governor of the colony was different, when he used to govern the country, he never got a State car, and are you giving him this car now that his position is reduced to that of a rubber stamp? The Governor is no longer responsible for formulating the policy of the country and even the administrative work which used to be attached to his office is now divided among a number of Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries in the Secretariat. As a matter of fact, we have come to the point where, with the Secretariat

divided as it has been, with Assistant Secretaries being in charge of various Departments, one wonders what a Governor and a Colonial Secretary are required to do. If the Secretariat has been divided into various Departments what, in the world, do you want a Governor and a Colonial Secretary for? We are paying a lot of imported officials handsome salaries for doing nothing.

Let us assume that the cost of living has gone up for the Governor as well as for everybody else; he does not have to pay his servants 90% of their salaries; we are paying expenses which he formerly used to pay, and why therefore should we now begin to assume the responsibility for giving him this car for \$7,800? The fact that the principle has already been agreed to by this House only serves to show how far we have travelled along the road of failing to appreciate what our responsibilities are. At the time when this matter was first brought before the House, I, personally, expressed strenuous opposition to it, therefore it would be extremely peculiar if I failed to support the motion for the postponement of this Resolution, my only regret is that it is not possible for the motion to be one for the rejection of the Resolution. I cannot view with anything but opposition the action of the Legislature in 1951 as compared with the attitude which was adopted in the past; especially in view of the changed circumstances, it would be even more unnecessary for the colony to contemplate supporting a Resolution for this amount today. I am in total disagreement with this Resolution and I regret that the motion cannot be one for the rejection of the Resolution instead of a mere postponement.

Mr. REECE came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. CRAWFORD was speaking.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Resolution is for the sum of \$7,800. There has been some talk about giving the Governor a car;

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the honourable member is speaking on the Resolution, but the motion now is one for reporting progress.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I like to follow your guidance. There is a motion before the Committee for the passing of this Resolution, there is a counter motion for the postponement for six months and there is another motion for reporting progress. On which of those motions shall I speak?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Speak on the motion for reporting progress, which is the last motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That motion is really one for adjournment; therefore I submit that on a motion for adjournment I am entitled to refer to any matter under the sun, according to procedure in debate, and the only people who would object to that are those who do not want to hear me speak. I was saying at the beginning that it is being argued that somebody is giving the Governor a car; but I would never sit here and vote money to give the Governor a car. As honourable members will recall, some time in February this year a Resolution was brought before this House for the sum of \$7,200 to provide a car for the use of the Governor, and the honourable Leader of the Opposition agreed with the principle with the result that we agreed to provide this State car. The argument was put forward that a car was required for the use of the Governor on State occasions. Do not let it be misunderstood that the Governor is not going to use his car; the honourable Leader of the Opposition after consulting us, because there is no backbencher over here, agreed to the principle that we purchase a State car for the use of the Governor, and we agreed on an amount of \$6,000, but not more than that. The honourable junior mem-

ber for St. Andrew was not yet returned to the House. During the period between the introduction of the Resolution and the discussion on it, those of us who are in the Opposition made certain enquiries and discovered that a proper car could be obtained for use on State occasions for around \$6,000 and we decided that we would not support a Resolution for more than \$6,000 in that connection. I am not one of those who would agree to that and now, because we are getting a little nearer to the Elections, say that I am not supporting it. What I am not supporting is a Resolution for \$7,800 and I told the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that.

There is a lot in the argument of the honourable senior member for St. John; he believes what he says and so with the honourable junior member for St. Philip. I am not an avowed Socialist and I take off my hat to the honourable senior member for St. John when he makes his speech. The honourable member believes that a man who is a Socialist should not ask for a \$6,000 car. Judging from the prices of items today, the price of the average car is in the vicinity of \$2,400 to \$3,000; that is what you would have to pay if you want a car, and therefore this \$6,000 for which I am voting, would appear to be a lot of money. I should like to point out that we are purchasing a car for Barbados; we are not giving the Governor any car. When you compare the price which an ordinary individual has to pay for a car and what I understand from the honourable junior member for St. John who had the distinction of driving in State cars in New Zealand, and the honourable junior member for Christ Church who drove in some of the State cars in Jamaica, there seems to be some misunderstanding. I agree that we should pay an amount not exceeding \$6,000 for this car because of the reasons given that we want a State car. I have been told that in some countries the State cars are American cars; somebody will say that it would be a shame to buy an American car, but in such a car there is more room and more durability. The reason why we agreed to vote \$6,000 is that the car has to be of a suitable size so as to accommodate the Governor when he is wearing his plumes and so on. Today you can buy an American car for \$4,800; is the Governor of this colony any different from the Governor of Jamaica or the Governor of New Zealand?

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has accepted the motion for reporting progress and if that motion is carried I am allowing the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to know that we, of the Opposition, will not vote for more than \$6,000. I have counselled the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I know he will not let us down; I know that he would have been opposed to this matter if he had been here in the first instance. As far as the honourable junior member for St. Andrew is concerned, I know that it is his intention not to give one cent more than \$3,400 for a car. The honourable Leader of the Opposition is out of the island and we cannot, after having consulted with him and agreed to vote \$6,000, agree to vote for any greater amount for the purchase of a State car for this colony. If you carry the argument of some honourable members to its logical conclusion, it would mean that we are voting this \$6,000 to purchase a State car for the use of the Governor while there are people who are underprivileged and underfed; it would also mean that we have our cars while people are still sleeping on floors; but those honourable members are avowed Socialists and they practice what they preach. If I were an avowed Socialist or believed in the principles of Socialism like hon. members on my immediate right, I too, would say, like the honourable senior member

for St. John, let the Governor buy his own car. If I felt like the honourable senior member for St. John, you would have to move the gates of Hell to convince me that I should vote money for purchasing this car. However, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has accepted the motion for reporting progress in order to make further enquiries as to the cost of a suitable State car; if the argument is used that you want a car which will afford room and the like, there is no harm in cutting down the amount of this money and buying an American car which is used in nearly all West Indian colonies for the purpose of a State car. It may be that the Governor would not like it, but beggars are not choosers; we are not paying \$7,800 for any car.

Mr. DOWDING: I am speaking on the last motion before the House, that we report progress and ask for leave to sit again. At the time of the Estimates we, on this side of the House, agreed to the principle of providing a State car for the use of the Governor, but the Resolution before us, as I understand it, provides for a State car, it provides for an ordinary car, one which is a little more expensive than the general run of cars. We, in this island, are always crying out for the lack which is shown in official quarters in so far as capability is concerned, and it is up to us to make our offices such that we can get persons who are capable of dealing with the problems which confront this island. In this House we do all the talking, but those persons have to do the actual work. If an officer comes here and finds that he has a car at his disposal, that is a definite part of the allowances of the office and there is the possibility of getting a better type of official of which I think we are sadly in need: therefore, I, personally, am in perfect agreement with adding to the Governor's office a car which is not the Governor's car, but the property of Barbados. That will add to the office as far as allowances are concerned and it will add to the dignity of this island, which is something I feel should always be upheld. However, I shall not vote for this Resolution at any stage unless those who are responsible for it can tell me that this car will be a State car—a car which is suitable to the dignity of Barbados, a car in which you can see the personalities who are dressed for occasions in their official and ceremonial attire, a car which can accommodate people in the rear compartment, a car which is in all respects a State car and which can be described as a "Limousine". I must either be told that this car will be a State car, with which principle I agree, otherwise I shall vote with the honourable junior member for St. Andrew for a car which is quite capable of conducting the Governor to any part of the island and which is at a price in the vicinity of \$3,400. I would like to have that matter made absolutely clear to me before I consider it again; we must either have a State car for which we must pay, or we do not want a State car, but an ordinary car. I will not vote for any intermediate model. As the honourable member on my right has just said, if the motion for reporting progress is carried, let us consider the possibility of getting an American car which is capable of replacing the English car on account of the room which it has; but we do not want anything intermediate. I would consider having an ordinary car, a State car or an American car which, on account of its style and design, can be used on official occasions. I must be told definitely whether this car is of any one of these types, otherwise I cannot vote for the Resolution.

Mr. REECE: It is unfortunate that the Governor has been mentioned in this debate; the Governor does not show any leaning towards any parti-

cular Party in this colony. It is regrettable, I say, that the Governor should have been mentioned in this debate particularly since the question before the Committee is whether we should purchase a State car at this particular figure or not. When this matter was before us some time ago, the honourable Leader of the Opposition agreed to the principle of purchasing a State car, and for that reason certain members of the Opposition would be bound to support the purchase of this car. I would like honourable members to get it in their minds that this State car is to be used for the business of the State, and the Governor cannot use it for his own purpose. Having agreed to the principle of purchasing this car, the next question would be at what figure should this car be purchased. On the last occasion the honourable Leader of the Opposition said that his Party would be prepared to vote for the purchase of a State car provided that the amount did not exceed \$6,000, but to-day this Resolution asks for \$7,800. I was not here earlier in the afternoon to hear the figures put forward by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph but I take it that after the figure of \$6,000 was quoted, the honourable member made good enquiries as to the cost of cars in this island. However, we are now asked to report progress and I take it that it is the intention of the honourable member to make further enquiries of agents for motor cars and see what is a proper figure at which we can purchase this State car. I intend to support the motion for reporting progress in the hope that further enquiries will be made and the figure arrived at will be such as will not call forth the storm of protest which this figure has called forth to-day, but that it will be taken without any amendment whatever.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. MAPP, MILLER, BRYAN, ADAMS, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GODDARD, E. K. WALCOTT, REECE and BETHEL—12.

Noes: Messrs. CRAWFORD and ALLDER—2.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

DAMAGE TO ST. ANDREW ROADS

On the re-assembling:—

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—I am moving the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of great importance to the colony—damage to roads in the parish of St. Andrew. I think that it is a matter which deserves a certain amount of publicity. For several months we have been having severe rainfall, and in addition to that there have been landslides on various roads. Attempts of some sort have been made from time to time to do something to these roads; but these attempts to my mind are of such a nature that nothing will ever come out of them. Last Friday, Saturday and part of Sunday we had another eight inches of rain. You can imagine sir, what the parish was like after that. The bridge between Haggatts and Bruce Vale, although repairs have just been done to it, was absolutely impassable this morning. Not only is the new part gone, but the old one has

been entirely pulled away. It does seem to me that something is wrong that work should be done like that, and then to have such damage occur in such a short period of time. This is the most important bridge in the parish for one who wants to get out of the parish and get back into it. Then you come to Greenland. There are two bridges there that are in first class condition, but water is running over them. No attempt has been made to canalise the rivers or to cut trenches to take off this water, and it is after heavy rain that these bridges are impassable to motor vehicles and to pedestrians wearing shoes. I consider that that is absolute neglect. Next you come to Walkers, another bridge where they have been playing with repairs. Before they turn off the water by canalisation, they are going on building and repairing. One of these days the bridge will be completely isolated, and there will be no approach to that road. Now you come to Triopath. For three years that road has been impassable, and as a result people have to send their canes nine or ten miles to get them to the factory. With the price of gasoline and tyres what it is, that is a terrible imposition. When you come to Baxter's, that is another case of the river coming behind the bridge. This is a case where the Director of Highways and Transport asked me since November last year to cut off canes so as to enable him to drive in piles. This is September and not a pile has been driven yet. What is going to happen if the rains go on? That bridge will be cut off. You come next to Springvale, the main road of the parish, and you find that that has not been touched for the last six months. It is a deplorable state of affairs. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew will bear me out in every remark that I have made. Now we all realise that St. Andrew is the poor relation of Barbados. For that reason I do not see why it should be neglected in this way. The Vestry has sent several deputations to the Colonial Secretary. He has done his very best. On one occasion he called the Director of Highways and Transport and the latter said that he had no money. Within two weeks a Resolution was down for \$36,000. It is not a case of lack of funds. It is a case of lack of interest. I cannot visualise this state of affairs going on any longer. There are over 150 motor vehicles licensed in St. Andrew alone. Do you think it is fair that they cannot even get a proper road? I called the attention of the Government by way of an Address some time ago, to the state of the Lakes and Corbins Villages. I am sure that the honourable member for St. Joseph will bear me out, because I am told that in this case he made a careful survey of this place. The only result we got was a reply that they have a temporary bridge. What is this temporary bridge? A half dozen stone blocks thrown in the river bed that are washed away with an inch of rain. People are prevented from going to church and market. I think it is high time that matters are brought to a head. It has been brought up by a member of the Other Place today, a member who during the last couple of days has been displaying much interest in the condition of the parish of St. Andrew. He is an engineer, and probably can view this matter in a way which I as a layman cannot view it. I am therefore depending on this member to get this matter to the ears of the proper member of the Government, in an effort to see that some steps be taken to remedy this state of affairs. From one point of view it is good to see the rain falling. But if proper steps are not taken all these roads will go. It is a serious situation. I hope that I will convince the Government that something more substantial should be done. When I went down in the parish yesterday I was surprised to see just a few men working on the road. I thought that at least 50 or 60 temporary workers would have been taken on.

I brought the matter of payment of the Highways and Transport workers to the attention of the Government by means of a question, and I was told that it was a political move. These men are getting 6/- a day—the same thing that they got three years ago. There are agricultural workers getting more than that. Will they be satisfied? As long as this state of affairs continues, you will find that these men will take no interest whatsoever in their work. I think it is a very false policy for the Government not to allow the Director of Highways and Transport to let these men do task work, thereby earning more money. If the Government does not feel like raising the wages of one branch of the service they can do what I have suggested. But nothing is done whatsoever, and I think it is a very deplorable situation. I am hoping that my remarks will reach the proper authorities.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second the motion for the adjournment. My colleague has drawn a very genuine picture of the condition of the roads in St. Andrew. I went down there this morning to see the damage for myself, and I was fortunate to get about 12 men to help me get my car out of a ditch. If anyone in that area became in need of a doctor at night, the doctor in order to get there would have to drive 11 or 12 miles instead of the three miles that he could drive if this unsatisfactory state of the roads did not exist. If he has to go to St. Simon's, the patient will never see him. He cannot get there by way of Haggatts, and the other entrance has been abandoned for a few years now, and no effort has been made to put it back. I am happy to say, however, that I had an interview with the acting Director of Highways and Transport, and he assures me that they are working on the Haggatts Bridge, and they hope to have it opened partially to traffic very soon. Walkers Bridge, which is apparently being undermined, will be washed away if the rains continue. I am suggesting to the Government that in view of the nature of the roads down there, they should make a road leading from the road in St. Simons down to Walkers's cart road so that in the event of anything happening to the Walkers Bridge or Haggatts Bridge, the people will be able to get out of the parish. The Springvale Road has been giving trouble for some years, and at the moment it is again impassable. So far as Belleplaine is concerned, people have to walk a long distance to get a bus, as the main highway from Belleplaine is out of order. I wonder if the Government will consider spending a good sum of money to have these roads done. It is no use spending small sums; a good sum is needed. I think too that the Government should consider putting out the repair of some of these roads by contract, so that they can be done properly and immediately. I do not mean that the Department is not capable of doing the work, but the amount of work that they have to do at present makes it impossible for them to devote as much of their time to these roads as the roads need. I hope that the Government will take some notice of this motion for adjournment.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—If it were not that the mover and seconder of this Address do not do it, I would say that this is a purely electioneering stunt. My portfolio is nothing to do with this matter; neither is that of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, nor that of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. At least, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew knows that this matter belongs to the portfolio of the honourable senior member for St. Peter. What is the use of raising this question? They do not have a word to say against the Government. This is purely a departmental matter, and the honourable junior member for St. Andrew raises it when the one member of the Government who

knows anything about it is not in his place. Honourable members raise a point when they expect a reply from the Government. The honourable member whose portfolio it is, is not here. What can I say? Purely by accident I happen to have a file concerning roads in St. Andrew. St. Andrew has had more attention than any other parish as regards flood damage. But I am not in a position to reply to the speeches of the honourable members for St. Andrew. Not a point has been raised that the Government has not already considered. I see that there is a separate file attached to the main file. I see remarks on "Haggatts Bridge." I also see remarks on Walkers Bridge. I see "Baxter's nearly completed" etc. I know nothing about the matter apart from what I see here. Honourable members should have known better than to have brought up this point when the member responsible for it cannot answer. From the time in April when this matter was raised the Government has been asking for progress reports on what is happening in St. Andrew, and the Executive has been considering the whole matter particularly since Dr. Senn made his report about the geological structure of St. Andrew. The Executive has been going into the question of whether to build new roads; they have been considering the question of Lakes Bridge; they have been going into figures as to how much was spent for the last ten years on repairing and how much new roads to serve St. Andrew would cost. We have taken the position that possibly the East Coast Road should start from St. Andrew and that whatever is done in St. Andrew should be related to the East Coast Road. I just know that from what has taken place. But what is the use of coming here and without giving the Government a chance to ask the Secretariat or Mr. Skinner what is happening, just to make speeches? It is purely a matter of making a speech which may get into the Advocate tomorrow and be read by people in St. Andrew later in the day. If a member wants information he should make sure that the member in charge of the particular department knows so that he can get the necessary file. Sometimes we try to get the file only to discover that it is after six o'clock and everybody in the Secretariat has gone home. It is just wasting the time of the House to make a speech when the Government does not know what you are asking about. It is purely a question of departmental work. If Mr. Skinner does not get on with his work, tell the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker—I cannot understand the argument of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew has brought to the notice of the House the fact that the roads in St. Andrew are in a deplorable condition. He is not asking the Government for an explanation. He is only drawing it to the attention of the Government through the Government's medium. Any member of the House has a perfect right to bring to the notice of the House a matter of importance. The question is not whether the Government is able to reply to it: it is brought to their notice. It is then the Government's duty to seek into it and try to put it right. Since we have had party politics the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has tried to adopt other methods. But Party Government does not alter the rules of the House. I want to support the honourable junior member for Christ Church because the roads are in a deplorable condition. Government should know that. Government having learned that, should take the necessary steps to remedy the condition.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker—My opinion is that if the roads in St. Andrew are in the position in

which they are reported to be, and the honourable junior member for St. Andrew had come here today and said nothing about it, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would have been the first person to go in St. Andrew and tell the people that they do not have any representatives. He would have told the people down there that if they had real representatives they would have brought the matter to the attention of the House. I cannot understand what the absence of the honourable senior member for St. Peter today is to do with the raising of this question by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. Do you mean to say that an elected representative of the people must wait until the honourable senior member for St. Peter feels like walking into the House before he can raise a question? I have never heard such tomfoolery. Some time this year someone in St. Andrew wrote me a letter and purely by accident I have that letter with me today. My correspondent suggested that what was needed was not so much repairs to the roads after these periodical damages by rain, but the actual damming of the flood waters in the hills. Every year—and this is the second time this year—you get these roads damaged and bridges destroyed, and there is a recurring expenditure of government funds on this area. According to my correspondent if you were able to dam the flood waters in the hills you would prevent flooding and erosion of the soil that takes place and you would reclaim two or three thousand acres for cultivation. Therefore it seems to me that the Government should concern itself with investigating the possibility of taking action along these lines. Otherwise, whenever there is abnormal rainfall you will find yourself in the position where you will have to look for appreciably large sums of money to spend on repairing the damage done. If it is possible to remedy the trouble at the source, especially bearing in mind the reclamation of land in the area, I believe it may be possible to tackle the situation once and for all. However, sir, I sincerely hope that every honourable member of this House regards it as a solemn obligation immediately after anything of vital importance to his constituents happens to bring it to the notice of the authorities in the way that he thinks fit—either by asking a question or moving the passing of an Address or making use of the motion for adjournment as has been done this evening. What of course would be wrong in bringing things in this way would be to expect any accurate or detailed reply from the Government spokesman. But that is an entirely different matter from asserting your right to impress as forcibly as you can on the minds of the members of the Government the danger of a particular situation that may exist.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—I would not have even attempted to speak on this matter if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had not made the speech that he has made. I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Philip. I go a little further and say that so often it is said whenever speeches are made that they are political speeches. But you get into this Chamber on political speeches; therefore you must make political speeches, or speeches with a political background. It has been said very often that the Opposition is no Opposition; that they do not make sufficient noise. But the Opposition is constructive. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to know that we are conscious of our right to get up here Tuesday after Tuesday and move the adjournment of the House for five minutes and talk on any subject un-

der the sun. But it is because we want to see the Government's business go on that we do not adopt that attitude. We appreciate the fact that certain members of the Government are in charge of particular portfolios. Have you ever heard a more reasonable speech than that made by the two honourable members for St. Andrew? If those speeches had been made by members like me, or like the honourable junior member for St. Philip, or the honourable senior member for St. John it might have been a different matter. But the honourable members for St. Andrew merely drew this matter to the attention of the Government; they did not accuse the Government of anything. They drew the condition of the roads to the attention of the Government and expressed the hope that something would be done to remedy the situation. I have come to the conclusion that it does not pay to be too decent. Both of you are too decent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member addressing the two honourable members for St. Andrew?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The two honourable members for St. Andrew should be still talking. I am sure that you have never sat here and heard more reasonable speeches than those which they have delivered on this matter. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph should not have spoken as he has. No one asked him to reply. If there is anyone who keeps back the work of the House at times, it is the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. All that he needed to have done was to have noted what was said. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew is only taking a leaf out of the book of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. Time was when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was in the position of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew; and at that time he would have talked for an hour on a subject like this. Now he seems to resent the constructive bit of criticism from the two honourable members—two members who are the least harmful of all the Opposition because of their decency. There are some of us who if we had to reply the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would not like it. We would be strong. I suggest sir, that the honourable junior member for St. Andrew is the last person who would come in here and make a flamboyant political speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that you need defend the two honourable members so well.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, are you suggesting that I am out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am suggesting that you speak on the motion for adjournment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: An honourable member now tells me that we have not done any work, and that I should sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is speaking in answer to asides.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, if you heard these asides you should have called the honourable member who made them to order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member had better stick to the question that is before the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was only thinking that way sir. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph must realise our position and know that we must at times make speeches. As far as the roads in St. Andrew are concerned, I have spoken to engineers and they have told me that it is a most difficult job. It is a job which must give the best engineers a headache. If the honourable junior member for St. Andrew had come here and criticised engineers

I would just have laughed at him. He is only asking that you do something about the condition that exists. There is one point which the honourable junior member for St. Andrew raised, and which I think the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should make a special note of. That is the dissatisfaction of the road workers because they are getting no more money than they got three or four years ago. What is the use of trying to repair these roads when the men who have to do the work are dissatisfied? That is really the point. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has not said one word about that. Everyone knows that the Government is going to come down with resolutions for a cost of living bonus. But while the grass is growing the horse is starving.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Sir, I have only risen to support what was said by the last two speakers. Making a motion for adjournment in order to discuss an important matter should hardly bring any resentment to the honourable Leader of the House or anyone else. It is a member's privilege to make such a motion. Such a motion is never one for a vote of censure. There was never any idea as far as I heard to blame any member of the Executive or any member of the House. It was merely a question of the honourable member in full accordance with his rights bringing to the notice of the House and of the Government, a matter of interest to his constituents. A member of the Government can never know as much about a constituency as the member representing that constituency, although a member of the Government who is a member representing a constituency may be capable of carrying out both duties. I feel that the Leader of the House was not looking at the matter that way. If we had been asking a question which required a reply from the Government and we had not given notice, I would consider the criticism of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph justified. I would have supported him. I believe that in this case, as is usually done, before the honourable member actually made his motion he acquainted Your Honour of his intention. Because that is a courtesy we always pay to His Honour the Speaker. If His Honour says that we should not raise it, then we have to bow to the discretion and wisdom of the Chair. I merely rose because I think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph missed the point. He was thinking of an occasion when the Government would be required to furnish certain information. If this were such an occasion I would support the honourable member; but not in this case where the members of a constituency want to draw forcibly to the attention of the House and the Government something that has gone wrong in their constituency. Because, you know, if they do not make these representations they can be accused of either not knowing anything about what is wrong, or knowing, and doing nothing about it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—I do not want to tire the House, but it must be realised that good roads are a necessity. If you live in Taitt Hill to-day and you are sick a doctor cannot get to you. The honourable senior member for the City has said that the two honourable members for St. Andrew were too mild. I agree with him. The two honourable members know with whom you have to deal over at the Highways and Transport Department. They know the bosses over there. There are bosses over there that seem to have more power than the Governor and they have no use for members of this House. Now, Sir, in St. Andrew it is not only last year or this year that we

have been getting heavy rains; but you have never heard of such damages to bridges as you hear nowadays. What is happening? These bridges need attention, supervision and inspection. Take Greenland Bridge. I know that when I was a boy the water was far from top of that bridge. Now as soon as you get a few inches of rain the water runs completely over the bridge. What is needed is canalisation. As soon as you get a good fall of rain and you go down to Greenland Village you see about 100 men raking off the water. Government spends a great deal of money on it. Now I have been told that that bridge is rotten. If it had had any kind of inspection the authorities would have known that it was rotting and would have been able to stop it. What St. Andrew needs is a resident engineer. But as I have said, the bosses over at the Highways and Transport Department have no use for a politician. Until something is done to make them understand that we represent the people the situation will remain as it is. This may be called an election speech. This is election year and I have to let my constituents know that I remember them. Parris Village is obstructed with the water in the road. Myself and my colleague took it upon ourselves to get the assistant Director to come up and tell us whether they would do the road. He said he would make out an estimate of what it would cost. Months ran by. Nothing has happened. If they do not care about the Leader of the House will they care for the honourable members for St. Andrew? They told me this: "The Commissioners of Highways of St. Joseph sent down and asked me to send up Mr. Minnett. I have sent him up to where the Commissioners want a road put. Mr. Minnett said it would cost too much, and I dropped the matter." That is the man who went up to Parris Village with the Leader. A man came into my office and talked with me relative to the way the men are working in St. Andrew. He said he could not get any stones from out of the quarry. He said he had telephoned Mr. Gill and Mr. Gill told him he had drawn it to the attention of the Director, and the Director said he could not do any better. Imagine, a representative of the people goes to the Head of a Department, and the Head of the Department tells him that he cannot do any better. These people are kings. We have to vote money for them. But the parishes cannot get it to spend. I repeat that these bridges in St. Andrew need inspection, and supervision. A lot of things could be done; but all is not well with the Highways and Transport Department. Until Government gets rid of the water by canalisation, they will go on spending money on these roads and bridges year after year.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker—It is called "electioneering" when a member performs his duty to his constituents by bringing to the attention of the House a matter of importance.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I was careful to say that the two honourable members for St. Andrew are not the type who make electioneering speeches.

Mr. DOWDING: The honourable member referred to the speeches of the two honourable members as "electioneering". In addition to that the whole attitude of the honourable member was that of a schoolmaster addressing the school boy, while the schoolboy must say nothing. Well, Sir, all that I can say is thank God that there will be electioneering speeches, and thank God that the people of this island still, have a vote. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has just sat down has, in my opinion, hit the nail on the head. There seems to be some temerity

on the part of the members who form the Government to call this department to order. I suppose the answer will be that these members have no ministerial responsibility, and therefore can take no action. To me, Sir, that is only pulling wool over the eyes of the people. If those honourable members and this House as a whole come to the conclusion that, as the honourable junior member for St. Joseph said, there is something wrong at the Department of Highways and Transport, I defy the Governor or anyone else to try to prevent it from being put right. This matter has been going on for a long time. It does not need any looking into files. Dissatisfaction with this department is well known to every member on the other side of the table. Every member on that side has from time to time spoken of the lack of capability of that department. If we go on doing as we have been doing—this member and the other going to the department and requesting action—it will always be refused. It is time that an Address was passed by this House calling for an investigation into this department, and to put matters right. All this money is being expended year after year; and with what results? All that you get is a certain amount of antagonistic feelings between the “high ups” and other members of the staff; and there are those who have time to do private work for people, and time to do their own work. These matters need putting right. This is the time for the Leader of the House, rather than taking the attitude that he took at the beginning of this debate, to join with us in our view that all is not right with the department and with the view that it must be put right. These bridges in St. Andrew have been a constant source of trouble for the last five or six years. They are repaired today, and gone again tomorrow. I admit that for the last couple of years we have been having abnormal rainfall. But for all that there must have been times further back when there were abnormal rains. Yet I cannot remember as a boy hearing week after week and year after year that this and that and the other road in St. Andrew was impassable. It is time for the Government to check up and see how much money has been spent on a particular bridge, and whether it would not be wise to go over the head of the Director of Highways and Transport and appoint a committee in an effort to see if you can stop the constant waste of money, and the constant impassable condition of these roads in St. Andrew. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will follow the example of his junior colleague and let us show these gentlemen whoever they may be that they are not the bosses, and that the wishes of the elected representatives of the people of this island have got to be taken notice of.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—I have a few remarks to make on the question of bridges in St. Andrew. I would like to say that new methods of engineering, road construction and road building have entirely replaced the old methods. It is unfortunate for the Government and the country generally, that an engineer like Mr. Minnett who has made a particular study of bridge construction should be kept off that type of work. Year after year I have been hearing of bridges being washed away in St. Andrew. You will understand that all country roads started as tracks, and from time to time you built over those tracks. And in those times when it was seen that some kind of bridge was necessary, bridges of wood were constructed. The time has come when we should employ some kind of engineering skill in the construction of roads and bridges. You should pay attention to whether the roads are in the sheet water areas, and where you find water seeping into the areas you should change the direction of the roads so

as to save the bridges. I quite appreciate the making of these temporary roads. But I think that engineering skill is needed to see where it is necessary to change the direction of the roads so as to save the present re-spending of money. Seldom have I heard any one department come in for more criticism than the Department of Highways and Transport. I think that the Head of that Department must be particularly insensitive not only to the opinion of the Government but also to that of the members of this Chamber. Seldom do you find a man in such a high position willing to compromise his personal honour. If a particular body employed me, and had so much to say against me over a period of three years I would surrender. I could not withstand constant abuse. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if you took a secret ballot in that department, except for a couple of his cronies, the whole of that department would vote for his removal. It is unfortunate for the Government to have a head of a department with whom most of those who work under him are discontented. It is alright to say that we have better roads than Trinidad, the country from which we buy our colas. And it is alright to talk of our coral foundation, unlike Trinidad which is volcanic. No engineer can claim that it is a part of his engineering skill just to use the materials that happen to be at hand. When the Highways and Transport Department keeps a man who has made a special study of this type of work pinned down to his desk week after week writing minutes, the Government is not getting the best that this man can offer.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—I rise now to ask leave to withdraw my motion. In doing so, I must say that I was amazed at the attitude adopted by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. I thought he would have looked on it as a matter of helping the Government, and as being above party politics. But it seems that he took the opposite view of the matter. I did not know whether the appropriate member for that portfolio was in the House or not. If we must remember who is the appropriate member for what, it should be published on the Order Paper. But I am still hoping that the honourable member will realise that the condition of the roads in St. Andrew is a calamity, and that he will do his best to get something done to improve this very serious situation. I now formally ask leave to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection leave was granted.

BILL TO PROTECT WAGES OF WORKERS

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take Order No. 9 as the next order of the day. There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas—to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the wages of workers.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is another of those international Labour Bills. This one makes provision for the protection of workers' wages, and provides that they be paid in legal tender, although it does make provision for such allowances as food and accommodation as part of wages. It also sets out that the advances made to workers shall be limited, and that deductions made from their wages shall not exceed one third of the total amount in any one pay period. It also provides that no wages shall be paid in a liquor shop. Finally, sir, it makes provision for the making of regulations by the Labour Commissioner, with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I move, sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

Motion that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox, His Honour the Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The nineteen clauses of the Bill were read and agreed to.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title read and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND LABOUR DEPARTMENT ACT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas—to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Labour Department Act, 1943.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to extend the powers of the Labour Commissioner and the Labour Officers with regard to the inspection of premises where workers are occupied. The Bill also gives them powers of interim inspection of premises where workers are employed, and there is a clause which makes it an offence for the Labour Commissioners or any of the Labour Inspectors to reveal at any time any manufacturing secret or process which may come to their knowledge during the course of their duty. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to say this: whereas on certain occasions it does not matter if you jump the Order Paper, it is sometimes inconvenient. This is one of the occasions when it is inconvenient. Here we are dealing with No. 10 on the Order Paper, and I cannot find my copy of the Bill. I suppose it is the fault of someone in my chambers, but the result is that not knowing that it would be discussed to-day I cannot give it the attention that I would like. I think that the introducer of the Bill said something about its being similar to some other Bill; but I am sorry that I did not have my copy to check it. I have only now checked it. That is one of the misfortunes of when you jump the Order Paper.

Motion that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I have not yet seen a spare copy of this Bill. Not even the Librarian or Clerk can find one.

The four clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was read and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND NATURALISATION ACT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take No 12 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St.

Joseph—to move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Naturalisation Act, 1915.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—As honourable members will see, this is a very simple Bill. The Naturalisation Act of 1915 fixed certain fees to be paid by persons desirous of becoming naturalised. This Bill increases the fees from \$5.00 to \$9.60 in one case—the application for the grant of naturalisation, while the fee for the actual grant of naturalisation has gone up by 50 per cent. to bring the fees into line with those in the United Kingdom 1948 British Nationality Act. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Motion that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The three clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was read and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND VESTRIES (COST OF LIVING) ACT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to deal with the amendments of the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Honourable members will see that apparently the Bill as it passed this House was a Chinese tailor's copy as a result of which the date 1948 (1948—7) appeared in the title etc. The amendments of the Other Place have the effect of putting the dates in this Bill right wherever it is needed. I beg to move that the amendments be read a first time.

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.*

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the amendments were read a second and third time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXCHANGE OF LAND

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I now ask leave to take the next Order standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. Speaker accordingly called on Mr. ADAMS to move the passing of a Resolution that the House of Assembly approve under the provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951, of the exchange by the Executive Committee of a parcel of land situated in the City of Bridgetown and vested in them and described in the first Schedule to this Resolution for a parcel of land situated in Eay Street and described in the second Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I think that honourable members know these strips of land, and the Addendum shows why this exchange is desirable. The Executive Committee have the power to lease, sell or exchange land owned by them subject to the approval of the Legislature. This Resolution now seeks that approval in respect of these two strips

of land. The pieces of land are shown on the plan. I move, sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, —I am not objecting to the passing of this Resolution. I just want to make a few observations. The Addendum points out that the Government proposes to provide certain open spaces leading to the sea. But there must be some particular reason for proposing to provide this one. It is just a bald statement in the Addendum. I agree that it would be well for some of those dilapidated buildings in Bay Street to be abolished and the land taken over. But it does seem that the provision of these open spaces leading to the sea will make it more difficult for your police to control the illegal landing of goods. Are you just having open spaces, or are you going to demolish these dilapidated buildings?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker—My opinion is the opposite to that of the honourable member who has just spoken. An honourable member of the House who is not in his place today told me one day that he used to have something to do with the prevention of smuggling. He told me that while on the one hand these open spots do improve the actual appearance of the area, they also assist the police in curbing smuggling which was very rampant in this particular district, and which these closed places to some extent facilitated.

Motion that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried *nem. con.*

RESOLUTION TO ACQUIRE LAND FOR ST. CHRISTOPHER'S GIRLS' SCHOOL

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I am now asking leave to deal with Order No. 15.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—to move the passing of a Resolution that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of one rood and seven perches of land adjoining the lands of St. Christopher's Girls' School in the parish of Christ Church and bounding on lands of M. Hazlewood, of A. Clarke, of Estwick Kirton and on the public highway, alleged to be in the ownership or occupation of Mrs. Sarah Kirton of Hopewell, Christ Church, for the following purposes, that is to say, for increasing school buildings and furnishing playgrounds for St. Christopher's Girls' School.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker — As honourable members will see from the Addendum, this is a matter of the compulsory acquisition of a spot of land at St. Christopher's. The Legislature have already agreed to the principle of the purchase of this land, and the transaction was agreed upon between the Government and Mrs. Kirton. But it has transpired that she cannot make out a proper title, and therefore the Government is proceeding under the Compulsory Acquisition Act. It is consequently necessary to come to the Legislature for their approval under Section 5 of the Act. I move that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker—We in Christ Church are very pleased to see that this school is getting a playground. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that there are many such schools in Christ Church which want proper playgrounds. The area it is proposed to acquire in the present case is very small indeed. But

I suppose that half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. The children will be able to make use of it during their recreation periods. This question of playgrounds has often been discussed. The time has come when Government should spend a sum of money every year for the purpose of acquiring these playgrounds. They should have a scheme for that purpose.

Motion that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried *nem. con.*

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SALE OF LAND AT CHALKY MOUNT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I ask leave now to deal with Order No. 16.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—to move the passing of a Resolution that it shall be lawful for the Executive Committee to sell all that parcel of land containing by admeasurement one rood, thirteen perches situate in the parish of St. Andrew, site of the former Chalky Mount Boys' School, bounded by the public road, by lands of Joseph Springer, and by lands of Ruth Small.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— As honourable members will see the purpose of this transaction is explained in the Addendum. Those members who know Chalky Mount School—and also the honourable senior member for St. Andrew—will know that it is a marvel that it has remained a school and dwelling house for so many years. It was not considered worthwhile to repair the house and it was decided that it was not worthwhile to keep the land. The House is therefore asking the approval of the Legislature to sell this land on which the former school stood. I think that the honourable members for St. Andrew will bear me out that as regards the land on which the schoolmaster's house used to stand, this is one of the few occasions on which the Government might well get rid of some of its land, without making it a principle to sell government land. I move, sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker—I agree with what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said. I would like to ask what about the new site.

Mr. ADAMS: I promise the honourable member that I will get that information for him as soon as possible.

Motion that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried *nem. con.*

BILL TO AMEND CINEMATOGRAPH ACT

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker—I am asking leave to take Order No. 18 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael—to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Cinematograph (British Films) Act, 1935.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker—The Cinematograph (British Films) Act, 1935, lays it down that theatres should show a minimum of 20 per cent. of British Films. It has been pointed out that there is a lot of difficulty in getting that amount of British Films, and as a result the theatre owners could not comply with the law. It was therefore decided to amend the Act so as to make the minimum 15 per cent. instead of 20 per cent. I do not

think that it is necessary to say any more. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—I want to make a few remarks on this. I want to draw attention to a point that I raised about three years ago, and on which the Government has taken no steps. This is the only West Indian island of any importance where one can put up a cinema building without any regulations. People are entitled to recreation as much as to work and rest, and the people who erect these places of entertainment should be compelled to erect buildings containing proper sanitary arrangements, as is the case in Trinidad and British Guiana. There are absolutely no such arrangements in some of the cinemas in Barbados. Seating accommodation is also unsatisfactory in some of them. In Trinidad and British Guiana people who erect places of entertainment such as cinemas have to see that seats are a certain distance from each other. In Barbados you can put them so close that people can hardly pass between the seats. I think that some of these theatres are robbing people. Some of them are absolutely stink, and the seating accommodation in some of them is horrible. It is time that we had some sort of legislation to protect cinema goers. I am told on good authority that some of these cinemas we have here could not even pass the department of building in Trinidad far less the Fire Department. In this country the builders do not have to give the Fire Department any satisfaction. If you had a fire, God help the patrons. It is true that the owners of some of these theatres here are enterprising, and put up buildings that can compare favourably with these in other countries. They have good seating and sanitary accommodation, and they keep the places clean. But there are others who do not do these things, and the Commissioners of Health of any parish do not have the right to call on them to do any cleaning. In some of these buildings, after you have paid your shilling or whatever the price is, you find enough bugs to carry you away. I do not think that such a state of affairs should be allowed to exist. These theatres make money, and they should provide proper accommodation. The next time that we are amending this Act we should put in a provision that no one should put up a cinema without submitting the plan to the building authorities and the Fire Brigade Department. I hope that the remarks which I have made will not fall on deaf ears. This is the second time that I have spoken about it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker—I intended to raise the same point that has been raised by the last speaker. But we must not forget the fact that these theatres are what I call “non-productive” places. They scarcely ever show films of an educational nature. While the springing up of so many theatres will undoubtedly cause people to become more theatre-minded, the theatre owners, because of the fact that they have to import these films from England and America, are sending a lot of money out of the colony every year. Every theatre added to the already existing ones means that more money is leaving the colony, especially when they buy American films. They not only put on one show per day; some of them put on three shows on certain days. While you may say that the population needs recreation, you must safeguard them against what might be a detrimental hobby. My view is that when you have all these theatres springing up in a small island like this, there should be a law compelling that only so many theatres per head of population should be

built. If you have 200,000 people, allow one theatre to a couple of thousand. I feel that this is very necessary, sir, because it is a fact that poor people who can ill afford it, subsidise these concerns to the extent, I am told, of \$30,000 or \$50,000 a year, or even more sometimes. It may sound illogical, but it is true that the more theatres that are put up, the more people go into them. When I saw so many theatres being erected I thought that competition would cause a reduction in the entrance prices; but far from that being the case, the prices are higher now than when we had one or two theatres. Therefore the people are at a disadvantage. Sir, I do not see why the Government should allow theatres to make all this money without getting back some of it by way of Entertainment Tax. If you stand outside these theatres at night you see people struggling to get in. Some of them want to see every picture that is shown. While it is true that a man is free to do what he likes with his own money, yet when they are allowed to squander what they can ill afford on theatres, the Government will have to provide them with old age pension when they can work no longer, or the Vestries will have to relieve them. Government should forbid the erection of any more theatres in St. Michael. Let them go to St. Andrew and accommodate the people down there if they want to. It would not be surprising if within the next two years you see at least six more theatres erected. These films are sent from one island to another. Sometimes the same picture is shown here twice or more, and the same people pay sometimes to see it twice or even three times. It is a case where they have developed such a weakness for the theatre that they cannot help going. It seems to me that the business makes huge profits, or they would not put up so many. There is one in Barbarees Hill. About a half mile away is another. There are three or four near to each other in the City. They are making huge profits for shareholders who live in other countries. Government does not get sufficient revenue from that source. I hope they will do so in future. The Government should get at least three pence for every ticket so that they will have something to aid in their old age some of the same people who now patronise the theatres.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker—The last speaker is always preaching about unemployment. Whenever a theatre is being erected it provides work for carpenters and masons. No one holds a man and compels him to go into the theatre. I believe that if I went into one they should kill me. In my view theatres make their money out of fools. Intelligent people do not go to the theatre. I say let them put up a hundred theatres, and charge ten dollars for a ticket. They are providing employment. I would be very glad to see a nice one at Thorpe's Corner. At present the people from Sugar Hill come down to town every night to see a show. Look in the bus and you will see them. I cannot afford to go. If the people want their sport, give it to them. Do not debar them. Whatever it costs, give it to them. Let them build more theatres. We could do with a nice one at Walkers, and another at Massiah Street.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker—I have a couple remarks to make on this Bill. There has been a lot of stupid talk going on all evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not make such references. Please withdraw that.

Mr. MILLER: I will withdraw it, Sir. What I know is that many people find the theatre a cheap means of entertainment. Many of us who have been reading Shakespeare's works for years never

had the opportunity of having them brought home forcibly to us until they were shown on the screen. There is another thing. No film that fails to establish a moral is allowed to go on the screen. It is alright to talk of the masses being prevented from going to the theatre, when other people spend much more than that on gasoline for joy riding, and the masses only spend a sixpence. Some honourable members—and some of those who are of the masses at that—would like to deprive the people of theatre entertainment. Mr. Speaker, do not let them fool you. Anyone who happens to be a member of the masses—

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker—On a point of explanation: I would be the last person to wish to deprive the masses of healthy entertainment. What I was suggesting was that the Government should control the erection of theatres.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker—Is the honourable member objecting to my calling him one of the masses?

Mr. SPEAKER: He made no reference to that.

Mr. MILLER: Everyone does not understand the cultural value of films. There are provisions that prohibit producers from producing films that would be harmful to morals. Honourable members talk about preventing people from spending their money in the theatres etc. when as I have said others who can afford to spend more can have their means of relaxation. But the masses are not to be allowed to spend sixpence on a little culture and music. Are we trying to produce a police state where people will be forbidden to go to the theatres for entertainment and education? As regards the actual bill, the Trinidad Act makes provision for showing just 15 per cent of British films. As we get our films through Trinidad it is necessary for us to amend our Act to make provision for 15 per cent also. We are also told that there has been a drop in the allocation of British films. Has the drop made this Bill necessary?

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker—I do not think that the provisions of this Bill carry out what the Objects and Reasons say. This bill only purports to alter the percentage from 20 to 15. It does not alter the amount of British News Films although apparently representations have been made in respect of British News Films and Feature Films

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker—The honourable senior member for the City has raised the question of fire escapes. That is a very good point. I would like to tell him that only last week the Fire Brigade Department wrote one of these companies asking that certain alterations be made to the building. As I have said, the Trinidad Act provides for 15 per cent just like this Bill. There were one or two points made by the honourable senior member for St. John to which I do not think it is necessary to reply. But there is one thing. He talked about theatres charging prices that are too high, and suggested that the Government collect Entertainment Tax. If you put on Entertainment Tax, the price of tickets will go up. I do not think that the question of telling people whether or not they should go to the theatre should worry us at all. As the honourable junior member for St. Joseph said, it is a matter for the people. If the theatre put on three, four or ten shows a day it is because they know that they are getting patronage. I know that the greater part of the income from these concerns goes out of the island; but the same is true of the Electric Co. and the Telephone Co. But income tax is collected from their profits here.

Motion that the Bill be read a second time was put and carried nem. con.

On motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, His Honour left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On separate motions of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Chairman reported and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title read and agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS fixed Committee of Supply as the first Order for the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I move that the House do now stand adjourned until this day week at 3 p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.