

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 14, 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, L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), R. G. MAPP, F. C. GODDARD, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., J. C. MOTTLEY, E. ST. A. HOLDER, C. E. TALMA, Mrs. M. E. BOURNE, and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, L.L.B.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES

Prayers were read.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Minutes of the last meeting were not yet ready for confirmation.

MESSAGE FROM OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Other Place:—

A Message returning the Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor the following Papers were laid:—

Dr. CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Message No. 17/1953 dated the 10th of July, 1953, from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House that there has been a further exchange of notes between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America regarding amendment to the Economic Co-operation Agreement to bring that Agreement into line with the present United States of America Mutual Security Legislation.

Dr. CUMMINS: Message No. 18/1953 dated the 10th of July, 1953, from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House of Acts assented to in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen.

Mr. COX (for Mr. WALCOTT): Post Office Advances for Payment of Money Orders to 30th April, 1953.

PETITIONS

Mr. LEWIS presented a Petition from the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Peter praying the House to pass a Bill to authorise them to increase the salary and allowances of their Inspector of Highways.

Mr. GODDARD presented a Petition from the various Vestries concerning the Bill for Local Government.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

The following Government Notice was given:—

Dr CUMMINS (for Mr. ADAMS): Bill intituled an Act to establish a loan fund for the purposes of Higher Education, for the making of loans therefrom and for matters connected therewith.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

The following Private Member's Notice was given:—

Mr. LEWIS: Bill to authorise the Highway Commissioners of St. Peter to increase the salary of their Inspector of Highways and also his travelling allowance.

QUESTIONS.

The following Notices of Questions were given:—

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

Is the Government aware of the general condition of the ceiling of the Parcel Post Branch of the General Post Office.

2. Would Government consider painting this ceiling white?

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

Will the Government state the reason for the delay in making available to workers, other than Civil Servants and sugar workers, monies which it

is proposed will be used for the purposes of building or repairing houses?

2. Will the Government in any event immediately undertake a comprehensive survey of the housing needs of such workers and take steps to place and expedite the re-housing of these workers, as proposed in the Five Year Plan?

Mr. VAUGHAN entered the House and took his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox the Bill intituled an Act to establish a loan fund for the purposes of Higher Education, for the making of loans therefrom and for matters connected therewith was read a first time.

On motion of Mr. LEWIS seconded by Mr. SMITH the Bill to authorise the Highway Commissioners of St. Peter to increase the salary and Travelling allowance of their Inspector of Highways was read a first time.

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

Dr. CUMMINS: Sir,— I am commanded to lay the following Paper:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, — If I am in order I would like to ask that the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft reply to His Excellency the Acting Governor's Message at the re opening of the Legislature be discharged. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for St. Philip, the Chairman of that Committee, is not in his seat. I spoke to him on one or two occasions, and from what he has told me it seems that he cannot get a quorum. The committee would not meet to do its duties. I feel, Sir, that there are certain courtesies which exist in everyday life. (Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat).

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip is now in his seat.

Dr. CUMMINS: For the benefit of the honourable member I will repeat that I am asking that the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft reply to His Excellency the Acting Governor's speech be discharged. I have spoken to the honourable member who is Chairman of the Committee and the impression that he gave is that he cannot get the committee to meet. He cannot get a quorum. I think, sir, that there are certain courtesies which exist in everyday life between individuals as well as between bodies, and I believe that as far as this House is concerned it is the first time in its history that we have had an occasion of this sort.

If we want the Administration to respect this House we too must grant them the respect that is their due. I feel very strongly that when this House appoints a Select Committee to prepare a draft reply to a Speech from the Throne it should be done; hence my request. I think that the Marshal is now distributing copies of a simple, formal and non-committal Address which I hope we will pass as a Reply to His Excellency's speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before leave is granted, referring to certain remarks of the honourable Deputy Leader of the House, I want to say that the Administration must always and in every way respect this House. As far as the Committee appointed to prepare this Reply is concerned I was interested because there were certain people in this island who ignorantly believed that I was something to do with it, or that I could compel the committee to meet. It was always my intention to tell this Committee when they reported that they had broken the rules of this House, and that that being so, it would be necessary for them to ask that the rules of the House be waived

before they could present their Report; and this opinion I indicated to the honourable Deputy Speaker before I left the island. I am not in a position to censure that Committee. Whenever it appears to me that a rule is being broken I will let the House know the position. I am glad that the Chairman of the Committee is in his place. As he seems anxious to make a statement to the House I will give him an opportunity to do so before leave is granted to the honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—No one regrets more than I do the failure of the committee to meet. I would like to say that no slight, so far as I know, was purposely intended to the Acting Governor in this respect. No one in this House as far as I know would think of offering any slight or insult to an officer administering the Government, and least of all to Mr. Turner during his term of office. But the Clerk of the House can substantiate that no less than three times I summoned a meeting of the Committee. On two occasions the honourable junior member for Christ Church was there; but at no time did we have a sufficiently large number to constitute a quorum. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas questioned me about the situation and I told him what I am telling the House now, that the committee seems loath to meet.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not appreciate the word "loath."

Mr. CRAWFORD: Perhaps I should say that they did not meet. We did not get a quorum. Perhaps the Speech from the Throne was not one of those greatly controversial ones that would arouse the interest of members of the Committee. Whatever the reason was, sir, they did not meet. I am not absolving myself from all blame; but I certainly tried to get them to meet on three occasions.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I think that this matter should be looked at in its true perspective. It is an unwritten rule of this House I understand, that the senior member of the House on a committee automatically becomes the Chairman of that committee, and that is why the honourable senior member for St. Philip became the Chairman of this particular committee. The honourable member has told us that he summoned meetings on three occasions and did not get a quorum. So I do not see any reason why it should be regarded that the committee appointed for this purpose is reluctant, or loath or anything else to meet for the purpose for which it was appointed.

Another thing that I would like to say is that it is not the first occasion on which at the first meeting after the opening of a session a reply to the Speech from the Throne has not been ready for consideration by this House. On several occasions in the past that has happened. But since this committee has been appointed the Other Place has created a precedent. The precedent is that one branch of the Legislature has replied to the Speech from the Throne without the other branch. That is unusual in the history of this colony and that position will have to be considered. The next thing is that it is not a precedent that an Acting Head of the Administration has delivered a speech at the opening of a Legislative session and the reply has been sent to the substantive holder of the office. There is a case on record in 1925. But the present position has to be considered from the point of view of the precedent created by the Other Place. They have created the precedent, not the House.

It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this matter with you, because we would have to decide what is to be done. I understand too, that it has

happened already that the substantive holder of the post of Governor has delivered a speech at the opening or prorogation of the Legislature and the reply has been sent to the acting holder of the post. But what is the position today? The honourable junior member for St. Thomas in my humble opinion is out of order. I think also that if we adopt this procedure today it would look as if this committee intended not to report or to offer to some slight. I appeal to the honourable member not to ask that the committee be discharged. It is to be presumed that honourable members of this House are responsible people and that they will carry out their duties. Since your return, sir, we have had the Maude Bill and other legislation taking up much of the time of this House and we have not had time to consider this point. I do not think that we can accept a reply not signed by the Chairman of the committee that was appointed to prepare the reply. I do not know what is the position of your discharging this committee before they have replied. I do not know what is the motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the House. Leave is being asked by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. LEWIS: As far as waiving a rule is concerned the rule can be waived when the report of the Select Committee comes in, because it would not have been considered on the particular day that the rule says it should be considered on. But as I have said that has not been the practice recently. We do not have the reply ready at the first meeting of the House. I would not like you to give a wrong impression. As far as I am concerned I want the committee to report. I am only too anxious to have the report of that committee before the House. I will see that certain things are put in the reply. I would just like to know if the request before the House is to discharge the committee or to ask for leave to proceed with an Address which I deem out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The request is for leave to make a motion to discharge the committee. It is purely a matter for the House. It is not within my province. Does the honourable member want to see Rule 28?

Mr. LEWIS: If the request before the House is for leave to make a motion that the committee be discharged I would like to say that it is unusual. I am merely saying that I sincerely hope that honourable members will not agree to the discharging of the committee. The committee is there and it can function. To ask for the discharge of the committee in these circumstances is tantamount to saying that it is a strong desire of the committee to offer someone an insult or to create some precedent that would be unfavourable to the history of this House. But that is not so. The committee can report and will be prepared to report.

I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas did not tell me of his intention. I was a member of the committee at one time and I might have been Chairman. Other things have happened which created a precedent in this matter. The committee should have an opportunity to discuss the matter with Your Honour and with the honourable junior member for St. Thomas as well. I hope that honourable members will see that they would be condemning themselves to agree to the request that is before the House at present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say that it would serve no useful purpose for the committee to see me over this matter. Under Rule 28 that committee cannot report unless the rules of the House were broken. They would first of all have to ask that Rule 28 be waived before they could report.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it that if the committee brought in their report they could ask that Rule 28 be waived and then they could lay their report. It was my intention to put the matter before the House but the matter did not come up.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—I am a member of the Select Committee. I was summoned to three meetings, two of which I attended. At no time did I hear any member of the Committee say that they did not meet and report for any reason except those given by the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I have been asked outside of the House why the committee did not meet and why they did not report. It was even suggested that some slight to the Acting Governor was intended. I cannot say that that is so. As I have said, I attended on two of the three occasions on which I was summoned—the last two occasions. I could not come on the first. The matter rests there. I certainly cannot say that there was any intention not to meet.

Mr. Speaker put the question that leave be granted the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to make a motion for the discharge of the committee appointed to prepare a draft reply to His Excellency the Acting Governor's speech delivered at the re-opening of the Legislative Session 1951—54, and said if there was no objection leave would be granted.

There being one objection the question was put to the vote and on Mr. Speaker declaring that the "noes" have it a division was called for. The question was decided in the negative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mrs. BOURNE, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. Cox, ALDER and SMITH—(5).

Noes: Messrs. MAPP, LEWIS, TALMA, HOLDEK, BRYAN, WILLIAMS, CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, VAUGHAN, HAYNES and GODDARD—(11).

Mr. SPEAKER: I now declare the "noes" have it. Leave to make a motion to discharge the committee has been rejected.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas—to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

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

Dr. CUMMINS asked for and was granted leave to take charge of the Resolution for \$25,162 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member to move the passing of the following Resolution:—

A Resolution to place the sum of \$25,162 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. 7 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Head VIII—LEGAL—Item 10, Purchase of Law Books, \$242 was called.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—My opinion is that an explanation is necessary where this item is concerned. Is this supplementary vote necessary because these law books have not been printed? If you knew that you did not get these reports for 1949, 1950 and 1951, you should have included the

money for them in the Estimates. For three years you include money in the Estimates. These reports do not come. You know that they must eventually come but you stop including money in the Estimates for them. What is the explanation? I do not know if someone forgot to order these Reports or if they were never printed. This kind of thing happens too often. To deliberately leave out the money for something that you know you have ordered is to give a false picture of the island's financial position. This item may be only \$200.00 but it may happen with something for \$200,000. If you knew that these law books had not come you should have included the amount for them in the 1953-54 Estimates.

Dr. CUMMINS: As far as I can see from the files it is merely a misunderstanding on the part of the people on the other side relative to the printing and binding of these books. The bound volumes were sent out after the matter was taken up.

Mr. LEWIS: That is an explanation that the honourable member must give and we must sympathise with him. But do you mean to tell me that a misunderstanding existed, not for three months, but for three years? Do you mean to tell me that these things are of no consequence? That you did not get the reports for 1949-51 and you made no attempt to get them? These books are not necessary at all if you can forget them all that time. That is not giving this Government good service. It means that at some future time it will happen again with a larger amount.

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

HEAD XX—EDUCATION—Grants in Aid—Item 46 (g) St. Michael's Girls' School, \$1,377. Item 70 (New) Fire Extinguishers \$301.00 was called.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman—I would like to know at what point the Fire Officer is going to stop recommending that the existing fire extinguishers at the various government departments be replaced by new ones. It is sometime since this officer has been giving the impression that he is more a salesman of fire extinguishers than a Fire Officer. I cannot understand that all the fire extinguishers that were at these departments all along were so bad that they now have to be discarded. But that is the only conclusion that I can arrive at. At least we can tell this expert that we cannot afford to replace all these extinguishers at one time. The replacement should be done over a period of years. All of them could not be so bad.

Of course it is the policy of the Government to accept all that these experts recommend. Still the Government can tell him that while we agree that the existing extinguishers may not be as good as the ones he is recommending we cannot replace them all in one year. Money seems to be running out of the Treasury, and unless you stop all these petty things which cost too much money, the money which is in the Treasury will go. I feel it is time to call a halt to this. This officer is more successful in having his recommendations carried out when he recommends things to Government than when he recommends them to private enterprise. That is because the people who run private enterprise have more business acumen than the Government. The officer goes to a particular business house and makes certain recommendations; but the management does not respond to his recommendations unless the finances of the business afford them to make the recommended change. But where Government is

concerned, as soon as the Fire Officer makes a recommendation a Resolution is sent down and passed by the Legislature.

Further down in this Resolution there is an item concerning the provision of new fire extinguishers for the Public Library. I do not know if I am too much of a optimist, but certainly you do not have fires so frequently or so easily as the Fire Officer is trying to suggest. You would be surprised to know how difficult it is for a fire to be caught. It is difficult for a fire to be caught to a well constructed building, and if it was caught you would be able to fight it. I am not saying that precaution should not be maintained. But I feel that it can be carried too far. I hope that the Government will consider the frequent criticisms by members of this Chamber of what can be considered the unnecessary recommendations for the replacement of these extinguishers at various Government institutions.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—What I am going to say is that the very first time that this matter came up before this House we asked what was the type of fire extinguisher that the Fire Officer was recommending. The Government could not answer the question and it eventually led to the remarks that if you left the matter in the hands of the Crown Agents they would very likely send down the same type of extinguisher that the officer was now condemning. Government could not say then what was the type of extinguisher. On this occasion they have gone a little further and they describe it as a "water (compressed gas) extinguisher". I would like the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to tell me the name of this extinguisher so that honourable members can be assisted in knowing what it is all about. There might be a racket going on, and I hope to be able to get the Government to stop it. But unless they tell the public the name of the extinguisher they are importing they cannot get any assistance. If the extinguishers are being bought locally tell us who are the agents. You should not hide these things. It leads to bribery and corruption. We do not want to emulate the worst features of the colonies around us. We should set a good example in the spending of the taxpayers' money. If we do not get any information about these things someone may be accused of something. Why keep it a military secret? Ever since this game started you cannot get any information about it. Is it part of the atom bomb secret or what? There is no clerk in the Government Service who should have the temerity to make up an explanatory note like this for the people's representatives. Say what make of extinguisher you are importing. If you are importing it from the Crown Agents you will have to come back for the money again anyhow. If this thing is above board there is nothing to hide.

Imagine Mr. Chairman, the Fire Officer has only now got to the Public Library. He has gone all around — to Government House, the Hospital the House of Assembly—all around, and he has only now got to the place next door to him, so to speak. All the books in the Library could have been destroyed since he started making his rounds of inspection; and he is getting a good salary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is —

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—We are entitled to an answer on this matter. If we continue like this we will set up a police state about here.

Dr. CUMMINS: I have been looking at the file, sir, and I do not see the name of the particular fire extinguisher. I have seen that the ones now in use are not suitable for the ordinary combustibles such

as wood, and the officer now recommends compressed gas extinguishers. I have sent across to the Secretariat to see if I can get further information. If honourable members want, we can go on with consideration of the other heads and as soon as I get the information I will pass it on.

Mr. LEWIS: This is a matter that we cannot hold up. It is to save the books at the Library, and perhaps the lives of school children and people at Erdiston I accept the assurance that we will get further information. But in future we do not want to have any mystery about such things or we will have to do someone maybe the injustice of accusing them of something.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—My experience with fire extinguishers is very limited. I wonder if the honourable junior member for St. Thomas can tell us if when these extinguishers are bought they can be refilled in Barbados. Some years ago the agent of a firm came around selling extinguishers to the mercantile community. We were told that they would be bringing down equipment whereby they could be refilled in Barbados. That we could send it to the agent here to be refilled when necessary. As a matter of fact they said that you should send them every six months to get them up to high pressure. I wonder if there is any information like that in the honourable member's files. Is it the type of extinguisher that uses CO² gas? That is got from Trinidad. It has a very high pressure and it blocks out the air therefore preventing combustion, and an added advantage is that it does not make a mess. Apart from the actual fire damage no mess is made in the place where the fire occurs. I would like to know if they have equipment for refilling these extinguishers after they are used.

Dr. CUMMINS: As I have already said I have sent for further information, and as soon as it comes I will pass it on. This file does not give all the detail that honourable members are asking for.

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

HEAD XXII — PUBLIC LIBRARY — Item 22 (New) Fire Extinguishers, \$272.00 was called.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Head 22 stand part.

The question was put and agreed to.

HEAD XXIII—MENTAL HOSPITAL —Item 37. (a) (New) Allowance in lieu of Quarters \$216.00 was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—This item as is shown is a new one and it results from the Turner Committee recommendation that certain officers at the Mental Hospital should now get allowance in lieu of quarters. I move that Head 23 stand part.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—I am rather intrigued by the note to this item. It says:—

"In accordance with the recommendations of the Turner Committee report on the conditions of service of Administrative, Professional and Technical staff, the conditions of service of the medical staff at the Mental Hospital were brought into line with those of Medical staff at the General Hospital. Officers on agreement therefore became eligible for free furnished quarters or an allowance in lieu at the rate of 10% of salary. Until the Government quarters at the Mental Hospital can be furnished it has been decided that officers eligible for such quarters should receive an allowance at the rate of 2½% of salary for supplying their own furniture. No provision for this purpose was made in the Estimates for the current year and supplementary provision of \$216 is now required

to pay the allowance to Medical Officers at the Mental Hospital in respect of the year 1953-54."

It does seem a bit foolish. Furniture is nothing that you have to import. It can be bought from stores in Bridgetown. You can furnish a hotel within 48 hours purchasing all you want in Bridgetown. It seems to me the most unbusinesslike thing possible to give this excuse for giving this allowance of 2½ per cent. I cannot imagine any business concern doing business like that. The whole thing looks like a farce. Before these officers were recommended for quarters they used to pay the Government five per cent. of their salary as rent for quarters. Now Mr. Turner and his committee have come along with their wonderful report and recommended an allowance of 10 per cent. in lieu of quarters. But they only used to pay the Government five per cent. They will now get 10 per cent. of their salaries in lieu of quarters, and if you have no quarters ready they will get this 10 per cent. plus 2½ per cent. for furnishing the quarters. That does not recommend itself to me.

It is in order to do all this stupidity that we have made the cost of running this country as high as it is. Even ordinary postage is higher than in any other part of the West Indies. You can get a letter from any part of the world to Barbados cheaper than you can send it from Barbados to that part of the world. At one time Medical Officers at the Mental Hospital got less salary than corresponding officers at the General Hospital. Now they are on a par, because the number of people at the Mental Hospital is increasing all the time. There was a time when they got less salary and not the same conditions of service as the Medical Officers at the General Hospital got, but as the numbers at the Mental Hospital increased you increased the salaries of the Medical Officers there and improved their conditions of service. If you go on saddling the country with a high cost of living in order to pay these high salaries and grant these extraordinary conditions of service you will have to increase salaries at the Mental Hospital higher than those at the General Hospital because you will have two or three times the number of people at the Mental Hospital that you have there now; because everyone will go mad trying to live.

At one time the Medical Superintendent at the Mental Hospital got a salary of \$5,760 a year. Then you increased his salary to \$6,480, following the wonderful report of the Turner Committee. But in addition he will get in lieu of quarters 10 per cent. of his salary. When he was getting \$5,760 a year he paid the Government five per cent. of his salary as rent. Now that he is getting \$6,480 the Government will pay him 10 per cent. of his salary in lieu of quarters, plus 2½ per cent. in lieu of furniture, plus £300 for four years' leave passage for himself and his wife.

What really irks me is that the Government had no right to appoint a Civil Servant or Servants to review conditions of work of the Civil Service including their own conditions of work. When we got this report we should have asked the Colonial Office to transfer Mr. Turner; to promote him elsewhere; in other words get rid of him. But the Government took the report and swallowed it hook, line and sinker; and to-day because they have not got furniture ready for free quarters for these officers we are going to give them 2½ per cent. in lieu of furniture. Even if we are committed to the principle of free furniture these officers could at least in common decency give the Government a chance to get it, if they have to have it made. But because the furniture is not ready on the dot Government must pay this allowance for furniture which they did not get before. Because an officer has to wait a few months for furniture we must

give him money. I think, Mr. Chairman, that all of us should be in the Mental Hospital where he is if we vote for this. I am moving, sir, that the Resolution be reduced by this amount; that this item be deleted.

Mr. VAUGHAN seconded.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,— My feeling is when we consider all this free spending of money that sooner or later the Government will have to re-adjust its whole policy of spending money. I do not blame Mr. Turner for one moment. If I was an Englishman I would try and get some money for some of my boys too. As the honourable senior member for St. Philip has reminded us, the Turner Committee Report recommended that the salaries and conditions of service of the Medical Superintendents of the General and Mental Hospitals should be the same, and therefore it was decided to give the Medical Superintendent of the Mental Hospital free quarters or in lieu allowance at the rate of 10 per cent. of salary, plus 2½ per cent. for furniture if the quarters were not furnished. But what strikes me as regrettable is the fact that it is a year since the implementation of the Turner Committee Report; and I do not think it is impossible for the Government to get this furniture ready in a year. But you allow the officer to wait all this time and so give him a chance of demanding his pound of flesh. The Government must be blamed for that. It is 15 months since you decided to implement the recommendations of the Turner Committee. This is the kind of administration that allows chicanery behind the scenes.

We have got to watch, carefully, Mr. Chairman, how we pay out these little sums of money. The small sums aggregate and add up to a large total. There is a possibility that sugar might fall, and we might find it difficult to keep on pouring sums of money like this all over the place. It is nonsense.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,— There are many things that could be said about this item. First of all, I am going to bring the Dos Santos Report into this. The Turner Committee Report said that the big boys at the Mental Hospital should be on a par with the big boys at the General Hospital; the Dos Santos Report said that the small fry at the Mental Hospital should be on a par with the small fry at the General Hospital; but they have been forgotten. (Shame shame). Both sets were supposed to be put on a par; but the big boys have friends at court. They have friends in the Public Buildings. It seems to me nowadays that Barbados is outside of the Commonwealth. You can come from England or from anywhere else you have got to get your pound of flesh or you are doing nothing. I hope that when the next war starts Barbadians will go out and show them that we are still in the Commonwealth and that we are prepared to lose our lives for them. There is no more family business in this thing. If the Government does not have your furniture ready you say you have got to give me money until it is ready.

The next thing is that this question of furniture at the Mental Hospital brings to mind another matter. I hope that the Government will investigate and find out whether or not some mahogany trees which they had down there have not been cut down by this officer and made into furniture and the furniture put in the officer's house; and now the Government has to pay him 2½ per cent. of salary for furniture. I want the Government to investigate that because I want the officer cleared of that charge. The honourable senior member for St. Philip does not know all that will have to be given to the officers down there. Government is now allowing its female employees to be married, and there is one at the Mental Hospital

who is married, and her husband has moved into the government's house. I wonder if the Government is charging him any rent, and what provision is made for maternity allowance to the lady. You may have to pay someone to do her duties for six months. Everyone is doing as they like. Recently there was a similar case at the General Hospital; but the quarters are no longer occupied. The lady in question is living outside with her husband, and the quarters are not occupied except perhaps during the day. I would like to know what arrangements are made for these things. Has furniture been made at the Mental Hospital and put in any of the houses down there, and is any rent being charged anyone down there. I am counselling the Government not to allow any slackness to go on because the finger is going to be pointed at them. They will get severe criticism. They must open both eyes and keep them open.

I really do not know what to do about this particular matter because if you have agreed to give people furnished quarters you should have them furnished. If you agreed to give them 2½ per cent. on their greatly enhanced salaries they will not remind you to bring in furniture. They will put in furniture, pay for it out of the house allowance and then probably sell it back to you at the original price. I would like the Government to assure me that they have not allowed any officer in residence at the Mental Hospital to use trees growing down there to put furniture in his house and now perhaps the Government is being charged 2½ per cent. on it. I would like to have the assurance that they know about this thing and that it is alright; or that they will investigate it.

As I have said the Turner Report said that the big boys at the General and Mental Hospitals should be on a par; and the Dos Santos Report said the same thing about the small fry at both institutions. But while we have just passed washing allowance for those at the General Hospital we have not done the same for nurses at the Mental Hospital. Was it ever considered and turned down, or has it never been considered at all?

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I will say that there is a statement made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip that should be corrected. It is not true to say that you can get a letter from any part of the world to Barbados cheaper than you send it from Barbados to that part of the world. It costs more to get an air mail letter from British Guiana here than to send one from here to British Guiana. It is not good when you have a good case to spoil it by statements that are not strictly correct.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,— I think that it is the duty of honourable members to support the motion for the deletion of this particular item, and I think that Government should investigate the running of this department to see if all the trees that were there are still there. It has been widely rumoured that the Head of that Department has been having these trees cut down and using institution labour to have them made into furniture, some of which furniture was bought outside the institution. What is more, sir, I think it is true to say that this particular officer has been holding office and living at the institution since 1947; so he must have had furniture there all that time. Why is there this new demand for furniture, and what has become of the old set of furniture which was down there, and who owns that furniture?

Another thing is that for some time now a lady has been going around purchasing household equipment and putting down this institution as the place that would be responsible for paying the bills

for this equipment. I do not know how it comes that the Government permits the wife of a Head of a Department to go around spending Government's money. She cannot be questioned on the spending of Government's money. It has been going on for some time now.

Now we are being asked to pay a percentage for furniture which may belong to the present holder of the post or to give him a new set. It is bad business. What happens with the Government is that whenever you draw anything to their attention they always feel that you are attacking them. But it is not always so. If the Government is wise they would investigate these things and see whether the accusations are based on fact or not if you allow the Head of a Department that spends hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers money every year to do as he likes without investigating his actions of course he will be encouraged to increase his demands all the time. He is not obligated to safeguarding the interests of the taxpayers of Barbados inasmuch as he is a stranger and may be sojourning here for a short time only. It is the representatives of the people of this country and the Administration who are responsible for seeing to that. It is time that an investigation be carried out at this institution.

Every now and again you get complaints from nurses at this institution. You hear "the Medical Superintendent has done me this and that and the other." The day before you are discharged you are told that your services are required no longer. There are decent young women employed down there some of whom contribute by way of taxation some of the money that this Head of the Department squanders. There is no one to take up their cases; no one to appeal to. The Head of the Department feels so authoritative that even if someone attempts to ask something on behalf of the injured party a sufficient explanation is not given. You are just told that she does not suit any more and must go. This Government is a Labour Government and should not permit those things. You import people who have had contact with a war torn Europe, and that may have given them an outlook which is detrimental to colonial people. Government should see to it that these people do not take advantage of colonial people who have to work under them.

Sir, I support strongly the remarks of the honourable Junior Member for the City and Senior Member for St. Philip. I feel that this is one occasion when there is no party issue, but an issue which affects all and sundry in this colony. At times you must support what is right rather than what might be might. I feel this is one issue on which this House should be very strong, therefore I consider it the duty of all honourable members of this Chamber to support the deletion of the amount of \$216 which has been set down in this resolution to provide for this allowance.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—For the number of years that I have been a member of this Chamber, I have never heard such serious allegations made against an officer of Government and so direct as what I have heard this afternoon. I think these allegations are so pointing that it behoves the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas, whom I think holds the portfolio for Medical Services and Health to investigate this matter and see whether all these allegations are correct and if they are to put them right; if not so, to come and explain them to the House of Assembly. Some really bad things have been disclosed with some direct charges. In one case, an allegation was made that the wife of the head of the Medical Asylum bought furniture for her own use and put

the expenses to an account of the Mental Asylum. I think all honourable members in this Chamber are aware of their responsibility and would not say such a thing if it were not so. This is no joke. I am hoping that the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas will leave no stone unturned until he finds out how many pieces of furniture were bought at the various sales and everything in connection with this matter and let us know something about it.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Before you put the question, I would like to say that although I agree with many of the points raised by the honourable Junior Member for the City and other honourable members who have spoken in so far as specialist officers are concerned, yet the fact remains that we are committed to the recommendation of the Turner Committee. I think the majority of honourable members voted in favour of an additional increase to the salaries of technical and specialist officers. The officer of whom mention has been made happens to be a specialist officer and as far as I know, has been appointed on contract for a specific number of years. Under the terms of the contract it has been agreed to pay him a specific salary and to give him free furnished quarters among other things pertaining to his office. It must be remembered that this officer worked here already for the Government in the same capacity and must have given satisfactory service that the Government should have decided to re-appoint him as a specialist officer on contract. If by the terms of the contract, Government cannot provide free furnished quarters for this officer, it must do something by way of compensation or otherwise a breach of contract is committed. Therefore this provision in this resolution shows that Government is trying to save itself from out of an awkward position. That is all that this vote means. I am not saying that the furniture which may be available at this officer's quarters is necessarily unsuitable to this specialist or that you should have specialist furniture for a specialist. I do not think that you need to carry it to that extent. What I am saying is that a breach of contract would be committed by Government to this officer if it does not carry out all the terms and conditions of the contract. Although I disagree with certain recommendations of the Turner Report and just as strongly as any other honourable member, I having taken exception to the manner in which the Turner Committee was set up, yet the fact remains that that the Turner Committee has been accepted as well as the Committee's report was passed on the floor of this Chamber. Although I am not arguing the case of the Government, I feel that the Government is in duty bound to provide free furnished quarters for this specialist officer and if by way of avoiding a breach of contract on the part of this Government, it is compromising in this manner until such time as it can fulfil the terms and applications of the contract, I feel that this allowance of 2½ per cent. of salary for this purpose should be agreed on.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church has said much of what I intended to say. There seems to be some criticism by honourable members on the Government for bringing the terms of the appointment of the Medical Officer of the Mental Asylum in line with that of medical officers of the General Hospital but I do not see the reason why those honourable members should be discriminatory to that extent. In both cases, these officers are professional men; they spend the same time qualifying for their profession and those specialising in the various branches of the profession have to take post-gradu-

ate courses in the specialised branch they choose. These same honourable members who think that the Government should employ the medical staff at the Mental Hospital on different terms and conditions to that of similar officers of the General Hospital would be the first to say something else if Government had not done that at the time and was thus unable to secure that staff at that institution. These honourable members would say that because of a few paltry dollars this Government is unable to recruit staff for the Mental Hospital. As the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church said, these were the terms under which these officers at the Mental Hospital accepted their jobs. Why the administration should be rather dilatory in securing furniture for these officers, I do not know, but I would make enquiries as to the reason. Probably, the administration feels that inasmuch as those officers have provided their own furniture there was no need to hurry to buy furniture for their requirements. I said probably; I may be wrong.

Sir, there has also been some criticisms by the honourable Junior Member for the City with respect to the washing allowances for the nurses at the Mental Hospital not being granted to nurses at the General Hospital. During the past two weeks, I have had the opportunity of sitting at one or two Whitley Council meetings owing to the absence of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and this question of washing allowance was brought up. The representative from the Mental Hospital said that he understood that washing allowances were granted to the nursing staff at the Mental Hospital at a former meeting of the Whitley Council. He said that he was present at that meeting and he thought that the decision of that meeting was that this allowance should be granted to the nurses at the Asylum. On perusal of the Minutes of the meeting of the Council, there was nothing to confirm the opinion of this representative on that subject and the matter is still in the air. It seems to me that somebody has probably taken too much for granted and is saying that this allowance was granted. In any case, I am not saying that these nurses should get it or that they should not get it; I am only saying that there was some misunderstanding which I hope in the not far distant future will be put right.

Sir, I have heard a lot of talk about mahogany trees being cut down and furniture made of them. I know nothing of it. I cannot say anything more on the matter. I admit that it is rather disquieting and it causes me some concern. I will promise this House to investigate the matter thoroughly and see whether this allegation is correct. I have also heard the remark that the Sister Tutor there has been recently married and that her husband is living on the premises with her. I will also make enquiries about that. I am however asking honourable members, in view of the remarks made by the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church — and what he said was really correct — to let this vote pass but I will again promise to investigate the matter and give an explanation. Probably at the next meeting of this House I will be in a position to give the information which honourable members have been asking in connection with the mahogany trees, the furniture, with respect to the Sister Tutor and one or two other things. I agree that if the allegations are well founded, it is not the state of affairs which should exist. I again repeat that I will make the necessary enquiries and report as soon as possible.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, if there is one question that the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas should be able to answer today is why furni-

ture has not been bought for these officers at the Mental Hospital. First of all, if you agree to employ somebody and to give them furnished quarters, you have no right to place them in unfurnished quarters. If those officers were able to get furniture for themselves, you should have been able to do so. The reason for this state of affairs is that you have not been able to supply this furniture, therefore, you have to pay rent for them. The questions are: Why have you not been able to get furniture for these officers? Are you paying rent for the furniture which is in the place; or, are the officers buying furniture and collecting the rent?

I would not like the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas to get the impression that the Sister Tutor's husband should not be allowed to live with her because the wife of a married man is allowed to live with him. The questions in this case are: Is this a new arrangement in which the Government has entered? Was that the agreement entered with this lady and have the Government made arrangements for maternity allowances? If Government allows a situation like this at the Mental Hospital, why has it not been allowed at the General Hospital? There is however one question which the Government should answer and that is: Is it the intention of the Government to get the necessary furniture? We have not yet heard this answer. All that we have been made aware of is that we are to provide for this 2½ per cent. of salary in lieu of inability to supply free furnished quarters. And it is put down in this resolution as if it were included in the 1952—53 Estimates. I wonder if it was made last year and a supplementary vote is now required. I think this is a peculiar way to set it down if that were not so. Sir, we are not told how many officers would be getting this allowance or who they are.

I have not argued against the principle enunciated by the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church. I am not against that at all. I would say that these officers had no right to accept the condition of going into unfurnished homes when furnished homes should have been provided for them. If these officers were at the General Hospital and free furnished quarters could not be provided for them, they would be given a house allowance. I am not arguing against that principle. The peculiar thing about the whole matter is that the Government leaves this provision out of the Estimates, and is now making it a supplementary estimate. Have the Government changed their idea of buying furniture for these quarters? This is a very unsatisfactory way to handle this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Just another point, Sir, before you put the question. The honourable junior Member for St. Thomas says he does not know the reason why the furniture was not bought. The point is that this honourable member is responsible for Medical Services and health—that is his portfolio—and if he tells us today when we are committed to giving these officers free furnished quarters that he does not know why the furniture was not bought, we can only say that he is not performing his duties satisfactorily. When the honourable member says so, he is admitting to rank indifference and incompetence in so far as matters come within his portfolio. In my opinion, this officer in question was actually living in a furnished house so when you come along and offer to give him free furnished quarters and furniture, you have not got to buy furniture because it is already on the premises. It seems to me that for the three years of this officer's contract, Government will not be buying this furniture.

In so far as the honourable senior member for Christ Church who says that he endorses the princi-

ple that these specialist officers are entitled to this specialised treatment in matters of salaries and conditions of work, it is true that this House has adopted in principle the Turner Report. What I merely want to ask the honourable member is if in his considered opinion he thinks the increase in the salary and conditions of work should rise from \$5,432 per annum to \$8,010 — an increase of \$2,538 per annum.

(A VOICE): How do you get that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The figures are at present:

Salary	\$6,480
12½% on salary in allowances ..	810
At the end of four years £300 for himself and £300 for his wife equal to £600 divide per annum ..	720
	\$8,010

Sir, I would like to ask the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church if he does not think that even if this Officer be a super-specialist that this increase of \$2,538 is extravagant for a small pauperised colony like this.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,— had it not been for the remarks of the last honourable member relative to the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas I would not have risen to my feet. I think the remarks which the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip made that because the honourable member did not know why the furniture was not bought, whether it was bought, or when it would be bought, that he was admitting to rank indifference and incompetence, is grossly unkind, unreasonable and unfair. The honourable Senior Member for St. Philip knows as well as anybody else that the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas who holds the portfolio for medical services and health is not an administrative officer. The honourable member knows that the Deputy Leader is only an officer to formulate the policy of the Government. There is no ministerial status at present therefore, you should not go prying into the business of a department unless you hear something going wrong. Perhaps, if honourable members were taking their duties seriously, when they heard happenings contrary to the good running of a department as was aired just now, they should report them to the Colonial Secretary so that they could be brought to the notice of the Government. Those honourable members have not done that; they have aired them in this House and then the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip goes on and accuses the honourable junior member for St. Thomas who is a member of Government and who merely formulates policy and very seldom has the authority of carrying out that policy, of indifference and incompetence. I think it is grossly unfair and indiscreet. Every honourable member knows that this Government merely comes to the House and put bills, resolutions, and things of that sort to which we agree in Executive Committee, they being more or less our policy and every honourable member also knows that in so far as administration is concerned, there is no authority whatsoever given to members of this Government. When something is brought to the notice of a member of the Government he goes to the Head of the Department concerned and investigates the matter. Therefore, how can you accuse the member of Government because he did not go and pry in on that Department of Medical Services and ask questions on things which he never heard? How can you say he is incompetent and indifferent? Sir, I say it is regrettable coming as it did from the honourable senior member for St. Philip and more

particularly as the honourable member referred to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—The honourable junior member for St. Thomas is responsible for formulating policy, in other words, he is responsible for seeing that this officer has furnished quarters. That is part of the policy for the conditions of service of this particular medical officer at the Mental Asylum. Bear in mind that the Government formulates such policy and this is the portfolio of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas who now comes to the House to give this officer at the Mental Asylum some money because the quarters there were unfurnished for nearly a year. Now, Sir, if you were not a minister, even although this Government does not have ministerial status, you would expect the person whose duty it was to present this resolution to enquire why have we not got the furniture for this place. It is a most ordinary matter of fact sort of thing to expect would be asked you if you were coming in here to present a resolution like this. That is not important administrative duty. You would certainly get this information because you will reason to yourself saying that I am sure to be asked why after a year this furniture has not been bought. You will meditate on what is the reason—somebody is negligent; somebody is indifferent; somebody is not performing their duties. As a matter of fact, in not being able to answer such a simple question is tantamount to saying that you have not read the resolution at all. The first thing that strikes your eye, as was questioned by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and the honourable junior member for Christ Church; "My goodness! could we not get a few pieces of furniture for this place?" It is something you can buy anywhere in Bridgetown. Let us say this question escaped the attention of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas; he had not read the notes accompanying this vote carefully and as a result he did not go and see about it; but do not tell me that because you are not a full pledged minister you cannot go and find out the reason why this state of affairs exist.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, — the more one listens to remarks coming from this Government Bench, the more one becomes dissatisfied with its technique. The honourable senior member for St. Michael made a dangerous admission of the Government's inability to control the affairs of this colony. I do not believe that the honourable member studied the remarks he made because such remarks can only leave us to resolve ourselves in a state of chaos and hope that the not distant future will provide us with a government more able to govern us. Sir, you cannot tell me that a government comprised as this is, having these institutions to appeal to it for funds for the running of them, cannot control and have a say in the administration of the funds of these institutions just because members of the Government have not got full ministerial status.

Mr. COX: Nobody is saying that.

Mr. ALLDER: What is it that he said then, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I have never said that because members of the Government have not ministerial status, they have no say in the administration of the funds of the running of government institutions. I have already said that members of the Government are not administrative officers. If questions are brought to our notice in connection with the running of a department, the member of Government whose duty it is, can go to the particular department and investigate the matter and report to the Government and then the Government can take action. I did not say we cannot do anything.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir,—When you are a member of Government, you are everything. You have to be an officer, clerk, cantonnier, scavenger and everything else. There is no line of demarcation drawn in so far as administration. It is not a question of prying into anybody's business; it is your business. It is your duty to know how institutions under your charge are running. It is not the duty of other honourable members to go and find out what is taking place, but it is the duty of the member of Government concerned with the running of that Department to see that nothing goes wrong. As I have said, it is not prying into anybody's business; it is your business. There should be nothing secretive in the administration of Government so far as a Government member is concerned.

Sir, just as you demand numerous reports from the educational authorities—some of them unnecessarily—why can't you demand termly reports from these institutions that spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money so that you can be made aware of what is going on there? Sir, why can't you delegate an official to go and look around places like the Mental Hospital and make surprise visits? It appears as if after government appointment a head of these institutions it is not really interested in the running of that institution and if they are interested, they are interested on the side which the big official is interested. There is still that short-sighted policy going on. This Government is still perpetuating a system which we expected its members would destroy. Sir, things like what have been complained of will continue to be done by these officials because nobody questions them. They tell one another that they need not be afraid of what they do as if they were in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales or Scandinavia for that matter, because they are in the West Indies where the colonials are unaccustomed to power, therefore, they can do as they like. This is what honourable members on the Government Bench do not realise. Sir, at the Mental Hospital over \$13,000 was spent during last year on provisions, food, etc. How, therefore, can Government permit the Sister Tutor with the duties attached to her office to go out of her way to rear turkeys and ducks—the loveliest in the island—with the aid of an unfortunate patient who goes around the institution to gather up the patients' meals to feed such stock? This lady is then permitted to sell this stock outside the institution. I feel that the administration of this institution should not permit this thing to be done. This is something which the member of Government concerned should go around and investigate. Sir, if this institution were run by private enterprise, it having over 600 persons to feed daily, do you think that the management would not be interested in the swill? Do you think the management would allow persons whom they are paying to do other work? Do you think this lady should be allowed to keep a farm there? What is more, she pays a shilling a month to a patient to use his or her skill to go around the institution to pick away from a weaker patient his meal which he may not have eaten readily. If you consider that the population of that institution is at present between six and seven hundred, you can imagine the difficulty of feeding the people there and how costly it is to the taxpayers. You are bound to reason that out of that number of people there you should obtain so many hundred pounds of refuse per week which could go towards the raising of so many pig, poultry and other livestock for the use of the institution. With proper administration, you will see that all the refuse from that institution goes to

the feeding of this stock and at periodical intervals you will slaughter some of this stock and send it back to the kitchen to provide food for the stomachs of the patients. By this means you will be creating a saving and will be easing the hard-pressed taxpayer.

The honourable senior member for St. Michael suggested to honourable members that if they heard anything wrong going on at Government institutions they should inform the Colonial Secretary. Sir, why must I go to the Colonial Secretary; why must I take that course to give evidence when there is this Chamber for me to express the things which I feel should be aired. The honourable member thinks he is smart; he wants to reduce our position. Government, certainly, has already reduced our status but we want to save the little that remains. Sir, all sorts of complaints come from the servants attached to that institution. They tell me: "Can't you feel for people like ourselves?" "Why should you allow this English Matron to treat us like that?" "Can't you see that the representative who pretended to represent this kind of employee allowed himself to be bullied by the indiscreet patronage and concessions which they gave him and to which the Government agreed?"

Dr. CUMMINS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Honourable members have been asked over and over again in this House not to attack the character of officers and Civil Servants. They are placed in a position where they cannot defend themselves. The honourable member knows this and yet is making attacks on the character of these people.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir,—The only authority in this island that can attack the character or can remark on the behaviour of Government employees is parliament; and if there be cause, it should be done without fear or favour. This House of Assembly is the only correcting body that this island has for employees of Government. I was stating what is a fact when I referred to the concessions which were granted to that particular officer. This officer gave other employees the impression that they were treated well and that he represented them well.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, some time ago, this House passed a resolution to authorise that certain allowances be paid to certain subordinate staff at the Mental Hospital and the General Hospital. It included housing allowances for attendants at the Mental Hospital who are also entitled to furnished quarters, but owing to the fact that the accommodation at this institution is so hopelessly inadequate for these attendants, nurses and other employees, the Government in its wisdom on the recommendations of the Whitley Council has seen fit to grant these housing allowances varying from \$208 to \$275 to the Head Attendant and other attendants there. It raises an interesting point because I would like to know Mr. Chairman, why the Government in granting these allowances for furniture in this resolution on a basis of $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the salary of the particular officers who are appointed on agreement did not grant a similar allowance to these other ordinary officers at the same institution? Sir, why should the Government discriminate with officers on agreement and ordinary officers at the Mental Hospital? These ordinary officers are also entitled to free furnished quarters; they are paid an allowance in recognition of that fact, but no mention of these is seen in this resolution. We only see mention made of officers on agreement who are two or three people whom as the honourable junior member for the City suggested, must have quarters of some comfort and must necessarily have furniture. It raises an interesting proposition because I am wondering whether the Division III

people, such as the Head Male Attendant and other employees in that category are not justified in using this resolution as a springboard for addressing their claims for furniture allowance as well. Are these officers of Division III supposed to squat on the floor? I feel what is good for one is good for the other.

Sir, I entirely agree that we cannot afford to provide furnished quarters at the Mental Hospital for all those people who are entitled to them. We know why Government has not obtained them. Obviously, it is because Government would have to indulge in capital expenditure of considerable proportions for employees who prefer their present concessions, but when it comes to providing quarters for officers such as those under agreement, it is a different matter entirely, because those officers usually prefer to have government quarters rather than to pay house rent outside and the number of buildings which the Government would have to erect for these officers is not really prohibitive. It is understood to be the orders of the day in this place that officers in the category of those under agreement should have quarters provided for them and the subordinate members prefer to get allowances rather than have quarters. However, if these subordinates are also entitled to free furnished quarters, would not they be entitled to furniture allowances in like manner as the other officers? This is the one problem which presents itself to me.

Sir, I would like to take this opportunity of drawing another matter to the attention of the introducer of this resolution although I notice that the honourable member is not in his place. It has been brought to my attention that the Farm Superintendent of the Mental Hospital has not been given housing allowance when this allowance was given to the other attendants. Government has it on its programme that the Farm Superintendent should be provided with free quarters and to the best of my knowledge from the time that the resolution which provided allowance for the other attendants at this institution was passed up to now, the quarters for the Farm Superintendent have not been built. That particular officer is living in bachelor quarters in which the Head Male Attendant and other officers of that category spend their spare moments. He is getting no house allowance while the Head Male Attendant and the other attendants are getting housing allowances. Sir, the Farm Superintendent is the one person who has to attend to cattle—calves, goats and pigs—at all hours of the day and night, and he has received no recognition by Government for this allowance. I understand the reason for this lack of consideration is because the Head Male Attendant and the other attendants were represented at the Whitley Council but because the Farm Superintendent is recognised to be a specialist officer, he was not so represented. This is something which the Head of that Department should check and regulate and bring to the notice of Government. I hope the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas would investigate this matter.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I have not risen to answer anything which the honourable senior member for St. Philip or the senior member for St. George has said though, I may say that they have said some ridiculous things. I only rise to ask leave to withdraw this head from the resolution — Head XXIII (3) Mental Hospital — in view of all the criticisms. Before bringing it back to the House I will make investigations which I promised to do earlier. (Hear! Hear!)

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I now beg to move that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. COX seconded and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. 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. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

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

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

Head XXIII (8)—Maternity Hospital

Head XXIII (8) Maternity Hospital, was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXIII (8) Maternity Hospital, stand part.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Sir, It is true that there is no particular way for the framing of the notes to these supplementary estimates, but while that may be true and for any honourable member to banter with words like the accompanying notes to this head would probably be a waste of time, yet I must draw this note to the notice of this Chamber. It reads as follows:—“The linen and bedding at the Maternity Hospital have been reported as being in a serious state of disrepair. The majority of the articles have been in use since the Hospital opened in January, 1948, and replacements are now required at an estimated cost of \$1,430. No provision for this expenditure was made in the Estimates for the current financial year.”

Nobody really wants to seriously criticise the Government for this sort of thing, but Sir, there must have been somebody in charge of that institution to see that the bedding was getting in a bad condition, and certainly, it should have been reported on before it got to this serious state of disrepair, if bedding can be repaired. Several people use this Maternity Hospital and it is very likely that wear and tear would occur. The note states that the linen and bedding have been reported as being in a serious state of disrepair. I think this wording can never apply though it is not my intention to banter with words, but surely it is always feasible to come to this House and get supplementary estimates for a purpose like this, Government knowing too well that no honourable member of this House would vote against it. Assuming that this bedding was getting too bad for further use since last October—possibly much longer than that—a supplementary vote for these requirements has not been brought down until now. I think it is high time that matters like this should be dealt with more expeditiously.

Mr. VAUGHAN: This type of thing is disgraceful, Sir. After five years, during which time the linen and bedding at the Maternity Hospital were used, it has now been brought to the notice of the House to ask for replacements. One can imagine the state of things at that institution during the past year and the discomfort that was caused to those who were compelled to use it.

Sir, while on this point, I would remind the House that it is five years since Colonial Development and Welfare established this Maternity Hospital and I take this opportunity to appeal to Government to take a leaf out of the book of that organisation and establish several other of these

hospitals in this community. I feel the time has come to do so. This institution has proved very valuable since its inception. I happen to know how young mothers who have made use of it feel about it but this single centre is insufficient for the needs of the entire community owing to the fact that there are districts in the rural areas which can very profitably benefit from a Maternity Hospital. When we think of the infantile death rate in this colony which is actually the highest in the world, we must think of institutions like this, because we know that since this Maternity Hospital was instituted it has cut down that unsatisfactory state of affairs and I am sure that the multiplication of hospitals like this must have a further effect on lessening this death rate in the community. I therefore, am really appealing to Government to think seriously of multiplying institutions like this. I feel they are more profitable to this community than the \$200,000-Fire Station that we voted to erect. Many of the building programmes like this Fire Station are not as essential as more of these Maternity Hospitals. I see in the Five Year Plan the sum of \$150,000 set down for the erecting of a new parliament building, but that is not as essential as these social institutions, therefore I will ask to forget all about that building and erect more Maternity Hospitals. Projects like a new parliament building are out of the question. Instead of spending money on building programmes like that, use some of the money earmarked for those ventures on the building of social institutions like this Maternity Hospital.

Mr. LEWIS: Just a word to let the honourable junior member for St. Lucy know that so far as I am aware, Government has circularised all Heads of Departments asking that they make out estimates for the requirements of their Departments in time to be put in the Annual Estimates and to try and avoid as far as possible their having to apply for a supplementary estimate. It has also been stated in the Five Year Plan.

However, Sir, this is capital expenditure and it is something that you can budget for annually. You can know that your linen and those sort of things are wearing — their life is not indefinite — and you should put in the Annual Estimates a certain amount for replacements. Certainly, an item like this should not be one that the Government should accept in the middle of a financial year. Somebody is slacking; somebody is not doing their work properly. This is not an item which should come to the House in June on a supplementary estimate. When we pass this, it is encouraging the people whose job it is to look after this matter of this sort. Do you want the people to go there and do not get a mattress or bed linen to rest on? It is a place where children are given birth to and we know that young children destroy bedding and things of that sort. We are aware that we must replace these things by degrees and because of that the Maternity Hospital should have a certain amount in the Annual Estimates for normal replacements of these furnishings. I condemn this vote at this time coming as it does under a supplementary estimate, but it seems to me that it is just a waste of time. Just fancy, we have this vote to deal with although we have not increased the accommodation at the place.

The question that Head XXIII (8) Maternity Hospital, stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXVIII,—Subsidies and Grants

Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, stand part.

Mr. Cox: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if you start anything at all and ask Government for a contribution it is afraid to say no. Government is absolutely afraid to say no to the giving of contributions and to things of this sort. I am not saying that the provision of a new building for the Mycological Institute as has been recommended by the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux is not a good thing because as soon as you use the word 'agriculture' no matter what it is about, Barbados is going to subscribe to it.

Sir, if you look at the amount voted under subsidies and Grants in the Annual Estimates, you will see that it is a considerable amount and every year that sum increases owing to the fact that the items under that head are increasing. I feel that a good case should be made out before Government agrees to subscribe to things of this sort. Not long ago, we started some farm in Trinidad and British Guiana who at first agreed to make a contribution to it, had the guts to say afterwards that they were not going to do so. As a result, this colony had to take over more of the expense. Now we have the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux Conference in 1950 recommending for the provision of a new building for the Mycological Institute owing to the inadequacy of the present accommodation and we are asked to contribute towards the cost of the building in the same proportions as we contribute to that Bureaux. What I am stressing is that every now and then we are asked for contributions to these various institutions and every other sort of thing and it seems to me that whatever comes up, that the Barbados Government is the first to agree to contribute to it. I hope that we will get some benefit from this cause. In the meantime, I will look up the Annual Estimates and tell you the amount which is voted under the Head, Subsidies and Grants.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Sir, when this House was dealing with this Head, Subsidies and Grants in the Annual Estimates, I pointed out that it was taking up a great deal of our revenue. I am one of those people who feel that Barbados in its small position cannot afford to contribute to every international organization that is started. We may be ambitious but ambition must be limited to commonsense and in keeping with our revenue. If I may be allowed to give an instance, I am very worried over our subsidy to the University College of the West Indies which must necessarily be our national adjunct to nationhood. When that institution was first started our contribution was small but recent increases have put our contribution to a very big figure. Earlier this year we also made contribution to the Caribbean Farm Institute and to some International Airport Convention at Seawell. I feel it is time that these subsidies should be carefully watched because with our limited revenue we have a number of things to be done and when these international bodies get in touch with our Secretariat, the officers of that Department should be bold enough to decline joining in these schemes so as to avoid this increasing expenditure. Barbados cannot afford to join every international organisation. It is not a country like Egypt, India or Pakistan.

Mr. ALLDER: I think this Government should take a leaf out off the book of the Government of British Guiana in this respect. I notice a lot of international bodies to which we contribute, that British Guiana tells them that it is not interested and if that country is forced to contribute, it contributes a negligible amount. Schemes like this which this Government is subsidizing should be subsidised by the

Sugar Producers Federation because the motive behind all ventures of this sort is to help facilitate the Sugar Industry. Since the Sugar Producers Association of this Island has been amalgamated with the Sugar Producers Federation of the West Indies and have recently even gone further afield and have merged themselves with an international body, I am sure that the facilities and the technical advice which the association now gets for nothing from the Barbados Government can help the others. They therefore should decide to pay for some of these things which this Government is called on to pay. Certainly this Mycological Institute is of no particular interest to the colony.

Instead of contributing to these organisations here and there, I would contribute—say for agricultural purposes—to the Peasants' Loan Bank so that peasants could get the benefits of the money that it subscribed to that Bank. That money could be spent in employing another agricultural inspector to advise and encourage peasants to till every square foot possible of their land and in certain cases, where necessary, recommend certain peasants to the Department for assistance. We should strive to grow more food in this island. Some poor peasants who own a quarter or half acre of land find it difficult to till their plot although they are willing to do so, but they have not the initial amount to start cultivation. If this Government supply a few more agricultural inspectors, these inspectors would be able to urge these peasants to till their land, and would be in a position to offer them advice and to recommend to Government those who need some assistance. Of course it may be said that the Peasants' Loan Bank helps in this respect, but although we have extended the scope of this Bank recently, there is still some difficulty for some peasants to obtain a loan and some of them do not think about it at all. I would like to see it made so simple that every peasant could obtain a loan so that every bit of agricultural land in the island could be tilled.

Certainly, this contribution to the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux is necessary, but certainly the Sugar Producers Federation should be making it available. Sir we have to overhaul our expenditure in matters like this and get down to brass tacks. Let us face facts. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy said so and I say so too. The future looks gloomy and we should plan so that we can meet it successfully. All these little bodies that we are serving here and there, other governments are trying to rid themselves from serving. I feel that this Government should refuse to consider some of these little useless bodies like this with which we are confronted in this resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, as promised, I have looked up the amount voted under the Head, Subsidies and Grants, for the current financial year and the amount voted under it is \$378,266, which is an increase of almost \$51,000 over the previous year. Not only that, but we are contributing \$2,400 already to the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux this year. If the honourable senior member for St. John thinks that this is a little body which this Government is contributing to he is wrong.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the remarks of the honourable junior member for the City, I will just make this point. I think this is a matter which we can help the Government by our vote. What I mean is that members of the Government might not be wishful of granting some of these contributions, but might be reluctant to say so. If we take our business seriously, we can help Government by not voting for some of these things which we think are unnecessary. If the Government

feels itself obligated to bringing down these subsidies and grants, we can help by refusing to support everything. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask honourable members to make up their minds on this supplementary vote of \$672 to the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux and see whether any harm would be done to this colony if we refuse to grant it. If they arrive at this conclusion, which is my opinion, I am asking them not to vote for it. I now formally move that this item be deleted.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, in spite of what I have said I am appealing to the honourable Senior member for St. John and other honourable members who may view the matter in the same light as he to see that this \$672 is needed for capital expenditure to provide for a new building for the Mycological Institute in Trinidad. If this \$672 which this island is called on to contribute will help to erect a new building, let us hope that we will get something out of it to justify the \$2,400 that we contribute every year towards the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau. This \$672 will not be recurrent; it is for capital expenditure; therefore, since it is for that purpose, I am prepared to vote for it. I however hope that honourable members of the Government will keep their eyes open on these kind of things and dissent to some which they think this island will not stand to benefit from.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague is taking too many things for granted and would help this Committee if he gave more information than what is stated in the notes. I would like him to tell this Committee: (1) If Government is satisfied that this Mycological Institute is of benefit to Barbados; and (2) if he is satisfied on the basis on which this contribution is being made.

Dr. CUMMINS: Well Sir, I have been asked if Government is satisfied that an institute of this sort would be of use to Barbados and I can only say that Barbados is an agricultural community it having only sugar and a few potatoes, yams and eddoes. Therefore, I feel that anything which will go to the improvement of agriculture and to the development of the crops would be of benefit to Barbados. I heard the colony of British Guiana was mentioned by one or two honourable members in comparison with the attitude of this colony towards contributing to things of this sort but I will tell them that British Guiana has its diamonds, gold, bauxite and other things and even a continental destiny but Barbados has no such minerals nor a continental destiny—it has only sugar. Therefore if British Guiana can afford not to contribute to things of this sort, it must be remembered that British Guiana has something else on which to fall back. I feel Barbados should support this Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux. As has been said by the honourable junior member for the City this supplementary vote of \$672 is for capital expenditure and is based on the proportion which this colony is called on to contribute along with other colonies within the bureaux. According to a note which I have here the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Gold Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and the Windward Islands were circularised on this matter. The capital cost of the Mycological Institute is estimated at \$50,400 and Barbados is called on to subscribe \$672.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the contribution is on the same basis as the annual contribution which we are making to the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux. The contribution which we are now called on to contribute is towards a building which is to be built in the West Indies and for that reason also, I am willing to vote for the amount. The only thing

about this matter is that it is not a case that the Mycological Institute has not a building for this purpose. According to the note, this Bureau Review Conference in 1950 recommended the provision of this new building owing to the inadequacy of the present accommodation. I have seen this place and it has a lot of room to all appearances. But of course, I am not a technical man. I do not know if it is a lot of room for that purpose.

Sir, while on this matter, I would like to draw to your attention that I notice that the Sugar Industry is now getting the Regional Economic Committee to choose delegates to send to the forthcoming Commonwealth Conference about sugar and the Sugar Producers Association will not be contributing anything directly to that conference. Therefore there is something in what the honourable senior member for St. John said a few minutes ago when discussing this matter. Sir, the sugar industry in this colony has been on a sound footing for many years now and this colony is very generous to the industry by allowing in taxfree everything which is imported for its upkeep. This colony is even providing for the rehabilitation of factories which are going out of production. Now that the Commonwealth is holding a Sugar Conference it is the Regional Economic Committee which is choosing the delegates and not the West Indies Sugar Producers Association. I suppose that it will be claimed that something will benefit Barbados as a result of this Conference.

The question that Head XXVII, Subsidies and Grants, stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXIX,—Miscellaneous Services

Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, stand part.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Government Bench why Government has allowed an association which pays its manager between \$400 and \$500 per month to occupy offices in a government building without paying one cent. That particular association occupies valuable space at the Customs. I am told that this association does not pay one cent for rent while Government pays a high rent for a property which it occupies at White Park for Old Age Pension Offices. Sir, why should not this association be asked to pay something for the space it is occupying at the Customs? Space at the Customs is very valuable. That association formerly occupied space in the Central Foundry Building which was destroyed by fire and since that fire that office was removed to the Customs. I take it that this association is not a government concern. Even although Government may have given it some kind of sympathy during the war years; and did assist it then with free offices, now that there is peace,—in this part of the world—this association is still permitted to occupy free government offices. Sir, I want honourable members to realise and the Government especially, that office space at the Customs House is very valuable space and that this association should either be asked to pay rent or to get out.

The question that Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, stand part was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXX—Income Tax and Death Duties

Item 15 (new) Office Equipment and Furniture \$100.00.

Dr. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that the Head stand part, and the question was put and agreed to without division.

Head XXXII—Highways and Transport — Item 38 (a) (new) Repair shop tools and equipment. (b) (new) Normal running spares for heavy equipment. Item 47. Upkeep of Chamberlain and Victoria Bridges.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—I am speaking on Item (a) in which \$1,000 is being asked for tools. I remember that early last year during consideration of the Estimates I asked that the Government seek to get a proper supply of road repair tools as year after year seasonal unemployment becomes greater, and especially during dry years. It is absolutely imperative that there should be a reserve stock of such tools so that workers in the country districts can be employed when agricultural work becomes slack, and they find themselves working perhaps only two days in a week. If the necessity arises to start an unemployment scheme for those normally employed in the agricultural districts it cannot be put into effect unless the tools are there. One of the chief means of employing that type of labour is in road repair work, and there are many roads in the island which need repairing and reconstruction. Lack of tools is an effective barrier to any additional employment. I think that the sum of \$1,000 which is asked to be voted is too small for what I envisage. I am asking Government again to consider seriously the purchasing of a good stock of road repair tools—picks, shovels and such tools as cantoneers use.

Year after year seasonal unemployment increases because the necessity for work in the labour market increases. Industries are not increasing at any rapid rate. As a matter of fact, with so many factories going out of production there will be several hundreds of people who formerly would be employed throughout the year, thrown on the labour market. But for the little rain that we have just got the situation would be pretty acute. (A MEMBER: In what way?) A Government Member asks in what way. Cannot he in his position envisage it? Is he not convinced daily about the lack of employment? In all the agricultural districts as soon as the crop is over you hear serious complaints about the lack of employment. It is a scandal to hear a member of the Government ask in what way the situation would be acute, and talk about unemployables. Ten years ago he would not have made such remarks. The only unemployables are in gaol, or perhaps on the Executive. However, I am warning the Government to prepare so that when the situation becomes acute they will not be found wanting. It is better to give people employment than to give them a subsistence dole.

I remember seeing in the Five Year Plan that expenditure of nearly a million dollars on roads was recommended by the Director of Highways and Transport, and Government, mistakenly in my view, reduced that proposed expenditure considerably. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary to keep in reserve a good stock of road repair tools in order to provide work for people when the crop season is over, and especially when drought makes the position more difficult.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman,—The note says that when the Estimates for 1953—54 were being prepared it was the intention to remove these items from the Non-Recurrent Item No. 49 and include them under (b) Other Charges (ii) Operation and

Maintenance of Plant and Machinery as Recurrent Expenditure. Although they were omitted from the Non-Recurrent Item No. 49 their inclusion under recurrent expenditure was inadvertently omitted and supplementary provision of \$4,000 is therefore required for the purpose.

In Appendix 7 of the Estimates reference is made to the type of tool—one D.2 Johnson Pile Driving Unit, one battery charger etc., but there is no reference made to the type of tool to which the honourable junior member for St. John has referred, tools which would be used in the repair of tenantry roads. I am wondering if right now there is not a shortage of that type of tool.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to members at the lower end of the table to keep quiet.

Mr. BRYAN: As I was saying I am wondering if there is not a shortage of the type of tool referred to by the honourable junior member for St. John. The tenantry road programme has been entered upon in St. Michael. Quite recently I visited the Eagle Hall area and found a very small gang employed there. I made enquiries and found out that the gang was small because of a shortage of tools.

Everyone will agree that the road repair programme is an important item, and that it cannot be efficiently carried out with a shortage of tools. We have to look at it not only from the point of view of the benefits to be derived by the people, but as the honourable junior member for St. John has rightly said, it would be by way of assistance in relieving unemployment particularly in the period after the crop. I am going to appeal to my colleague, the honourable senior member for St. Michael, to find out if there is a shortage of that type of tool and if there is, to see if some improvement cannot be brought about by importation or otherwise so that we can facilitate the drive we are making with our road programme.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to comment on Item 47—repairs to the Chamberlain and Victoria Bridges. The note says that the amount of \$5,000 provided in the Current Estimates has been found insufficient to cover the repairs and maintenance which are required for the Chamberlain Bridge alone. Supplementary provision of \$1,000 is required." I think, sir, that the time has come for the Government to implement the proposal of constructing a third bridge to span the Constitution River at a point somewhere between Fairchild Street, River Road and Constitution, in order to divert some of the heavy traffic from the two existing bridges. As a matter of fact, sir, certain people who like yourself have to use the Victoria Bridge are considerably inconvenienced by the delay and the congestion of traffic that has to cross the Victoria Bridge alone. With the increase of vehicular traffic in the colony the Victoria Bridge is in itself incapable of handling the flow of traffic at a reasonable rate which is diverted to it when the Chamberlain Bridge is swung. Moreover, even pedestrian traffic is often more than these two bridges can cope with satisfactorily.

To implement the proposal to which I have referred would do no harm. On the contrary it would save a lot of extra burden which these two bridges are now called on to bear. If we are now spending \$6,000 a year to maintain and repair the two existing bridges it can be readily seen how heavy is the traffic which must pass over these two bridges. I am sure that these two bridges, as originally constructed, were not meant to bear anything like one half of the amount of traffic which they now bear everyday. No one could have envisaged then that pedestrian and vehicular traffic would have increased to the extent that it has within the last 15 or 20 years. So I think

that both in the interest of prolonging the life of these two bridges, and facilitating the public we should seriously consider the spanning of another bridge at a point higher up.

Someone has mentioned that we might utilise the old railway yard. As far as that is concerned I am of the opinion that it is almost a criminal waste of valuable land to use it for the purpose for which it is now used, just crushing stone etc. However, sir, if you go on using the two existing bridges alone for bearing all the heavy traffic that they now have to bear you can expect something serious to happen sooner or later, or to pay the cost of constructing one of them in its entirety.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I think that the point which the honourable senior member for St. Philip has mentioned is a good one. As far as the old railway yard is concerned, maybe the Government might consider putting government buildings there. I think, too, that the railway yard would be an ideal spot for a bus terminal. The traffic position in the City has become very acute, and I think it would be worthwhile going into the suggestion that has been made.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—There are one or two points to which I would like to reply. The first is the one made by the honourable junior member for St. John. He spoke about shortage of tools at the Highways and Transport Department and he admonished the Government to purchase more tools for the purpose of carrying out road reconstruction. My view is that he has placed the cart before the horse. He will remember that in the last Estimates, where tenantry roads are concerned, we voted \$128,000. It was made clear at the time that the Government could not afford any more for that purpose. According to the Five Year Plan it is proposed that expenditure should be over a period of five years. I think I am correct in saying that the amount for tenantry roads over the five year period, or may be a period of four years is something like \$480,000. It is not good enough to say that we must have more tools when in the first place the money is not there for the employment of the number which the honourable member envisages. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the new Director of Highways and Transport is doing a good job indeed, and I am sure that every member of this House who has had contact with him will agree with me that he is a very efficient man, and we can reasonably assume that if he had wanted a greater supply of tools he would have submitted a request to Government for them. I am also sure that the Government would have given favourable consideration to his request.

As far as I can see, sir, this Department had a surplus of tools. As far as I have been able to gather there are tools lying around absolutely useless. The former director just ordered and ordered. There was a wasting of money in that direction. With the amount of money allotted to the department to be spent over the financial year, the present Director feels that by the end of this year that money will be exhausted. Therefore, the question of getting more tools in order to employ more people does not bear relation to the programme of work which has been agreed to by this House in the Estimates for 1953-54. To employ a greater number of people for a shorter period would not in any way help us.

I have not heard as my colleague has said just now that the reason why a larger number of persons has not been employed is because there is a shortage of tools. If that is so, I have an appointment with the Director to-morrow and I will question him on the point. But I am not convinced that it is so.

What I am convinced of is that the amount allocated, with the present staff, will be all exhausted by the end of the year. Therefore, as far as I can see, it would be unnecessary, and in my opinion unwise to purchase a greater number of tools for them to be thrown one side for another six months or a year or so, there being no need for them.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip made a point about a better use of the land in the area of the old railway yard. I would like to tell him that we all agree that that land has been wasted for a long time, and there again the blame can be attached to the last holder of the office of Director of Highways and Transport. Since the new Director has come he has recommended that that area be developed and be used for siting of various government offices for which we now pay rent. I think that the Director has the plan made and perhaps it is already submitted so that it will soon be before the Government. Therefore I want to assure the honourable member that the Government is in agreement with the suggestion.

I do not know if there is anything more on which I should reply. Honourable members know that until quite recently the Chamberlain and Victoria Bridges were under the Head of Public Works. It is only for this financial year that it has been decided to transfer them to the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Before the question is put, sir, I want to say that while one has got to admire the work of the new Director, I do not think that any Government Servant would appreciate working in an office and having vehicles being brake tested in the yard below. I do not think they will appreciate it even if you use the modern standing test machine.

Mr. VAUGHAN: There are a few points to which I would like to reply. The honourable senior member for St. Michael, replying to me, made some startling remarks. I hear some member on my right saying *sotto voce* "eat him up" but as I do not practice cannibalism I will not attempt it, and in any case some meals are very indigestible. (Laughter). The honourable senior member for St. Michael asked where is the money to come from. But all that we have been doing this session is sanctioning legislation for the collection of more money.

Mr. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman I never asked where was the money to come from. I said that we had agreed in the Five Year Plan to the amount of money to spend on tenantry roads over the five-year or four-year period, and we voted in this year's Estimates the amount to be spent for this financial year. The honourable member seems to be speaking from his imagination.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The honourable member said that the money was not there. What have we been imposing so much taxation for? But the most startling remark which he made, and the one on which I was advised to "eat him up" was that if the Director wanted more money he would have asked for it. Who is controlling policy in this country, the Government or the officials? Does the Director advise the Government on their employment policy? It is too ridiculous coming from members who hope to achieve ministerial status in a short time.

I am glad to hear, Mr. Chairman, that tools are idling. But what I am advocating is the putting of these presently idle tools in the hands of presently idle men. If the Government does that they would be carrying out a very useful policy for the country.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to make a few remarks relative to the two bridges. Honourable members will remember that the sidewalks of the Victoria Bridge were not well finished before they had to be repaired, and the bridge on the west side had to be repaired almost as soon as the other one was completed. I am not blaming anyone. Do not get the idea that I am criticising any particular person. I am criticising the way in which the bridges were repaired. I do not know who did them, and I do not care. If the honourable senior member for St. Michael has some pets I want to tell him to be careful. If you employ people to do a job it is foolish to tell them how wonderful they are because they do it well. The Director is getting a good salary and he should do a good job. He is getting a lot of people to help him. As a matter of fact some of the repairs were not done by the Department at all. I hope that honourable members know that. I said I do not care who did them.

I have suggested in this House years ago that there is a method by which you can put asphalt coating on the greenheart that you put on the Chamberlain Bridge. I have seen that done myself. I have told members of the Government so and I wonder if they ever investigated it or passed on the information. The Chamberlain Bridge, I understand, cannot take anything very heavy. There is a method by which you can treat wood so that it looks like macadamised road. It is carelessness. Every year you have to spend money to repair that bridge, and there are people making money out of it. It is not done by the department. There are people who virtually have a contract for repairing it and supplying the wood. It is time that the Government looked into the matter. These people put down the wood and repair the bridge and before very long they have to come back and repair it again. It can be done in such a way that you do not get the water seeping through it. The way it is done now looks as if the water runs off; but what happens is that it runs down between the holes and rots the wood.

We have several Barbadians working in Curacao. Ask them what the pontoon bridge down there is like. And it takes traffic heavier than you ever get in Barbados. What happens here is that inferior material is put into the bridge.

Mr. Chairman there is another point that I want to comment on. I do not like the idea of these tools becoming recurrent expenditure. If honourable members will look at the supplementary estimates for these tools they will see that a colossal amount is voted for them. Every year you have about two supplementary estimates under this Head. If you buy a tool to repair machinery I do not see why you should regard it as recurrent expenditure. If you follow the practice of regarding tools as recurrent expenditure you will find that as soon as they are used once they will be gone. I sincerely hope that a check is kept on these tools. I hope too that the honourable senior member for St. Michael is right and that there is a change of heart in this department. I understand that there is a big spraying machine that was bought and never used; a machine for spraying colas on the road. It is a serious matter. The moment we transfer tools from non-recurrent and place them under recurrent it will mean that the tools will disappear. It seems to me that we are encouraging slackness. I hope that I am mistaken.

Mr. COX: I would just like to inform the honourable junior member for St. Lucy that all brake tests are now made at the Pine. None is made in

the yard of the Department of Highways and Transport at all.

Question that Head XXXII stand part was put and agreed to without division.

HEAD XXXIII—AIRPORT—Item 30. (New) Aeronautical Telecommunications Equipment \$1,728.

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

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—I notice that the amount of \$1,728 under Item 30 is new expenditure. But in the explanatory note it is stated that an amount of \$1,728 was provided in Supplementary Estimates 1952-53 No. 28 for the purchase from the Air Ministry of certain equipment for use at Seawell Airport. As the Crown Agents accounts were not received before the end of the last financial year, this amount could not be brought to account and therefore lapsed. A revote is now requested.

There are two things that I would like to know. The first is whether the equipment which has been ordered has arrived, or whether it has been ordered at all. A very interesting situation will arise if the equipment has not been ordered because we may well find that a few months hence they will come back with another supplementary estimate for the same \$1,728. I also want to know whether the equipment is really necessary. When they talk of this aeronautical telecommunications equipment it is all very high sounding but I do not know exactly what they mean. I do not know if the terms are used to disguise the fact that someone may want a telephone over at the manager's new house on the other side of the road so as to be in contact with the control tower or to telephone the fire tender. What they mean is difficult for me to understand with my limited experience of seven years, and we had all kinds of telecommunication equipment and all kinds of wireless equipment. You might mean V.H.F. equipment which is already installed in the tower at Seawell for contact between Barbados and any aircraft that may happen to be flying. On the other hand, W. T. Communication—wireless telegraphy—is done by International Air Radio Ltd. and is not under the aegis of the Controller of Aviation at Seawell at all.

I would like this explanation given in the note to be more specific. We want to know what we are spending money on. We only have one aircraft here—Miss Bim—and that does not belong to Government. I do not know what new telecommunication equipment means. It could cover a multitude of sins. We would like some explanation as to what this amount is for, whether it has been ordered and at whose request.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I have no technical knowledge of telecommunications; but I have had sufficient experience in this House, particularly as regards Seawell Airport, to tell the honourable member that since this amount in this item is not a million dollars he should vote for it quickly or it may reach that amount. If you add up the amount for lighting the airport and the buying of equipment that has not been used and now telecommunications—I thought we had all the communications that were necessary up there—I will tell the honourable member to put his mind at rest that if tomorrow they can find other words to put on him they will be coming back for twice the amount, and it will be voted too.

I would not like to say, sir, that there is a racket up there. But with all the money for digging up the cable wires, the lighting of the airport and all the other things, there is only one thing that I can say: They light the airport; but they cannot enlighten the members of this House.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I presume that the honourable senior member for St. George will un-

derstand the list of items which I will read out. A claim of \$1,728 was received from the Air Ministry in respect of the following:—

- One G. 12 Transmitter.
- One T.1403 Transmitter.
- Two A.R. 88 Receivers for aviation.
- One A.V.T. 22 "B Modulator.
- One Collins Transmitter.

Of these items, Nos. 1 and 2 were used by the Director General of Aero-nautical Telecommunications to construct a radio beacon at Seawell; but the result was unsatisfactory, and a new beacon was installed by International Air Radio Ltd. and the original one kept as a standby. Item 3 is included in the list of the items owned by the Government and used by International Air Radio Ltd. at Seawell. Nos. 4 and 5 are in such a bad condition that they never left the Customs shed.

I may remind the Committee that this Resolution has already been passed by the House and it is now merely the question of a revote because the amount lapsed.

Mr. BARROW: I am glad of the very frank and shocking disclosures made by the Honourable Senior Member for St. Michael. I am not concerned with whether this is to be revoted or devoted, or anything else. I do not know if the explanation now given by the honourable member was given to the House before. I am sure that if that explanation was given honourable members would have asked a few more questions about the matter. The honourable member has read out a list about transmitters, modulators and that kind of thing. The only kind of equipment they need is V. H. F. equipment in the tower which, to the best of my knowledge is adequate for the job which it is supposed to do.

I cannot remember all the figures on the list which the honourable member read out. But as far as Item No 1 is concerned I understand that the Director General of Aero-nautical Telecommunications constructed a beacon which was defective. What beacon do they mean, and what has that to do with telecommunications? Then apparently although the beacon is defective it will be kept for use as a standby. The next thing is that items 4 and 5 are in such a bad condition that they have never left the Customs shed. Why not sue the suppliers for a breach of contract? Then we hear that International Air Radio Ltd. is using Government's property at Seawell. How does that happen? International Air Radio have the contract to supply all W.T. and R. T. services throughout the Caribbean area. They are supposed to supply not only the operators but also the equipment. As a matter of fact we cannot even question them on anything because they are a completely independent organisation. They have a monopoly for the services I have mentioned in the Caribbean area and I believe they have muscled into South America too. And here is an admission by the Government that we are voting money to buy equipment for International Air Radio to use. The Honourable Senior Member for St. Michael read out a lot of things about this and that; but he is not confusing me.

Mr. COX: The honourable member is always being unkind. He just cannot help being that way. He himself wanted to know what the items were, and now that I have read them out he says I want to confuse him. He does it all the time.

Mr. BARROW: I am not confused. I wanted to see the list. Honourable members have not been granted the courtesy of a detailed explanation of what telecommunications equipment means. When I asked to see the list it is a secret file and this and that and the other. The honourable member could

have been courteous enough to write the names and numbers of the transmitters on a scrap of paper so that I could check up. But the things that struck me most forcibly were that we are spending money to buy equipment for International Air Radio to use, and that we have purchased defective equipment that has not yet left the Customs shed. If the Government is buying modulators etc. there must be something wrong with the stuff up at Seawell. What about the transmitter for the beacon? It might be a W.T. beacon for direction finding. I do not know. The only beacon I know about up there is the one that flashes the blue and white alternating lights. If it is a radio beacon why not say it is one and some thing is wrong with it? Do not come in with a lot of talk of telecommunications equipment. And do not buy equipment for International Air Radio to use. They are being paid to provide equipment and we have perfect equipment in the tower for the limited purpose of airport control.

The next thing I want to know is what is the Director General of Civil Aviation got to do with the matter that he should be telling that one of our beacons is to be used as a standby. As far as I know the gentleman who exercises the function of presiding genius at Seawell is the Controller of Civil Aviation. No recommendation for spending this money comes from him or from the Airport Committee. And if this beacon that is to be used as a standby is a radio beacon for direction finding what consolation would it be to an aircraft in distress to know that the beacon is out of order? These are rather shocking revelations, and I am glad—even though I might have irritated the honourable senior member for St. Michael—that I did rise to my feet and draw to the notice of the Committee the reckless way in which the taxpayers' money is being spent.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I agree with the honourable member that it does seem that we are allowing International Air Radio to use equipment of ours. For the ordinary purposes of the airport there is equipment in the tower for ground to air control. Long distance control is done by International Air Radio. From the information which the honourable senior member for St. Michael read out about beacons they are presumably the type of direction finding beacon which gives a particular type of code. When you pick up that type of code you can know your position. If the type of beacon mentioned in this item is the one for direction finding we are being asked to spend money unnecessarily. Long distance control equipment should be provided by International Air Radio. Government seems to be asking the House to vote money to buy something for people who have a contract to supply it.

As I have said, I do not want to add fuel to the fire. I think that the criticisms of the honourable senior member for St. George have been both lucid and clear. It has been said that this is a revote resulting from the fact that the Crown Agents' accounts were not received. I think that most honourable members will share the view that this dealing with the Crown Agents is unnecessary sometimes. We are creating a lot of specialised agencies—a West Indian Trade Commissioner etc. I hope in course of time that all these Irish West Indians that are talking about the appointment of a Trade Commissioner—it reminds me of a group of Irishmen trying to get together—I hope that when the time comes and we appoint a Trade Commissioner the stuff that we want will cease to come through the Crown Agents so that we will not have these payments of commissions, choking up of accounts, etc.

As regards the particular item we are discussing I think that an investigation should be made so

as to find out whether we are spending money as regards International Air Radio or as regards the control tower at Seawell.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to hear if what I said is correct. I would like to know if we will have to pay for the defective equipment that has not left the Customs shed.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I have no technical knowledge along these lines nor do I have access to the Government files on this matter. But after listening to the honourable senior member for St. George I think that we should approach this matter carefully. If his disclosures are correct—and I have no reason to believe that they are not—honourable members should evince a greater interest and guard against any further wastage of money at Seawell. Every now and again a large percentage of the taxpayers' money is spent up there. Every other month more money is asked for. They have much to do with internationals, people who are accustomed to handling big things. My view is that if the honourable senior member for St. Michael feels as strongly about this matter as he has expressed himself he should do something to get the item postponed so that a proper investigation can be carried out, and carried out by someone who is impartial as far as things up there are concerned.

We cannot continue spending money like this just because we are a body of laymen who are supposed to give our blessing to any resolution. And then the Government Members always seem to be only interested in getting through their Resolutions. It is not enough for a Government Member to say that he has the job of handling a particular measure in this Chamber and he must therefore use all his efforts to get honourable members to support it. One should go into these things in detail. We hear too many reports of robbery of governments by people who transact business with governments.

What about this defective equipment in the Customs shed? Government has admitted that. The information which Government members have should be placed at the disposal of every member of the House when Resolutions come down here. It should not be that this information is secret and that only Government Members should know about it. The honourable senior member for St. Michael read out a list of technical items which we know nothing about. No detailed information is available to us. It is trying to keep us in perpetual ignorance of the administration of the Government of this colony. We should know details about these items—the first cost, and the cost after insurance, freight etc., are added. We should know why they are to be replaced. We have to accept what they force down our throats. You do not read it out.

Mr. MAPP: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, to whom is the honourable member referring? He persists in breaking the rules of the House. He seems to think that he can refer to anyone as he likes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. Thomas would like to know to whom you are referring.

Mr. ALLDER: "You" is a term in general use. I was of course addressing the Chair. I want to be serious in this matter, Sir. If we make objections to these things and still vote the money what is the use? That would be assisting in sending things from bad to worse. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. George will lay more emphasis on his criticisms by moving that the item be postponed. It can do no harm to postpone it for a couple days and have it properly investigated, so that everyone will be satisfied as to whether the expenditure is necessary or not.

Mr. BARROW: I merely want to say that I feel it is a profound discourtesy—it is true that we do not get the full notes that members of the Government get—but I feel it is a discourtesy on the part of members of the Civil Service to supply information of the kind read out by the honourable senior member for St. Michael as an explanation of the way in which this money is to be spent. There are different brands of transmitters—Benedix, Marconi, Pye, etc. They are manufactured with certain numbers according to the model and there is the registration number. I am sorry that my colleague is not in his place because he revels in these terms which have sprung up in governmental circles. Instead of referring to them by their names, we refer to them by code number. When the honourable member read out one T so and so, few knew that T stands for transmitter, and that the number following after the T is not the Mark of the Beast but the factory patent. Honourable members want information in plain language. They do not want to hear about T. 1403 or Eau de Cologne 547. They want to know if someone dropped a bucket of sand on this transmitter by accident or some thing like that.

It is either a discourtesy or the people who have to make these notes do not understand the matter themselves. They must know what they are doing; but they feel that if the notes are couched in vague terms there is a better chance of the particular item being agreed to by this Chamber. Fortunately when they say modulator I know what it is. But other members of the House would like to know. How much does it cost? Five pounds or five hundred pounds? I do consider that there are certain things that need investigating such as the defective equipment in the Customs shed, and International Air Radio being mixed up with this business, and the Director General of Civil Aviation, two parties who have nothing to do with the Barbados Government. Their names have been mentioned as being instigators of part of this money vote. I am asking the honourable member in charge of the Resolution to accept a motion for the postponement of this particular Head. I now move formally that the Head be postponed.

Dr. CUMMINS: I am surprised to hear the amount of argument that has taken place on this matter. On January 13 this year this Resolution was passed by this House. The whole resolution, the addendum and everything else is the same and the same names were mentioned as have been mentioned today by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. It is nothing new. If it was a Resolution coming here for the first time I would understand. It is a revote which is necessary because the Crown Agents' accounts were not received by March 31. But there is no more information that we can add that we did not give on the last occasion.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—In view of the fact that the honourable senior member for St. George has requested an investigation I will promise him and the committee that I will report the matter with a view to having his request carried out. As soon as possible I will report the result of the investigation.

The question that Head XXXIII stand part was put and agreed to without division.

Head XL — Waterworks — Item 1. Chief Engineer \$2,400 Item 15, Cost of Living Allowance \$39.00, was called.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I understand that this Officer — the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks — is on contract. He has come on contract to work for a certain amount. He got an increase. Do you mean to tell me that he gets cost of living

allowance on that too? If anyone signs a contract to come and work for a certain amount it does not sound right to me to tack on cost of living to the contract price. After he signed the contract he asked for more money and now we are paying cost of living. In my view cost of living is included in the contract price.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—When these salaries were being reviewed sometime ago the Resolution dealing with them was introduced by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who is not in his place right now. He said that the Government was more or less worried or had to make up its mind whether to pay cost of living on the increased salaries and they would have to make up their minds on what to do. (A MEMBER: That is not correct). I remember hearing the honourable senior member for St. Joseph put the position that way. The honourable junior member for the City is correct in asking what is Government's policy on the matter. It is not good enough to say that two wrongs make a right; that we have done it before therefore we can do it again.

I am not singling out this particular officer who everyone knows is doing a fine job. The honourable junior member for the City is saying or rather asking in a general way what is the policy of the Government as regard cost of living allowance on the salaries of people on contract. It is a point that has been in the air since the Turner Committee reported, and the report was implemented. Surely the Government must be keeping these things under review.

Mr. COX: As honourable members can see, this is a revote, the House having already committed itself to this amount for the officer in question. The honourable Junior Member for the City said that when the Leader of this House was putting through this resolution he made a statement about the decision of the Government relative to cost-of-living allowances but I am definitely certain Sir, the honourable member is wrong in his view because I was the mover of the resolution and I am definitely sure that the honourable member was not in his place. This is the position. When the Leader of the House was putting through the Turner Report and the House queried as to the decision relative to the cost-of-living allowances, the honourable Leader of the House in reply stated quite frankly that the Government had not at that time taken any decision as to whether to continue or discontinue these cost-of-living allowances. That was a general statement which was not applicable to any particular officer but was more or less a statement of policy.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Sir, I did not think the honourable member would have questioned this statement. I am well aware of this matter. As a matter of fact, I have at home on a file the whole debate and the honourable introducer of the resolution who was the Leader of the House making a general statement on these cost-of-living allowances said that the Government had not agreed whether it would continue or discontinue them or what was the future policy to all cost of living, but that cost-of-living allowances would be in abeyance until the Commissioner enquiring into the other grades of the Service had reported. This was when consideration was given to the Turner recommendations. Certainly when the Dos Santos Report was considered, it adduced some more argument on cost of living owing to the honourable Junior Member for the City asking to clarify the situation on it. The position is that when the House considered the Turner recommendations the statement was made that cost-of-living allowances would be in abeyance until the Salaries Commissioner had reported.

Mr. LEWIS : Sir, it is in the Estimates that these cost-of-living allowances were paid out. I am not questioning the cost-of-living policy because I know what it is. What really does matter is that of all people in the Government the Colonial Secretary and those officers who are hired on contract are receiving this allowance. I am saying that I did not know that and there is no way that I could have found it out. As you know, cost-of-living allowances are voted to these departments under a lump sum. Now this case has cropped up, I know that these people who are here on contract are being paid more because they are also receiving cost-of-living allowance. I did not know that these particular people were treated like the normal Government servants. I did not think so. Now I know, it is alright.

Mr. ALLDER : Sir, if I may be allowed to speak...

Mr. COX : Sir, I gave way to the honourable Junior Member for the City but I am not giving way to the honourable Senior Member for St. John. Reference has been made by both the honourables Junior Member for the City and the Junior Member for St. Lucy on cost of living with regard to officers on contract; therefore I feel it is right to draw to the attention of this Committee that so far as the policy of Government in respect of cost of living is concerned, the matter has not yet been fully decided, consequently, it has to be taken for granted that this allowance applies to every officer in the Government. The honourable Junior Member for the City singled out a few officers for reference. He mentioned the Comptroller of Customs, and the Income Tax Commissioner. Surely, he has forgotten that all the Medical Officers of the General Hospital are on contract with this Government; so too the Medical Officer of the Mental Asylum. They are all drawing cost of living allowances. I therefore accept the statement by the honourable Junior Member for the City that he did not know that these officers were drawing cost of living allowances. I am glad to learn that he now understands the situation.

Mr. ALLDER : Sir, when this gentleman was brought out here, I as a member of that Committee felt that he was coming at the salary of \$800 per month, as the honourable Junior Member for the City has also said. Regardless of what happened locally, I felt that would be his salary until his contract had expired. No suggestion was made when we were discussing his appointment then of paying him on the same basis as other Civil Servants here on contract.

(A VOICE) : When that officer was appointed, no Civil Servants were on contract.

Mr. ALLDER : Sir, there was no suggestion made of any increase in the salary or any concessions for the period for which he was contracted. What has happened is that the Executive has gone beyond their bounds and extended this cost of living allowance and increase of salaries to people who are here on contract. I do not agree with the honourable Senior Member for St. Thomas when he said that because something might have passed this Chamber on some previous occasion that if the matter happens to come back before this Chamber, honourable members cannot take a stand against it. It strikes me very forcibly that on a recommendation, it was agreed to increase this officer's salary to \$800 a month and it further irritates me that after this handsome increase from the salary which he was contracted for on the first occasion that we are now making provision for a cost of living allowance on this amount. In my opinion, cost of living allowances should not be paid on salaries

above a certain figure. Cost of living allowances should only be paid to those people whose income does not afford them to live reasonably well. I think it is absurd to give a cost-of-living allowance to an officer who is drawing \$800 per month as salary. I am going to suggest that when this officer's contractual period is up within the next three years the scheme for which he is contracted to carry out would not be half way because his post is too lucrative. This officer is a man advanced in years and I doubt whether any government other than the Barbados Government would have offered him such a lucrative salary.

(A VOICE) : That is a joke. The question is that this officer is doing a good job.

Mr. ALLDER : Sir, I have every reason to believe that if it were agreed to extend the contract of this officer to an additional three years at his former salary at the time when this new contract was made out, he would have accepted the contract.

Mr. VAUGHAN : The principle of a revote really is one which honourable members should have to debate upon but I am in my right if I object to this present vote because I remember quite well that on the day that this matter was discussed by the House it was postponed until another day. It was passed later on the very day it was postponed at a time when those who were opposed to it were absent and because of that they did not vote against it. I was one of those who were opposed to it and the first time that I knew more about it was when I read in the newspapers that it was passed. It was passed by a select few who would pass anything so long as it was brought down by Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I think the honourable member is going too far by your accusation.

Mr. VAUGHAN : Sir, I personally can criticise this head of this resolution. I was opposed to the granting of this salary of \$800 per month to this officer. I cannot see how a Labour Government can with justification pay a cost of living allowance to any officer of Government receiving more than \$400 per month. Cost of living should not be given to an officer receiving more than \$400 per month. This is a scandal. How can Government justify this to any body of citizens whom they claim to represent? It is a matter of impossibility to do so. I do not think any other government in the British Empire would have made such a ridiculous contract.

The question that Head XL, Waterworks, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows :—

Ayes : HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. COX.—9.

Noes : Mr. LEWIS, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, and Mr. ALLDER.—4.

Dr. CUMMINS : I beg to move that this resolution as amended for \$24,946 do now pass.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of one resolution in committee.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, 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,

AMENDMENT FROM OTHER PLACE TO BILL RELATING TO INCOME TAX AGREED TO

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, There is one amendment from the Other Place to the Bill relating to Income Tax. I am asking leave under Rule 262 to deal with this amendment now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to draw the attention of this Honourable House to the Bill intituled an Act to amend the law relating to Income Tax which has been sent back from the Other Place with an amendment and although at first sight this amendment might seem to be trivial, yet it falls a breach of privilege of this House this being a money Bill. I may point out to honourable members that this Bill passed this House on the 19th May, 1953. It did not pass the Other Place until the 2nd July, instant. Ordinarily, it might have been possible for this Bill to be passed by the Other Place before the 1st day of June, therefore doing away with the resultant amendment. As I mentioned already this Bill was not passed by the Other place until the 2nd July, instant. It is still my duty to bring to the Honourable House this breach of privilege although I would ask honourable members to waive their privilege.

Dr. CUMMINS: Yes Sir, I quite agree that this being a money Bill as such could not be amended by the Other Place. However, I think this House would agree to waive its objection in view of the fact that this Bill was not passed by the Other Place until 2nd July instant, and as a consequence could not take effect in June. Sir, this is the only amendment—this amendment to section 9,—which originally read “not later than the thirtieth day of June one thousand and nine hundred and fifty three,” but which is now amended to read “not later than the thirty-first day of July one thousand nine hundred and fifty-three.”

I beg to move that this amendment be now read a first time.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. COX, the amendment was then read a second time and agreed to.

COMMITTEE RESUMES ON BILL MAKING BETTER PROVISION FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill intituled an Act to make better provision for Local Government in the Island.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion, there were a few sections which were postponed for further consideration; there was also an added section—Section 32—which was moved by the honourable Senior member for St. George and which was eventually carried. I am going to ask that Clause 32 be deleted in order to insert the same clause with an addition as Clause 40. The reason for this change in order is that this clause deals with the disability of members of Councils for voting on account of interest in contracts. On the last occasion, a sub-clause of Clause 31, which was sub-clause (e) was deleted. It dealt with

the disqualification from office of a person who has any pecuniary interest, direct or indirect in any contract with the Council and this Clause—Clause 32—was inserted at that position. It is proposed to make this Clause, Clause 40, because it is better situated there, it dealing with disability of members of Councils for voting on account of interest in contracts. At this stage, I beg to move that Clause 32 be deleted.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Clause 32 has already been passed. How do we get back to it unless we re-commit it? I think the honourable member should move that Clause 32 be re-committed.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, if I be permitted, I am asking leave to withdraw the motion before the Committee in order to move that Clause 32 be recommitted.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 32 be recommitted.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: For the reasons I have just given, I am moving that Clause 32 be deleted.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clauses 33 to 40 inclusive be re-numbered Clauses 32 to 39.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: Now Sir, I beg to move that the following be Clause 40. I think honourable members have been supplied with copies. It deals with the disability of members of Councils from voting on account of interest in contracts. It will be remembered that last Tuesday when this Bill was under consideration in Committee, the honourable senior member for St. George dealt with this clause but on further consideration by Government, the Government has added one or two sub-clauses.

Clause 40 reads as follows:—

“40. (1) If a member of a Council has any pecuniary interest direct or indirect in any contract or proposed contract or other matter, and is present at a meeting of the local authority at which the contract or other matter is the subject of consideration, he shall at the meeting as soon as practicable after the commencement thereof, disclose the fact, and shall not take part in the consideration or discussion of, or vote on any question with respect to, the contract or other matter:

Provided that this section shall not apply to an interest in a contract or other matter which a member may have as a ratepayer or inhabitant of the area, or as an ordinary consumer of gas, electricity or water, or to an interest in any matter relating to the terms on which the right to participate in any service, including the supply of goods, is offered to the public.

(2) For the purposes of this section a member shall be deemed as having an indirect pecuniary interest in a contract or other matter if—

- (a) he or any nominee of his is a member of a company or other body with which the contract is made or is proposed to be made or which has a direct pecuniary interest in the other matter under consideration; or
- (b) he is a partner, or is in the employment, of a person with whom the contract is made or is proposed to be made or who has a direct pecuniary interest in the other matter under consideration.

(3) In the case of married persons living together the interest of one shall, if known to the

other, be deemed for the purposes of this section to be also an interest of that other spouse.

(4) If any member fails to comply with the provisions of sub-section 1 of this section, he shall for each offence be liable on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding two hundred and forty dollars, unless he proves that he did not know that a contract, proposed contract or other matter in which he had a pecuniary interest was the subject of consideration at the meeting."

Sir, the Government thinks that sub-clause 3 should be included and the reason is quite obvious. Without it, a husband or wife, as the case may be, can transfer his or her interest to the other and still go and take their seat on the Council well knowing what are the circumstances. This entire clause seeks to prevent people who having a personal interest, direct or indirect, in any contract with the Council from voting. Sub-clause (4) of this clause is a penal clause. On the last occasion, no penal clause was considered.

I beg to move that this be clause 40 of this Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I just want to be clear on what we are doing. The honourable member is moving that the old Clause 32 with the two sub-clauses inserted by Government be re-numbered as Clause 40 of this Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: That will be Clause 40.

The question that Clause 40 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 42 be recommitted.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: The reason for recommitting this clause is that on the last occasion that the Bill passed this House, it was decided to increase the fine relating to persons convicted under this clause to five hundred dollars. There must have been an omission in the reprinting of this Bill. I therefore beg to move that in the penultimate line of this clause the word "one" be deleted and the word "five" be inserted in its place.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I well remember that this amendment was agreed to by the Committee on the last occasion.

The question that Clause 42 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: I will now go to Clause 52 which was postponed on the last occasion for further consideration. When this Clause was dealt with by the Select Committee before this Bill was passed, the Select Committee recommended a proviso which was agreed to but for some reason or other, it was not inserted.

The proviso reads as follows:—

be a sanitary inspector, nurse or midwife, or dismissed from any such post except with the approval of the Governor."

There are certain sections of this community who feel that a proviso of this sort is necessary in view of happenings from time to time at these Vestries in the island generally. The people feel that the Governor should be in a position to sanction or act otherwise in the case of a dismissal of these persons—sanitary inspectors, nurses or midwives. They feel that although they have security of tenure that a condition of this sort is quite necessary. I am sure that honourable members of this House will agree with this proviso. I therefore beg to move that this be the proviso to sub-clause (1) of Clause 52.

Mr. COX: In seconding this motion, I should like to substantiate what the honourable junior mem-

ber for St. Thomas has said. No doubt, the employees of these various Vestries and the subsidiary boards live in fear and trepidation all the days of their lives. I too should like to say that quite a number of them even a few from the good parish of St. Philip, have asked me to do my best to see that some provision is put in the Bill whereby their appointments and dismissals could be approved by the Governor. They feel much safer in the hands of the Governor than the present employers or even the future employers who will become members of these various Councils. No doubt Sir, we have had a few glaring examples recently, the latest of which was one of the most highly qualified sanitary inspectors of this island who is trying to further his studies with a view to giving this island the benefit of his knowledge

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but it strikes me that you are trying to make another second reading speech. I will ask the honourable member to speak on Clause 52.

Mr. COX: I am always willing to obey the Chair. I will not say anything more.

The question that Clause 52 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 87 be recommitted.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the following be Clause 87:—

It deals with the method of estimating income for purposes of Trade.

"(1) The assessable income of any person for the purpose of trade tax shall be determined in the same manner as the assessable income derived by any person from trade as required to be determined under the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1921:

Provided that in determining the assessable income of any person for the purpose of trade tax —

(a) no deduction shall be allowed in respect of any of the matters mentioned in paragraph (2) and paragraph (3) of section eighteen of the Income Tax Act, 1921;

(b) no deduction shall be allowed in respect of any of the matters mentioned in section twenty of the Income Tax Act, 1921;"

And this is the new part Sub-clause (2) is deleted and this is inserted in its place.

"(c) a deduction shall be allowed in regard to the management of any business in lieu of salary, fees or other allowances of a like nature, in respect of proprietors of businesses actually engaged in the management of such business or, in the case of companies registered under the Companies Act, 1910, in respect of the managing, governing or other directors, attorneys, managers or secretaries, such deduction not to exceed in respect of any one such person such amount as the Commissioner of Income Tax considers reasonable in the circumstances and in any case not more than fifty per centum of the assessable income without such deduction or the sum of five thousand dollars whichever shall be the less."

Well sir, we have to thank the honourable junior member for the City for bringing this to our attention. I would say that if this Clause had been passed in the old way, it would mean that each director of a company would be in a position to get an allowance of five thousand dollars of the profits and that was not what was really intended. Provision is made here in (c) that in no case shall this deduction exceed one half of the profits. I think this sub-clause

will be acceptable to all honourable members, it being more or less an old Vestries' Act, in which provision for trade tax is made whereby a trader is allowed half of the profits if he be manager and in case of directors £600. In view of the fact that the value of money has gone up that amount of £600 has been advanced to \$5,000.

I beg to move that this be Clause 87 of the Bill. Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: Sir, Clause 88 was postponed for further consideration and we have come to the conclusion that it should be deleted. I beg to move that Clause 88 be deleted.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: As a result of the deletion of Clause 88, the balance of sections in this Bill would revert to their original numbering.

Sir, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill with amendments in Committee.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The Chairman reported and 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 and the title read and agreed to.

Honourable members cheered on the passing of the Bill.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that this House be adjourned until this day week, Tuesday, 21st July, 1953, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

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