

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 15th, 1953.

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. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs. M. E. COX, J. E. T. BRANCKER, F. E. MILLER, J. A. HAYNES, B.A. R. G. MAPP, E. ST. A. HOLDER and V. B. VAUGHAN

PRAYERS

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings of the 10th and 11th days of November, 1953, respectively have been printed and circulated among honourable members, and unless there be any objection these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection the Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor, Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS laid the following Papers:—

Report of the Auditor General on the audit of the accounts of the Colony for the year 1951-53.

Abstract of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1951-52.

By Command of His Excellency the Governor, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT laid the following Paper:—

Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Resolution that with effect from the 18th of April, 1952, the list of unestablished and Casual Staff as set out in Appendix "C" to Resolution No. 33/49, the salary scales of

which were amended by Resolution No. 32/1953 dated 12th May, 1953, shall be amended as shown in the schedule.

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Resolution that with effect from the 18th of April, 1952, the salary scales payable to the persons holding Non-Established offices and other persons as set out in the Schedule, shall be varied as shown in the said Schedule.

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Resolution to place the sum of \$8,700 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54 No. 24, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Resolution to place the sum of \$10,300 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953-54 No. 25, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Bill intituled an Act to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Bill intituled an Act to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1901.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—Before I take my seat I am asking leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 later on in order to deal with the Resolutions of which I have given notice as well as one Bill. The reason is this: Some of these resolutions are the cleaning up of the Dos Santos Report, and I am asking the House to be good enough to deal with them to-day so that the people concerned can get their money for Christmas. There are also two other Resolutions and a Bill dealing with arrangements which must be made for the starting of Ministerial Status. As regards the Bill, in order to have offices for Ministers it has been decided to use the offices now occupied by the Registrar and Provost Marshal, and the latter two offices will be removed elsewhere. In view of the fact that honourable members do not want to come back here for the rest of the year we are asking them to pass this Bill which is a very short one, to-day. Its object is to amend the Executive Committee Act so that permission will be given to remove these offices from the Public Buildings. There is also a money Resolution in connection with the object of the Bill, and it seeks to provide for the expenses of removing these offices and providing furniture.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Bill intituled an Act to amend the Peasants Loan Bank Act, 1936.

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. Adams): Resolution to place the sum of \$2,822 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part II, Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953—54 No. 26 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$2,038 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54 Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953—54 No. 27 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with these two Money Resolutions of which I have just given notice.

QUESTION

Mr. BRANCKER gave notice of the following question:—

To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

1. Whether Government appreciates the inconvenience suffered in the Half Moon Fort District of St. Lucy through the lack of a proper fish shed such as obtains in other fishing districts of this Island.

2. If the answer is "Yes," will Government intimate to Department of Education that the sooner the old wooden building (which housed the Half Moon Fort Infant School) is demolished, the sooner will there be a suitable site available for the erection of a fish shed.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891, was read a first time.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1901, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr Cox, the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936, was read a first time.

RULES SUSPENDED

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended for the reasons which I have earlier given.

Mr. Cox seconded.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, — Since we last met, the death has occurred of the father of the honourable senior member for St. James. As is customary, I would like to move the passing of a Resolution in connection with the death of this gentleman. Before doing so I would say that I had the honour of knowing the late Mr. Holder for many years. I knew him first in the capacity of a schoolmaster, in which capacity he wielded a great influence for good on the boys in his school. After his retirement, he began to take an active part in politics; he did not enter this House, but he sought political honours in the Vestry of St. James, where he served as a vestryman for many years.

While, sir, our politics did not always agree, I admired him because he was convinced that the stand he took and the views which he held on questions of the day were right, and he had the courage to express those views. Any man who is convinced that he is right, and who has the courage to stand up and expound his views is worthy of admiration.

I know, sir, that as a father the late Mr. Holder gave of his best to his children. The eldest of his sons I knew well. We were contemporaries at Combermere School and then as medical students. He predeceased his father. We have only to look at the honourable senior member for St. James, and if we believe that only a good tree can produce good fruit we have every reason to say that the father of the honourable senior member for St. James was a good man.

Without more ado, sir, I beg to move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolved that this House place on record their profound sympathy with the hon. senior member for St. James, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER and all members of his family, at the loss sustained by them through the death of our said member's father.

Resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the family of the deceased.

Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN seconded the motion which was put and agreed to, honourable members standing in their places.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, —I rise to thank the honourable Deputy Leader of the House for the kind words of appreciation which he has spoken on behalf of the Holder family and myself in connection with our sad bereavement.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. COX Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair, with instructions to the Committee to deal with the Resolutions of which notice had been given.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (CURRENT). No. 21

Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of \$102,475 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953—54, No. 21, which form the Schedule to the

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — the first Resolution, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

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

As is customary, sir, I propose that we deal with the Resolution head by head. The clerk will call the heads.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — I think that the House would like to know exactly what is happening.

Dr. CUMMINS: We are dealing first with Resolutions on the Order Paper.

Mr. LEWIS: I understood that we were going into committee to deal with Resolutions of which notice had been given today. Now I find that we are in committee dealing with Order No. 6 on the Order Paper.

Head I — Governor

Head I Governor was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Head I stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am very glad to know that the domestic staff at Government House is getting an increase. As far as I remember we did say that we would pay up to 75 per cent of the wages of that staff. I got this Resolution over the week-end, and I have not been able to check on it, but I think we said that if the wages went up we would increase our allowance to the Governor accordingly. I suppose it is in order.

Question that Head I stand part was put and agreed to.

Head II — Colonial Secretary

Head II—Colonial Secretary—was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved, seconded by Mr. Cox, that Head II stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to say that this item about flags does need some explanation. There is a note here which says that due to an alteration in the sizes of the flags the price has gone up. If you alter the size of the flags the price must go up. What I am at a loss to understand is how you can order flags in a competent way and then discover that the flag you want should be of a larger size. If you are ordering flags for a particular purpose you should know what size you want. You cannot order a flag of any size. I suppose the explanation is that the size you wanted was not available and you had to order flags of a different size. If that is the explanation why not say so? Have the buildings or the lifebuoys or the boats got bigger since the flags were ordered? The note does not give a satisfactory explanation. If the people you ordered the flags from could not send you the right size they should have notified you that they could not supply the size you ordered.

The next thing to which I want to refer is the item dealing with diving equipment. The note says that the amount of \$550.00 provided in the Estimates to purchase light diving equipment for use in marine salvage work and other work which the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department is required to undertake has proved to be insufficient, and supplementary provision is now required. I would like to know if this equipment is going to be of any use to us in getting rid of the Potick. I do not know if anyone is keeping check on the amount spent in trying to remove that obstruction. I understand that this equipment can be used in that connection. I would like to know if that is so. I have only heard it as a rumour that certain equipment has been imported to be used with the Potick. I hope that that is so, and that we will get rid of that obstruction from the inner basin.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is —

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Surely someone could give some information in the points that I have raised. Who altered the size of the flags? Was the wrong size ordered? Is this the only size available? If people are going to order things and then cannot make up their minds on what they want this House will always have to waste time voting several amounts for a particular item. If the honourable member does not know the answer he should say so. I have also asked whether the diving equipment will be used for removing the Potick. I have seen people working around there for several months. They are apparently getting some assistance from outside.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to know what is the Government's policy as regards salvaging. Take for instance the Potick which is privately owned and which used to trade between

these colonies. During some hurricane season it foundered on our coast. It was towed into the Careenage and deposited near the Victoria Bridge. Since then much time and money has been wasted in trying to remove the obstruction. Government servants and equipment are being used in so doing. I would like to know who is paying the cost of trying to salvage the wreck. I want to know whether the owner can dump on the Government the responsibility of removing it. That is something on which some explanation should be given. You might get a larger ship being sunk near the harbour and the owners will throw on the Government the trouble of salvaging it, and the Government in turn will spend the taxpayers' money on doing so. In regards to the Potick I have not been able to hear whether the cost of the salvaging work is falling on the owner or on the Government. I do not see why the cost of removing the Potick should fall on the taxpayers when the owners of the boat made profit out of it when it was in operation.

Dr. CUMMINS: As regards the point made by the honourable junior member for the City the increase in the price of the flags was due to a different size being ordered because the dimensions of those first ordered were not proportionate. As regards his next point, it is believed that the diving apparatus will assist us in removing the Potick. I am not in a position to say positively who is bearing the cost of salvaging it, but I will make enquiries and let the honourable member know at our next meeting. I will say that as long as the wreck remains there, it is a danger to shipping, and the Government may be liable if it causes danger to shipping. I do not know who is bearing the cost, but I think that the Government should be commended for trying to have the Potick removed as soon as possible. As I said I will make enquiries and let the honourable member know.

Mr. ALLDER: For the purpose of an easy passage of legislation promises have been made previously to get information for honourable members and those promises have not been kept. I remember that sometime ago the House was discussing a particular Resolution, and the honourable member promised us to carry out investigations as regards the absence of certain trees etc. Several months have passed but we have heard nothing of the promised investigation. I think I can remember many other instances when promises have been made and not kept.

Mr. VAUGHAN: While on this Resolution I may ask whether or not the Government has made up its mind where the Deep Water Harbour is concerned. I think that it is time we should get some statement on that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am just going to call the honourable member's attention to the fact that he is out of order in discussing the Deep Water Harbour. I did not stop him before because I wanted to see how far he would go.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Am I out of order in dealing with the Deep Water Harbour when we are discussing the Harbour and Shipping Master's Department?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLER: As regards the remarks made about the diving equipment I think the position is that a wreckage like that is regarded as a possession of the Government. Obviously, if the new owners fail to remove it, it will pass into the possession of the Government. In the interest of the safety of the Harbour the Government will have to remove that wreck. I say that with the knowledge that it has always been the policy of the Government. I remember that sometime after the Potick sunk it was sold to some individual or group who were expected to remove it within a given period. If they

failed to remove it the Government would have the right to take possession of it. As long as it was wrecked in territorial waters it would not be subject to Marine Law. The policy that I have mentioned applies in almost every country.

Mr. ALLDER: I did not understand fully what the honourable junior member for St. George was saying. I would like him to tell us whether it was the Government which sold the craft on that agreement. I hope that the honourable member is in a position to clear up that issue. He claims that when the Potick was sold it was sold with the understanding that if the owners failed to salvage it it would automatically become the property of the Government. I did not hear if the honourable member said that the Government entered that agreement at the time. It would be a poor bargain if the Government undertook to become the owner in case the then owners failed to salvage it. I do not see that there will be anything worthwhile in it even if the Government succeeded in salvaging it.

Mr. MILLER: I am not responsible for the ignorance of the honourable member. I am wondering why he did not worry to ask members of the Government for the information he wants. I expect that in this case the Government will act like all wise governments. I am not in a position to say to whom the Potick was sold. I simply know that it was sold on the condition that it should be removed within a given time. I must admit that a lot of the stuff has been taken away from time to time, and if the honourable member bought what is left he might find some difficulty in selling. But it is the duty of the Government to remove this wreckage.

Mr. ALLDER: The hon. member in his first speech made statements that might have been taken seriously by this committee; but after listening to him speak again I notice that he is only theorising; he does not know the facts relative to what has taken place. I hope that the Government will take steps to investigate the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to thank the honourable junior member for St. Thomas for the information which he has given me. If it would be of any help I would like to recall that when the Guarany was burned in the harbour it was discovered that there was no authority for cutting it adrift. I think that that is one of the reasons why we have a retired naval man as Harbour Master in this colony. I do share the view that there may be considerable expense in getting this wreckage removed and that that expense should be borne by the owner. The Government should, if it is at all legally possible, say that the person who owns it should pay; although I suppose that it depends on who the person is.

Question that Head V stand part was put and agreed to.

Head VI — Customs

Head VI — Customs — was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Head VI stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I am speaking on item 21 — Drawbacks General. There seems to be some mistake in the printing of this note. If I read into it something that I should not I hope that I will be excused. The note says: An amount of \$53,000 is provided in the 1953—54 Estimates to meet claims for refunds of duty and payments of drawback. With the increase in gross revenue receipts there has been a corresponding increase in refunds of revenue in respect of short landed goods and duties paid in excess or in error; in addition there has been an increase in exports of goods entitled to drawback. Supplementary provision of \$40,000 is required." I do not think that that is the right explanation. There is no reason in the world

why because you import more goods you must have more drawbacks. It is not necessarily so.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, — In view of what has happened as regards missing rum at the Customs I would like to know if the staff or the people responsible for these bonds are really more qualified. It has been mentioned to me that sometimes very junior clerks are put in charge of these bonds, and that is by no means as it should be. The person who told me that worked in the Service, and he said that there should be always a senior officer or one as nearly senior as possible in charge of these bonds. I notice that a supplementary provision of \$800.00 is required for travelling expenses under this item. Do the officers use their own cars or do they rent cars? I would like to know if everything is going quite well at the bonds. I hope that no more rum is missing. Since the last case was publicly heard I have heard that more rum has been missing. That is a condition which should not exist. It is a serious thing for a merchant to be missing hundreds of gallons of rum. I understand that more rum has been missing. Is that so or not?

Dr. CUMMINS: I am sorry that I cannot give the honourable member any information on that point.

Question that Head VI stand part was put and agreed to.

Head XIV — Judiciary

Head XIV — Judiciary — was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Head XIV stand part.

Mr. WILLIAMS: With regard to the court at District "B" some effort has been made recently to build shelves up there, but the position up there as regards space for documents is alarming. It is time that something should be done about the way in which public documents are kept. It amazes me how the officers of that court ever find anything. The court has become very cramped. I do not think that any blame can be attached to the officers of the court. It is time that something should be done about the situation.

With regard to Item 48, West Indian Court of Appeal, we had a sitting here recently, and it was a common thing for the judges to have to cable down to Trinidad for books and other material. I think that a lot of that expense should be avoided. It is true that certain things cannot be avoided; but the expenses like those incurred by having to cable for books could be avoided. We also had the spectacle of counsel engaged in serious cases lending judges books. There are no proper books to use when the judges come to Barbados.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—I am not satisfied with these expenses of the West Indian Court of Appeal. As you know, sir, unless you are a man of means you do not go to the West Indian Court of Appeal. I cannot find out why these additional expenses are not borne by the various clients. They can find large sums to pay to the various lawyers and I do not see why this expenditure cannot be handed on to them in the same way. Why should the taxpayers have to find money to spend on people who have to go to court? I would ask the appropriate member to see if something cannot be done about the matter. Here it is that an amount of \$1,200 was voted in the Estimates, and now we are asked to vote a supplementary provision of \$1,304, a total of over \$2,500. I do not see why these expenses cannot be added on to the various costs that are approved in this higher litigation. It would be a mere bagatelle when compared with what these people pay their counsel. I am asking the appropriate member for an assurance that something will be done.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,— I wonder if the honourable junior member for St. Andrew realises that the Government cannot do anything to make the administration of justice too expensive for the people who seek justice. He must also know that not only the wealthy might have cause to go to that Court. If litigants are to absorb these expenses it would become too prohibitive for a poor man to be able to get justice. I do not think that the Government could do what the honourable member suggests.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — Honourable members seem to be labouring under a misapprehension where this item is concerned. This is due to increased subsistence allowance for the judges.

Mr. LEWIS: What is here is due to the fact that they had to appoint a retired judge to act for one who was ill, although it is doubtful whether it was the judge's illness that caused this. As far as litigants are concerned I do not think that you can ask litigants to pay for these expenses. If you renovate a court and someone has to go before that court as a litigant I cannot see how you can ask him to pay for the renovation. If a judge gets sick, or they say that he is sick, the Government will have to provide a substitute judge. It is a question of providing a court for the litigants who have paid their money to be served by the court. As long as the expenses incurred are nothing to do with the litigants I do not see how you can ask the litigants to pay.

Question that Head XIV stand part was put and agreed to.

Head XV — Police

Head XV — Police was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Head XV stand part.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to speak on the Item relative to extradition expenses. The note says: "The amount of \$100.00 provided under this Item has been exhausted and supplementary provision of \$150 is required. I am very strong on this matter, sir. In recent weeks I have noticed dozens of young men and women who were in Trinidad and British Guiana and who were suddenly called upon to pack up their belongings and come back to this colony. Although we see what is happening in these other colonies we still continue to vote this small amount of \$100.00 for the purpose of extraditing from this colony people whom we know are undesirables. Regulations were recently changed to give greater authority to the Police Department so that they could control the influx of people who do not contribute anything to the welfare of this colony. I am wondering if they are carrying out their duties. It is becoming intolerable, sir, to see so many unwanted strangers from the other colonies knocking about our streets, congesting our limited living space and making our housing situation more difficult than it already is. You do not have to go very far to see whole streets of nothing but this type of person sitting on the sidewalks, annoying the public and polluting the morals of this city; and no one has yet attempted to do anything to remove what can be considered as a blot on the fair name of Barbados. It is time that the Administration call on the Police Department and find out what they have been doing since the regulations have been changed for the purpose of giving them more authority to control the influx of people to this colony.

Today, sir, not even a man or woman who has a profession and can by his or her labours contribute to the economy of the colony is permitted to remain

in Trinidad or British Guiana and some of the other West Indian colonies. But every day you see more and more of this type of people coming into Barbados with the intention of doing nothing at all to improve the condition of the island. I say that the time has come when we must take this matter seriously; because it is no use forming committees to go into the problem of over-population in this colony in one instance and then in another instance allow people to come in to become liabilities on the resources of this island. Our institutions are congested with this type of people; that happens because the method of living of these people is not the type which would prevent them from becoming a burden upon the resources of our institutions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is going a little too far now.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member read the explanatory note before he began. He has gone far from it.

Mr. ALLDER: We are dealing with the amount which is to pay the expenses of repatriating people whom we regard as undesirable. I hope that the Government will take note of what I am saying, because the honourable junior member for St. Thomas knows that there is a committee on over-population of which he is a member —

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think it is doubtful whether the item we are dealing with has anything to do with emigration.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—This item deals with the extradition of people —

Mr. ALLDER: Am I speaking?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me speak to the honourable member.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I merely wanted to say that this item deals with the extraditing of people who come as stowaways and things like that. I do not think it deals with people who are already in the island and who become a danger to, or charge on, the colony under the Undesirables Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I was trying to draw to the attention of the honourable member.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not know if honourable members would like to limit discussion beyond the point that is reasonable. I take it that I am right in saying what I have said. Extradition, repatriation and immigration are related to each other. I do not know if there could be a more appropriate time for me to express my feelings on the unnecessary influx of strangers who can be considered as undesirable. I am hoping that the Government is listening to me and taking my remarks seriously; because whether or not we allow discussion of the matter in this committee the result of the shortsightedness is still there, and will continue to grow; and if we do not face up to it now we will have to face up to it sooner or later. I am sure that it is time that something should be done along these lines. Whether I am correct or not, I am sure that it is the duty of all of us who are interested in the welfare of Barbados and Barbadians to realise that other colonies have started to take care of their nationals, and that we should do our best to remove this difficulty which I see is continuing to develop. I say the Police Department should be asked what are they doing in the matter. I say that, sir, because as a member of the Committee set up to deal with the question of over-population in this island certain statistics have been presented to the members; and many of those members as well as many people connected with public institutions are becoming more apprehensive over the situation.

I feel, sir, that the only body which can handle this situation is the Assembly. That is why I have raised the matter here, and the honourable junior member for St. Thomas knows that what I am saying is correct. I hope that as a member of the Executive he will take some steps to see that the Police Department draw the net tighter as regards the immigration laws.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, — This item deals with cases of people who attempt to enter the island as stowaways etc. The question of immigration comes under the Immigration Act of 1952 which took the place of the Immigration Act of 1920. Cases of people coming into the island as undesirables come under the Undesirables Act. I do not think that the point which the honourable member has raised applies to any of those people.

The question that Head XV stand part was put and agreed to.

Head XX — Education

Head XX — Education — was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Head XX stand part.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — I do not know if the honourable junior member for St. Thomas is going to be able to help me. There is a strong rumour that some of the people whom we pay for supervising examinations in this island have been lax in the performance of their duties to such an extent that some of the boys at a first grade school in this island have been suspected of collusion, and a lot of other things like copying, picking etc. I think that if these people whom we have to pay for supervising examinations did a good job they would lessen the chances of such a thing happening. I suppose it is a boyish prank and there is no intention of dishonesty on the part of the boys. The boy's parents are at home ready to take it out of him if he does not do well at the examination and the boy feels he owes it to himself to pass. I am not condoning copying or anything like that; but the fact remains that the Government employs these people because they feel that it is a thing which should not happen. Why do you have a watchman? Because you feel that there is something to steal and that someone will steal it.

There has been too much of this nonsense in our educational system. You employ people because they have degrees; but that is no qualification for being an honest worker. Even the names of some of these people who have been lax in their duties have been stated to me. I am willing to pass on my information privately to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. It is necessary, sir, that we get the help of the right people. If the fee is too small, raise it or search for people who will deem it an honour and a duty which they are willing to perform at the fee which is now paid.

I am saying that you must remember that we have taken a turn in the Education Authorities in England for sending out imposters and crooks to this island, and if they want to get back at us they will probably take every chance to do so. It behoves those who are employed in this supervision work to take their duties seriously.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, — With regard to Item 55, Examination Expenses, there is a point on which I would like to get some information. I understand that the number of people taking these examinations last time was over 500, and there was some difficulty in finding accommodation. I understand that there is some ruling by the London Authorities that the papers are to be taken up at the same time. I do not know how that will be done. The candidates take the examination at different centres.

Another point on which I would like some information is whether representations have been made as regards examination charges by local examination authorities. I am told that those charges are too high, something like £20 for conducting a public examination. In time gone by old priests used to do this job more as a public duty than anything else. We realise that today everyone wants remuneration for their services. But can nothing be done to lighten the cost to the candidates?

It has also been mentioned to me that irregularities have gone on as regards "cribbing". You will find dishonest people anywhere. But I think it is a thing which the Government should try to prevent happening. I agree with the honourable junior member for the City that you never know when someone may be trying to pick at you.

The question that Head XX stand part was put and agreed to.

Head XXI — Science and Agriculture

Head XXI — Science and Agriculture — was called and agreed to.

Head XXIII — Director of Medical Services

Head XXIII—Director of Medical Services — was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Head XXIII stand part.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—I am speaking under the item which deals with Druggists' Examination Fees. I will say sir that there is some grievance among druggists. From 1894 or 1898 the maximum fee paid to the druggist appointed to supervise these examinations has been £3 an examination. They have to supply samples of drugs, and to supply scales and weights and spend a whole day away from their business. Surely it is time that the Government recognised that in 1953 it is worth a druggist a lot more than £3 to go to the trouble and to take the time to prepare samples of drugs—bearing in mind today's prices of drugs—and to be away from his business for the period of a day. I am sure that such a druggist must sustain a definite loss. I think that Government should consider a substantial increase in the fee. There are at times several candidates at these examinations.

Dr. CUMMINS: When that complaint reaches the Government in its proper form the Government will consider it.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—Under this Head, Director of Medical Services, I see a reference to Field Force Inspectors. I am at a loss to know what is meant. I would like some information as to who are these inspectors and what are their duties, and where they operate.

Dr. CUMMINS: Evidently the honourable member does not live in Barbados. He should know that for many years the Board of Health has had a group of inspectors who travel by car and operate all over the island checking up on the work of the Sanitary Inspectors of the various parishes.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I thank the honourable member for the information but I think it is misleading to put the item under Director of Medical Services.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have no desire to reprimand the honourable Deputy Leader in any extreme way; but surely he has been in the Government long enough to have learned how to give a courteous reply to the representatives of the people in the House. I am a representative of the people and I am a druggist and would know of the grievances of druggists. I have brought this matter to the notice of the honourable member and he has said that when it comes

from the proper quarter the Government will consider it.

Dr. CUMMINS: I did not say that. I said that when it comes in the proper form.

Mr. VAUGHAN: In what more proper form could it come? This grievance has been brought to my notice by other druggists, who asked me to bring it to the notice of the Government. Surely he could not want a more proper form.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to say to the honourable junior member for St. Philip that there was a time when this Field Force operated under the Board of Health. But for about two years now they have been placed under the Director of Medical Services because he is more in charge of the personnel. I would like to assure him that these inspectors must do some work because they issue reports on inspections made all over the island, and they bring to the notice of the Director of Medical Services and thereby to the notice of the public many things pertaining to their work. I will see that the honourable member gets one or two of their reports.

I must say that I was a little disappointed at the reply that the honourable Deputy Leader gave to the honourable junior member for St. John. I feel that if anyone has a grievance he is quite in order to approach a member of the House and ask him to bring it to the notice of the Government. I think that that is a very proper quarter for a complaint to come from. The honourable member could be told if it is a fact that the Government has got any complaint from the druggists who supervise these examinations. If these people have made a complaint I think that the Deputy Leader should tell the honourable member so. I do not see that it is anything to hide.

If no complaint has come from these people it may give rise to an awkward position. It may be that only druggists who are rich enough to give up a day from their businesses will conduct these examinations. But it may be in the interest of the island to have these examiners rotated. A rich man owning a drug store may not like to see young druggists coming up in the island. If you do not take these complaints seriously you may find everyone objecting. I think it is something that the Government should take seriously. I think the honourable member is entitled to be heard. If what he says is true the time will come when the Government will be in a tangle like in the case of the Public Utilities Board. You will find that two or three druggists will control the whole of the business.

Dr. CUMMINS: I maintain, Sir, that I do not see anything discourteous in what I have said. All that I have said is that when the particular matter of which the honourable member made mention of comes before the Government in a proper form, the Government will discuss it. As is known, the local druggists have formed themselves into an Association, therefore, they should work through their Association. Let them put their case to Government through the Director of Medical Services, but not by a single member of the profession just getting up in this Chamber and making a verbal statement on it. When this matter reaches the Government in its proper form, the Government will then take action.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, this is the proper place for honourable members to make complaints and the honourable junior member for St. John is quite right to air the complaint here. It is a fact that people in these associations are somewhat afraid when it comes to airing grievances, and the Civil Service Association is an example of my argument. Many times, the Civil Service Association comes in with a

recommendation for a penny increase for casual workers in the Public Service and the House has to say to the Government that a penny is not sufficient and that four cents should be given. I will again say that honourable members are quite right in bringing complaints before this House and the honourable junior member for St. John has acted quite right when he brought this matter before the House. I do not think that he should have been told what was told to him. He is entitled to be told that no complaint has been received from the actual examiners.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I have been approached by the Secretary of the Pharmaceutical Association as well as by other druggists on this matter and sooner or later, I will make a formal complaint, but because this resolution deals with the matter, I thought it was appropriate to draw the attention of the House to this complaint. I am very glad that the honourable junior member for the City has supported me. The honourable member mentioned something concerning certain examiners and since he has touched on that point, I will endorse what he said. There is a practice that examiners should only come from a certain clique of druggists. I have been a qualified druggist since 1929 and have never been asked to supervise an examination. As the law stands, any qualified druggist could be appointed an examiner. I am not singular in this respect; there are many qualified druggists who have never been asked. The tendency is to confine the examiners to a certain clique. I mention this matter because the honourable junior member for the City made some small reference to it and because it should not be said that I have some personal grievance. Had it not been that the honourable member had brought it up, I would never have spoken of it.

The question that Head XXIII stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXIV — Barbados Regiment

Head XXIV—Barbados Regiment, was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXIV stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Under this Head is the item, Arms and Ammunition, and I do know that the honourable senior member for St. John likes to voice his disagreement with the vote for this item whenever it comes up for discussion. However, the honourable member is conspicuous by his absence, although he was in his place a short time ago.

(A VOICE: The honourable member has gone to a funeral.)

The saying is "Let the dead bury their dead!" However, Sir, speaking on this item, this is a case where we have a revote of what was contained under the 1951-52 Estimates for expenditure on this item. This is what the note says: "Revote of the unexpended balance of \$5,733 of the provision of \$9,100 made in the 1951-52 Estimates. This revote is required to meet an account which has now been received in respect of ammunition indented for in the year 1951-52."

Sir, could anybody imagine anything like that? Since this order was outstanding, the 1952-53 and the 1953-54 Estimates have been made up and yet nobody could know that it was outstanding. You just have to point out facts like this to show that something is radically wrong. Sir, do you mean that a certain amount of ammunition must be ordered every year although it is unnecessary? This is absolutely absurd. Let us know what has happened. Did the Barbados Regiment borrow ammunition from the Police when they did not receive all of theirs? I do know that soldiers in the Regiment must shoot

a musketry course annually. Did the Regiment have to borrow that which was outstanding from the Police in order that the soldiers might complete their course? Honourable members in this House have said over and over again that no charging back should be done. We have altered the Estimates and in doing so have had a bearded gentleman to help us so as to ensure that there should be no charging back. Now that we are on the verge of completion of the 1953-54 Estimates, we are going back to what was done in the 1951-52 Estimates. Sir, something is radically wrong. Certainly, this is a thing which should have struck the minds of members of the Executive. We are now called on to make a revote under the item, Arms and Ammunition, that was voted for in the 1951-52 Estimates. This means that for two years, estimates have been prepared and this House was not told that there was an order for this item outstanding. It is ignorance to call this a revote now. How can you call it a revote after you have passed two sets of Annual Estimates?

Sir, I am hinting that the financial position of this colony could never be known by the people's representatives as long as things like this continue to be practised. This order is for \$5,733. We try to get a comprehensive picture of our financial position when we pass our Annual Estimates, but how can we get a comprehensive picture when things like this are practised and by people who should know better. Sir, I am wondering when things like this will cease to happen.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Sir, what the honourable member who has just sat down said struck me on Sunday night last as I was sitting and giving consideration to this resolution. I cannot for the life of me see how this could be a revote. Even in ordinary business and there is some outstanding order, the firm writes to the person who is to deliver the goods and asks when is it likely to receive the goods and to send a bill for them so that the firm will know what will be its financial commitment. This Government has a Financial Secretary and as the honourable junior member for the City has said a gentleman from C.D. & W. has helped this Government to put the colony's financial picture in better shape. But is it in better shape than before? One only has to see matters like this and how they are handled by the Financial Secretary for one to know what this island would be reduced to in the course of time.

Mr. LEWIS: I have another point to make to which I would like the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to give an answer. It is in regard to Item 37, Medical Expenses. The note to it is stated as follows: "The amount of \$1,440 provided in the 1953-54 Estimates for the payment of medical and dental expenses of all permanent staff of the Barbados Regiment has proved insufficient. It is difficult to estimate these expenses with any degree of accuracy. Supplementary provision of \$100 is required."

I would like to know if the Government is insisting now that those persons who need medical attention should go to the General Hospital because I was made to understand that that was not the practice before. Really and truly, I have a certain amount of sympathy for those persons who formerly received their medical attention in such matters as these by private medical practitioners. I have been told since that I am a little bit too generous in this respect because the Police are provided with a Police Medical Officer and if they do not go to him for medical attention but to some other medical practitioner, they will have to pay for the medical attention which they may receive out of their own pockets,

while if they go to the Police Medical Officer, they will get that medical attention free. If that is the case, I do not see any reason why the medical attention to the permanent staff of the Barbados Regiment should cost more than what is voted. I would therefore like to know if members of the permanent staff of the Regiment would not seek the medical attention which they may need at the General Hospital when they are ordered to do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: With reference to the Item, Arms and Ammunition, the inefficient auditing of that item is not the only aspect which is deserving of some criticism. Obviously, the complaints with regard to the incompetent bookkeeping is well founded but it appears also obvious to me that the complaints which have been made from time to time with regard to the wasting of public funds on ammunition are correct. As the honourable junior member for the City has pointed out, the honourable senior member for St. John has been most consistent in his criticisms that we are spending too much money on ammunition in this island. Ammunition is a thing which spoils after a fairly limited time. If in 1951 we voted \$9,000 for ammunition for that year which I presume would have come if it were obtainable and we only got a little over \$4,000 of it and that amount was made to serve the requirements of the Regiment; it means that originally, the amount of \$4,000 in ammunition would have done. The Barbados Regiment has carried on for three years since then with that amount of ammunition and no one was made to understand that there was a shortage. It would therefore show that if the Regiment had obtained the amount of \$9,000 in ammunition, it would have been spent, wasted, thrown away, or dumped in one year.

Sir, how many occasions arise for the using of ammunition in Barbados? A few, and all for purposes of practice. I feel that the combined amounts spent annually on ammunition for the Barbados Regiment and the Police Force might well suffice for the operations carried on in a grand scale at present in Kenya and Malaya. I am therefore suggesting that the utmost caution should be exercised in the future with regard to the amount of money which we are going to expend on ammunition in a peaceful and law-abiding country like this when there is no use for it and as a result will be wasted or thrown away. It is criminally extravagant to provide \$9,000 for one year to be expended on ammunition, particularly when it appeared sometime in the last three years that the amount of \$4,000 was apparently sufficient to serve the purpose of this island.

The question that Head XXIV stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXV—Public Works

Head XXV—Public Works, was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXVIII—Subsidies and Grants

Head XXVIII — Subsidies and Grants was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXVIII, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: The vote of \$6,720 under this head is an addition to the amount of \$17,482 which was granted to the Commissioners of Highways from the amount which was provided in this year's Estimates. I would like some further information as to which road is this money allocated to be spent on.

If it is allocated to be spent on the Spa Road, I shall be glad. I was made to understand that a similar grant was given last year but the money was expended on other roads besides the one for which it was given. I think, Sir, that you will also remember that money was granted to be spent on Mellowes Hill Road last year and not a single cent was spent on it. That road is still in bad shape and I am hoping that a member of the Government will give me some information on it. I am also hoping that a member of Government would tell me which road is this money allocated to be spent on.

According to the note, the Director of Highways and Transport will supervise the work which would be done on the road for which this money is voted. I am very glad to hear that because it is ridiculous to vote money to be spent on a particular thing and then to learn that it has been spent on some other project. I will await a reply from a member of Government on the questions which I have asked.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, the Commissioners of Highways receive a grant for their supervision of the work that is carried out on roads in the parish. If the Director of Highways and Transport is going to supervise the work that they should supervise, are they going to receive a reduction in the grant which is given them for supervision? Is this supervision to be carried out by the Director of Highways and Transport because these Commissioners of Highways have been found incompetent to do so?

Mr. HAYNES: The honourable junior member for the City has made some remarks to the effect that there will be no necessity for supervision by the Commissioners of Highways on the roads to which repairs will be carried out, but that is not so; the Director of Highways and Transport will only see that the money is spent on the road for which it was earmarked. "Checking" is the word which should have been used; not the word "supervise."

Mr. LEWIS: Perhaps, the honourable member did not read the note to the item. If he had referred to it, he would have seen that it is stated that the work will be supervised by the Department of Highways and Transport. I take it that when the work is carried out, it will be supervised by a member of the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I appreciate the point made by the honourable junior member for the City but I do think that the word "supervise" is wrong and that the correct word which should be used is "check." As a matter of fact, the actual supervision is carried out by the parochial authorities, but the Department of Highways and Transport sends an Inspector to check that the work is done and the money spent on the particular road. I sincerely hope that the Department of Highways and Transport will never cease to check on the money which is given to be spent on road repairs in the various parishes because the parish of St. Philip has suffered severely because of misappropriation of these funds.

(A VOICE: All parishes).

Some honourable member has said all parishes have suffered in that respect. I do know that there is a tendency to mis-spend Government funds in this direction and unless a very careful check is kept on it, a lot of work which should be done would never be accomplished. I think honourable members are aware that during the last two years, there has hardly been any money granted by Government for road-building programmes and I think it is due to the fact that there was a serious misappropriation of funds for that purpose by the parochial authorities in the parish of St. Philip. I do not think that we should vote money for parochial authorities to mis-spend it. If that state of affairs is to exist in our road-

building programme, what we want done would never be done.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman, — In answer to the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, I cannot say at this stage the name of the road or roads that will be repaired by this supplementary provision but when it comes to the repairing of roads, it is true to say that it has been the experience of Government for a long time that the situation as it stands in St. Joseph and some of the other parishes is very unsatisfactory. In this particular case, it does appear as if the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph took it upon themselves to order some railway material from Trinidad to assist in effecting repairs to one of its roads and the Commissioners have put up a case to Government asking for this additional sum so as to complete the repairs. I think the road is somewhere around Cocoonut Grove.

I do know when it comes to the question of supervision that it is not only checking which will be carried out by the Department of Highways and Transport but that it will be supervision in its truest sense. Now that we have a Director of Highways and Transport who is very interested in his work and who seems to know his job extremely well, I do know that he is going to see that roads will be built to certain specifications and because of his wishes, he is going to carry out regular supervision on all roads which are being built. In addition to that, the expenditure on those roads would also be checked. Again, I would say that the arrangements for doing roads in some of the parishes are very unsatisfactory. You cannot get them to send in proper accounts nor would they comply in every detail to what they are asked to do. We can only hope that the Local Government Bill will soon come into existence and that it would change this state of affairs.

The question that Head XXVIII stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, — I would just like Head XXV be re-committed for the purpose of saying under Item 83, (New) Purchase of Theodolite and Level, that the note to it says that the existing instruments in use by the Public Works Department are both in excess of 50 years of age and the need to replace them is acute.

Sir, ten years ago, Government could have come here and say on this same matter that the instruments are over 40 years and the need to replace them is acute. I do not know if this is a good explanation to make why there is need for a new set of instruments. Certainly to say that the instruments are over 50 years of age is not a good reason. You could easily have said that they were over 40 years and that would also appear as a very long time. There should be some better reason than what has been given under the note.

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services

Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, was called. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXXII—Highways and Transport

Head XXXII, Highways and Transport, was called.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on Item 45, Special Reserve for Extraordinary Flood Damage. I want to raise

a word of complaint to this House on the question of flood damage. Last year, the honourable Leader of this House and the honourable junior member for St. Peter visited peasant holdings up by the Crane, St. Philip and made promises to them that they would do something to take off the flood water from lands there but up to now, nothing has been done. If you visit that area now, you will see an actual sea from the excessive rain which fell last Sunday, and as a result, the crops of the peasants are under water. I therefore must remind this Chamber of the promises made by the honourable Leader of this House to do something about it. Sir, I am laying strong protest on the tardiness of the Government in doing something to remedy that situation.

During this year, my honourable colleague was able to influence the Director of Highways and Transport to send a well cleaner to the area to clean the well there. Although that well has been cleaned, whenever there is an excessive rainfall, you still get that sea of water which damages the crops of the peasants before it dries out. I am therefore calling attention to the unsatisfactory condition of that area at the Crane, St. Philip, and am appealing to the Government to do something quickly to remedy the situation.

Mrs. BOURNE came into the Committee and took her seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I must say that it is most regrettable that the situation referred to by my honourable colleague should be allowed to remain so long undone. I would say that a little something has been done to improve the situation through the instrumentality of the Director of Highways and Transport. I think honourable members should, occasionally, whenever the occasion merits it, pay tribute to the efficiency which is expected of any head of Government Department in the carrying out of his duties, and in respect to this matter, I would say that early this year, before the rainy season set in, I complained of this matter to the new Director of Highways and Transport and asked him to send an engineer to see what could be done to remedy the situation. The Director made it his personal duty to go there and inspect it at first hand and I cannot but pay a compliment to him because I think his prompt action is unusual for a Head of Department in Barbados. Sir, he went there and gave instructions to have the well cleaned and as my honourable colleague has said, we did get some results by the cleaning of that well, but with the abnormal rainfall recently, the position is almost the same as before. Not only are the peasants' crops perishing as a result of flood water, but the people's yards are also flooded and if the rains continue, we may see a recurrence of the situation of two years ago when even the bus transport was held up because the road was impassable. I do hope that the Director of Highways and Transport would pay further attention in this matter and take steps to improve the situation in the best manner possible. As far as I can see, to merely clean the well there is not sufficient. Maybe, there might be the necessity for digging more suck wells to drain off abnormal water from heavy rains. Whatever might be the remedy, I sincerely hope that it would soon be attended to and in the best manner possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Under this Head, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to two observations by me under Item 44, Work undertaken for utility companies and Government Departments. It is necessary for utility companies to make certain alterations or repairs to their services underneath the roads from time to time, but I think it is incumbent on the Government to see that the road is replaced in proper condition as quickly as possible after

such alterations or repairs. It is true that the utility companies pass the buck on the Government, making it the responsibility of Government for doing it. However, I think such repairs should be carried out as quickly as possible. I know, for an instance, that in My Lords Hill the Electric Company has dug up that road to do something to its service, and that road which was once about 22 feet wide is now no more than 14 feet wide because the pavement has not been put back and the road has got into a state of disrepair. It is quite a long time since that road was in that state of disrepair.

Another thing which I would like Government to look into is a habit which is constantly practised when roads, particularly around corners are being widened, of not resurfacing and binding the widened part as quickly as possible afterwards. Particularly is this evident in the parishes of St. George and St. James.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I would like to ask the honourable junior member for St. Thomas whether any revised scale of charges to utility services for reconditioning roads after they have been dug up by those companies has been put before this House recently. I do know that this matter has been taken up on several occasions in this House and I remember that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on the last occasion promised that something would be done about it. The honourable member did say that Government was considering increasing the charges for reconditioning roads after they had been dug up by these utility companies.

Sir, I do know that it is a matter which is very difficult to estimate accurately but so far as I have been able to understand, the Government is very lenient and very low in their charges. Government has to get expert people to inspect the roads after they have been dug up by these utility companies and very often the Department of Highways and Transport actually have to take out and put in new material in the portion of the road which has been dug up. I therefore am wondering whether the Government is checking up on the charges which are made in this respect. I know of a case up Bay Street some months ago where one of the public utility companies broke up a sidewalk and when everybody thought that the company would be putting a pipeline underneath that sidewalk which was broken up, by the time as the sidewalk was demolished and the drain was cut, it was filled in without anything being put down it. The company then went to the centre of the road and dug it up. All of these things happen from time to time. I would therefore like to be sure that Government has revised its charges to these utility companies recently for this kind of work. It must be remembered that these charges are to pay employees who work on those roads. Very often, these employees have to be paid pensions also.

Dr. CUMMINS: The procedure is that after the utility company have finished what it was doing, the Highways and Transport Department will re-instate the road and then send the bill for such repairs to the company and the company will pay it.

Mr. LEWIS: I am aware that that is the procedure adopted. What I would like to know is whether there has been any increase in the charges recently. Are we charging only for the work done at the particular time without taking into account that a certain percentage should be added for pensions which we would have to pay the people who carry out the work? We have an example of the political and economic strength of these public utilities. They have held up legislation in this island and

have demonstrated their strength. In one instance, the Government and people of this country were libelled and slandered and then we had to pay a fine. What I would like to know definitely is whether this Government is getting back not only the money it has paid out at the time for reconditioning the roads after these utility companies have dug them up, but some sort of surcharge for the professional services rendered and the pensions for the people doing the work.

Mr. COX: The charge for replacement of this work includes all overhead expenses. This has been in existence for about a year.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to see some machinery set up by the Department of Highways and Transport so that charges for work of that sort will be made to the consumer directly for the service that has been done by the utility company. I say that, Sir, because I know of a case in which a householder was able to put in 155 feet of gas pipe privately employing one of the employees of the Gas Company and one other labourer to dig up the yard at a cost of approximately \$60. That work was done in a day, and with the necessary elbows, bends and 'T' joints. It then became necessary to join the end of the consumer's line with ten feet of pipe to the main of the company and to put in a meter. For this work, it took the Gas Company something like three and a half days. The company employed the same foreman with two or three other men, and the bill which the company sent to the consumer for that bit of work was almost \$90. I find it difficult, even taking into consideration what might be inefficient supervision on the job and the unnecessary length of time to carry out the joining up of the service, to understand why it should cost that amount of money. I do not know if to macadamize the portion of the road accounted for the discrepancy in cost. The only conclusion that I can come to is that the Public Utility Company is making a profit out of the transaction over and above the cost which they may have to pay to their own men. As a matter of fact, if any member of the Government is interested in this matter, he can get the exact bill that was sent in by the company and the name of the consumer. I will be willing to supply it because the consumer happens to be myself, so I am in an excellent position to state the facts of this particular case. As a matter of fact, it was on the specific advice of the better paid employee of the Gas Company that I elected to put down the 155 feet of pipe.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. We are dealing with Head XXXII, Highways and Transport. How does the matter to which you are referring come under that Head?

Mr. BARROW: Yes Sir, I am speaking on Item 44 under that Head, Work undertaken for utility companies and Government Departments. I am sorry if I did not say so when I began to speak.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, This is a vote for an item under the Head, Highways and Transport, and the Department is only interested in restoring the road. It has nothing to do with the laying of pipe by any particular utility company, nor what it will cost a consumer. The Department of Highways and Transport is only concerned with the restoring of the road.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I am talking specifically of the charge which is made for restoring the road. I was saying that the public utility company has charged me almost twice as much to restore ten feet

of public road as what I paid to restore 155 feet of my own road.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The Department of Highways and Transport did not charge the honourable member for restoring the road; the Department has charged the Gas Company.

Mr. BARROW: If the honourable member were listening carefully to me, he would have heard that I said that I hope some machinery would be set up by the Department of Highways and Transport so that charges for work of this sort would be charged to the consumer directly. I would be satisfied that I would be getting my money's worth. The Public Utility Company might feel themselves justified in surcharging for that sort of thing over and above what it costs them. That is the point which I am making. I do not think it is fair to the consumer. I was relating my personal experience in the matter. I have not protested to the particular company yet, but I feel I should lodge a private protest. Before I do so, I am further considering the matter to see how that company arrived at that amount or the method whereby there should be such a wide disparity in the cost of the repair of the 10-foot narrow strip of public road and the cost to me of repairing the 155 feet of my own road. I am accusing nobody of anything. However, I think it would be better for the consumer if the Department of Highways and Transport charged the consumer directly rather than the consumer being charged through the agency of the utility company.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the honourable member who has just spoken is drawing to the attention of the Government the likelihood that the public utility company might be making money out of the Government. I feel this is a matter that concerns the particular Government Department and I do not know how Government can get around it. The utility company has to charge for its own work that it has carried out for the consumer as well as it has to charge for what it has to pay for replacement of the road. I do not know, but it might be more expensive if the consumer is charged directly by the Department of Highways for the cost of replacing the road along with what the consumer will be charged by the public utility company for the work which that company has done. However, I will tell the honourable senior member for St. George that he is in an excellent position to know what was charged the public utility company by the particular Government Department for carrying out that job. Probably, if he finds out that, he will be able to make out a more specific case for a consumer being charged directly.

Mr. MILLER: Allow me to say a few words which I hope would clear up some misunderstanding on this matter. With regard to what the Highways and Transport Department charges for resurfacing the roads when they are dug up by utility companies or by the Waterworks Department, I can say that there is a standard rate which is charged. What I think my colleague failed to realise was that what might probably do for laying a pipeline in one's backyard might not do for laying it along the public road. One might only dig six or eight inches down to lay a pipe on one's private road but to lay it down on the public road the utility company might probably have to go down 16 inches or double that. It is also a question of the width which one might have to dig in one's private road as against that which has to be dug on the public road. Then there is also the question of resurfacing the public road which may not have to be done on one's private road.

It is far different to what it was before in the days of the old Gas Company when that company would dig up half of the public road and then fill it in with the same stuff it took out and leave it.

I have had to do with the laying of pipe both for water and gas on more than one occasion and I say that there is a standard rate fixed by the Department of Highways and Transport for re-surfacing roads after they have been dug up. The Department charges the same rate to the public utility company as it charges to the Waterworks Department which is a department of Government. It must be taken in consideration that in laying a pipe-line in one's backyard that one can choose to lay it where the soil is soft or easier to dig so as to reduce the cost to the owner.

The question that Head XXXII stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXIII—Airport

Head XXXIII, Airport, was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXXIII stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Under Item 9, Unestablished Staff, I would like to say that there is only one Assistant Mechanic on the present establishment at the Airport and that is in accordance with the note to the item. The note further says that "as it is absolutely necessary to have some qualified mechanic on the premises at all times during air traffic, the Grade "A" mechanic has had to work over-time and be paid for such work as a member of the Unestablished Staff. The average weekly amount paid for over-time to this employee is approximately \$17. Supplementary provision of \$600 is required to cover the cost of this over-time pay for the remainder of the financial year."

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand how a Socialist Government like this can allow a condition of affairs like that to go on. With all the unemployment in this island, do you mean to tell me that this Government cannot find one or two mechanics to employ at that Airport so as to assist the one there? Certainly, the amount of money which is paid to the Assistant Mechanic at the Airport can be paid to another mechanic and it is a reasonable amount for the person to eke out a livelihood and probably support a family. This vote of \$600 for the remainder of the year will work out at approximately \$40 a week overtime for one man. It is preposterous. It is stated in the note that the Grade "A" mechanic at present employed gets about \$17 a week in overtime, and the Grade "A" mechanic is paid something like 45 cents an hour. Certainly he should not be given that much in overtime. It is something that really needs investigation. Certainly, it would take a lot of explaining to allow one man to work for that much in over-time plus what might be considered as a reasonable regular salary.

Sir, there is room for another mechanic or two at this Airport. I would be very glad if Government would look into this matter at the very earliest possible time and correct it. The amount of \$600 that is set down here for overtime for the next sixteen weeks will work out to \$40 a week. This thing does not look right at all in the eyes of the public. I think this Government should take immediate steps to correct this state of affairs.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. COX: What the honourable member has said is the exact thing which has been done on this occasion. It is only recently that this matter has been reported to the Government by the Manager of the Airport and the Government decided rather than to have an individual working continually for that amount of overtime to employ somebody else. This vote is to employ some other mechanic until the end of the financial year.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I must say that the present draft of the explanatory note does not explain the matter in that way. Certainly the Government should have given a more satisfactory explanation than the one which has been given. I would like this Committee to consider every sentence in that note carefully because it deals with the question of Unestablished Staff and at the start it is drafted to read that in the present establishment at the Airport, there is only one Assistant Mechanic. It goes on to say: As it is absolutely necessary to have some qualified mechanic on the premises at all times during air traffic, the Grade "A" mechanic has had to work over-time and be paid for such work as a member of the Unestablished Staff." Here you have a Grade "A" mechanic employed at the Airport and when he works overtime, you pay him as if he were a member of the Unestablished Staff. The note further states: "The average weekly amount paid for overtime to this employee is approximately \$17. Supplementary provision of \$600 is required to cover the cost of this over-time pay for the remainder of the financial year."

Sir, whoever drafted this note really needs a course in logic, but there is another aspect to this matter which I feel honourable members may have some suggestion to offer and it is this. Personally, I feel that there was no need for that Grade "A" mechanic to put in all that overtime. I feel that an Airport Time Table can be made out for a half year in advance and if that time table is made out, the mechanic who has to work certain hours should more or less know what commitments as regards time he will have to fulfil. He should know by that a considerable time in advance when any aircraft would be arriving because there are few unscheduled flights after the normal working hours. I do not know if this mechanic is called upon to supervise diesel engines after the normal working hours but this should not be so. I am confident that a proper time table can be worked out to cover working hours and scheduled flights many months in advance.

While on this point, I would like to query about the poor firemen at the Airport. Are they paid overtime whenever they have to be away from their homes for 48 hours? I would like to get some explanation on this question. I think the firemen must be very much in the same position as the Assistant Mechanic and as a result, they should have been entitled to some overtime or allowance, or there should be provision for more firemen. I happen to know from complaints by ex-members of the Royal Air Force who fill such positions at the Airport that the Airport Manager expects them to work 48 and sometimes 72-hour shifts which I consider is unreasonable. It does not matter whether those firemen have to put out a fire or not — I hope they will never have cause to put out one — they have to be on the alert whenever an aircraft is sighted. They have to be awake at any hour of the night that they are on duty and if they are not awake, they are subject to disciplinary action. I hope the Government would investigate this matter and see that equal terms are meted out to all employees at the Airport. There should be no separate treatment for some employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, even subject to what the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has hinted to me, I must still say — and I consider I am right to do so as a member of this House — that the note to this item is drafted stupidly and far from what is proposed to be done with the vote for the item. If it is the intention of the Government to employ another mechanic and to pay that person out of this vote, it cannot be gauged by that note because it specifically states that the Assistant Mechanic at the Airport draws approximately \$17 weekly for overtime and the \$600 that is voted against the item is to pay that mechanic for such overtime.

However, in circumstances such as these, and particularly in an island where there is so much unemployment, it is inequitable to allow one employee of the Government to be able to earn all that amount from overtime when it is sufficient to allow some other person to live on and such a person could be found to fulfil the task. I therefore cannot see why the Government should not have two or three such mechanics so that while one is on duty, the others could be on reserve or leave and the amount which is paid in overtime at present would become void. When that is done, there will still be a competent officer to carry out special duties. I would say that the \$17 a week which is paid for overtime at present to this Assistant Mechanic is in keeping with what other workers in that position live on in this island.

Dr. CUMMINS: We must remember what was the position at first at the Airport. It began on a small scale and there was only the necessity for one Grade "A" mechanic. Within recent months, the traffic at the Airport has increased considerably. We now have T.C.A., B.O.A.C., L.A.V., and other airlines calling at this Airport and because of that there has been more work for the employees at the Airport and in consequence for the mechanic who had to put in overtime which amounted to all that money. The Government decided last week to appoint additional staff at the Airport and it will be coming down soon with a resolution to increase the establishment there. It can be seen therefore, that the Government is aware of the position at the Airport and is already taking steps to remedy it.

Mr. LEWIS: I too want to say that the note to this item does not put a clear picture of the case. Obviously, the honourable senior member for St. Michael did not read the note. It is a pity that all of these things continue to happen. It seems as if Civil Servants are concocting all sorts of notes and putting them before the Executive, and members of the Executive are accepting them. According to the note to the item, a Grade "A" mechanic is even drawing rates of pay for overtime work as if he were a member of the Unestablished Staff. I think that is a very peculiar arrangement. However, I agree that the Airport is growing and naturally it is straightening out its difficulties as it goes along. But this is a serious matter, if as the note says, it was absolutely necessary for that mechanic to work all that length of time. If he had to put in all that overtime at nights, I do not think he could come out to work on the morning afterwards and put in a proper day's work. I suppose that Government might have got away with this state of affairs, but to put it down on paper makes bad reading. I contend that the Government should not have allowed this vote to pass without telling all the facts in the matter. The situation seems to be very much in favour of the Government because as we have heard, it is taking steps to remedy the situation.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Looking at this matter from the point of view of a member of the Whitley Council, I will just like to explain the difference between the various grades in the Government Service as the personnel of them are applicable to overtime. There are no overtime rates for members of the Established Staff. If you are an officer of Government on the Established Staff, there are no rates laid down for overtime work as in normal Trade Union practice where overtime rates are based on one and a half of your substantive wage per the time you work overtime on ordinary days and double pay per the time you work on special days. The only rates in the Government for overtime are rates which are fixed for personnel on the Unestablished Staff. Therefore, whenever an officer of Government of any given salary who is not on the Unestablished Staff has to work overtime, he has to be paid according to the rates of pay set down for members of the Unestablished Staff. That is to say, if you have an officer who is getting \$40 a week as a member of the Established Staff, if he works that amount of hours overtime, he would not get \$60 for it. He will be paid according to the maximum rate of pay for a member of the Unestablished Staff. There are no overtime rates for a Grade "A" mechanic, and because of that, the note was drafted as you see it.

If I may say something further, Government does not have a scheduled system of rates of pay for any officer when it comes to overtime. Some officers are required to work overtime without receiving any pay for such overtime. No officer in the Secretariat draws pay for overtime although many of them are called on to work overtime frequently. With regard to an officer who works in the Customs or such offices, when he works overtime he is given a fee and you will find that an officer who may be working for much less than another in the same Department will receive the same fee for overtime, as the better paid officer. It therefore means that the higher an officer is in Government, the less does overtime mean to him. As you see, this Grade "A" mechanic to qualify for overtime pay must accept rates of pay for members of the Unestablished Staff.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Am I to understand the honourable member as saying that the fees paid for overtime to a clerk in the Post Office or Customs are based on Unestablished Staff rates?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I was pointing out that just as you have fees that are unrelated to salary for those who are paid for overtime work on the Established Staff that have to be paid for overtime work, but for which no fees are laid down, they have to accept rates not based on their salary, but based on rates of pay for members of the Unestablished Staff. That is to say, you do not have overtime rates for a Grade "A" mechanic, but if that type of mechanic works overtime for which he is entitled to pay, he is paid according to what is the rate most suitable for his position according to the rates of pay laid down for members of the Unestablished Staff. I may say that it is not a very happy system, but it cannot be dealt with adequately and scientifically in this Chamber, because it gives rise to many complications. Sometimes, you get some one who is supervising some work that is done overtime getting less pay for the overtime work he performs than the other person whom he is supervising.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I do not think that the people who are being supervised when doing work overtime should receive a better pay than the supervisor. I think that is wrong.

(A VOICE: But that is so, because there is no rate laid down for the supervisor.)

Mr. VAUGHAN: The lesser should not be drawing more money than the greater. Now that we are on this point, I do know that state of affairs occurs with workers at the Bowmanston Pumping Station. I do not see any reason why an ordinary worker at the Waterworks Department when he works overtime should work for more money than the foreman who has to supervise that overtime work. It is not correct.

Sir, at this stage, I move that you report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Dr. CUMMINS: I move that the Resolution for \$102,475 do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (CURRENT) NO. 21.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is as follows:—

A Resolution to place the sum of \$9,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1953-54, No. 21, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

As honourable members will see in the Addendum, this money is needed to purchase additional equipment for the Government Laboratory. It will be remembered that \$8,000 was voted previously in the Estimates. That was the first instalment, and this \$9,000 is the second. The new Chemist has reorganised the Department and brought it up to standard. When I say that, I mean a standard comparable with standards abroad. With this equipment the Chemist will be capable of doing almost anything in his line. The matter has been investigated by Sir John Saint and he has reported favourably on this new equipment.

I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I do not know why this Resolution should come before us now when on the 27th of October we passed the supplementary estimate of \$250 which we see here. Do you not think, Sir, that we could have heard about this vote at the same time? On the 27th of October the Government came for \$250.00 because the \$8,000 had been spent. But they wait until December and come back to say they want this \$9,000 as a second instalment. If the Executive wanted to spread this work over two years and then decided to get through it as soon as possible, do you think it was necessary

to come with this matter to the House now when on the 27th of October they came for a supplementary estimate of \$250.00 to complete the first part of the work? It seems to me that the financial side of the Government feel that we are here to be called on whenever they want us to vote something. When ever they have a second thought they can call on us and then write down anything in the Addendum.

Mr. WILLIAMS: It was on the 27th of October that I pointed out that it was a silly idea to spread this work over two years. On the other hand I think the Government should be commended on deciding not to spread this building work over two years. It is heartening to see that the Government sometimes pays some attention to what we say.

Mr. LEWIS: I hope that the honourable member does not think that they are building anything with this money. They are not putting up a building with this money. I am at a loss to understand why laboratory equipment should be classified as structural alterations. Structural alterations do not mean equipment. I do not know if the Government can reconcile the two things.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I hope I have not given the impression that a building is being built. The position is that certain structural alterations are being made for the new equipment.

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

RESOLUTION *Re* COMBERMERE SCHOOL BUILDING

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is as follows:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$20,700 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1953-54 No. 24, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

This Resolution is in connection with Combermere School. You will remember, Sir, that it was felt that we might have to do away with Combermere School altogether. But the present Colonial Engineer thinks that the main hall could be lightened by taking off one storey and making it a one-storey building, and then as the Addendum shows, the Colonial Engineer feels that the building should be carefully watched, and if it shows signs of further cracking, the first floor should also be removed and the building reformed into a single-storey block. Therefore this is the first stage for which the sum of \$20,000 is being asked.

The Addendum goes on: "The opportunity is also being taken to integrate into this stage of the re-organisation of the buildings, the provision of a General Science Laboratory for Combermere School. It was originally intended that this laboratory, at a cost of \$25,000 should be provided from the amount of \$250,000 included for Secondary Education in the Five Year Plan. As the Science Laboratory will now be housed in the reformed hall the only provision required will be \$2,000 for fittings and services and \$1,200 for furniture and apparatus will now be required. These amounts are also included in the Resolution."

Some of the pupils now go to the Drill Hall. They will not be kept there permanently. The whole hall will not be used as the laboratory; part of the hall will be used for that, and part for four class rooms. These class rooms and the laboratory will be acquired at a cheaper cost than was anticipated. It will be done at a cheaper rate than

\$25,000, with the conversion of this hall into class rooms and the laboratory.

I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—This is a substantial additional amount to be spent on Secondary Education in this island. Before the House approves the Resolution it should be made acquainted with conditions now obtaining at Combermere School which are entirely detrimental to the progress of that school, completely unsatisfactory to the parents of pupils and totally unfair to the pupils of that school. Those remarks are specifically made with reference to the Headmaster of that school. It has been brought to my notice, Sir,—and before we pass this Resolution we should know these things—it has been brought to my notice that the headmaster is absent for days at a time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with the headmaster in this Resolution.

Mr. VAUGHAN: We are dealing with Combermere School.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with Combermere School building.

Mr. VAUGHAN: We are spending money on Combermere, and thus on Secondary Education. The headmaster of that school—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member cannot deal with the headmaster. I am not going to allow it.

Mr. VAUGHAN: This Resolution is to provide money to be spent on an institution for Secondary Education. Walls do not teach children.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Neither do personnel crack walls.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Before more money is spent we should know what we are going to get inside those walls. The headmaster is absent for days on a stretch.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—You rightly ruled that the honourable member was out of order to bring the Headmaster of Combermere School into the debate on this Resolution. It is bad policy for honourable members to argue with you or with Mr. Speaker. I hope that you will insist on your ruling being obeyed.

Mr. VAUGHAN: It is preposterous for honourable members to feel that one must obey the ruling of the Chairman just because the Chairman made that ruling and whether it is a right or wrong ruling. It has been brought to my notice that for several consecutive days on a stretch this headmaster—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have told the honourable member that I will not entertain that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I appeal to you to call His Honour to the Chair and allow him to rule on this matter. This is a money Resolution and I feel that I am entitled to speak on it. The headmaster of a school is important to the success of the school, and I have reasons to advance why the Headmaster of Combermere should not continue to be headmaster.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not entertain it.

Mr. VAUGHAN: He is absent from the school for several days without notifying his deputy. He has not had the courtesy to notify his deputy. During the Coronation period he was absent for three weeks.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—If the honourable member refuses to obey your ruling you should ask him to take his seat.

Mr. VAUGHAN: During the Coronation period he was absent from the school for several weeks. Mr. Chairman, we cannot spend money on these

institutions when the people who are in charge of them do not administer them properly. I do not see how the Government can take up \$20,000 and spend it on a school when the headmaster is unfit to be headmaster. The discipline of that school is at stake because of certain facts which I will enumerate tonight. Before we get through I hope to satisfy this House that this school should not continue to be administered by the present headmaster.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will call His Honour the Speaker to the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN leaves the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER takes the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me that the honourable junior member for St. John while speaking on the Resolution which is now the subject of debate touched on matters relating to the Headmaster of Combermere School and the administration of the School which were not matters pertinent to the subject in issue. The Chairman of Committees further reported to me that he cautioned the honourable member to leave off the question of the headmaster and the administration of the school and that the honourable member refused to stop and continued to speak on those matters. This is a matter which I regard as a very serious breach of discipline. No honourable member should behave in such a way, and the honourable member should apologise to the Chairman. If he does not do that I will have to let him know how serious an offence it is, and I shall tell him what are the powers of the House to deal with the offence that has been reported. Now I shall ask the honourable member to express himself with regard to the report that has been made to me.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—After the Chairman objected to what I was saying I dealt with the matter in a manner to bring in the headmaster incidentally. The headmaster's study is dealt with in this Resolution. Dealing with a money Resolution I felt that the study should not be repaired for such a person. I brought in the administration of the school on which the Government was proposing to spend \$20,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: And the Chairman ruled that you were speaking outside of the scope of the Resolution. If you want to question the Chairman's ruling, which ruling I uphold, you can do so. I am giving a gentle caution.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Your Honour has crossed me, perhaps without the desire to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: My position is one of great tolerance. If the Chairman of Committees has ruled that the honourable member was out of order and the honourable member wants to challenge that ruling he should ask honourable members to support him in that challenge. I uphold the Chairman's ruling and I would advise the honourable member to apologise and let the matter end there.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Since it is Your Honour's opinion (Mr. SPEAKER: Not opinion; my ruling) that I have offended the Chairman I gladly apologise.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN resumes the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—Before I can vote for this Resolution there are one or two things that I would like to ask for information on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to know if the honourable junior member for St. John was finished speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for the City caught my eye.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This is a Resolution for \$20,700. Some years ago, when I came to the House in 1949, immediately after the flood, there was a hue and cry by a few people that Combermere School be destroyed. Somehow after much investigation it was discovered that there was some ulterior motive in some people's minds, and the whole idea was squashed. I observe from the Addendum that it is as a result of questions asked by my colleague that this Resolution is before us; and that on the 21st of July the following reply was laid in the House to questions asked by that honourable member:—

"After a preliminary inspection on the 27th May by the Acting Colonial Engineer of cracks which had appeared in the walls of the Headmaster's study and the Hall at Combermere School, a Board of Survey consisting of the Acting Colonial Engineer, the Director of Highways and Transport, and the Building Adviser to the Comptroller, Development and Welfare Organisation, was appointed to survey the School Building and make recommendations. The Board has held seven meetings at the School and is keeping careful watch on the structure by means of weekly inspections. Trial holes have been dug for the purpose of examining the subsoil and the foundations of the buildings. Until the extent of the problem can be determined it is not possible to make plans for remedying the defects in the building."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter in my opinion. I notice from the Addendum that the Government has now considered the three interim reports and the final report of the Board of Survey. Government has also considered the recommendations of the Colonial Engineer who arrived in the island after the Board of Survey had submitted its final report. My colleague asked questions which apparently resulted in the Government appointing a Board to go into the matter. I think that this honourable Chamber should be made acquainted with the Report of the Board. There should be no secret about it. It should be laid on the table of this House for honourable members to see. As a result of a question asked by a member of this House the Government appointed a Board and has seen fit to send down a Resolution for \$20,000. I am going to move that this Resolution be postponed. If, I repeat, this thing comes as a result of a question asked by a member of this House, then as the night follows day it follows that the other 23 members and the general public would like to know something of the report of the three-man committee which was appointed to make a survey. If that had been done honourable members would be in a position to give fair criticism on the entire matter.

As the matter stands now honourable members will take refuge in criticism of the headmaster, while others will take the attitude that it is not necessary to spend this money. Now we have all heard the criticism that the present site of Combermere School is most unsuitable. Long before my time as a member of this House we have been hearing that. The next thing was that cracks developed in the building, and none of us know that cause. Now we are going to spend \$20,000 on the removal of the first floor and upper part of the walling and the conversion of the existing building to a single storey building thereby reforming the existing hall into four class rooms and a Science Laboratory.

In 1949 after the flood cracks appeared in the building and water went in. Since that we have had an earthquake and more cracks appeared. Before I vote this money I would even like to know if the committee discovered that these cracks were normal, or if they are as a result of the earthquake. Until we know that none of us

should vote for this Resolution. At St. Saviour's Church in St. Andrew, elsewhere in St. Philip and in buildings throughout the whole island cracks appeared after the earthquake, and I know that St. Andrew drew a handsome sum from an Insurance Company as a result of the damage caused by the quake. If the Engineers have discovered that the cracks in the Combermere building were as a result of the quake, the next question is whether money has been drawn from the Insurance Company. The Government is asking us to vote money to remodel a building that developed dangerous cracks. We are not told what the Engineers said. They have dug trial holes at the site; surely they should be able to tell us whether the cracks are normal and due to the condition of the foundation or whether they were as a result of the earthquake.

I am telling the Government that they should not try to rush this through. It is the consensus of opinion that these cracks were due to the earthquake and the Government should collect insurance money as did the parishes of St. Andrew and Christ Church. I do not think anyone would deny that these dangerous cracks showed up as a result of the earthquake. I am asking honourable members which of them could conscientiously vote this \$20,000 with the knowledge that it was the earthquake which caused the cracks in the walls? If that is so the Government should collect. On the other hand, let us suppose that it was not as a result of the earthquake. Are you going to vote \$20,000 to repair a damage that is due to the unsuitability of the land and then look at the Addendum and see that the final stage of the reorganisation will be the erection of another single storey building on an adjacent site? Where will be the site? From the top of Roebuck Street right down is Weymouth, and it is the same silt.

Without further ado, sir, I move that consideration of this Resolution be postponed, and that this House ask the Government to send down a copy of the report. There should be nothing confidential in a report made on an institution that is the leading secondary school in this island. That school houses 500 children from hundreds of homes. You either know the truth or you do not know it. If the truth is that the damage was a result of the earthquake the Government should say if they collected. If not, why? I move that this Resolution be postponed. When we have seen the report of the Committee we will be able to make up our minds on what the engineers say should be done. I am not criticising any of the engineers. The question that we have to ask ourselves is whether we should spend this money without having seen the report of the committee and without knowing what caused the cracks.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, — I beg to second the motion for postponement of this Resolution. With the facts before us honourable members should support that motion. The position is this: Bearing in mind the Resolution which we have before us and what appears in the Addendum, the only way in which we can support it is if the honourable introducer had made a very explanatory speech in support of the Resolution explaining the position as set out by the committee which made the survey.

We are reminded in the Addendum that serious cracks appeared in the walls at Combermere School. We are told that a survey was made and that the sub-soil and the foundations were examined. Without being told the result of the survey, and without being told what is the condition of the sub-soil and the foundations we are asked today to approve of the expenditure of a further sum of money to re-

model one part of the building and at the same time we are waiting to see what happens to the other part. I have never heard anything like it. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas is laughing. He is in a position to laugh because he has information which we have not got. But the information which he has is for the purpose of enlightening this committee, not keeping it to himself. If he is laughing at the comments made by honourable members he should be in a position to explain to them why he is laughing, unless he wants to establish a reputation for laughing without sense.

We have heard today that there were three interim reports on this building, and there was a further report by the Board of Survey. Then we are told that the Colonial Engineer has recommended that after we have pulled down part of the hall, lowered the roof and converted it into four class rooms we should wait and see if the remainder of the same building shows definite signs of failure. If it does we should then take off the first storey. It seems to me that if you have to wait and see what one part of the building will do in the future you are justified in waiting to see what the whole building will do. It is one large block of buildings. You cannot approach it in a piecemeal way from the engineering point of view. In all my life I have never heard anything like what is proposed here.

I went to see the school some months ago, and in my opinion it was in a serious condition. There were crevices in the walls at the side and front and what not, and I personally would not have remained there for any length of time. I am saying, sir, that unless and until this committee is assured by the introducer of the Resolution that the steps proposed here are justified it is not to be expected that the committee would support the Resolution. There may be information at the disposal of the Government which justifies their sending down of this Resolution. It is not good enough for the introducer just to come here and read out the Addendum and then sit down and laugh. It is the honourable member's duty to come here and satisfy the Committee that the Government does not propose to squander the taxpayers' money, but that they are justified, from the reports and the surveys, in taking this step.

Without knowing anything about the report on the sub-soil and foundations we are told in para. 3 of the Addendum that later on you will erect another single storey building on an adjacent site. Furthermore we are told that when the first floor is removed etc. steps will be taken to include in this hall a General Science Laboratory. You are going to have a Science Laboratory in a weakly constructed hall and sit and wait and see what happens to the remainder of the building. If anyone has heard anything like this outside of a mental hospital I would be surprised.

We are entitled to be told what caused the cracks to the Combermere School building. Was it the fault of the construction or the fault of the soil? When we are told exactly what was the cause we will know whether we are justified in taking these steps. We have not been told that the foundation is unable to carry two storeys. We are left to imagine from the proposals here that in the opinion of the surveyors the site or the foundation cannot carry a two-storey building. But we are not here to spend money by imagination or implication. We are here to be told what the facts are; and after judging these facts in the light of reason to act accordingly.

I do not know who is drafting these Addendums to the Resolutions that are coming before us;

but it does appear to me that more attention should be given to see that they are drafted in a manner that would not give offence to intelligent opinion in the House. The people who draft them seem to think that they can draft anything and send it to the House and get it passed. It was never done so before in my time. I cannot imagine in any legislative chamber in any part of the world members conscious of their responsibility agreeing to the expenditure of money on a statement like this.

We are spending a lot of money on Combermere School. The honourable introducer himself said it was thought that we might have to build another Combermere. Now we are asked to pull down some of it, rebuild it another way and sit down and see what happens to the remainder. Are we all lunatics? You may have to abandon the school completely, either because of the foundation, or because of the sub-soil, or for some other reason. I am not saying that the sub-soil cannot be utilised. It may not be any worse than that of the Barclay's Bank building—a building of three storeys, nor the foundation on which this chamber is standing. Barclay's building is only a stone's throw from the waterfront. As far as we know, the Government does not know what is wrong with Combermere. If they know, then it is as closely guarded a secret as the manufacture of the atom bomb. But we are told that we must spend money on it even if we throw that money away. We may have to abandon completely the existing building. Would it not be more sensible, instead of pulling down part and waiting to see what happens to the other part, to watch the entire building a little longer, while carrying on the existing arrangements?

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I thought that the history of Combermere School was so well known to every member of this House that it would have been redundant to come here today and give it all over again. When these cracks first appeared in the walls after the flood we had a full dress debate in this House. There were all sorts of rumours. Some said the soil in that area was bad; others said it was the fault of the material. I even heard that it was the fault of some inferior white lime from St. Philip.

As far as the question of insurance is concerned I will say that the Government did put in a claim after the earthquake. The Insurance Company wanted to have an investigation, and the matter is not yet closed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If that is so why have you come with this Resolution?

Dr. CUMMINS: Every little boy and girl knows the history of Combermere, I am sure that if I were a member of an insurance company I would like to have an investigation and see things for myself. As far as what we are dealing with today is concerned, Government appointed a body of expert engineers as the board of Survey. Subsequent to that, the Colonial Engineer arrived in the island and he undertook an investigation of the building himself. I might say that from my dealing with the Colonial Engineer he seems to be quite a capable man. I say that for this reason: Members of the Executive Committee are not engineers. We have probably just the average intelligence. We are not like our friends on the left with high intelligence ratings, and therefore experts in everything. In this matter, therefore, the Government had to be guided by the advice of engineers.

Now, Sir, if honourable members are interested in the Reports of the Board of Survey—they put in about three or four, the first one on the 18th of

June, I will read. It says: The Board met three times on the site. We recommend—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I hate to cross the honourable member, but surely he heard me say that the Reports should be laid. Just reading them is not good enough. The Reports should be laid so that honourable members may have a chance to study them. Perhaps after I have studied them I may feel like voting even more money. But do not just read them out. Be fair to the members of the House.

Dr. CUMMINS: If it is the feeling of honourable members that they would like to see the Reports printed and circulated, I will accept the motion for the postponement.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Before this debate is adjourned I would like to inquire whether Government's interfering with the school in the major manner proposed here will not prejudice their claim as far as collecting insurance money is concerned. The honourable member says that he does not have all the information.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This building is cracking at the top of the first floor. If you pull it down and reduce the walls how can you survey it? What will the insurance company survey?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman.—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member speaking on the motion for postponement?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not think it is within the province of the Chairman to enquire of me what I am going to speak on. The Chairman can rule me out of order if I go away from the point. When I rise to address the Chair it is the duty of the Chair to listen to me, and if I am out of order to call me to order. The chairman cannot challenge my right to speak.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, do your duty.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I object to the remarks of the honourable Deputy Leader. The Chairman has no right to challenge my right to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not a vagabond. I do not challenge anyone.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am speaking on the postponement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what I was asking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: But it is not within the right of the Chair to ask me, or it would mean that before any member could speak he would have to tell the Chairman or get a message to him and let him know what he was going to speak on. My point is that the honourable junior member for St. John has made some unfortunate comments about the Headmaster of Combermere School. He even said that he was unfit to hold the post.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything about the headmaster.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As Chairman you should have asked the honourable member to withdraw that statement. That statement went on record and it has not been withdrawn. It is not fair for a member of the House to challenge anyone's profession in such a manner as to say that he is unfit to hold the post which he is holding.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The honourable member is discussing the same matter which I was not allowed to discuss.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not so.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to a point of order, sir. I merely want to point out that the motion for postponement should be put to the Committee and the Committee should agree to it. If an honourable member objects to leave being granted to discuss anything the question has to be put to the House. The motion for postponement of any matter should

be put to the Committee so that the Committee can vote on it. While I am on that point I would like to say that if a motion is put for the postponement it should be disposed of so that the Committee can know where it stands. If an honourable member can merely accept a motion for postponement, one could bring any matter before the House and then before it is properly discussed, accept a motion for postponement, and that would be the end of it.

Dr. CUMMINS: As far as I know the procedure has always been that the introducer of a measure can accept a motion for its postponement. He says, "I beg to accept that motion," and that closes it. The honourable junior member for the City himself has often heard that done. It is only for the last two or three weeks that the honourable member has introduced this idea that it must be put to the House or Committee.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not entering into any argument with the honourable member. An honourable member can get up and say anything at all, and then another honourable member can say let us postpone it. The motion is accepted and the debate is shut down. That is a serious matter. The honourable member has not been caught by that yet, and he can afford to argue. But he may be caught one day. The rules of the House are there to be observed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

(CURRENT) No. 24.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,— There are some Resolutions of which notice was given earlier today, and which I obtained leave to proceed with. The first Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54 No. 24 which form the Schedule to this Resolution and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

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

This Resolution, sir, comes as a result of the Legislature agreeing to the implementation of Ministerial Status. This amount is to provide furniture for the offices of Ministers, for telephone rentals and transfers, and under Judiciary, provision for new rent. The offices of the Public Trustee and Registrar are to be removed from the Public Buildings. The provision of \$200 is for the purpose of paying rent of temporary offices near the Town Hall for the Public Trustee until such time as provision can be made for the building of quarters in the back of the Police Court. The money included in the Resolution is also to provide desks, typists tables, filing cabinets etc. for the Ministers' offices.

Later on, sir, I will deal with an amendment to the Executive Committee Act. That Act says that certain offices including the Registrar's Office must be housed in the Public Buildings, and the amendment will give permission for the Registrar's Office to be removed.

I move, sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,— I think that this is a matter which needs a little debate. It seems to me that we should first agree to the removal of these offices from the Public Buildings. I think that we are putting the cart before the horse.

We have not yet agreed to the removal of the offices mentioned; but we are asked to agree to the alteration of the Public Buildings so that someone else can move in.

What strikes me is that when we were debating the implementation of Ministerial Status we were not given a definite statement that we would need to do it immediately. This is a matter that is really being rushed. May be the Government had its plans made and knew that the moment they got Ministerial Status accepted they would bring in this.

Dr. CUMMINS: The Government considered that inasmuch as we were doing money Resolutions today, and these were two money Resolutions, we might as well do everything at the same time. It was mentioned in the Memorandum sent down on Ministerial Status that it was the intention of the Government to move these offices.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—My regret is that to the already high expenditure on the Ministerial Status proposals must now be added this expenditure for the rental of offices. It does appear to me, sir, that we should be trying to minimise the cost as much as possible. It does appear unsatisfactory that in addition to having to spend money, which so to speak, we could not get away from spending, there should now be the necessity to rent offices in consequence of these proposals.

Dr. CUMMINS: These offices will only be rented for a few months, that is until provision is made at the Courts for the Registrar. It is not a permanent rental.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (CAPITAL) No. 25.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — The next Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of Ten Thousand Three Hundred Dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1953—54, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1953—54, No. 25 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

I will read the addendum, sir. It says:—

The interim proposals for office accommodation with the establishment of the Ministerial system of Government are outlined in His Excellency's Message No. 25/1953 of the 3rd of November.

It is proposed that the Registrar and Public Trustee will vacate the Public Buildings and their offices will be taken over by Ministers. The Registrar will be housed in the Town Hall in the area now occupied by the clerical staff of the Petty Debt Court. The staff of the Petty Debt Court will occupy the building to the north of the Town Hall and the District Auctioneer moved to an out-house at St. Cecilia Barracks. The Public Trustee will temporarily occupy rented offices near the Town Hall. The Cypher Section of the Secretariat has been moved to Government House.

These arrangements involve considerable internal structural alterations for which provision is required as follows:—

	\$
Town Hall	6,200
Secretariat	1,610
Government House	500
St. Cecilia Barracks	600
Transport	500
Contingencies	\$90
	\$10,300

Transport is included in addition to the removal of office equipment the proposals involve the removal of many of the public records of the Island and particular care and supervision must be exercised to prevent damage or loss of these archives.

I beg to move, sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—The transfers which are contemplated of various judicial offices such as the Registrar, the Provost Marshal and the Government Auctioneer may be necessary on the grounds that the Buildings now occupied by these various offices are needed for ministerial offices. But I wonder if the Government is well advised on the spending of this particular amount of money in this particular way at this particular time. It is the intention of the Government to house the Registrar's Office temporarily in the room or rooms now occupied in the Town Hall by the clerks of the Bridgetown Petty Debt Court. Right opposite, and facing the Town Hall is the Waterworks building which in the opinion of many persons who have to deal with the Courts from day to day and with the Registry is admirably suited for the Registry and perhaps a juvenile court; and certainly there is enough floor space for the Public Trustee to be transferred to that building as well. I see no earthly reason why the Waterworks Department should remain in its present location. These offices into which the Government intends to transfer the Registrar and the Public Trustee and the clerks of the Petty Debt Court are hopelessly inadequate. Only today I walked through the building to which it is intended to remove the clerks of the Petty Debt Court, and that building is more like a cow shed than anything else. To spend \$6,200 to transfer that into a thing of beauty is, in my opinion, not worth the taxpayers' money or the time of the Government's engineer.

Now, sir, what is the position over at the Waterworks Department? They keep their pipes on the reef where from time to time the pipes, or some percentage of them are lost by theft or negligence; and yet they have a vast area of land at the Belle Pumping Station. Also, right opposite the Police Station and the Town Hall they store dynamite. I understand that the dynamite and gasoline used to be stored not only in the same building, but in the same room. Now what is the position? The gasoline has been put next door; but vast quantities of dynamite are still stored opposite the Town Hall and Police Station and next door to the office of the honourable senior member for the City. Perhaps it is a new Gun Powder Plot to create a vacancy in the constituency of St. Michael.

I see no reason why the Waterworks should be allowed to remain there and to store volatile petroleum and high explosives next door to such valuable property.

In my humble opinion, the Waterworks Department can be removed from the premises it now occupies to some other place out of Bridgetown. All that Department needs in Bridgetown is a small office where rates can be paid and where consumers can lodge complaints. All that you see as you approach that building is a number of workmen queuing up, probably for orders, and a large amount of stores. I understand that even dynamite and gasoline are stored there. That building is hopelessly unsuitable for a Waterworks Department. I understand that the Superintendent of that Department was asked about the removal of that Department to somewhere else and if it were necessary for him to have that large

paying office, but he is opposed to the idea of moving. I feel Government should have the last say in that matter and should remove all of that Department from Bridgetown, save a suitable paying office. Very little would be necessary to the remainder of that building to convert it in an office suitable for the Registrar and Public Trustee. It will lend itself excellently to that purpose. First of all, it has an excellent vault where all the public records could be kept if a little air conditioning is done to it. These valuable archives could be kept where there is now dynamite, gasoline and cockroaches. Upstairs of that building could also be used as a Juvenile Court and this court would be in easy access of barristers and other officers of the Courts. I see no reason why the Waterworks Department should not be banished to the Belle Plantation in the vicinity of the Belle Pumping Station and if that were done, there would not be the necessity to convert that old, shapeless, decrepit building to the north of the Town Hall into an office for clerks. That building was formerly used for people who were detained, but up to recent times was occupied by the Government Auctioneer. It does appear as if the Government Auctioneer was afraid to go into it because most of the furniture which was distrained on by him was stored in the gallery. I do not consider that building as a suitable place for clerks and in my humble opinion, the \$6,000 which would be spent on it for that purpose is a waste of money. However, I will tell honourable members this: we will have to vote the money because work in the renovation of that building for the purpose has been started already.

Sir, I feel that the Government should urgently consider the question of over riding the wishes of the Superintendent of the Waterworks Department and remove that department to a more congenial area. As I have said before, the only thing which we need to have of that department in Bridgetown is a paying office and we can have that upstairs of the present building or underneath the offices of either the Public Works Department or the Income Tax Commissioner Department. I see no reason why underneath of those offices should be merely a storeroom for Coronation bunting and a lot of other devices like emblems and shields. The offices of the Public Works Department and the Income Tax Commissioner are situated on part of the most expensive land in Barbados. Certainly, underneath of them should not be used only as a storeroom. I think underneath of any of those offices would be an excellent place for a paying office for the Waterworks Department and you could banish the other part of that Department to the Belle Plantation and use that building as I have stated already. I know that a lot of people in the Administration are in favour of using the Waterworks Department building in the way I have outlined. Why store dynamite on such a central spot? If honourable members doubt that dynamite is stored there, ring up the Superintendent of the Waterworks Department and ask him about it. It must also be borne in mind that most of the people engaged at the Waterworks Department work outside of the City. Why not remove the Waterworks Department from out of that building and carry it to the Belle? Valuable space would be liberated that would be more suitable for offices for the Registrar and Public Trustee.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I think anybody who has gone into the present Registry recently knows that it is very cramped with all the filing cabinets and archives that are contained there. I am not pleading the case of the Registrar but any person whose

business calls them to use that office knows that it is very cramped at present and day by day more volumes are added to the many that are there. I therefore cannot see how the Registry could be housed in the Town Hall in the area now occupied by the clerical staff of the Petty Debt Court; therefore, I think the suggestion put up by the honourable senior member for St. George in connection with the use of the Waterworks Department building for that purpose and removing that department to some other place is very admirable in every respect. What the honourable member also said about work being in progress on the building next to the Town Hall is also correct. I have passed there and seen doors being dug out. I would however state that even when that building is renovated, it would be inadequate to house all the Clerks of the Petty Debt Court and the Assistant Court of Appeal as has been mentioned unless it is expanded. I do not see how they can be housed in it at its present size.

I would also add that there are officers in the service who are very favourable to the suggestion that the present Waterworks Department building be used as a Registry although I understand that there has been some objection. I do not know how true is the statement that the objection has come from the Superintendent of the Waterworks Department. At any rate, I too feel that if the Registry is to be removed from the Public Buildings, it would be better housed in the Waterworks Department building. No one needs to be an architect to know that where it is proposed to put it is more incommodious than where it was. I cannot see how it is going to work well. I have heard the honourable mover of the Resolution say that it is only a temporary measure but I hope that the Registrar would not sit down and put up with any sufferings without making complaints. I would say that if this measure were for all time, it certainly cannot work well. It is also true to say that the bottom floors of the offices of the Public Works Department and the Income Tax Department could be better used than for storerooms. I think the suggestions of the honourable senior member for St. George are very admirable in every respect.

Mr. TALMA: I am quite aware of the fact that the present office of the Registrar is insufficient to serve the needs of the day and that state of affairs has been in existence for many years now. Today, the average members of the public fully realise that they should take full advantage of the Public Registry with the result that the Registration Office is always a mass of confusion. I am not censuring any particular Registrar at all, but certainly the accommodation in the Registrar Office at present does not meet the needs of the day. The suggestion that the vault in the Assistant Court of Appeal which is one-sixth the size of the vault at present in use by the Registry is sufficient to accommodate the archives of the Registry when it is transferred to the Town Hall is preposterous. At present the vault in the Registry is insufficient to accommodate all the archives of that department, therefore, I cannot see how a vault which is one-sixth of the size of the present one can hold all the documents. The documents in the Registry are of great importance and if they are left to knock around anywhere, I think the island will find itself in a very peculiar position. The loss of any of those documents might mean the inability of securing a new title to a property, therefore, the accommodation for documents of the Registry is a matter which should not be taken lightly.

I think the suggestion made by the honourable senior member for St. George is a very ideal one and

should be looked into, but assuming that the urgency to get the necessary accommodation for the introduction of ministerial status has taken precedence, and it may not be able to adopt the suggestion of the honourable member overnight, his suggestion should be given careful consideration at the earliest possible time. I think it is very good advice that the Registry should be accommodated at the building now occupied by the Waterworks Department and to leave the Assistant Court of Appeal and the Petty Debt Court as they are in the Town Hall. I hope this matter will be carefully considered again, else it might cause a lot of unnecessary expense and inconvenience.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Government is cognisant of the fact that the records of the Registry are very important, because in the explanatory note, it is stated: "Transport is included as in addition to the removal of office equipment, the proposals involve the removal of many of the public records of the Island and particular care and supervision must be exercised to prevent damage or loss of these archives."

As the honourable senior member for Christ Church has stated, those records may be records on title deeds, but I think the explanatory note even carries it further than that, because it suggests that they are not only records of somebody's land, but also records of births and deaths and things of that nature.

On that point, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the present method of filing and recording documents is obsolete. I would like Government to consider for the safety and preservation of public documents the setting up of a photostatic department and the putting of such copies in proper vaults where they will occupy one-thousandth of the space now occupied by the cumbersome documents which are stored away in the vaults of the Registry. I am making that suggestion because it is done even in the most progressive West Indian islands and because it is now a recognised method of recording documents and getting authentic copies of documents. It is a far more useful method than the copies which are made, very often wrong, from those documents by copyists. If that photostatic department is brought into being, there would be a saving of at least three or four of the copyists who are now employed in the Registrar's Department. It would also be a saving in time to litigants who would go there to get records. At present, you have to wait sometimes two weeks before you can get a copy of a will out of the Registry; sometimes longer. There is a terrific backlog of work in that department and the copyists there have to type or write out in long-hand copies and then read them back twice before the copy is considered as accurate. This procedure takes a whole day to make the copy of a single document. If the photostatic department is brought into being, the police photographer can be assigned to that department. Possibly, he may be able to get a little more money because he will be able to carry out that job with his substantive duties. You will not have to train anybody else, because the police photographer is trained already in that sort of work. He will be glad for something to do. Very often now, the police photographer is given other duties to do because the demands for a photographer in the Police Department are not sufficient to justify the wholetime service of one man. I understand that documents of 40 or 50 square feet can be photographed and brought down to a size of one square foot; sometimes less than that, so you can see the immense saving it will be in space. The change-over will not take any great sum of money out of

the Treasury. All that will be necessary is a few minor alterations to the Registry.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, that very wonderful suggestion about up-to-date method of recording documents has been suggested to the Government many years ago but the result was that more copyists were employed. Sir, I have learnt to-night that not only is the money needed by this Resolution, but that the work has been started and it strikes me that honourable members have taken very little notice of that. I feel that if the Government found it necessary to start the work on these alterations and proposals, at least, it should have, with the permission of Mr. Speaker, circulated these resolutions a day or two ago, so as to let us know they were urgent and would be dealt with at this meeting. Instead of that, these resolutions and bills are only introduced today and we are expected to sit there and complete them to-night; yet we hear tonight that the work has been started sometime ago and we have just been handed the resolutions.

Mr. MILLER: I did not thought it was necessary for me to say anything on this debate but my colleague made mention of the necessity for a photostatic department attached to the Registry and I think I should make some reference on it purely for record purposes. There are two points which my colleague made which I would contradict. In the first place, it is by no means correct to say, as my colleague represents, that documents can be better preserved in a photostatic form, and in the second place, there is no actual saving by the process because Government will still have to retain some copyists to check and recheck documents before they are photographed by the photographer and put in a photostatic form. I do want to stress that no photostatic record is used for the preservation of documents. If documents are to be preserved, they are all written on parchment. Photostatic records are done mainly for handling purposes, but it is a fact that a photostatic record can only be preserved for anything between ten and fifteen years. If documents must be preserved for any length of time, they must be written on a parchment.

As I have said, I did not intend to say anything at all on this resolution, but I could not allow the remarks of my colleague to go unanswered because I would not like the House to be misled. Let me again say that the original copies are always kept in files and if they are to be preserved in finitely, they are invariably re-written on parchment. Photostatic records perish after a length of time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this stage, I beg to move that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I see some honourable members are anxious that this Committee report progress and ask for leave to sit again, but before that is done, in reply to my colleague, I want to say is that I never suggested that when a document was filed in the Registry and a photostatic copy of it was made, that the original document was destroyed.

Mr. ALLDER: I rise on a point of order, Sir, we have been talking on these irrelevant matters to the resolution for too long. What does the preservation of documents has to do with this resolution? I am getting tired of it. Sometime ago, my colleague was talking about something relative to the resolution and he was prevented after introducing it by the same honourable member who has introduced this irrelevant matter.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, The mere fact that I drew to the attention of the Chair on a previous

occasion that another honourable member was out of order is no justification for another honourable member to get up to see if he can have tit for tat.

Mr. ALLDER : On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is accusing me of raising this point because of some previous motion made on a point of order. It is not so. I think the honourable member should use some discretion.

Mr. BARROW : Mr. Chairman, I am not going to prolong this discussion any longer. All I wish to say with reference to what I was speaking on previously is that I never said that the original documents were destroyed. If honourable members want to be more informed on this matter they can easily refer to the practice of the Congressional Library in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS : Mr. Chairman, I heard the honourable senior member for St. Michael say that they intend to keep the documents upstairs in the Town Hall. From my observation of that building, I am suggesting that the place where they will be kept should be properly conditioned before they are put there, else it may be found that in the course of a short time they will be destroyed by the dampness of the walls there. I hope the honourable member would draw that to the attention of the Executive Committee.

The question that the Chairman report progress and ask for leave to sit again was put and agreed to.

The Chairman reported and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Dr. CUMMINS : I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling.

Mr. SPEAKER : When the House was adjourned, it was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

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

On motion of Dr. Cummins, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of four resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Dr. Cummins, seconded by Mr. Cox in each case, the four resolutions passed in Committee was then read a first and second time and then agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS TO REVISE KEY SCALE RATES OF NON-ESTABLISHED STAFF AND OTHER STAFF

Dr. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, there are two resolutions of which I gave notice earlier in the day in connection with Unestablished and Casual Staff and for which it was agreed to deal with by suspending Rules 88 and 89. These resolutions, I think, are the last which involve the payment of money to Unestablished and Casual Staff and otherwise under the Dos Santos Report. This is the cleaning-up so to speak.

I am glad to report that all these people will get their back-pay in a couple of days and I think it will be very useful to them for Christmas. I may say that Government is very anxious that they should

get it at this time particularly after such a long delay but this delay was unavoidable because of the number of people in the various departments involved. The departments had to check on every individual that it employed and their earnings and that took some time. It must be remembered that there were no additional clerks employed to do that job, it being done by the regular clerks day by day in conjunction with their normal duties.

The first resolution reads as follows:—

Resolved that with effect from the 1st of April, 1952, the list of Unestablished and Casual Staff as set out in Appendix "C" to Resolution No. 33/1949, the salary scales of which were amended by Resolution No. 32/1953, dated 12th May, 1953, shall be amended as shown in the Schedule hereto, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in,

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

This resolution applies to the Coxswain and the Crew of the Fisheries Boat "Investigator." The amendments are to delete the word "Coxswain" from Grade IV and put it in Grade V and to add "Crew— Fisheries Boat Investigator" to Grade IV. This is to give effect to the decisions of the Government which are in accordance with agreements in Whitley Council in respect of omissions and anomalies arising out of the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner.

The additional cost of these proposals is estimated to be \$454 in respect of the year 1952-53 and \$601 in respect of the year 1953-54, and will be met from the provision in the Estimates under Head XXIX, Miscellaneous, Item 39—Salary Revision.

This money is available and the only cause for the delay is for the Legislature to agree to the change. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX : I beg to second that.

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

Dr. CUMMINS : The next Resolution reads as follows:—

Resolved that with effect from 1st April, 1952, the salary scales payable to the persons holding Non-Established Offices and other Persons as set out in the Schedule hereto shall be varied as shown in the said Schedule, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and, if concurred in,

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

This resolution is similar to the previous one, the main difference being that more persons are involved. Like the first, it has to do with matters omitted and anomalies arising out of the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner. The persons involved are the Scrubber to the Governor; Scrubber and Cleaner to the Fire Brigade; the Scrubbers and Cleaners for the Police Courts, the Hospital Messenger, Scrubbers and Cleaners, and Car Park Attendants attached to the Police; the Laundry and Scrubber of Erdiston College and Relief Teachers—Men and Women; the Supervisor of Gardens of the General Hospital; Maids and Cleaners and Servant, Matron Quarters of the Maternity Hospital; the Chief Clerk, Senior Clerk, Junior Clerk, Female Clerks, Messenger and Watchman of the United States Workers' Savings Branch; Carters and Crusher Jobbers for the maintenance of highways, Department of Highways and Transport; and

the Stenotypist and Book-keeper (to be changed to Clerk) of the Housing Board.

The additional cost of these proposals is estimated to be \$11,780 for the year 1952-53 and \$11,962 for the year 1953-54. The cost will be met from the amount of \$415,000 provided in the 1953-54 Estimates under Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, Item 39, Salary Revision.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable introducer of this resolution will find that honourable members will be in general agreement with this resolution. I notice that Relief Teachers are also set down under this scheme and seeing them brings to my mind that Casual Nurses at the Hospital, whom I consider are in the same category, are not treated similarly. Casual nurses at the General Hospital are employed on the same basis as Relief Teachers; in other words, in order to increase the nursing staff at the General Hospital, you more or less appoint relief nurses. I know several of them who think that they should be employed on the same principles as relief teachers. I think, if on the one hand you give consideration to relief teachers, you should also give some consideration to that type of nurse at the General Hospital. Apart from that, I do not think honourable members have any qualms or doubts over this resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: I will promise the honourable member to make some investigation into the matter but I think those nurses are in a different position to relief teachers. The nurses that are taken on by the Hospital are paid the current rates as are paid to regular nurses. I think the honourable member is making reference to nurses who work for only a week or two when they are wanted by patients. They are sometimes called special nurses. However, I will make some enquiry on that point.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I note here that relief teachers previously both men and women were paid the same rates. List A received \$1.68 a day and List B \$1.18. The proposed rates are different; the men and women in each list getting a different rate. Sir, when you consider that relief teachers are not permanently employed, I fail to see why the Government should fail to continue to pay both men and women at the same rate. The proposed differences look like a feeble attempt to reduce the cost of this increase at the expense of the female. Here it is, under List A, the men will receive \$2.00 a day and the women \$1.92. Under List B the men will receive \$1.50 a day and the women \$1.44. While the principle of equal pay for men and women has never been accepted, not only in Barbados but other countries, I feel that so far as these relief teachers are concerned, they could safely be paid the same rates. As I have said, they are not employed on a permanent basis, therefore the principle that applies to members on the permanent staff need not apply to them, especially when it is considered that in this field of work both male and female have to perform equal work. I really feel that members of the Government should have questioned this difference and should have seen to it that the principle of paying both male and female relief teachers the same rate should have continued.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the Government for bringing down at long last these recommendations although some of the increases are somewhat insignificant. I would like to know if these new increases are retrospective.

(A VOICE: Yes.)

I am throwing out this hint. I hope that those entitled to these increases will not have to wait another year before they get their retrospective pay.

(A VOICE: They will get it this week).

I do hope that they will get it in time for Christmas.

Dr. CUMMINS: I will give the honourable member that assurance.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to what can be termed an old, apparent grievance of relief teachers. While in truth and in fact, the appointment of a relief teacher is a temporary post, it is not of a temporary nature because many of those relief teachers work all the year round. So far as I have discovered, relief teachers are of three grades. There are relief teachers who are employed to relieve assistant teachers who are sent to Erdiston College for further training and those relief teachers are paid on a monthly basis. There is a second group who although they are not employed on a monthly basis actually work permanently because they work for teachers who are on leave, during the influx of pupils on a school roll and so on. Then there is the third grade of relief teachers as set out here who are paid daily. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as you can see, some of those teachers who are paid on a daily basis are employed just as permanently as those who are employed permanently.

I am hoping now that the attention of the Government is drawn to this fact that the time will not be very far distant when relief teachers—as they are called—who are permanently employed, will be placed on a proper permanent basis. There is no point in calling them relief teachers and treating them in that manner when they are permanently employed. They seem to be the forgotten teachers and are likely to grow old before they are appointed. If they are good enough to be relief teachers, they are good enough to be appointed permanently and granted all the facilities, rights and prerequisites which ordinary teachers enjoy. This is an old, burning grievance of relief teachers and is causing some hardship to many of the ardent workers.

Mr. VAUGHAN: This is one occasion on which I must commend Government for the bringing down of these prerequisites for these employees of Government although I am aware that it should have been sent down ever since. It has been said by the honourable introducer of the resolution that these workers will get their retrospective pay in time for the holidays and I do hope that the prospective ministers will see to it that the departments concerned pay out that money to every one entitled before Christmas Day.

I must endorse the suggestion made with regard to relief teachers. I do know that they are not fairly well treated. There is also the fact that when other teachers are paid by the 28th day of the month, relief teachers very often have to wait until the 7th or the 10th day of the next month before they get theirs. Why this should be so, I cannot understand. They are working in the same way as the other teachers; their service to the Government is equally as good as the others; therefore, they should receive their pay at the same time as the others. I think it is quite unfair to keep those relief teachers who are actually employed permanently and call them relief teachers. I think it is a subtle means of paying them less than other teachers. Why cannot this Government bring down a Bill to call such relief teachers, permanent employees. I have been made to understand that the only thing this House of Assembly cannot do is to make a man. The Government should not exploit those people. The Education Department should recommend a cessation of that state of affairs. I heartily endorse the view of the honourable senior member for Christ Church and am glad that he has brought this matter to the notice of the Government.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, I think it is time that Government realise that it cannot continue to pay watchmen the small pittance as provided in this resolution. It is time that the least that a watchman should get per period is two dollars. They should not get less than that owing to the conditions under which they have to perform their duties. Sir, there is a system under which watchmen employed by Government are expected to be on their jobs at all times that workmen are not engaged whether it be heavy rains, a storm, earthquake, or anything for that matter. They have to get on the job before workmen leave the work on evenings and be there until all the workmen arrive on the job next morning. For some time now, these watchmen have been given \$1.50 for what is called a period which is, as I have said before, from about 3.30 o'clock in the evening until around 8 o'clock the next morning. Sir, you will be surprised to know the number of hours which these watchmen have to spend on their jobs. They cannot get on the job after workers have left it on evenings nor can they leave before the workers arrive on the next morning. They also have to keep watch on Sundays, Bank-holidays, Good Friday and even Christmas Day. These watchmen have been given \$1.50 per period for many years.

(A VOICE: That is not true; only from 1949.)

Sir, that means that prior to 1949, they were getting less than \$1.50 per period. The proposal now is to increase that pay to \$1.75. Could not this Socialist Government—this Trade Union Government—have considered that these watchmen were deserving of at least \$2.00 per period? Certainly, they are entitled to that because they have to be on the job for 14 hours.

(A VOICE: It is \$1.75 and cost-of-living allowance.)

Sir, you must also bear in mind that watchmen have to huddle up anyhow on the side of streets; if watchmen working under that condition were employed by somebody else, honourable members on that side of the Table would be saying: "Those watchmen are working for too long hours without adequate compensation." Now that they are employed by Government, honourable members are saying that those watchmen sleep and are paid adequately; they do not worth more. Sir, if you have watchmen who do not their duties; sack them but do not pay them starvation wages. As far as I can see, they perform their duties well because I do not hear of any loss by Government in their respect. These watchmen have been complaining for a long time over the inadequacy of their pay. Some honourable member has said previously that the salary for a minister under ministerial setup is inadequate. If that salary is inadequate, how is it that this pay per period for watchmen is not inadequate?

Another thing. With regard to relief teachers, they are expected to go in a school and teach children to be upright, decent and useful citizens, but the men are only offered \$2.00 a day and the women \$1.92. I know that there are some school teachers who have to leave Bridgetown on mornings and catch a 7.30 or 8 o'clock bus to go as far as St. Joseph and then walk to the school where they teach. Those teachers have to spend something like one shilling and sixpence to get them to and from their work. They also have to dress themselves tidily and to eat something to sustain their bodies. They are also expected to live up to a certain standard so that they can be an example to the children they teach and yet, with all that, they are only offered what I consider is a small pittance. How the Government has arrived at the decision to pay them only \$2.00 and \$1.92 per day is beyond my reasoning. The teachers accept that amount merely

because they know that if they do not accept it, they cannot get anything else to do. I feel Government should not take advantage of the unemployment situation. It does not become a Government which has branded itself as a Trade Union Government to perpetuate a system which has been created by reactionaries of the past. That pay is unreasonable for relief teachers of this time. Of course, sometime ago, that pay might be adequate because the cost of living was low. I do hope honourable members of the Government would study more carefully the unreasonableness in their practised and avowed policy as to some of these ungracious things which hurt the same people whom the Government has to depend for their support.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable member who has just spoken was somewhat strong in his criticisms against the pay given to relief teachers but I will make one or two suggestions to Government over the matter which I hope will be paid some attention. I have heard some complaints with regard to this matter before, but I acknowledge that when one is employed as a relief teacher, it is a stepping board to permanent entry into the teaching service; therefore I am not going to argue against the amount that is paid per day to those teachers. I am however going to issue an appeal to Government on their behalf and because I firmly believe that if Government knew of what I am going to tell them, it would have put it right already. The pay that is now granted to relief teachers of the various grades appears to be adequate plus the cost of living allowance which will be added, but these teachers are only paid for the days they work. That seems to be mean. You keep these relief teachers acting, sometimes for more than two years and pay them only for such days as they work. If a day is rainy and the children cannot get to school, a relief teacher is not paid for that day. They are not paid anything at all during vacation periods. I do not think that is right. That practice is not even accepted by parochial boards. Where supernumeraries are employed to assist sanitary inspectors, they are employed on a minimum basis, but if there is a holiday or a half day given, those supernumeraries are paid for the holiday and for the half-day as if it were a whole day. Some relief teachers from St. Michael go as far as St. Patrick, Christ Church, to fulfil an acting appointment and acts sometimes for as long as two years. That relief teacher will tell you that if there is a holiday in any week, she is not paid for it. I appeal to honourable members of the Government to regularise that, particularly as those teachers are paid at the minimum rate. Sir, the big grievance among relief teachers is that they are not paid for holidays like exhibition days and race days. If you depend on relief teachers for assisting you to run your educational system you should give them some further consideration. Surely you can say that if they are employed over a period of three or four months and they take sick for a day or two during a week after that, so long as they satisfy you that they were sick, they should get pay for those days. Any commercial body would extend that privilege to its employees. Another thing is that if they are called upon to act for any length of time, they should be given at least half pay during the vacation periods. I think the wages are reasonable but relief teachers really deserve some consideration along the lines I have suggested.

There is another thing which is a sore spot with me and I tried to get some information about it from the honourable member in charge of that department.

I refer to the Chief Clerk, Senior Clerk, Junior Clerk and Female Clerks employed at the United States Workers Branch. These people deal with emigration which I feel is of more importance to the common man as any of the other things which we discuss in this Chamber. Nothing is more gratifying to the common man than to hear that 10,000 West Indian workers are wanted for employment in California, and that 500 will be taken from Barbados. And it is a fact that if they get away from here and spend only six months, you can be sure that you would not have sufficient things to sell in Bridgetown for the Christmas.

The criticism which I am going to make is this. I do not think that it is right to have Mr. Chase, a retired officer, to fill the chief post at that Department along with other posts which he is now holding. I say so for the reason that there are other younger men who can be trained to fill such a post. Sir, you hear people in and out of this colony saying: "Mr. Chase did the census of Barbados; Mr. Chase works with the Gulf Oil Company; Mr. Chase gets a pension; Mr. Chase works at the United States Savings Branch; Mr. Chase does all these things when a lot of people are out of work." Sir, I feel that no man, however good he is, should have a monopoly on jobs. I am therefore appealing to the honourable member of Government in charge of this matter to make investigation into it. I do not want it to be said that I am against some person who is drawing a small pension from doing a little extra work, because it is a well known fact that some people in this country have registered and are only receiving a small pension, therefore they must do a little extra work to keep them a-going. However, when you see one man monopolising all the extra jobs, there is something wrong. It creates dissatisfaction.

Sir, the United States Workers Savings Branch is a department which we must keep up to a certain mark. I know that there was some difficulty in that department already, but there will be always some difficulty in departments like that because it is handling funds belonging to people. However, I have always felt that any position which is held by a person who does his job with the greatest credit, could be held by somebody else tomorrow who would also carry it out creditably. I am of the opinion that no person is indispensable. I do not think it is quite right to have people walking from door to door asking for a job while one man is called upon to hold all the jobs. More often than not, some of those who are called upon to monopolise jobs are square pegs in round holes. I would like the Government to look carefully into this matter.

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

BILL TO AMEND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACT, 1891

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, Earlier, I gave notice of a Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891, and it was agreed to suspend Rules 88 and 89 to deal with it later. I will now proceed with the second reading of this Bill.

The Objects and Reasons of this Bill read as follows:

Consequent upon the decision of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to introduce a system of ministerial government in the Island, certain amendments of the Executive Committee, Act, 1891, have become necessary.

Section two of the Executive Committee Act, 1891, provides that the members of the Legislature

appointed to the Executive Committee hold office during pleasure. The last sentence of that section is no doubt meant to be subject to the foregoing provision, which would be in accordance with the conventions to be applicable on the introduction of the ministerial system. However, the last sentence of the section is not expressly made subject to the earlier provision and it is accordingly sought to amend this section by removing any doubt that this is the position.

Section two of the Act reads thus:—

"Immediately on the opening of each session of the Legislature, it shall be lawful for the Governor to appoint during pleasure one member of the Legislative Council and four members of the House of Assembly not being already members of the Executive Council, to be associated with and to form, together with the Executive Council a committee for the transaction of public financial business, for the consideration of ways and means, for advising the Governor on any measures which the Executive may deem expedient to bring before the Legislature, and for the conduct of public works, and the control and management of public institutions of the kind and in the manner hereinafter mentioned. The members so appointed to be associated with the Executive Council for the purpose of this Act shall continue to be members of the Executive Committee during the Session of the Legislature, except in case of resignation or absence from the island as hereinafter provided."

The amendment seeks to make this section perfectly clear with the introduction of ministerial status that the members of the Government should hold office during the pleasure of the Governor. To do this, Section two of the Act is amended by deleting the word "The" at the commencement of the last sentence thereof and substituting therefor the words: "Subject to such appointments being during pleasure as aforesaid, the," and the sentence will continue: "Members so appointed to be associated with the Executive Council for the purpose of this Act shall continue to be members of the Executive Committee during the Session of the Legislature, except in cases of resignation or absence from the Island as hereinafter provided."

There is also in the ministerial memorandum which came down from His Excellency the Governor the note that a minister can be only dismissed with the consent of the Prime Minister. Of course, before a member of the Government can be dismissed by His Excellency the Governor, the Governor has to consult the Premier.

As I have said earlier today, consequent upon the introduction of the ministerial system of government, it will be necessary to provide offices away from the Public Buildings for some of the officials referred to in Section 11 (2) of the Executive Committee Act, 1891. It is intended to provide different accommodation for some of these officials immediately and for others when new office accommodation has been built in accordance with the present intentions of the Government. It is also considered that a provision in an act which requires the Government to provide accommodation for stated branches of the Government in a specified building is too rigid and presents difficulties on occasions when the Government may wish to re-organise office accommodation. Consequently, this bill seeks to amend Section 11 (2) by repealing the provision that office accommodation shall be found in the Public Buildings for those branches.

Section 11, sub-section 2 of the Act states:—

"The Public Buildings shall contain halls, courts and offices for the following persons, bodies and de-

partments, that is to say: The Legislative Council, the House of Assembly, the Colonial Secretary, The Attorney General, The Solicitor General, The Provost Marshal, The Registrar, The Official Assignee, The Auditor General, The Colonial Treasurer, The Savings Bank, The Post Office, and no public officer shall be liable for any tax by reason of his occupying offices in the Public Buildings."

It is proposed, as I have said earlier, to remove the Registrar and the Provost Marshal's staff to the Courts and because of this, it was thought best to delete all these offices from the Act for the very good reason that the section should be made flexible; at some other time, it may be necessary to remove some of those other officers from this building. Sir, that is the substance of these two amendments and I now beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

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

The three clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND MOTOR VEHICLE AND ROAD TRAFFIC ACT, 1937

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take Order No. 4. I think it will be the last thing which will be dealt with today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to take Order No. 4 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael: Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

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

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I think honourable members should be in agreement with this Bill. As they would see from the Objects and Reasons, it is considered anomalous that, whereas the consular representatives of foreign powers may be exempted from the payment of any tax or fee in respect of any motor vehicle owned by a consular officer or consular employee, the Governor, who is the representative of Her Majesty the Queen, is not so exempted.

This Bill seeks to provide for such an exemption and also to provide for a suitable distinguishing mark to be carried by the vehicle in lieu of the registered number which would be allotted if the vehicle were liable to registration.

Honourable members will remember that some time ago, the honourable junior member for the City raised the question as to the Governor's car carrying the emblem of a Crown rather than a number as is prescribed in Part II of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937. As can be seen from the Act, Part II, Section 9, deals with the registration of motor vehicles which is commonly known as placing a number on such vehicles. Part III deals with the licensing of those vehicles. At present, there are two motor vehicles which carry the emblem of the Crown; the State car which this House granted

money to provide for the Head of the Administration, and one which is the Governor's private property. I think honourable members will agree that if foreign consuls and their servants can use a motor car free of tax, that it is logical to conclude that Her Majesty's representative should also have that facility. The amount involved is very small, but the principle is of more importance. I hardly think it is necessary to say anything more because in so far as identification marks are concerned, the cars are used with the emblem of a crown on the number plate and I am sure no honourable member would object to that.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, Even if you exempted the motor vehicles of the Head of the Administration from bearing a number on the number plate of such vehicles, inasmuch as you give that concession to representatives of the diplomatic groups of foreign countries, I do not think that you should give the Head of the Administration permission to run all the motor cars that he might have without paying adequate licence fees for them. If you accept the principle that the Head of the Administration should be driven around in a state car, by all means that car should be recognised by a crown, but because we accept that principle, should we give a Governor, if he might own four or five cars, permission to run all of them without paying adequate licence for their use? Should we allow him to run all with crowns? I think it would be very confusing to all. I feel that it will be overdoing the principle. While we respect the Head of the Administration as we should, we have to be very careful to see that we do not overdo things. We should grant him certain concessions, but we should not grant him everything. It seems to me as if the Head of the Administration is exempted from everything.

The honourable senior member for St. Michael has said that not only the various consular representatives of foreign powers are granted permission to run their cars without licensing them and a number on the number plate of them, but even their servants are allowed that privilege and because of that, we would not be doing anything wrong if we grant the Head of the Administration the privilege of running all the cars he might own with the emblem of a Crown on the number plate. I am saying that the Head of the Administration should be permitted to run only one of his automobiles with the insignia of the Crown but any other that he may own, he should pay the licence fee for it. We have today increased the allowance to servants of the Head of the Administration although we have previously agreed to pay three parts of their wages. I wonder whether the Head of the Administration has granted a similar increase on the part he is called upon to pay to those servants.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is straying entirely from the point.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against the holder of the office of Governor, but we are lavishing things on him and we are doing it too recklessly. In the past it was not done and I do not see why we should do things more generously than the former members of Government used to do. I am wondering if the honourable senior member for St. Michael does not think my argument is reasonable and that is to give the Head of the Administration permission to run one car of his free of licence fee. Suppose the Head of the Administration had one dozen cars and the members of his family living at Government House had another dozen cars. Would you allow all of them to carry crowns because all are attached to Government House? Would you

allow all of those cars to damage the streets and inconvenience the travelling public without adequate licence for them to do so? I feel it is time that these glaring unnecessary concessions should cease. We are now granting the Head of the Administration more concessions. We are granting him now freedom from taxation, freedom from licence fees, freedom from custom duties and other things. This is an error on the part of the Government. I feel the Head of the Administration should only be granted permission to run one of his cars without paying the necessary licence. I throw out this suggestion and hope that Government would change it. Any Government which cannot change things when errors are pointed out in them is fast becoming a dead Government. I hardly believe that if this matter were discussed by the Executive without one or two members suggesting what I have suggested, that the Head of the Administration would not have readily agreed with the point I suggested.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I remember that when the Bill to change the Governor's car to a state car which would carry no number plate came before the House the honourable junior member for the City pointed out that it was anomalous that under the Consular Conventions Act the consular people had concessions which were not given to the Head of the Administration. When he raised the question later on about the Governor's private car carrying no number plate a lot of people thought that he was bringing unnecessary censure on the Head of the Administration; but it was within his right to do so. The whole purpose of this Bill is to regularise the position; but it is unfortunate that the Government did not see fit to take heed of the constructive suggestions which were made by the honourable junior member for the City at that time.

I am not going into the question of whether the Head of the Administration should have two cars. It is largely a matter of whether we, as keepers of the purse strings should allow the Head of the Administration to have two cars, and whether two cars are necessary for the duties of his office. I do not see any real point of contention on whether his car should wear a crown or not. I have seen Queen Mary's state car with a registration plate. I think the most important part of the Bill is that having exempted the consular officers from paying parochial licence on their cars we have to give the Head of the Administration the same concession.

Mr. COX: The Consular Conventions Bill became law on the 11th of July, 1951, and the honourable member who has just spoken was not in the House then. Now if under that Bill we allow the American or any foreign consul or his servants to use motor cars free of taxation there is no reason why the Governor, who is the Queen's Representative, should not also be allowed that concession. I am sure that the majority of members of the House agree with that. The amount of money involved is small; but I am suggesting that the money involved is not the important thing. It is the principle which is important. I think that all honourable members, perhaps with the exception of the honourable member who has just spoken, will agree that it is a principle which should be adopted.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. Cox 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 called and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill

in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until the 5th day of January, 1954, at 3 o'clock p.m. In doing so, sir, I think that I am voicing the sentiments of this House when I wish you a very pleasant holiday, a merry Christmas and a prosperous new year. I hope, sir, that if I happen to pass your way during the festive season you will be able to recognise me.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—Before the question is put, I would like to say that I indicated to the Deputy Leader of the House about two weeks ago that there was a pressing matter which concerned the people of my constituency; and it was at the instigation of the Deputy Leader that consideration of the Measure which was being debated — it was a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. George to raise a loan of £6,000 to repair certain parochial buildings including the Medical Officer's house— was postponed.

I think it is a deplorable state of affairs, whatever we may think of vestries, that the comfort of the constituents of the various parishes should be a secondary consideration to the desire of honourable members to repair to their beds or to whatever places they go when they leave this Chamber. I think it is also deplorable that the whole of the day's sitting should be taken up with Government Business, and no time allotted for the no less than 25 items of Private Members' Business on the agenda. It is likewise regrettable that the felicitations of the season be extended to everyone while my parishioners in St. George who may unfortunately fall ill will not have the facilities of medical services to which they are entitled and to which they are accustomed.

I can only say that I deplore the lack of responsibility of certain members of this House in these matters. Not all of the duties which we have to perform in this Chamber are at all congenial to members. But we have certain constitutional duties to perform, and we have to safeguard the rights of our constituents. It is for those reasons that I am urging honourable members before they wish peace on earth and goodwill to all men, to express tangibly that goodwill towards my constituents. Before they entertain such pretty sentiments they should show their practical christianity by giving some consideration to the suffering people of this island who have to languish in conditions of unemployment and malnutrition when you have these institutions placed at their disposal to remove their misery and to give them the medical services to which we are entitled.

I am asking honourable members to bear with me, to think a little less of their anxiety to get home and to think a little more of their constitutional duties.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question for the adjournment, I must thank the Deputy Leader for extending to me wishes for a happy Christmas. May I reciprocate those wishes to all members of this House. I hope that we will all re-assemble in good spirits, and feeling very fit at the beginning of the new year.

Question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, January 5, 1954, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and agreed to without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.