

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23rd February, 1954.

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*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., (*Premier*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR CLERK

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I am asking to grant leave of absence to the Clerk for the day's session.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Since that leave is granted, I am moving a motion that Mr. Dave A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk in place of the Deputy Clerk who would act as Clerk.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. ALLDER and Mrs. BOURNE entered the House and took their seats.

MISLEADING HEADLINE IN ADVOCATE NEWSPAPER

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before further business is begun, I wish to draw to the notice of the House, without necessarily any further action on the part of this House, to what I would call a misleading and under the circumstances a mischievous headline which appeared in the *Advocate* newspaper on Thursday of last week referring to some part of the proceedings of the last meeting of this House.

Sir, at the end of Government Business last week, the honourable senior member for St. Philip asked leave of the House without previous notice on the honourable member's part, to proceed with a resolution—an action to which he is perfectly entitled. That leave was granted the honourable member for St. Philip and he proceeded to move the resolution which was to the effect that Dr. Cheddi Jagan and another member of the British Guiana Legislature should be allowed to land in this colony en route from London to British Guiana for so long a stay as would be necessary to arrange transit to their homeland. A further paragraph asked that they be allowed to do so without restriction or words to that effect.

As soon as the honourable member moved the motion, I drew to the honourable member's attention that most of what was stated in the first sentence. I had agreed with, but in accordance with the usual practice, Government members would not remain in the House. I then pointed out to the hon. member that if Government members left then, there would be no quorum. I therefore suggested to him to go outside and get other honourable members to come into the House so that there would be a quorum when the Government members left the Chamber.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, On a point of order. The honourable Premier is making a statement about something which appeared in a newspaper. If the honourable member wishes to make such a statement, he should put in that newspaper as evidence. It is customary so to do. I may remind Your Honour that sometime ago, the honourable junior member for St. John moved an adjournment of this House to discuss something which appeared or did not appear in a certain newspaper and Your Honour pointed out that the honourable member could not proceed with the motion until he had put in the newspaper.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: If action is to be taken, the copy of the newspaper would have to be put in. When the honourable junior member for St. John intended that some action be taken by this House in the matter which the honourable junior member for the City referred to, I disallowed any action of this House because the newspaper was not before the House. If, as the honourable Premier has intimated, he is simply making an explanation, he can proceed to do so as there will be no further action on the part of this House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — I have been too long a member in this House to do anything other than to be polite to observations that come

from the honourable junior member for the City. Your Honour has ruled already that no rule of the House has been broken. I took special pains when I got up to say "without intending to proceed further with the matter. I am only drawing attention." Sir, I think that the misleading headline is a matter which should be brought to the attention of this House. I cannot help feeling that it is something which is more than ordinary, and that it is intentional. Whether it be so or not, it is a matter that affects the procedure of this House and the credit of the Government and for that reason, I think it is my duty to draw the attention of the House to it.

Sir, when the honourable senior member for St. Philip moved the motion for the passing of the resolution and began to speak on it, I called across the House for everybody to hear that as far as I was concerned — and I think other members of the Government — we, the Government, were in sympathy with the first paragraph of the honourable member's motion. This Government has always clamoured for freedom of movement on behalf of colonials. Certainly Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham can come here, but I do agree with what the honourable senior member for the City said that we cannot let them come and roam at large. Let me remind honourable members in drawing attention to what Government members did last Tuesday, it is what we have been doing for the last seven years, and of necessity, we have been doing it. Honourable members know that as far as Addresses to this House are concerned, — and they fall into several categories, — such Addresses as confined to matters affecting the Crown, matters of sympathy, matters of congratulations, say as congratulations on the birth of an heir, and social matters, — we pass them as a House. However, when it comes to addresses or resolutions such as the resolution which was moved by the honourable senior member for St. Philip last week, and addresses which the Government would have to legislate on, how can Government members sit in and deal with such things when they are only part of the Executive and when the matter would have to come before the Executive ultimately. It is true that Addresses are addressed to the Governor, but the Governor does not send down legislation; he sends down legislation only on the advice of the Executive Committee. On the old Executive Committee it was on the advice of the Government members from this House and to-day it is by the Ministers. Sir, imagine the childish absurdity of passing an Address to yourself and sending down legislation to yourself. On the other hand, if you did not agree with the terms of the address, imagine the impropriety. Government members, as I have said, are only part of the Executive Committee. It is true that under ministerial system the Governor has to accept the advice of members of this House on the Government, but we are still part of the Executive Committee. How could it be propriety for the members of this House on the Executive to make a decision on anything before it has been even called or even brought to the notice of the full Executive.

Sir, the procedure adopted last Tuesday by Government members is one which we have been doing for the last seven years. It is the only thing to do owing to the Rules of this House. According to the Rules, Government cannot sit in on a measure and abstain from voting. We cannot do that. A member of this House must be outside of the Chamber if he does not want to vote on a measure, but if he sits here, he has to vote. There is no alternative.

Sir, to say that members of this Government walked out of the House because they did not wish

to speak or decide on a resolution with regard to Dr. Jagan—I am trying to be very charitable—is absurdity at its highest. People who are responsible for the running of the *Advocate* newspaper are not strangers to the procedure of this House. One can excuse the *Trinidad Guardian*. What has been done by Government members is because of the Rules of the House. What has been done was necessary because if the Government members had sat in, they would have had to vote and it would be impropriety on the part of Government members of this House to express a point of view on a matter before it reaches the Executive, therefore, there is no alternative but to absent yourself from the Chamber when a question is to be decided. Suppose the honourable President of the Other Place or the Hon. Mr. Cuke were to move an Address in the Other Place suggesting something that the Government should do without the five of us from this Chamber on the Government having an opportunity to say something on it, what would this House say? The honourable junior member for Christ Church at the last meeting of this House wished to proceed with a Bill and because I knew that the Executive did not have the opportunity of discussing it, I asked the honourable member not to proceed with it that day, but to let it stay over until it could be dealt with last Thursday by the Executive. The honourable member can proceed with it at any time it suits him now, because I have informed him that the Executive Committee has approved of it. Some time ago, the honourable junior member for St. John was about to discuss a matter in this House and I told him to leave it off until the Executive had the opportunity of discussing it. The honourable member readily agreed to allow it to stay over for a week. Sir, if these things can happen and have happened recently, how can one excuse the local newspaper for coming out with that extremely misleading statement which is a grave reflection on the Government.

Sir, the honourable senior member for St. Philip has gone on record as saying that I have said that anybody can come here, even the late Generalissimo Stalin so long as he behaved himself.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, Is the Honourable Premier making a speech on a statement which he has made before? The honourable member seems to be rambling now.

His Hon. The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier is making a statement in connection with some public statement. I will however ask the honourable member to refrain from making any reference to the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, as the honourable senior member for St. Philip did state that I had gone so far as to say that if the late Generalissimo Stalin landed in Bridgetown, I would see no reason why he could not land, and stay as long as he liked so long as he did not break the law, I throw it out so as to say how can it be suggested, as was suggested by the misleading statement in the *Advocate* that the Government disapproved of the resolution and walked out of the House because of that. Sir, the real facts, as those responsible for that newspaper know, are that it is improper for members of this Government to sit and pass a resolution which has not been discussed with their colleagues on the Executive Committee. That is the point which I wish to make. Sir, I am not suggesting that the matter is sufficiently enormous as to merit the Editor of the *Advocate* being summoned to the Bar of this House, but it is a completely misleading statement, therefore it is the duty of the Government to defend it.

self as I have done to defend it on the floor of this House.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, ...

His Honour The SPEAKER: I will not allow any further discussion on this matter by any other honourable member on the floor of this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, May I be permitted to make a statement concerning the remarks in the *Advocate* arising out of that resolution.

His Honour The SPEAKER: No Sir, the matter is closed.

DOCUMENTS

His Honour The SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month of January, this year.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am commanded to lay the following Message:—

Message No. 7/1954 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly presenting for the consideration of the Honourable House the draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1954-55.

The Message reads as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 7/1954.

*His Excellency The Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to present for the consideration of the Honourable House of Assembly the draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year, 1954-55.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
22nd February, 1954.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am commanded to lay the following:—

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the six months ended 30th September, 1953.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the eight months ended 30th November, 1953.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I am commanded to lay the following:—

Report of the Hospital Planning Committee.

Film Censorship (Charges) (Amendment) Regulations, 1954 and Film Censorship (Fees and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1954.

I take the opportunity to say that the Report of the Hospital Planning Committee would be discussed immediately after the Annual Estimates and I am giving this notice in order that honourable members would have sufficient time to peruse it before it is dealt with.

PETITIONS

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the Vestry of the parish of St. George, praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to raise a loan of £6,000 for the repair of parochial buildings in that parish. The amount of money is allocated in the following manner:—

Erection of Communal Bath and Latrine	£ 750
Repairs to the Rectory	750
Repairs to residence of Parochial Medical Officer	4,500
	£6,000

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon'ble G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Bill to amend the Accountant General's Act, 1951.

Bill to amend the Legislative Debates Act, 1894.

Bill to amend the Officers of the Assembly (Salaries) Act, 1912.

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$1,530 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. 42 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution relating to the Pan American Sanitary Organisation.

Hon'ble M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$416.00 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. 43 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution in connection with staff at the Airport.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BARROW: I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. George to raise a loan of £6,000 in order to carry out extensive repairs to parochial buildings in that parish.

ADDRESS

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, — Before I give notice of this Address, may I be permitted to enquire what is the position exactly with regard to given Addresses. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has just stated that Addresses may not be sent to the Ministers in question owing to a Minister being only a part of the Executive.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of correction, Mr. Speaker. May I save the honourable member of any misconception whatsoever of what I said just now. I do not know if the English language does not come to my lips as simple as the honourable member would like. I said that an Address passed with members of the Government deciding in favour of the Address is an Address from ourselves to ourselves.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is perfectly understandable. What I was enquiring of was what is exactly the position now with regard to the giving of notices of Addresses. According to what the honourable Premier said, a Minister is only part of the Executive. To whom must we address our Addresses now?

His Hon. The SPEAKER: Continue to address them to the Governor.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a further point.

His Honour The SPEAKER: That is no point.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to give notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House are profoundly concerned over developments which increasingly affect adversely the operation of the recently established Textile and Shirt Industries in Barbados.

2. The House desire to point out that in consequence of these factors hundreds of employees have been already laid off and the industries are faced with virtual extinction.

3. The House are convinced that steps should be taken immediately to ascertain, among other things, what protection and assistance, if any, should be given these industries in order to guarantee their continuance, and what should be done to make the colony more self-sufficient in this direction.

And of the following:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House are deeply concerned over the grave situation which, in consequence of the inadequate number of medical practitioners, confronts the general public who are unable to obtain medical assistance at night.

The House would point out that it is physically impossible for the small number of physicians in the colony who are harassed and overworked during the day to cope with the situation, but would also emphasise that cases are becoming more frequent in which sick people have died at night for want of medical attention.

The House respectfully suggest that as a temporary measure, in order to alleviate the position until there is an increase in the number of doctors, there should be on night service at the General Hospital a small panel of doctors who shall be available to the general public on payment of the normal fees.

And of the following:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House are of the considered opinion that continuance of the prohibition against the importation of pickled pork products from sterling areas like Denmark and the Argentine, is most decidedly against the best interests of the colony and prevents the public from obtaining ample supplies of these commodities at competitive prices.

The House desire to emphasise that:—

(a) During the years which the imported pickled pork products have been banned from these two soft currency areas on the ground of the prevalence of Hoof and Mouth disease in these countries, no such restriction was applied to any of the other West Indian Islands and during the entire time of the prohibition in Barbados shippers from both of these countries have regularly forwarded pork products to other West Indian Islands such as St. Kitts, Antigua and Trinidad.

(b) at approximately the same time the prohibition was enforced in Barbados, the United Kingdom purchased enormous quantities of bacon, pickled pork products and salami from Denmark.

(c) expert opinion claims that the curing of pork products nullifies the virulence of Hoof and Mouth disease.

(d) although there is now no reported incidence of Hoof and Mouth disease in Denmark, the prohibition is still in effect in Barbados;

(e) it is understood that there are available in Denmark unlimited quantities of pickled pork products, including heads and ribs, which are available for immediate shipment at exceedingly competitive prices.

QUESTIONS

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:

(1) What is the amount of money collected by the Government *re* the shipment of Fancy Molasses in bulk during 1953?

(2) How and when does the Government propose to implement Section 5, Subsection 5 (a) of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export (Amendment) Act, 1953, which states: "Without prejudice to the generality of sub-section (4) of this section, Regulations made under this section may make provision in respect of the following matters:—

(a) the securing of alternative employment for labour displaced by bulk shipment of fancy molasses."

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Minister of Education:

Is it a fact that arrangements are being made for all Government Secondary Schools to hold their regular entrance examinations simultaneously?

2. If the answer to the above be in the affirmative, in view of the serious difficulties which confront persons who are desirous of obtaining secondary education for their children, will the Minister take steps to ensure that this decision be not implemented?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Minister of Communications:

What action has been taken by Government relative to the construction of the East Coast Road, since the delegation comprising members of the Vestries of St. Joseph and St. Andrew called on His Excellency the Acting Governor during his term of office last year?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:—

Is the Minister aware of the dissatisfaction which has been created by the policy of the Control Authorities under which quotas for dollar imports are allocated under the Token Import Scheme?

2. Is the Minister aware that as a result of this policy business concerns of even five years' standing which provide employment for appreciable numbers and make sizable contributions to the colony's revenue are completely prohibited from importing requirements from hard currency areas and are being subjected to unfair competition?

3. Is the Minister aware that this policy does not obtain elsewhere in the B.W.I. and that it is in need of immediate revision?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:

Whether the Honourable Minister would make provision for the registration of births and deaths to be carried out at the Police Sub-station in Belleplaine, so as to save the residents of Belleplaine and Boscobel from travelling up to District "F" Police Station?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Accountant General's Act, 1951, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Legislative Debates Act, 1894, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Officers of the Assembly (Salaries) Act, 1912, was read a first time.

On motion of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. LEWIS, the Bill intituled an Act to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. George to raise a loan of £6,000 in order to carry out extensive repairs to parochial buildings in the parish, was read a first time.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone items, Nos. 1, 2 and 3 of Government Business and that item No. 4 be the first Order of the Day.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable Premier: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity of enquiring why is it that resolutions to purchase lands (1) on which a school is already erected and (2) for a playing field for a school, should be in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries. Sir, the lands are not bought for the purpose of even a flower garden. It is rather peculiar to me, and I am wondering whether it is a mis-sight. I consider that such things give a wrong impression to the public.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I believe I am in order to speak on this question. If the honourable member would give a little of his energy and time to learn the normal procedure of the House of Commons which this Government is endeavouring to follow, he would avoid these interjections which at best are childish and at the worse are malicious. Let me say that any honourable member of the Government can deal with any subject that is put in his hands whether it is his portfolio or not. It is usual for certain measures to be dealt with only by the particular minister in charge of the question, but it is also the practice for a particular minister who might have a particular knowledge of dealing with a particular thing to open the debate on it. May be, the particular minister to whose portfolio the particular question may belong, can wind up the debate. The question of who handles anything is purely a matter for the ministers among themselves, therefore, there is no point in any honourable member suggesting to this House or questioning the cause why such and such a minister should deal with so and so. That is purely a question for the ministers among themselves.

The question that the House go into Committee of Supply was put and agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR EXTENSION OF VISIT OF METHODS EXPERT

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the first resolution is to place the sum of \$1,000 at the dis-

posal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1953-54 No. 38, which forms the Schedule to this resolution. It is in connection with the visit of the Organisation and Methods Experts.

As honourable members will see from the addendum, the sum of \$7,000 was provided in the Estimates 1953—54 to cover the cost of the secondment of an Organisation and Methods Officer from Her Majesty's Treasury for a period of four months, which allowed for approximately three months' actual residence in the Island, to review the organisation of certain departments (Treasury, Audit, Savings Bank, Peasants' Loan Bank and Highways and Transport.)

A much more detailed examination of this work than originally envisaged has been found necessary and in addition it is most desirable to extend the scope of the survey to include certain matters relating to other departments.

It is therefore proposed to extend the secondment for a further period of two months, subject to the approval of Her Majesty's Treasury.

The estimated additional expenditure will amount to \$3,000 of which \$2,000 will relate to the next financial year and will be included in the Estimates 1954—55.

I do not think that there is much that I can add to the addendum except to say that in anticipation of possible suggestions it will not be true to say in this instance that Government goes in for these things and after putting an estimate before the House, comes back and says it needs a further sum. Nothing of the sort has happened in this matter. This House will remember that this particular gentleman, Mr. Foster, was in the West Indies sometime ago, and as a result of the work he carried out in the Windward Islands, he was asked to come and do a similar job in Barbados. For one reason or the other, it was thought at the time that he should only look into the question of having efficiently run departments in certain departments of Government. It was not suggested at the time that he would come to overhaul the whole Civil Service. However, the result of his work shows that he must do more detailed work which necessitates his being here for a longer period than was at first anticipated, with the object of making it possible for us to have what one might call a full report instead of a three-quarter report on the organisation of our departments. Because of that, Government is asking for this additional sum.

As honourable members can see from the addendum, this money is not to pay that expert a salary, it is only to pay for his subsistence and expenses here in the usual way that a person who is employed by another Government is seconded to a colony. I therefore beg to move that this resolution for the sum of \$10,000 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, So far as the departments mentioned here are concerned, I do not remember that that was what was stated. I apologise if I am saying something which is not true. This money was put down in the Estimates for 1953-54 for the visit of an Organisation and Methods Experts. (I am trying to get a copy of the Estimates to verify this.) I do not remember any departments being mentioned for this expert to look into. At any rate what I would like to know is why the Revenue Departments like the Income Tax Department and the Customs are not mentioned here. If those departments had not been mentioned at the time, I am quite sure that some honourable member of the House would have wanted to know why. It is true, that we had some sort of statistician in the

Income Tax Department at that time but to tell me that you need no report on the principal revenue producing departments — Customs and Income Tax — is something strange to me.

What I would also like to know is if the Government Savings Bank is going to pay part of this fee. That department should pay part of it. The government is not entitled to send anybody in the Savings Bank to see what is going on there. Clerks working in the Savings Bank are paid from the Savings Bank fund. Why should this Government be paying to look into the working of that Bank? We are not required to know anything of the methods there. If somebody from the Government wants to know something of what is going on at the Bank, let them pay for it out of their own pockets. I consider this is a very peculiar way to handle this matter.

As I have said, I have never seen any particular department mentioned in connection with what this Organisation and Method Expert should look into until now. The Government of this country is not acting right to import somebody to come down here and give us the impression that it is going into the organisation and methods of its departments when it is not inquiring into these two principle revenue producing departments. In connection with this matter the note in the current estimates says: "It is proposed to obtain the advice of an expert in organisation and methods from Her Majesty's Treasury in connection with the organisation of certain Government Departments. Be that as it may, I feel that at least these two revenue producing departments should be the ones into which this Government should investigate.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that this House will be told what other Government Departments will be investigated now that more money is to be granted. Let us know which are the other departments to be investigated. After all, you do not want to investigate into departments on which money is spent alone; you want to investigate into those in which there is also a collection of money. I would like to have the assurance that the Customs and Income Tax Departments would be investigated into by this expert.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the Committee and took his seat while Mr. LEWIS was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, allow me to say that it is most sincerely to be hoped that the colony would benefit from this investigation by this organisation and method expert. It is to be noted that the cost of three months actual residence here of that expert in the first instance is \$7,000. Now it is proposed to extend his secondment for a further period of two months at an additional cost of \$3,000 so the five months' investigation would cost us a total of \$10,000. Well now, those of us who have some knowledge of the working of some of the Government Departments would readily admit that there is scope for improvement and, perhaps, for a savings in the expenditure of the running of these departments; but at the same time, even those of us who have that knowledge would want to query why would it take five months to investigate into the departments of the Government of these Departments. After all, there are not many Government Departments in Barbados and what they are, are more or less centrally situated in Bridgetown with the exception of a few at the Garrison. We have no big suburban areas with Government Departments in them, therefore, it does appear that this work can be done in the original scheduled time. None of us want to be uncharitable and to impute other than the highest

motives but it has happened in the past that these experts have come down here, especially during the winter when they are glad to escape the rigours of the northern climate and overstayed their time or lengthened what they had to do because of their own benefits. You cannot blame them if they try to stay as long as possible.

Sir, we are here as guardians of the public purse and if this expert chooses to take offence because I have said what I did, it is a matter for him. We in Barbados expect the best for our money. It is the duty of the people's representatives, to see that we do not spend money unnecessarily. I hope the Government have carefully considered this matter and have come to this conclusion based on sound, reasonable, business-like grounds that this further extension at this cost is imperative. I hope Government have not come to this conclusion merely because the expert has said that he wants two months more to complete the job. Two months more at an additional cost of \$3,000; that is what the addendum says. Barbados is not Jamaica, nor Hong Kong, nor even British Guiana. It is merely a colony of 166 square miles with a few Government Departments in it. As a matter of fact, it was queried in this House whether an expert from outside was really necessary to look into these Departments. Even if it is necessary, according to the opinion of some of us, we are bound to cavil at this proposal to extend the period of his investigation by two months and which will increase the cost by almost 50 percent.

Sir, I sincerely hope that the matter has been carefully gone into. We in this House will not have the opportunity to get the detailed knowledge of what he is doing like what the Government members may, or should have, but to judge by our experiences in the past and by the way in which Government squanders money, it is no wonder that we are apprehensive over the situation. We know that the voting of \$1,000 to-day for the extension of the period would mean that we will be called upon in the next financial year to vote for the further \$2,000 that is set out to cover the expenses. I think that it is worthwhile our binding down this expert to only another month, that is, half of the proposed time for the extension, and at half of the additional cost. Unless I can be satisfied that the matter has been carefully gone into and that we stand to benefit by his expert knowledge, I am afraid that I will have to suggest in a more practical form that the extended period be cut down by a month and the amount correspondingly reduced.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is a good thing that we are not paying the salary of this man, else we could not pay him. The amount of \$3,000 for additional expenses is quite a considerable sum. Not very long ago, we had some expert in this area to go into salaries and it cost us money. In my opinion, this going into the methods and organisation of Government Departments is a very difficult investigation. The man to do that must not be a novice. At any rate, you are supplying him with a cashier or a bookkeeper to assist him and yet he is taking five months to do it.

I do think that an Interim Report should be put in. We should know between the period what type of expert this man is. Do let us have an Interim Report so that some of the Barbadian experts can look at the work he is doing. If this expert is asking for an extension in time, he must have furnished some sort of report on what he has done and what he proposes to do. That report should be published immediately so that we should know what type of man he is. He may be deliberately delaying time to spend

the whole winter in this colony. Certainly we should be given the opportunity to see exactly what he is doing and to reason among ourselves whether what is done is the job of an expert. This expert is not looking into salaries; he is looking into organisation and methods. If he cannot get through a place like Barbados in less than five months, something is wrong. I suppose we will discover how much money we have spent or mis-spent after he has gone.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, — Some mention has been made as regards the exclusion of some of the Government Departments in the investigation by this expert. Nothing worse than that could be done because at this time, businessmen in Bridgetown are somewhat perturbed over the fact that when they apply for warrants at the Customs Department, there is much delay. They are saying that things are not what they should be at that Department. I would therefore like to suggest to the Minister concerned, now that this expert is in the island that they will put this Department in for preview. I think it is very necessary because, no doubt, any delay in the issuing of warrants and other documents at the Customs Department would mean an increase in the cost of the administration in the various business houses in the island and ultimately, that would mean an increase in the cost of the articles which those businesses handle.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, — I regret that I did not hear the explanation of this resolution by the honourable Premier. I listened to some of the argument and one of the things which I would like to be enlightened on is the question of how was this amount of \$3,000 arrived at. Taking the two amounts together, \$10,000 does seem to me a lot of money to spend on this investigation. However, I am not prepared to offer any criticism on that at this stage, because I have already agreed that someone should be brought out here with a view of going into the efficient running of the various Departments of Government. I will content myself by saying now that I hope when this investigation is carried out and recommendations are made, if some of the recommendations are made against friends of members of the Government in the Service, that the Government will still implement the recommendations. I say that because I know it is customary for the Government to get recommendations but because they interfere with some friends of Government, the recommendations are not implemented.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get this information before I vote on this matter. The system of Government which we have embarked upon is new and I intend to only vote for something when it is fully explained in here. Any member on the other side of the table who cares to accept dictatorship, that is a matter for that member. This \$10,000 expenditure on this investigation over the five-month period works out at something like \$66 per day. It is not stated whether this expenditure covers the cost of expenses for this expert and his wife. It does not say whether it includes passages for bringing out this expert and his wife. I want to get this information from the honourable Premier before I vote.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — Is the honourable member giving me an order?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes, I am giving orders and will not take any answers from the honourable Premier or any of the Ministers when they are sitting. I am saying that this expenditure works out at \$66 per day. It does not include salary. What I would like to know is whether the amount covers the hotel costs of this man and his wife because if that is so, it would seem reasonable. I would like the honourable Premier to give me a breakdown of it. Every honour-

able member worthy of his salts would ask for that information because \$66 per day to do this job is too much money to pay out for it, especially when it does not include salary.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, — I do not know if that gentleman is engaged or if he is married.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, — Is that the way the honourable member should reply? Such a statement may be witty for those in Fairchild Street but not for this House. Who is interested in whether that gentleman is engaged or married? That is ignorance on the honourable member's part.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — There is nothing on the file whatsoever to suggest that this gentleman has a wife, so when the honourable member enquires of that, all I would be able to tell him is that I see no mention of a wife.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, — the maximum price at the ordinary reputable hotels is \$15 daily. You must satisfy me how you have arrived at \$66 daily for subsistence and such things for this gentleman before I vote. Honourable members would be absolutely dishonest to themselves to vote on this measure unless they get a proper breakdown as to how the figure was arrived at. You have provided a clerk to assist this gentleman from the Labour Department and you are paying the salary of that clerk. Sir, you cannot get this expenditure which averages \$66 a day unless the person to whom you are giving it must be put up at one of those luxurious \$40-clubs along the St. James coastline.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is the honourable member in order? The terms for the getting of this gentleman to investigate into Government Departments here were put to this House before. This resolution is only saying that he cannot finish the work in three months. We are only asking that he be given two months more. I am not suggesting that it is not for the honourable member to make any comment, but it is a fact that what the honourable member is doing now is to the effect of criticising a vote of the House—unless you are prepared to accept it. . . .

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, Is the honourable member trying to bully you? I do not think you are so weak as to fall to his bullying. We have decided on the principle of bringing this gentleman out here and we did agree to the three-month term for the investigation and the expenditure of \$7,000 on it. But the honourable Premier has come back in here for \$3,000 to extend the period by two months and it is elementary that it works out at \$66 per day, and that is so, although we are not paying this gentleman's salary. The honourable Premier has said that he does not know whether this gentleman is engaged or even married. Sir, we are entitled to ask about that. The honourable member did not put me in this House; I was sent here by the people. Unless you can satisfy me and this Honourable House of the way in which you have arrived at this \$66 per day, I will not vote for it. I say again that you cannot arrive at that amount unless you made provision to put this gentleman up at one of those luxurious \$40-day clubs down St. James. As far as I am concerned, unless the honourable member is prepared to tell us the manner in which this sum is arrived at, I will not vote for it. The Honourable Premier might be able to give us the breakdown, despite what he said that he does not know whether the gentleman has a wife.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I say again that I do not know anything about that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You should know. You are the Premier. When you say that you do not know, that statement suits a porter. You have the right to know.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I never said that I did not know on what terms this gentleman was appointed. What I said was that under the terms under which this gentleman was appointed, there is no mention of a wife. I can say that she has no part in the arrangements according to the file I have on it. All this has been done when the last Estimates were discussed. I say again: the honourable member is entirely out of order by the comments he is making on this resolution. The question now is whether there should be a continuation of what the House has already decided upon.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Does the honourable Premier mean to say that no breakdown can be given us at this time? We said at the time when we were deciding on this question that all the various Departments wanted going into. There was the suggestion that the investigation could be done by some local person but I was among those who agreed to the suggestion to bring in somebody. What I am saying now is: do not come in here and tell this House that you do not know. We are going to ask questions. I am going to ask now: is part of this money to pay his passage back? The \$10,000 that we are voting for this investigation comes out of the Barbados Treasury. Because anything may come from the Colonial Office, it does not mean that it should be choked down our throats. Do you think that we are going to accept everything? The honourable Premier has every right to tell us the breakdown of this amount. Cannot the honourable member tell us if this gentleman's wife is responsible for part of this expenditure? Do not say you are not going to tell us. Does the honourable member want to claim that this part of the matter was discussed already? It was never discussed for one minute in this House.

Sir, I will be forced, if the honourable Premier adopts the attitude of "I have sufficient members in this House that I can get anything passed and if they do not vote with me, out they go," to say that the honourable member cannot do it to me. I want to know. I am going to vote against this resolution unless some breakdown of the amount is given me. The honourable member should let us know how this sum was worked out. When the honourable Premier leaves here for England or France on official business, we give him \$15 per day and allow him another \$15 per day for subsistence allowance. That amounts to \$30 a day. I am going to vote against this resolution unless the honourable Premier can tell this Honourable House the breakdown of this amount.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, it seems to me that the question of whether this House agreed to something already is cropping up too often within recent times. Nobody can criticise the \$7,000 which has been voted already for this gentleman to come here and do the job but when Government comes back to this House for an increase for that job, especially to the extent as that which is before us, it is an admission that Government has not made any proper calculations on the matter. This gentleman was not in England when he was called upon to make investigations into our Government Departments; he was in the West Indies making similar investigations. The Government of this colony had first-class examples to draw on. Therefore to put down \$7,000 when they knew that it would cost them more, or to say that they did not know what it would exactly cost, is carrying that principle much too far. In my humble opinion, every honourable member voted for the sum of \$7,000 in good faith. They voted for it because they knew that these Government Departments wanted going into in that way. At the time, Gov-

ernment told this House that a man suitable for the purpose was in the West Indies and there was a good opportunity then of testing out how much this work would cost, yet the same gentleman has been brought out and the work is costing this Government almost 50 per cent more on the amount that was sent down at first. This is a very serious matter indeed.

There is another implication to this matter. If you vote this \$1,000 in this resolution, you are bound to vote for the \$2,000 which will be set down in the coming Annual Estimates against this matter, because you have by implication when you vote this said: "Go ahead and spend the \$3,000." Honourable members are entitled to be very critical about a matter of this sort. These figures will be thrown at us in the future. It is a serious matter. Members of the Government, especially the honourable Premier who is in charge of this resolution, should regard this matter as a serious responsibility on his part and should satisfy honourable members on the points that are raised. I too agree that the average of \$66 per day is a considerable amount. It should not be a question of time to do this job. The gentleman could have told you that it will take him seven years to do it, but he must have told you that it would cost \$7,000. No length of time was put down; he said that he was going to do the job for that sum and it was based on the experience that was gained while he was working in this area.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that after all these years in the House, the honourable senior member for the City should have allowed himself to get in such a temper as to attack me in that manner. All I will tell the honourable member on that point is that we in this House are not removed from certain traditions. I really do not know what has happened to the honourable senior member for the City to-day. Mr. Foster, the expert in this matter was asked to come out here to do the job and the honourable member knows that we would have to pay the passage for bringing him here. Why has the honourable member gone off to the left like a pendulum and asked about a wife? I do not know if the gentleman is married. All I see here is that we must pay his passage and give him subsistence allowance. His salary is paid already. There is no mention made in these files of any wife or children. When we came down here for the first amount of \$7,000, nothing for a wife was computed in the amount.

I will repeat, as I have done on some former occasion that the Government is not going to fall into the trap—not necessary a trap that is set, but one which exists—of telling honourable members what has been done by this House. If Government does that, we will be here until two or three o'clock in the morning every time this House meets. If members of this Government fall into the habit of telling every honourable member who forgets what happened in this House last week, last month or last year, we would be here every time this House meets until the next morning. If I may put it this way. Suppose for instance, that we are considering a question of the construction of some road by the Highways and Transport Department and while doing so, some honourable member gets up and says: "Tell me what this Department proposes to do in that respect for another year and at the same time another honourable member gets up and enquires about salary, don't you see that we are going to have a whole debate on something other than what we are doing?"

(A VOICE: That is drawing a red herring across the trail.)

One honourable member has just said that we specified no time when we brought out that gentleman to do the job; all that we said was that it would be done for \$7,000. We said then that we expected it to last for three months. Mr. Foster left the Windward Islands in October and came here and made a preliminary investigation and then went back to England. That was in 1952. If I may let out certain things which are private, he told us certain things then which were going wrong for all the time. He was not appointed yet. He pointed out that those were the departments of Government which needed looking into. Mr. Foster went back to England and came back out to this Island on the *S. S. Golfito*. Sir, I am only incidentally answering the silly suggestion, which might be perhaps good for an after-dinner speech, that the Government should not be taken in by an English official who wants a job and who wants to run from the English winter. I repeat, the honourable member who made that criticism is going to be surprised when he hears of something which has been going wrong for ages, and what is more, not even the honourable junior member for the City who is so keen on these things is aware of it.

Sir, we have discovered that the more Mr. Foster has gone into the organisation and methods of Government Departments in this Colony, the more wrongs he has found out. He has already advised on such things as the getting of certain machines for the Government Savings Bank. With regard to the computation of the time, Government has found that he has more work than he can get through in three months and that is why Government has asked for an extension of the period. Government feels that it would be a waste of time for Mr. Foster to give a three-quarter report, therefore, it is asking for this amount of money so that he can stay here a longer time and give us a whole report.

Sir, I am not going to do what I have done in the past, that is, to repeat to honourable members what they should read at home and study.

(A VOICE: What has been said on this matter has not yet appeared in the *Official Gazette*.)

If honourable members do not know what was said, go to the reporters and make notes. I made notes of what happened in the Five Year Plan debate and other important things and I will do it again. I am counselling honourable members to make notes, or go to the reporters. I am appealing to honourable members to make notes of what was said at meetings of this House and then they can come back and say that they said so and so, or so and so was said on such a debate. May I repeat that Mr. Foster has proved himself extremely efficient already. He has dug out things and brought to the notice of Government that were going wrong for ages. Mr. Foster, when he came out here at first, strongly recommended that Barbados should send somebody out to do what we have got him to do. We have acquired his services instead for this short period and during the time that he is out here, we have a local person to go around with him. May be, that person will carry on behind Mr. Foster.

As far as trying to get a job, Mr. Foster is not trying to get any job. He is in a job.

(A VOICE: Who said that he was out here to get a job?)

Perhaps, I have enlarged on what I heard was said. What I may have heard was that the gentleman had come out here to get a holiday. Do honourable members think that everything that comes before the Executive is brought down to this House? This is one of the many things that come before the Executive. When one thing comes before this House there is the possibility that four or five such things

have come before the Executive and the others have been turned down. Do honourable members think that with such a critical Opposition this Government would lay itself open to spending the taxpayers' money without first going into the matter thoroughly?

(A VOICE: Ah! The honourable Premier has now admitted that there is an Opposition in this House).

Sir, what I am saying is that Government does not bring anything down here except on the assumption that the chances are that it is going to be attacked on the matter. Acting on that basis, the Government examines everything carefully before it brings it down. It weighs carefully the pros and cons to see whether it has a good case before it brings down anything. Sir, far from ignoring this House and accepting something which an English official may want done, it is only where members of the Executive in this House see that it is advantageous to get or bring a particular English official to this country to do something that the Government wants done that they agree to it. Honourable members will never get from me names, but I feel just as strongly as the two honourable members facing me on such things. I too feel that there are some English officials that this island cannot well do without but some that cannot get back home too soon. However, if we have somebody who is doing a good job, we should keep him, or try our best to keep him, of course, without making the Treasury bankrupt by paying him a fantastic salary.

Sir, I do appeal to the House to believe that the Government has already received much help from Mr. Foster's investigation into Government Departments. Government feels that it would be a pity if it cannot allow him to finish his work just because it wants to save \$1,000. I assure this House that this Government is going to save a lot of dollars, not merely in money, but in the running of the office. Let me remind this House that at first, there was the thought of appointing a businessman to go into the running of these Government Departments, but it was found out that it would cost more. This Government said that in order to save money to let us have Mr. Foster. This Government has examined this matter from every possible angle and is very pleased that it has obtained the services of Mr. Foster. Let me say again that this House is going to be very surprised when it sees something which we will be coming down for soon. It is something that was going on for many years, but it was wrong. Mr. Foster being in that particular line drew it to our attention and I may say that not even the people who were working in the past under that Act did not read that section of it and its interpretation is so simple that almost any layman if he had read it would have found out that mistake.

(A VOICE: That must be the fault of the Attorney General).

Do not look at it from that angle. For something like 200 years, sheriffs have been presiding over Vestry nominations and while doing so, were voting and returning themselves; and it was only by accident,—because of an election petition—although we had some of the best brains in the legal departments of Government at that time—that it was found out that the practice was against the law. Things which are wrong will exist, no matter how clever Attorney Generals might be. They will exist until you discover them.

Sir, I do appeal to honourable members to see that the looking into the methods and organisation of the running of Government Departments is no chance happening, nor the getting of Mr. Foster to

do the job is no gamble—nothing of the sort. This is something from which we can save money.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, I do agree that we should have this expert to look into the methods and organisation of Government Departments. I do not like to use the word 'expert' because its use is overdone in this island. We do need some person to go into the running of our Government Departments. However, I think it is reasonable and just—nothing unreasonable at all—to know what have been the expenses up to today for carrying out the work; what work has been done and what would be required to be done. I say so, because every individual would like to know that and because I know that any minister can ask the administration: "What are the expenses for so and so." I feel sure this resolution would not have come to the House unless the Minister in charge, or the whole Executive for that matter, knew what the expenses to date are.

This House has voted \$7,000 already for the carrying out of this investigation. Certainly, you can tell us how much has been spent and how it has been spent. All those points are given to the Executive beforehand. This is a matter which from my point of view I feel is not a question of a particular individual asking for something which he wants to know personally, but when questions of this nature are asked, they are asked for the good of the public generally. The public should know how much has been spent on this investigation already. I think everyone would agree that it is fair and just for everyone to know such questions. It would put the matter beyond suspicion. It is no question of impertinence for anyone to ask that question.

Sir, I feel that the additional expenditure of \$3,000 should be met. I want to make it clear that this money does not include salary for Mr. Foster. It is stated that this gentleman's salary is paid from the British Treasury. This sum therefore does not include salary. Because of that, this House should be told how the subsistence allowance works out per day. I am sure that the breakdown would have to be given to the Government before this resolution is brought down. There is nothing wrong in divulging that information to honourable members. To say that that information is not necessary for honourable members to know to decide on the passing of this resolution is to reduce parliament from its supreme position, particularly when the minister in charge of the resolution is in a position to give the information readily. As I have said, it is not a matter of impertinence on the part of honourable members in asking for such things. It is unfortunate that the officer who is carrying out this investigation had to be brought into this issue. I feel that it could have been avoided by simply giving the answers to the questions that were raised.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Honourable Premier in replying to the remarks of honourable members has tried to create the impression that there had been criticism of the officer. Let me tell honourable members here and now that if I had a criticism to make on this expert, I would make it because I have no social ambitions other than with my own. I am not interested in meeting people. That is a matter of indifference to me. I have made no adverse criticism on the officer. I asked a purely simple question. I am not relying on the honourable member's memory or imagination for answers to these things. He must give us the breakdown of this amount. I could possibly have created the impression that I knew. The Honourable Premier knows that what my colleague, the honourable junior

member for the City, said was correct. It is this: when this House first dealt with this matter, we all were in agreement with it; everybody was of the opinion that the necessity of having an officer or some expert was very apparent and all honourable members said "yes" to the vote of \$7,000 for bringing out Mr. Foster. The honourable Premier knows that I would be the first to vote for this additional expenditure so long as I am satisfied about the breakdown of it. I asked for that breakdown for the benefit of the public.

Sir, you have had \$7,000 already to provide for the bringing out of the officer to go into this matter. You are not paying his salary; you are not paying any other officer out of this money; you are not buying furniture; nothing of that kind are you doing with this money. I have heard some *sotto voce* remarks about all these things are being paid for, but if the honourable Premier thinks he is all-powerful, I will insist that he tell us everything we want to know or honourable members of the party to which I belong will show him what will happen although we are only a party of four. The Honourable Premier must satisfy me that this additional expenditure of \$3,000 is reasonable before I vote for it. What do you want it for? We have had Mr. Parris from the Labour Department seconded to this expert as secretary. There is no cost in this respect. It works out to something over \$60 per day for keeping this expert here although you are not paying his salary. If the honourable member is not prepared to tell this House the breakdown of this amount, I am going to move that this resolution be postponed. I am going to move that the Resolution be postponed until the Government can tell this House how this amount of \$3,000 is to be spent and how the other amount of \$7,000 has been spent. The hon. Premier has hinted something of members not doing their work and that he is not going to do it for them. The honourable member must act right now; he must remember that he is the Honourable Premier now.

When the honourable member accuses other honourable members of not reading their minute papers, that cannot apply to me, and he knows well enough that it cannot apply to my colleague; therefore we have been very reasonable in our request. You already had \$7,000, all the money is gone and this officer says that he cannot do this work in three months; are you asking us to vote this money without telling us how it is to be spent? The Government is not all powerful; will the honourable member tell us how this money is to be spent? You have a new set-up in this country, you boast that you will get done whatever you want done and there is no Opposition; well, I will show you that you will have to reckon with this Opposition and do your work. I feel that this officer should be given the opportunity to finish this job; he should be given the opportunity to tell us how we should run these departments and make recommendations. I hope that when the recommendations are made and they clash with the House (Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You will have his report). You have a lot of reports but they do not see the light of day. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed until the Government tells us how they spent that \$7,000 and how they propose to spend this money. The sum of \$15.00 a day seems to be a reasonable price for hotel accommodation, but there are some people who feel that they must go to some place and pay more than that, as much as \$40 a day. I move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. LEWIS: I have asked for information which the Hon. Premier has not given: I have

asked whether the Savings Bank will recoup the Treasury with some of this money. I am seconding the motion for the postponement because I feel that a reasonable request has been made at this time. I ask the Government to pay some attention to these figures; a period of four months' secondment will cost \$7,000; that means \$1,750 a month. If you extend the period you usually lower the average costs and initial expenses have been provided for already; but we find that they are making the period five months at \$2,000 a month! We have been told that this gentleman came to Barbados and set up his own standard for a preliminary canter; he went to one of the departments of Government and he had a good opportunity for study. The secondment period will now be a month more—five months—you got the initial expenses of having him here and the average per month has gone up by \$250.00!

Mr. BARROW: When the Government came before the House with this Resolution I said that it appeared to be an indictment on the Financial Secretaries whom we have had here from time to time. The justification given for not appointing local people to these high offices in the Administration has often been that our local boys have not got any experience in the organization and running of large Government Departments. In bringing down what the then Leader of the House was bringing down—a super-expert to inspect the inspectors—that was a confession that they were running the Administration inefficiently, and we have the disclosure by the honourable Premier to-day that the members of this Chamber will be astounded at some of the illegalities which have been done before the advent of Mr. Foster. The honourable member said that they were breaking the law and any breach of the law is an illegality. I was fortunate to watch the Organisation and Method branch grow up in the Treasury, but I will not bore honourable members with that. It is rather remarkable that Mr. Foster was content with a salary of \$590.00 a month in the United Kingdom and he had to pay income tax at 15/6 in the pound; why now should there be an amount of \$2,000 a month to support him in Barbados in a manner in which he is not accustomed? How can we, in these two months, put the expenditure for this gentleman at such a high level when, as the honourable junior member for the City has pointed out, this gentleman had to run a household in the United Kingdom on the maximum princely salary of \$590.00 a month and no allowances at all? Unless the House of Commons revises the salaries of the officers of the Treasury—which I doubt they will do for another 10 years—Mr. Foster's maximum salary was \$590.00 per month, which is less than what the honourable senior member for St. Thomas draws as a Minister in a small island like Barbados. I am asking the Premier to give us a breakdown of the \$2,000 a month which it will take to maintain this gentleman in this island. To the best of my recollection I did not hear any member of the Government give any indication as to the manner in which the \$7,000 was allocated when that Resolution was before the House: I do not think the honourable member should trade on the fact that the debates have not been printed; it is no misfortune of ours that the debates have not been printed; they have been in the hands of the Printer long enough to be printed by now. No member of this Chamber with whom I have talked has any recollection of any breakdown of the Resolution having been given at any time: to refer back to something which has never happened can only be considered as an effort to becloud the issue. In the normal course

of Parliamentary decency, a Minister who is armed with his portfolio and documents must have the information asked for, or the Assistant Secretaries are not doing their job.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member will give way to me, I must apologise to the House. I have a file here which contains more than 80 pages and I did not read it all. I had certain information put before me (MEMBERS: Shame!) I would like to see honourable members go through files and get in their beds at two or three o'clock in the morning as I have to do. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Ministers get salaries). Ministers' salaries are just pocket money having regard to what has to be done; people must like politics enough to work for what we are getting. I was unable to make any check by the debate on the Estimates; I was under the impression that by discussion in the House all the information had been given. In the file there is a statement as to the United Kingdom salary; I find that a portion of Mr. Foster's salary was included in the \$7,000. There is a suggestion of another officer, who is in the West Indies and who might be useful to Barbados, coming here. I have a minute here to the effect that in spite of adverse criticism, the matter was agreed to, and, apparently, the figures were given to the House. This matter in respect of Mr. Foster was discussed in this House about three times before today; there were certain things for which the Colonial Office asked and which were disallowed. Mr. Foster would not have to pay English income tax and Barbados income tax too.

As regards the other points, I did not have these things before me earlier, but I have them before me now and I am prepared to give the House the information now. Mr. Foster was prepared to go to the "Ocean View" Hotel; he was seconded to Barbados on the same terms as in the Windward Islands. As regards subsistence allowance, there is the rate of 50/- per day for the first 28 days, which is the United Kingdom rate, and 50 subsequent days at £2 per day. Then there is a portion of his honorarium as pension contribution and salary for three months, \$831; the cost of passage \$280; incidentals, \$75—all these various items came up to \$1,452, which brought the total to \$6,790 and we came down for an amount of \$7,000. I do not pretend to read through every line of a file although I have to do that sometimes. Let me give this assurance to the House; we have just started a Ministerial system of government; from day to day when honourable members have time off, we do not have any time off. I am not asking for any more salary, but if I accept a job like this, I repeat the salary is cigarette coppers. If honourable members think that this Government is not aware of its duties and we are not putting in hard work, they are completely mistaken. I assumed that it was merely a question of saying that we have appointed Mr. Foster on certain terms, we re-appoint him for a further term of two months, and I did not think it necessary to read through this file from cover to cover. I read through the file while honourable members were speaking. I do not blame the staff in any way.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If that had been done from the beginning a lot of unpleasant debate would have been saved. Now that the information has been produced I want to say in respect of the allowances agreed upon for Mr. Foster, that when people from this island go abroad, they are paid allowances which are far below these rates. I do not think you should send out your own people and give them less by way of allowances than what people who are coming here are given. It is not my intention to

divulge what has happened in Executive Committee; I regard that as something sacred; but what I am saying is that if you leave here to attend a conference in the West Indies you are paid \$12 a day for subsistence allowance. When people leave here and go to cold climates, they are paid allowances which other people get in warm climates; I think the Government has an opportunity of making an adjustment in this matter; they must pay their own people what other people are paid when they go abroad. In Trinidad you will get an allowance of \$10.00 a day; in Jamaica you will get \$15.00 a day; it seems to me that this gentleman is getting an allowance higher than what Professor Shephard got. I will say that we are committed to this expenditure because it is a necessary expenditure, but, as I said earlier, if the information as to the breakdown of the Resolution had been given, that would have saved a lot of debate.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I thank the honourable member who has just spoken; I have been told that the House was very chary as to paying proper allowances. I was the only West Indian who could not afford to travel by taxi in London; it is true that as far as Barbadians going to conferences are concerned, the Government is so afraid of the House cutting down the amount, that we have not asked for more. We have the reminder that very often we are very far behind what is allowed other people for subsistence allowance.

Mr. ALLDER: I should like to say that when questions are raised on this side of the House the honourable senior member for St. Joseph tries to suggest that they are raised out of bad motives. In future the honourable member should be very careful in giving consideration to what might be said by honourable members not only on this side of the table but from the other side as well. It is very difficult to compromise the statements which the honourable member has made to-day and those which he made when he first brought forward the Resolution to this House for the money to bring down this expert. The honourable member made the House to feel that the Barbados Government would not have to shoulder the salary of the expert, and that only his maintenance would be paid from the Treasury; now the honourable member is saying that part of United Kingdom salary will have to be paid from the Treasury plus part of his pension contribution, plus hotel fare and so on. Now I am making this statement; it is not sufficient for us to give the Government a blank cheque when an expert is to be brought down here, because you will always have the argument brought forward that we have committed ourselves to the principle of bringing down these experts. It is not right for the Government not to know at what hotel or guest house these experts will be staying; at least honourable members should know that the rates will be kept within what can be considered as reasonable, because it is not impossible to have some fastidious expert coming down here. I am told that there are certain hotels at which the rate is \$60.00 per day, but this Government could not afford such a luxury for experts to stay at such expensive places. The scale of rates which the Government is willing to pay for any of these officers whether they are local or imported should be stipulated. I am hoping that nothing like what has happened today will be allowed to happen again; I, like some other honourable members felt that we were getting the services of this gentleman free. I do not say anything about the services which the gentleman hopes to render us because I feel it is very necessary to have the working of these depart-

ments gone into; but it is not impossible for us to pay too much for gold.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not think it would be fitting for me to press my motion—there would not be any point in doing that—after the honourable Premier has done what he has just done. I should just like to say that it has been drawn to my attention that during a debate in this House some information was given by members of the Government and the Government's Spokesman in the Other Place gave information which was diametrically opposite to what was given in the House. And the Colonial Secretary was right.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Perhaps the honourable member will be sworn to secrecy in the future.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The time will come when I will be sworn to secrecy. Let the Ministers come in here with accurate information. I repeat that the information which was given in the Other Place was diametrically opposite to what was given here. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Name it). I am not naming anything; and Ministers have no right being rude either. Mr. Chairman there is no point in pressing my motion, but I would just like to counsel the honourable member that when other honourable members ask for information they are entitled to have it. If you have not got the information the best thing to do is to postpone the consideration of the particular matter until the information can be given. That would be much better than to get up in the usual manner and tell us one thing when it was another; it was pointed out to us that you must have these Secretaries to do the work and we expect that work will be done. Nobody expects any Minister to go through every detail, but when any matter is brought in here he must have all the facts. The Opposition are not duds as it has been said.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have never said that the members of the Opposition are duds or that they are dead; I have blamed them for being honest in saying that they do not differ from the Government Party except on the question of nationalisation. Therefore there is no opposition if you do not differ from us.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I want to rap the Honourable Premier on the knuckles; he is the chief honourable member of this House who accuses honourable members of wasting time. Today he has come in here unprepared to answer the Opposition and he has been the principal member who has caused the waste of a whole afternoon. Now that the honourable member has a new job it is his responsibility to use the Permanent Secretary in his office and come here prepared to give information. He cannot do all the work himself; therefore let him use his Permanent Secretary to prepare him for this House. He must have all the information from his Secretaries before he comes here, and that will stop any waste of time. With the plethora of legislation which is absolutely necessary for the progress of the country, you will need 10 years for a session before you get through a proper programme of legislation. The honourable Premier has wasted more time in here than anybody else; he had all the information at his fingertips and yet he had not got it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The speech made by the honourable member who has just sat down is one of the main points in this debate. I hope honourable members are not deluding themselves that the honourable member is feeling nowadays that he should peruse the files and come in here with information. He has not undergone any change of heart; if he did not appreciate the fact that this Resolution would have been postponed or thrown out, he would have spoken until next year and still have the files

before him. Since honourable members are taking their duties seriously and discharging the responsibility which they owe to the public, the honourable member and his colleagues will have to do what they are paid to do as Ministers and what it is their responsibility to do in the position which they are occupying. The honourable junior member for St. John is quite right; two hours have been completely wasted when, if the honourable Premier had made a proper presentation of the position, the Resolution would have been passed in 15 minutes. The honourable member did not do the work in the way in which he should have done it and it is to be hoped that this will be a lesson to him.

I was amazed to hear the honourable member suggest that if honourable members want to apprise themselves of the debate which took place on the former Resolution, they must go to the Reporters' houses to enquire what has happened. The Debates Committee made recommendations for speeding up the printing of the debates and instead of implementing the Report of the Committee, the honourable member has suggested that we must go to the Reporters' houses and ask what has happened a year ago. That is his idea of letting us know what has happened a year ago; instead of implementing the Report of the Debates Committee and seeing that the debates are published in time, the honourable member has suggested that honourable members should go to the Reporters' houses to enquire about the debates.

Mr. LEWIS: The position is worse than that; the persons responsible have taken every step they could to disrespect the House, and they have been taught to do it. You never get any information in the addendum to a Resolution and you have to ask for the breakdown and everything else. If they do not even give members of the Government the details, you will know what is happening: I am hoping for a change of heart; I am asking whether the Savings Bank will refund some of this money. I hope the honourable member will get that information and when he comes back for the other \$2,000 he will be prepared to give it. I do not want that information now, but let the honourable member not come down here in the Estimates without that information and ignore honourable members.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member has some bee in his bonnet about people; I have had to take the file and read it through for hours because I wanted to know the history of a matter. It is not true that any member of the Civil Service is disrespecting the House; in the old days the addendum to a Resolution was prepared in the Secretariat, but nowadays we approve of the wording of the addendum. If any mistake has been made, it is our mistake. Whatever might be true today, I am not sheltering behind anything; when it is the fault of the Ministers, I will say it is our fault.

Mr. LEWIS: I absolved all the Civil Servants from any blame from the 1st February; but they are doing all that the honourable member encouraged them to do. A lot of information is given to the people who have not got to face the electorate; it is 99% true to say that you cannot know anything about what is going on in this country through legislation until you read the debates in the Other Place.

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the Chairman declaring "I think the 'Noes' have it."

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the House was adjourned for half an hour.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

PURCHASE OF LAND ADJOINING CHRIST CHURCH GIRLS' SCHOOL.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$473 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54 Part II—Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953-54 No. 39 which forms the Schedule to the resolution, in connection with purchase of land adjoining Christ Church Girls' School.

As honourable members will see from the addendum to the Resolution, "provision was made in the Supplementary Estimates 1952-53, No. 34 for the sum of \$375 to purchase an area of land estimated at 10,890 square feet adjoining the Christ Church Girls' School to provide additional playground space at the School, but the provisions of Section 52 (9) of the Public Health Act, 1908 (1908—8) precluded the owner from selling the piece of land during 1952. Negotiations were reopened during 1953 and as a result of a survey the land was found to contain 12,000 square feet for which the Government has now agreed to pay the sum of \$413 plus certain other expenses, subject to the provision of the necessary funds by the Legislature."

The breakdown of the Resolution is set out as follows:—

Purchase price, \$413; Expenses relating to the purchase, \$40 and Reimbursement of cultivation expenses, \$20. For the benefit of honourable members I shall give a resumé as to the history of the purchase of this parcel of land, which I hope, will supply all the information and satisfy honourable members. Negotiations were first opened in October, 1951, for the purchase of this land which was estimated at one rood. In January, 1952, the owner of the land represented that he had already received an offer of \$375 for it; meanwhile it was discovered that the owner had already sold off a portion from the area of which the lot to be purchased by the Government formed a part. Owing to the provisions of Section 52 of the Public Health Act, 1908, the proposed purchase had to be postponed until the 12 months as prescribed in the Act, expired. In January, 1953, negotiations were reopened and by a recent survey the land was found to contain 12,000 square feet which is 1,110 square feet in excess of the estimated amount and for which an additional \$38 is being paid, making the total price \$413.

In so far as the \$20 is concerned, the explanation is that during the long pending negotiations the owner of the land started to cultivate it and incurred expenses to the extent of \$20. As regards the \$40, the cost of the Plan is \$12; Stamp Duty \$2.40; legal expenses \$25, making a total of \$39.40, say \$40. The price of the land is reasonable and, as I have mentioned, negotiations have been pending since 1951; when an attempt was made by the then owner, who died during the period of the negotiations, to double the price of the land, the Government held him down to the original figure of \$375 plus \$38 instead of \$720. In the Five Year Plan the sum of \$50,000 has been earmarked for the acquisition of land adjoining schools for the improvement of facilities for playgrounds. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that. The reason why I have risen at this early stage is because I want to be the first person to compliment the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries on having the courtesy to give the House the complete breakdown of the Resolution. This is the first time since I have been a member of the House that a member of the Government has come in here fully apprised with the facts, has concealed nothing and given the House the benefit of all the information he has at his disposal.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There is nothing I can say in connection with this Resolution except to offer congratulations to the hon. Minister for the decent way in which he has given information as to this Resolution: I echo the sentiments which have been expressed by the hon. senior member for St. George. However, I should still like to know whom I should ask when I want to find out anything. This matter is under the Head "Education" but it is being dealt with by the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

Mr. MILLER: I am in full agreement with the explanation as to the necessity for having a playing field for this school; that has been a necessity for a long time, but I am a bit unhappy about the details. It is a bit unusual to find that you can buy land which is regarded as agricultural land at 3½ cents a foot; I am wondering if the hon. Minister would throw a little light on this matter. It is apparent that when the owner of this land got wise as to the actual value of the land, he was willing to ask twice as much as was offered in the first place and he was pinned down to the original agreement. I think it is contrary to the law for any arrangement to be made in advance for the purchase of land on the conditions on which this land was bought. I was thinking in terms of rab land at 3½ cents a foot and I am wondering if because the owner of the land lacked advice that he was forced to sell this land at 3½ cents a foot. Since he is entitled to a reimbursement of cultivation expenses to the amount of \$20, it is obvious that this land can be regarded as agricultural land. I am not saying that the Government should not try and purchase land as cheaply as possible; if you think in terms of the land which was bought from the Admiralty, that was bought at a cheap price, but it was a large area of land. I hope the hon. Minister will throw some light on that aspect of the matter.

Mr. ALLDER: One does appreciate the acquisition of land at these schools. However, the successful use of the land surrounding these schools depends upon various circumstances and times. I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister for Education the fact that several parents have made complaints to me during the past week to the effect that children attending the Richmond School were prevented from taking their lunch on

the premises of the school during a very wet day, and I am hoping that the Minister concerned will pass on a recommendation to the authorities so as to prevent such an occurrence from taking place again. It is very ungenerous for a headmaster or headmistress to force children to go on the school grounds to take their lunch on a wet day; the children should have been allowed to use a part of the school building for that purpose on that day. Not only is it necessary to have adequate playing fields attached to the schools, but in the construction of school buildings in future, consideration should be given to the construction of lunch rooms for the benefit of those children who have to take their lunch to school.

There is another point which I would like to raise in connection with this question of schools. At some of these Elementary Schools the regulations seem to have been relaxed and you find that at several of these schools an attempt is being made to run canteens. I do not speak of Combermere School because the canteen there is properly regulated and people other than masters are employed to run it; but now this matter of running canteens has gone as far as the elementary schools and you will find that three or four masters who are reasonably paid spend much of their time in selling a "Ju-C" to a little boy or girl. That causes a lot of criticism by taxpayers in the area who used to supply the children with lunch; out of the profits which these people made they paid taxes which go to pay the masters at these schools. We cannot have three or four masters wasting time in selling these small items; the time which is wasted in running these separate canteens could be spent by these masters teaching children in the class-rooms. If a canteen is to be run at an elementary school then let a few girls be employed in the running of the canteen. It is a common thing to see a master who gets \$140 or \$150 a month going around during school hours to purchase a box of "cokes" or to pay a bill for something which was obtained in the running of a canteen.

While what I am saying might seem to be slight, it is very important having regard to the successful running of our educational system; having regard to the percentage of our revenue which is allocated to education, I feel that great care should be taken to see that the public gets a dollar's worth of work for a dollar in salary which is paid. I would also like to draw the attention of the Minister for Education to the fact that there is a vicious system which obtains at the Education Department; if a wick for a stove has to be bought, one of the masters is taken and sent to Bridgetown to comb all the stores so as to get the cheapest wick and after he finds the cheapest wick, before purchasing it he has to submit the price to the Education Department. That has happened in my presence at my telephone: it took a master at one of the schools in the City, half a day to purchase a wick for a stove belonging to the nutrition room. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: What has that got to do with the present discussion?) It has something to do with the present discussion because we cannot wait until it is too late to observe these evils. I have made these statements very timely in the hope that the Minister for Education will set about to see that these things are remedied.

Mr. LEWIS: I notice that this is a matter of finance and education and both finance and education are portfolios in the hands of the Premier. We have had a Message from the Governor saying who is responsible for what, and now the Premier says that any Minister can handle anything for any other Minister whether that other Minister is in the House

or not. Therefore you do not know to whom you should go for information; in my opinion, that is confusing to honourable members. I am not one of those who will offer any compliments in this matter; I am merely thanking the Minister for the information which he has given and which it is his duty to give. This land is being bought at some £300 per acre and the Government has bought whole estates for less than that. I would not like to give the impression that somebody is snatching this land out of some poor person's hand for a small amount of money. The Government must have paid £100 per acre for a whole plantation although it is true you could not get it at that price to-day. I think the Government should be complimented on getting this land cheaply.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I wish that honourable members would repeat what I say without saying something else. I have never said that any Minister is responsible for anything; I do say that it is not unknown in the House of Commons for a particular Minister to deal with a special subject, although it may not be his portfolio, because he may have some special knowledge about it; and it is also not unknown for a Minister to introduce a special Bill and the Minister for the particular Department wind up the debate. For instance, I will introduce the Estimates but when it comes to the matter of social services, the honourable junior member for St. Thomas will reply. As regards this particular matter, it affects education because it is a school, but it affects social services because there is the question of a playing field; and how could anybody say it is wrong for the honourable member on my left to handle it? It never occurred to me until somebody mentioned it, but imagine a Government being so weak that it has to put in the hands of a particular Minister something affecting his parish when the matter does not come within his portfolio!

I answer now the honourable senior member for St. John; he can write to me on matters of education, I will answer all those points. For several reasons a Minister cannot be present and some other Minister will handle his file; the fact that we are Ministers only means that we have that title, but the practice which we have been following under the "Bushe Experiment" is still the same. One Minister may handle the file for another Minister but the responsibility is with the particular Minister whose portfolio it is.

Mr. ALLDER: I am certainly worried about the occasional statements which the honourable member makes; it seems as if he is lacking in something or the other. The honourable member is suggesting that when something goes wrong where the public is concerned, instead of raising the matter here, honourable members must write him privately. In that case, we need not come here at all; we could remain at home and the country would be run.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I said nothing of the sort. Am I going to remember everything the honourable member says? Do I know the date to which the honourable member is referring or the school master responsible? Therefore I ask honourable members to write to the Ministers who will get an explanation from the particular Departments.

Mr. VAUGHAN: This particular matter should have been handled by the honourable Premier or perhaps the Minister for Social Services but not the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries. If we had in the curriculum for our elementary schools the teaching of agriculture, then it would be proper to put this matter in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I take it that as Minister of Lands there will be certain Resolutions which I will have to handle; I am also supposed to be Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. Government lands will fall into the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture; normally speaking, all matters affecting land, whether it is agricultural land, land to be purchased or land already in the possession of the Government, should be placed in the hands of the Minister of Lands.

In answer to the honourable junior member for St. George, I would like to remove all doubt from his mind as to whether the vendors of land in Christ Church are being victimised or undue advantage is being taken of them. For the honourable member's benefit I will let him know that Christ Church is fairly well represented (Hear, hear) and the honourable junior member for Christ Church would, in all probability, be rising to his feet if, in his view, any undue advantage was being taken of any member of his constituency. I will add further that in January, 1952, the owner of this land, Mr. Thorpe, represented that he had already received an offer of \$375 for the land and he asked the Government to pay him that price. It is not that the Government offered him \$375; he offered to sell the land to the Government for \$375. In view of the fact that there was someone who would have paid that price for the land, the Government paid that price for it and also for the excess of the estimated amount which brought the total amount to \$413. Far from any advantage being taken of this owner, it was agreed to compensate him for the expenses involved in cultivating the land in the interim and the out-of-pocket expenses and legal fees; so that the Government has acted very liberally with the owner of this land.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, Lest I be misunderstood, I beg to say that under the Head, "Details of Expenditure," I see the following: Part II—Capital, B—Available Funds, (iv) Education.—Purchase of land adjoining Christ Church Girls' School, \$473.

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

RESOLUTION TO PURCHASE LAND FOR CARRINGTON'S JUNIOR SCHOOL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next resolution is for the sum of \$1,804 for a similar thing as that of the preceding resolution. The Addendum to this Resolution, clearly sets out the information needed. It is stated as follows:—

The Resolution seeks to provide the necessary funds for the purchase of 14,714 square feet of land on which the Carrington's Junior School stands. This land was previously rented by the Government but the owners have now expressed their willingness to sell at a price of 12 cents per square foot.

The cost of the purchase is estimated as follows:—

Purchase price		\$1,766
Legal expenses		40
Total		\$1,806

That is the information given in the addendum. The additional explanation which I hope would satisfy honourable members on this expenditure is that the Carrington's Junior School has been placed

on the list of schools for a water-borne lavatory system and permission was sought from the original owners of the land for erection of the structure but was refused. The present owners are however willing to sell the land at a rate of 12 cents per square foot. The amount of square feet needed is 14,470 square feet and as can be seen from the breakdown, this would cost \$1,776. The school has occupied the site for the last fifty years and it is an ideal and central site. I do not think there could be a more central location to be found for this school in that district. The land was rented from the former landlord at \$12 a year. As can also be seen from the addendum, the legal expenses are estimated at \$40. I beg to move that this resolution for the sum of \$1,806 do now pass.

Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded the motion.

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

RESOLUTION FOR \$107,418 TO SUPPLEMENT ESTIMATES 1953-54

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,— The next resolution is for the sum of \$107,418 for ordinary supplementary estimates to supplement the Current Estimates. The sum is for expenditure under various heads and as usual, I am asking that it be dealt with head by head.

Head IV—Auditor General

Head IV,—Auditor General, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head IV stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head VI—Customs

Head VI—Customs, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head VI stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Is this expenditure under this head for the washing of rum bottles? Quite a number of times,—without number,—have I been discussing this expenditure and have never got an explanation. Will the Government give some consideration to it? I understand that the people who ship rum take the bottles with which it is shipped into the bond where it is stored and wash them there before putting the rum in them. I also understand that the merchants take the water to break down alcohol. Anyhow, the Estimates for 1954-55 will soon come up for consideration and, suppose, this same item will be put into it, I take it the information which I have been asking for will be given then.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I will promise the honourable member to get that information and give him when this Head is considered in the coming Estimates.

The question that Head VI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head VIII—Legal

Head VIII—Legal, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head VIII—Legal, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head IX—Public Market

Head IX—Public Market, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head IX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XI—Lighthouses

Head XI,—Lighthouses, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XI stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, This is something which honourable members should know something about. If you look at the note accompanying the item, you will see stated at (3): Late arrival of one case of chimneys ordered in 1952-53 but only received this year—\$302.46. Now these chimneys were out of order since the 1952-53 Estimates and although they were not received in that financial year, the money to pay for them has not been put into the 1953-54 Estimates. It is now well on to the time for the consideration of the 1954-55 Estimates now that these chimneys have arrived. Something is wrong. It is misleading when these sort of things are not accounted for, and it is a method which is going to bring trouble. I do not know whether it is legal or illegal, but it is wrong. If a department has orders outstanding, when the next Estimates are presented, it should show that those orders are outstanding, and that they have not been provided for in those Estimates. To come to-day to say that these chimneys were provided for in the 1952-53 Estimates but only received this year when no provision was made for them in the Current Estimates is something which I cannot understand.

Sir, a day will come when every dollar is going to count. In the old method of compiling Estimates, this House used to know what amount of money was unexpended under a Head from the previous year and it used to provide for the things that were outstanding. Nowadays, you have orders outstanding at the Crown Agents, whether they be for cast iron pipes that cost a lot of money or whether they be for a few chimneys for use at lighthouses, and you say nothing about them. It seems as if these things do not matter to the Government. Sir, this state of affairs does not present a proper phase of the financial position of the island and one of these days, when you may not be able to get money easily, you will discover that it is a very unsatisfactory system.

The question that Head XI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XIV—Judiciary

Head XIV Judiciary, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XIV stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XV—Police

Head XV—Police, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XV stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, Speaking on Item 50 under the Head,—Subsistence allowance to N.C.O.'s and men on Special Duty and attending Courts — it is my belief that this additional

expenditure could have been avoided. I know of a case in which an N.C.O. was called from District "F" Police Station to attend a Ceremonial Parade at District "A." This sort of thing has been occurring more often than before and I think it is only a waste of expense. They are also sending at the various District Police Stations for a couple of Mounted Policemen when at the same time they need three or four of them to man the districts. It is true that certain arrangements are necessary for the holding of a ceremonial parade, but as the honourable senior member for St. John has said before, I think these things are overdone. I also know of an occasion where an N.C.O. and five Police Constables from a District Police Station were asked to attend the Central Police Station for questioning. I think these things are overdone and that is the cause for this additional expense.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I am wondering if the Police have paid into the Treasury any amounts of money from what they receive from putting on entertainments for the public and tourists. I understand that many people go to see some of those parades and I remember that one or two were attended or held specially for tourists. I am wondering if there is corresponding revenue in the Treasury from that source and if the honourable Minister in charge would tell us that, it would be alright. Of course, I know that so long as you mention that the Mounted Men stationed at the District Police Stations have had to come in to District "A" more frequently than usual for ceremonies during Coronation time that you are not expected to be asked anything about this amount and that nobody should criticise it. However, I would like to know whether there is some corresponding revenue from some of the parades which are held at District "A" when the Police collect money from those who attend. I want to know if it is as much as would take care of this expenditure or if it is another way of contributing to the encouragement of the tourist industry in the island.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I notice that, under the head, there is the sum of \$300 to be voted for the remuneration of police informers. That is the amount to augment \$500 which has been voted under the Current Estimates. I believe at the present moment we have policemen at the Police Training School at Hendon, England, for training. We also have police dogs and specially trained dog masters as well as we have several Police Inspectors that have attended special courses at the expense of the taxpayers of this colony. It therefore seems to me a great indictment against training methods, if after we have had so many trained inspectors that this colony must still fall back on the method used in the Middle Ages to protect countries which are not so far advanced in crime detection as other countries.

(A VOICE: What are you saying?)

The honourable member who has made that aside should be the first person to criticise a vote like this, because this \$500 could better be used at the Baby Welfare Clinic in St. Thomas, which was started by his late wife, rather than to be spent on pimps and parasites. That is for what this House is asked to vote this money. Sir, we have a lot of Police Superintendents waxing fat on their salaries. They are getting allowances and all sorts of aids to do their job and yet we are called upon to pay out \$800 to 'pimps' in this year of grace. I am submitting that the Police are not doing their duty. They are taking the short circuit. In a democratic community like this, you cannot encourage this business about informing on people. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas may

say that they do it in America and Russia but what is done in those countries are no examples to quote to me. It may be said that a certain amount of money is paid out on this kind of information by the Police in the United Kingdom but we do not know how much. I am sure that any Police Inspector in England who is worth his salt would not ask his Local Council to go to the Treasury for money to pay a tout or pimp. Sir, when you get to the stage where for the preservation of order and justice you have to pay pimps and touts, you will get everybody in Barbados informing on the other fellow. Everybody would have to guard against the other fellow and this should not happen in a democratic community at all.

Sir, apart from the fact that the amount of money voted in the Annual Estimates for police pimps is \$500 both for this year and last year, we have the Police Commissioner naming a salary which should be paid for information which anyone gives. In one case which occurred recently, most of the \$500 which was set aside in the Current Estimates for that purpose was paid out. There may be a few five and ten-shilling pieces which were paid out before and a little more spent by policemen for paying for a few drinks at rum-shops but the majority of that amount has been spent in the detection of one criminal.

I am in the same position, Sir, as any barrister who is a minister of justice, and as such, one wants to see crime detected, but while one wants to see crime detected and the guilty pay for the crime, one does not want to see anyone convicted wrongfully. One wants to see the person that is suspected brought to justice and if that person is proved guilty, then for the law to take its course. It is our job, as barristers, when pleading on behalf of a person, not to tell lies for them, but to see that everything is done for them. If a person is guilty, we want to see them punished just as anybody else. I say that because I do not want to give the impression that we do not want the Police to detect crime.

I read in the daily newspaper sometime this week, that a tourist in the island was surprised to discover that there were no beggars. The only conclusion one can draw from that is that all had died from starvation. However, it is only because the poor Barbadian has a sense of pride and would rather go out and do anything to get a biscuit than to beg that we do not get more 'Lazaruses' around Chamberlain Bridge. Because of this sense of pride, in a community like this, could we afford the luxury of pimping, or taking the taxpayers money—to the extent of \$800 this year—to pay for police information? I am suggesting that this vote which we are considering is going to be paid out to a pimp and because that is so, it would be better to send those pimps on a course in England and let the Police Inspectors remain at home.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, I would like to support the substance of the comments made by the learned, gallant and honourable senior member for St. George. It is a very dangerous practice which the honourable member has brought to our notice and it must be watched very carefully. I am wondering if this vote is to assist in paying a Police reward of \$500 which is in connection with a certain matter that is now before the West Indian Court of Appeal. I would warn that before paying out this money to let the authorities make sure that the conviction has been upheld by that Court. They might find that the West Indian Court of Appeal may make short shrift of this particular case because of what this money was paid out to do.

Even although the principle of obtaining information by this source is a system practiced all over the world, it is very objectionable so far as this country is concerned, because it opens the door to a profession of the professional informer. Whether or not evidence is procured in this way in other countries, so far as this colony is concerned, where it is very easy,—perhaps more easy than any other country—to procure false witnesses or manufacture evidence, this fund should be administered with the greatest caution.

I do feel that if the present Criminal Investigation Department were staffed with more of the intelligent members of the Police Force than it is at present, that the Police would be able to get proper results in crime detection without having to take recourse to this method of paying an informer. As you can well imagine, it opens the door to all kinds of abuses. If you go through the present personnel of the C.I.D. and compare them in the light of the rest of the Barbados Police Force, you will find that the majority of the C.I.D. is amongst the dullest members of the Force. You will find that the brighter Police Inspectors and sergeants are not in that department. You will find there only people who would do things which the more intelligent members of the Force in the other Departments would not dream of doing. We, who practise in the Law Courts know that the members of the Police Force in the C.I.D. tell persons that are alleged to have committed crimes as well as witnesses that they must make statements and if those persons do not make a statement, this, that or the other happens to those persons. Sir, it has gone so far in the Police Courts nowadays, that you have to hesitate about asking for bail for a person on an indictable charge because Police Magistrates are afraid that they would lose their jobs by granting bail. I say that just to show how important it is to have only reliable informers and a C.I.D. comprised of the men of the highest ability and greatest integrity amongst the Police Force. That is not what is in the C.I.D. today. The tendency is to concentrate on the men who will do the shady thing in order to get a conviction whether the conviction is justified or not.

We know that there are people who have been put under third degree questioning. They were not exactly beaten as there is another method of scaring the person almost to death. While under that degree of punishment those persons are asked to give statements. They are not allowed to speak or communicate with Counsel nor are they allowed to use a telephone. Those persons are forced to make statements. Sir, I can say that there is something very rotten in the administration of the Police Force.

I hope the new Commissioner of Police will take this matter into consideration. He comes under favourable auspices and we do hope that Barbados will not become the police state of the Caribbean. This \$300 is to pay rewards to persons giving information to the Police. Let me also say that I deprecate taking the alleged suspect in a rumshop and treating him to beer in order that his tongue would be loosened. We had a case recently where an acting Puisne Judge condemned the act of a police corporal who kept a person against whom no charge was made under arrest without anything to eat. All those sort of things are not good enough. As I have said, making a suspected person imbibe beer is one of the ways in which this money is spent, therefore we have to be very watchful over its expenditure.

It has been mentioned that Mounted Men from the country Police Stations have to come to Dis-

trict "A" more often than before for various ceremonies. Well Sir, at the moment, they really have in the addendum an alibi for the frequency of these ceremonies. I agree that the various ceremonies for the Coronation warranted the attendance of Mounted Policemen more than for the normal ceremonial parades, but so far as asking mounted policemen to come in from the country districts,—for instance those stationed at the District "F" Police Station, which is in the parish that has the distinguished honour to be represented by the honourable Premier and you, the Chairman of Committees,—to attend a parade because the Governor of Alabama has a painting to present to the people of Barbados, and because he is a friend of the then Acting Governor, is something which should not be practised. When these mounted men are brought in from the country districts to give a show for these people, very often, their leave is curtailed. Sometimes, when these shows take place, as was said by the honourable junior member for the City an admission fee is charged. I trust that the Minister in charge would see that when these different shows by the Police take place at which an admission fee is charged, that the accounts be audited and that he make sure that the receipts go into the Public Treasury.

Sir, it is well that this vote is being scrutinised by honourable members of this Chamber and by those who know from observation the type of person who gets this money and the dangers and the abuses resulting therefrom.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not believe that I have heard a more unworthy debate in this House than what I listened to just how by the honourable senior member for St. George and the honourable senior member for St. Lucy. I have never read a book on reminiscences by any Scotland Yard Inspector that he did not point out that only in detective fiction was there the genius of discovering the criminal by the detective, but that real detection of crime was always the result of hard work and information which was received. Other than that, most of the murders and other crimes would go undetected. Sir, if you do not pay for that information, many and many a crime would go unsolved. Do the honourable members who have just spoken expect many criminal cases would go far on evidence unless money is offered? It is the duty of barristers to ask their clients: "What policeman beat you; what he made you do to obtain the statement." It is the duty of the Police Magistrate to see that the police witness is not a professional perjurer; but to suggest to drop a system of paying for information is not to face up to realities. It is just arguing for the sake of argument. I can promise to lend the honourable senior member for St. George half a dozen books written by Scotland Yard men and I am sure that he will not find in any one of them that point which he has just made. All Scotland Yard detectives stress that it is only in detective fiction that you find that wonderful reasoning on the part of the detective; other than that, it is hard work, and crime can only be detected by getting a word from an informer. Naturally, you do not pay out until you feel that the information has something in it. I hope honourable members will not really think that that argument by the honourable senior member for St. George is logical and should prevail; therefore you should stop paying informers. Barristers, who as the honourable member has rightly said, are ministers of justice, are there to see who is paid to speak the truth and who is paid to lie. What is the object of unravelling crime but to discover that?

I regret the statement made by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy about the Barbados Police Force. His statement gives the rest in the Caribbean the idea that our Police Force is composed of mostly all crooks. We do know that there are "bright, smart" fellows in the Force, fellows it they do not have the evidence can find it, but as soon as we find them out, we mark them. I would say this. At one time in the Courts of this island—I do not know enough of them today—there were Police Magistrates who practically said that if a policeman came before them and gave evidence, they would believe him. As a result, one of them called "March Monkey" gave lying evidence on an occasion and was found out and sent to gaol. The mere fact that one of them was found out and imprisoned for perjury is an indication that you can do wrong for a time but you cannot keep it up. I will not say any more on that point. I do not see how anyone can argue about paying for information. What I would invite barristers to do is if they know of any single case in which a policeman kept a man under arrest or any member of the community without his being charged, or in a case of beating him, to come to me with that information. Do that but do not give the people the feeling, especially those in other parts of the Caribbean, that the Police Force in Barbados is more brutal than any of the rest. That is not true. When the honourable senior member for St. George talks of wasting money by sending our policemen on courses at Hendon Police Training College because they do not detect crimes; I would only remind him that there are quite a number of unsolved crimes on the books of Scotland Yard in spite of police dogs, and police training and in spite of the tenacity of all officers; therefore, do not suggest that we are wasting money on police dogs or sending people abroad on courses because in any country there are some criminals who are more clever than detectives. The honourable senior member for St. George said that all this money is wanted to pay an informer in a recent case. In some cases, if the police want to bring a case, they must pay the informer, or who would give information? I will tell the honourable member that in that particular case, many people gave statements to the Police, but up to now, none of them has gone into the witness box and given evidence. It is clear that some will say: "If I talk too much, my house would get burnt down," or something of that sort. It is true that the Police very often get much lying evidence. That has happened to me also. You will get somebody coming to you and saying that he was there before the other fellow, and saw everything. Because you get a statement from someone who because of necessity, you must pay that person for that statement, does not mean to say that the statement is false.

Sir, I apologise for having spoken at such great length but information helps policemen and it also helps Police Magistrates to decide cases. Because there may be a few dull policemen, does not mean that you should make remarks of the whole Police Force to make the good ones feel that they are also branded as bad. I would say from my own experience that the "black sheep" are few. In my time, one or two of the older members of the Police Force rather than the younger, did feel that in every case they brought, they must get a conviction, and that their getting the most convictions meant their getting the most stripes. I would hate to feel—I am not speaking as an authority because, unfortunately, I have not been in touch with the Courts as I used to be—that it is genuinely true that you cannot trust members of the Police Force.

Mr. BRANCKER: Perhaps the honourable

Premier may not have been listening with the usual care when he suggested in answer to remarks made by me that the Police should not be all branded. I certainly did not brand them at all. I said the C.I.D., at present, has the largest percentage and the only percentage of the really "bad" men in the Force and I have no hesitation in saying that from my personal knowledge of the Police Force.

Since the honourable Premier has invited us to bring certain matters to his attention, he will find himself in the next few months spending most of his time in matters of this sort. However I must tell the honourable Premier that he must not start off on anything with the premise that anything done by the official is well done; he must start off as if he were a legal practitioner. Fortunately or unfortunately, the honourable member no longer has to resort to practise in Her Majesty's Courts and nothing could be more unreal than when the honourable member said that no policeman here is more brutal than anywhere else. How can the honourable member argue on that point when he does not know that nowadays when an individual is taken to the C.I.D., he is taken upstairs with no person with him and while he is not actually given a physical beating, the five or six policemen that go upstairs with him can adopt a sufficient straining attitude on the individual to make him give more than a statement by all of them lashing at something with a bull pistol. Actually, Sir, physical beating is out of date. The invitation to give a signed statement on the prisoner's part is modern practice by policemen and certainly they can get it done without any marks of physical injury left on the body of the individual from whom the statement is taken. What sometimes happens is that they find out which hand you write with and if you are a left-hander, they wring the right hand of the individual behind his back until he brings down the left hand and signs the statement. Sir, what evidence can these individuals get if they are alone and are not even given permission to telephone the honourable Premier or some other legal practitioner. As I have said, the individual is not allowed to have any friend or person in the room when he is interrogated.

As I have said, my complaint about the C.I.D. is that some of the best brains of the Police Force are outside of that branch of the Force and I do think that the C.I.D. should be the branch of the Force which should possess the men of the best brains and highest sense of integrity. Mr. Smith, the new Commissioner of Police has a name which all of us in this island regard with pride. Can you imagine that if Mr. Smith was not worthy of the name he bears, if he was not a man with an educational background and of that known integrity, that he would be placed in charge of this island's Police Force? I am afraid that he will see an entirely different type of policeman, so far as education, reputation for integrity and general ability are concerned in the C.I.D. than in the other branches of the Force.

Sir, not so long ago, there was a case in which a prisoner in handcuffs, a man alleged to have had a bad reputation, was arrested for some offence and while being questioned was alleged to have crashed through a door and fallen down a flight of steps to break his neck. At the Coroner's jury which was made up of the majority of ex-policemen, after many adjournments, there was returned a verdict of misadventure, and that, even after the medical evidence stated that the man died before he fell. The honourable Premier seems to have stopped practising so long in the Police Magistrate's Courts that

he has forgotten that he always challenged ex-policemen when he met them as jurors.

Sir, I think this debate will serve a useful purpose because we have a new Commissioner of Police. I will assure the honourable Premier that there are still a few members of the Police Force—they may not be in the majority—who feel that they must at all costs gain a conviction. They feel that unless they get a conviction, there would be no new stripes. These members of the Force should be made to understand that they must not be interested in the results of a case and that they should give their evidence without fear or favour.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I must really support much of what has been said and I think I have had enormous practice from both sides—as a prosecutor and a defender—to support such statements. The Honourable Premier is quite right in saying that you should not blame the majority for the few but the remarkable thing which the practitioner in the Law Courts of this island is worrying about is that in recent days the vagabonds of the Police Force are those getting the promotions and funny enough, they are not those who are in the bottom positions alone, but they are some of those in the office. I do think that it is for the people's good that a new Commissioner of Police has come to take up office.

In a recent case, in which the Police paid money to an informer, you will find that there was one man, who though not under arrest nor were there any powers to keep him under detention, was kept for five days in the C.I.D. and more than that, was never called as a witness. He was called upon to sleep on the premises because he would not give a statement. Sir, just fancy that a man was kept five days by the C.I.D. without a warrant and not allowed to leave. There was another man who was kept for four days and not allowed to leave and when Inspector Bourne could not get the necessary evidence from the man, or rather what he wanted, he left and asked Major Simmons to go and get the evidence.

Sir, we are not denying that there are only a few and not many of such policemen in our Police Force. As a matter of fact, I think we have probably as fine a Police Force from our point of view as any place else. I do agree that there should be some vote to pay informers. It is so all over the world, but you will find that whenever in this island they use this money for getting information, they are paying it to a criminal. You will find that in a recent case, the Police took a criminal named "Racketeer", who is not only known to every legal practitioner but to every other person in Barbados, for their star witness. I understand that he said that he would not give any statement until he got the money and I want to know if "Racketeer" got this money.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, it is true to say that the case to which the honourable member is referring is before the West Indian Court of Appeal. Ordinarily, a judge would not be biased by anything which he might hear, but strictly speaking, the case is still *sub judice*. I will promise the honourable member to hear more of what he just disclosed after the case is finally heard. I am far from being opposed to what the honourable member is saying.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I only wanted to state that this man denied that he was paid. I quite agree with what the honourable Premier said. I would say this: The honourable Premier would probably remember that on one occasion a jurymen told him when he was defending some one accused at an Assize Court, if he was paying out money, he could get

off the accused. What I am suggesting to the honourable Premier is something which he can do now in the position with which he is honoured. Later on, I would accept his offer to come to him with matters of this sort. If the honourable member is prepared to listen to legal practitioners, I am sure that every one of us, who have a big practice in the Law Courts of the island would tell him that what the honourable senior member for St. Lucy is saying is true, that is, they have some policemen who should be removed from the Police Force. They do have some officers in the Police Force who have been compelled to make reports on people contrary to what is true. These are things which I do not care who knows about them. I am going to apply to the honourable Premier on the points that have been raised here on this matter and am prepared to give evidence but the honourable member must handle the matter. The honourable Premier knows that this Government has had to pay money because of policemen breaking the legs of some person. The honourable member knows that policemen attack persons under arrest in their cells. The honourable member knows as well as I, that even in the Courts the chances against the matter being proved are as much against you as they are for you. The honourable member also knows that when junior policemen give evidence in Courts they are nothing but the shadow of other senior members of the staff who have given evidence earlier.

Sir, I am saying nothing more than the honourable Premier is right to find out if all that is said here is true and in the interest of justice. We have policemen and police officers who not only prosecute with ability and vigour, but prosecute with honour and integrity. I have heard a police officer who after a Police Magistrate had given his verdict in favour of the prisoner say that the verdict of the Police Magistrate was correct. The Police Officer told the Magistrate: "I am instructed to appeal but I agree with Your Worship's verdict."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, as I have promised, if the learned and honourable members give me a good concrete case, I will immediately advise the Governor to appoint a Commission to go into it. I will do anything in my power which will help purge the Police Force of "black sheep." Being the first politician to have something to do with the Police Force, I think it is more incumbent on me to keep the Force clean than if I were just an ordinary backbencher or ordinary member. I appeal to the honourable and learned members to give me concrete cases and I would see that a Commission of Enquiry be set up to go into them.

Mr. BARROW: I want to inform the honourable Premier that the position which he now occupies is the equivalent of Home Secretary as well as Premier, therefore, we expect certain directives from time to time handed from his office and from him to the officers administering the different departments in this island concerning the Police and the C.I.D. The kind of directive I would like to see handed out to the Police is one which was made in a recent pronouncement by Lord Justice Denning in the High Court of England. I think it was given within the last six or eight weeks. The Lord Justice declared that there is no such thing known in English Law as holding a man in custody for questioning without arresting him. I have raised this point on many occasions and I think honourable members of this House would be scandalised to know that one of the paid officers of the Crown, the Attorney General, said that it was a perfectly natural thing to arrest a man before questioning. I must side with the pronouncement by Lord Chief Justice Denning who said that arresting a person

before questioning is a principle completely foreign to English law. How could the Force be better when you get a paid officer of the Crown saying how must the Police detect crime unless they hold people in custody indefinitely or until such time as is necessary for questioning. Lord Chief Justice Denning has said that it is a principle foreign to British law.

I do not want any misunderstanding to arise from anything which I may have said. Although members of the general public may not know, nor perhaps the Commissioner of Police, I think I have more friends in the Barbados Police Force than any other practising barrister, possibly with the exception of the honourable junior member for St. James. Sir, I have been to school with some of them and even when I was at Harrison College, I met some there. I may say that those who went to Harrison College with me are only corporals, regrettably, but the elementary scholars are inspectors. Now we have a new Commissioner of Police, I do not want anyone to think that I am unfriendly with members of the Police Force because I have referred to practices which are undemocratic and illegal. If these practices are carried out by my best friends, I will have the same thing to say. You are not undermining the morale of the Police Force when you point to them. I think it is better to make members of the Force feel that it is better to rely on the information gained by their initiative and intelligence than to rely on information which you have paid people to get. I do not think that it is right for a Police Commissioner to advertise a notice of a reward leading to arrest of criminals for any amount unless he feels that this House is going to acquiesce to his nomination. I may further state that it is obnoxious to have money spent in this manner when it could be better spent in social services and bettering the lot of our fellow citizens. Government gives money to the public welfare crèches only in proportion to the contributions which these crèches receive from the general public. The amount which is given out as a reward for information in the *Regina vs Thomas* case is far beyond the sum of \$500. We cannot pay \$500 to informers and train policemen to detect crime. This money which we pay to informers and which we are now voting is for pimps and "parasites." I can see no justification for it at all. I am not saying that paying informers is not done in international countries but I am saying that it is not a thing to relish. I am looking forward to the day when we will have no cause to spend one cent on this matter.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I rise again to emphasize a point which I did not emphasize to the Honourable Premier. It is that the money which is paid to people who give information in the Police Courts today is in 99 cases out of a hundred given to the more notorious vagabonds of the island. We, who practice in Courts of this island, know who is who and when we see certain persons who are produced as star witnesses in a case and whom we know have been paid to give evidence, we have to sit up and think because we know that the liberty of the subject is imperilled by the evidence of the person who is paid to give that evidence which would lead to a conviction. Very often the subject against whom that evidence is given is a respectable person. It is because of the type to whom this money is paid and who looks to receive this money that I strongly deprecate it being paid out because that type of person has no conscience nor soul. That is the person who predominantly is in receipt of this money.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think it is a most excellent thing that this debate has lingered. It could have ended on the wrong point had it not been

for subsequent speeches which helped to preserve the matter in its proper perspective. Had the debate ended when the honourable Premier replied, it would have been a serious thing for this community. Even the honourable member's subsequent speech presented a different atmosphere. In his reply, the Honourable Premier gave the impression that the paid informer was highly respectable and highly desirable. One can easily see that if that impression had been made to stand, in the future there would be a large number of unemployed in Barbados making a living by becoming paid informers. Nobody wants to underestimate the aid to a police case by paid informers. What we are saying is that by paying informers, we may eventually get to a point corresponding to the OGPU in which almost anybody would be liable at some time or the other to be the victim of another person by the imagination of these professional informers. These professional informers might have multiplied after the remarks which were made by the Honourable Premier. That emphasis was made later that those informers are undesirable and should only be used as a last resort and only if it were impossible for the State to get evidence otherwise, did much to clear the atmosphere. It should not be a question of holding out a monetary reward. It should be stressed to the informer that money should not be his main motive for providing evidence to the State but that it is his duty and to give such evidence and that it should be given to help the Court to decide on the true merits of the case and not to help the Government to secure a conviction against the person accused.

I say Sir, that the subsequent speeches did much to preserve this matter in its proper perspective and sort of negated the possibility that it is a highly respectable and desirable thing to be a paid informer.

Mr. LEWIS: I think this House should hear something more on this matter other than from the legal members of it. It should hear something from people who are like ordinary citizens outside. I say that because it is unusual to see lawyers charged before a court of law. It may be due to the fact that they know how to handle and conduct themselves. What as a layman I have heard this evening relative to these paid informers must disturb my mind and anyone interested in the administration of justice. The assurance that something will be done is the only thing that should prevent any honourable member from moving a reduction of this vote, if it be only one cent. I do feel that some sort of protest should be done. I take it that it is not being done because of the assurance given by the Honourable Premier that the matter will be investigated.

Sir, it is the poor layman that is at a disadvantage in a matter of this sort; it is not the lawyer. A sound note was struck by the honourable senior member for St. Philip when he questioned: Are we using this as an unemployment relief? Sir, we have lots of people in this country who if this sort of thing becomes a source of income, will avail themselves of it and to such extent that the Police would not be obliged to do any work. All the Police would have to do is to draw pay and get free trips away to go on courses to enable them when they come back to ask for more money. They would get these paid informers to do their work. It is serious to know that in the detection of crime, you do not get people who do not wish money to come forward and give evidence to assist the Courts of justice but that you leave it to paid informers.

Sir, it is easy when places are over-populated like this island, for that type of thing if it becomes a source of income to be debased, and to jeopardise the security of all individuals. We would have a police State without people even knowing it. I am placing great reliance on the assurance given us by the honourable Premier that he would take to heart the cases which were given us. Sufficient evidence has been given that the honourable Premier should take notice of it as well as the people of the colony should know that justice will be done. While everything should be done to make sure that the criminal be brought to justice, the people should feel safe. They should be made to feel that evidence to assist the Courts in giving justice is given by people who are honest and not by people who will be tempted to say things because they are getting paid for it. We must remember that unemployment has its evils and if a thing like this take root, it will get to such a state owing to our unemployment problem that it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to eradicate.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Much of the debate that has taken place, has been hinged on the lot of the poor unfortunate people who are more or less arrested for alleged crime. I think the greatest concern should be given to the general tendency nowadays where you get a large number of cases in which the persons accused are not represented by counsel and because of that are more cruelly treated. Representation has been made on behalf of those persons who were represented by counsel but it must be borne in mind that the greater number of persons accused and who are detained under arrest are those that are not represented by counsel. The only cases in Barbados which we give free counsel to if the accused are not able to retain counsel are those cases in which the accused are charged with murder. Again, criminal appeals are limited. It can therefore be seen that much that can be done from arguments which have been adduced, rest here and with what the honourable Premier will be able to do, and I believe that this debate will do a lot of good and help much to protect those people who are looking for justice while charged for crime.

I do not know, but it seems to me as the honourable Premier is a great believer in the art of cross-examination and its effect upon a Court. I would like to tell him that in the short time I have had at the Bar, I have gone into court on many occasions and have seen many a counsel who has shaken a particular witness, yet the jury who was enpanelled to try the issue, saw it best to return a verdict contrary to the facts brought out in Court. Although a skilful counsel may be able to shake a witness, it does not follow that the art of cross-examination is the best that can be done to get justice for a client. With these few remarks, and the assurance given by the Premier, I would say that this matter must be watched carefully because I think any person who is given a reward for information must have a tendency to give the information that the person giving the reward wants. I would also say that I know that there are, right now, one or two grievances existing in the Police Force amongst N.C.O's and Officers owing to this getting of information at all costs. I will also say that from my knowledge of personnel in the Barbados Police Force, the majority are very nice men and intelligent, but I know of some who I can only describe as "Uncle Toms."

Hon G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Allow me to say that I have not given any undertaking that I am going to do something to do away with the system of paying for information. The honourable

senior member for St. Philip, in his usual form of distorting what one says, declared that I suggested that informers were highly respectable and highly desirable people. All I said was that it is impossible to conceive of any Police Force being able to track down criminals without paying for information at some time or the other. I then went on to say that it is for courts and counsel to see that the information given is evidence of truth. Again, what I will promise honorable members is that if they bring to my knowledge cases in which the Police have acted in an anti-British way as in the instances pointed out I will do my utmost to see they are stopped.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: It is really contradictory to anything that I said when it was suggested that there should not be paid informers. I have never said that. I made a different point. I said that you should not pay a man to get a conviction; you must pay to get information. There are people who have not enough money to support themselves and their families and as a result, they are not in a position to retain a barrister should they find themselves in a position where they are up against the law. I will again say that it is to the Police Force that we have to look for the protection of the community and its members must have the highest integrity. I agree with the honourable Premier that we have to keep the case to which I referred quiet because it is *sub judice*, but I can assure the honourable member that for my part, I am prepared to raise it, possibly in here, but certainly to him privately, for him to make certain investigations because I can assure him chapter and verse that this plot was hatched so successfully that a law officer was made to lose his job. The honourable member knows perfectly well that I know something of what I was talking.

The question that Head XV stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XVI—Prisons

Head XVI,—Prisons, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XVI stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am directing honourable members to look at a note against the item "Provisions" which states: "For a considerable time it was necessary to substitute bread for sweet potatoes." I believe the honourable senior member for St. John would like to deal more exhaustively with this matter, but so far as I know, bread is baked at the Prison, they do not buy it. The only thing I believe they buy is flour. It is true to say that part of the note states that the amount of \$26,000 provided in the 1953-54 Estimates has proved inadequate due to an increase in the cost of flour of over \$2.00 per bag from May, 1953.

There are certain of these institutions that have to call for tenders for supplying these things.

I see honourable members are anxious to get an adjournment including Your Honour. I am sorry that the rules by which we are now guided do not allow for a dinner adjournment at a scheduled time. Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the committee to sit again.

Mr. WILLIAMS seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of my intention to

move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the Colonial Estimates for 1954-55. Perhaps I should have done so earlier in the day. I also beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with two money resolutions of which notice was given earlier.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

ON RESUMPTION

On re-assembling,

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

His Honour the Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee reported progress, it was dealing with Head XVI.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I would like to tell honourable members with regard to the item, Provisions, bread and sweet potatoes are part of the diet of the Prison. I have a note here which states that in December last year, the potatoes were inedible so that the giving of potatoes had to be suspended and bread was given to the prisoners in place. I am told that potatoes are now plentiful again and up to standard and form part of the diet again.

Mr. ALLDER: I was unable to hear the statement which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has just made. Under this Head "Prisons", the note to item 18 "Provisions" says that due to the shortage of potatoes (MEMBERS: No). It says that at one time bread had to be substituted for sweet potatoes. The note does not say whether potatoes were in short supply or not, but that is the only thing which one can presume. It shows some weakness in the policy of Government as regards local food production; everybody knows that potatoes are considered to be among the principal items in the diet of the prisoners. When bread has to be substituted for potatoes there is something wrong because bread does not give that bulk which sweet potatoes give; I say that bread should not be substituted as a principal item of food in preference to potatoes. I do not feel that potatoes are the best food, but inasmuch as they are among the principal items of food for the prisoners, when bread has to be substituted for them that shows that the present affairs are wrong. What is more, the substitution of bread for potatoes makes the running of the Institution more expensive and the results are not so great. I am saying it is time that the Government pay some attention to the honest treatment of human beings if they are incarcerated in a place where they have no freedom other than that which the authorities allow them, and which does not permit them to seek anything to eat if the authorities by their wicked policy, fail to keep a continuous supply of the necessary means of existence of these prisoners. Members of the Government should take the statements which are made on this side of the House more seriously.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to deal with the matter which is before us.

Mr. ALLDER: The policy is wrong; you should make sure that those human beings whose liberty is curtailed, do not go for one day without

the necessary amount of food to maintain them. Potatoes as compared with bread, are better for a principal item of diet. A pound of potatoes has more resistive power in them than a pound of bread because of the solid matter; an agricultural worker can do better work if he eats a few stewed potatoes than if he eats bread. The only person who does not know that is the hon. senior member for St. Joseph; if dumplings had been substituted for potatoes, they would have been more suitable as a diet for a hard-working man than bread. I feel that more attention should be paid to local food production since certain important items of foodstuffs are becoming very scarce today and food is not anything in respect of which you can wait until you want it and then plant it: it takes weeks or months and sometimes years to prepare for the production of food. It is now four years since the question of local food production has been raised in this hon. Chamber and up to now the Government has not embarked upon any bold policy whereby the population of this colony can get a continuous supply of food. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph may feel that the substitution of bread for potatoes is something great, but it has its ill effects, because flour is brought in from countries whose workers enjoy a higher standard of living than ours, so that the cost of a pound of flour is higher than that of a pound of potatoes. In order to make sure that you do not have to embark upon the policy of substituting bread for potatoes, you should see to it that you encourage a proper cultivation of the land, you make provision for a reasonable percentage of employment for the unemployed and you prevent the sending of large sums of money out of this colony for the subsidisation of labour in a country or countries whose standard of living is higher than that of our workers and who would not accept our workers. I hope that even although the Government bench pretends to disregard suggestions which are based on experience and the fact that this particular issue not only applies to the Prison but to the whole colony—I hope that some consideration will be given to the points I have made even although members of the Government try to pretend that these suggestions are not beneficial to their planning.

There is another point. I have noticed that during the present financial year provisions at Glendairy Prison cost \$26,000 and this supplementary provision will bring the cost to over \$32,000; but in the coming Estimates although the Government has the experience that the cost of these provisions in this financial year is \$32,000, yet they have estimated that for the coming year an amount of \$28,000 will be sufficient.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is travelling a little too fast; we have not got to the Estimates for the coming year yet.

Mr. ALLDER: What I have noticed is that in the last financial year provision was made for an amount of \$23,000 for this item; in the present financial year the Government inserted an amount of \$26,000 for the item and now this supplementary provision will add another \$6,250 to the amount. One must join with the honourable junior member for the City in his numerous expressions of caution as regards the making of estimates for the running of Government Departments: the Government already has the knowledge of what it takes to run their institutions and with the Financial Secretary and all the Assistant Secretaries they still bring down estimates which are not in keeping with a proper system of Government. They purposely underestimate the cost of running a department because

they know that they can do whatever they like and they can bring down a supplementary Resolution every other day, even in the face of objections by the honourable junior member for the City. Of course, this is all a waste of time but the honourable junior member for the City seems to have some influence in driving fear into the members of the Government Party.

The question that Head XVI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XVII—Government Industrial Schools

Head XVII—Government Industrial Schools—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XVII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would like to know from the Minister of Social Services if the Government will decide on having a Borstal Institution at Dodds. I have been discussing this matter with certain people who are interested in this matter which has become a problem with the various institutions concerned. I do not want to say very much on the question here, but I notify the honourable Minister of Social Services that I shall make a long dissertation on this matter when the Estimates are before us.

The question that Head XVII stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XX—Education

Head XX—Education—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: When I saw this supplementary vote for nutrition for Elementary School children, it occurred to my mind that this supplementary provision was required to carry out the scheme for the provision of a hot mid-day meal free to all those school children who are unable to pay for it, and to the extent of the Government's financial ability to pursue that policy. As you will recollect, Mr. Chairman, that was a plank in our platform at the last General Election and I would add that that policy is still being very enthusiastically looked forward to by the people of this country. The people of this country are hoping that with the inception of this Ministerial Government and the fact that this Government is being run by Barbadians for Barbadians, earnest attention will be given to that promise which we made in "Labour marches on," the necessity for providing a hot mid-day meal for those school children who are unable to pay for it, and to the extent of the Government's financial ability it will pursue that policy. I am disappointed that this supplementary provision was not in respect of a token for the implementation of that promise, but I will leave the matter to the Ministers because they will be untrammelled by anybody in their desire to provide a free hot mid-day meal for these school children to the extent of the financial ability of the Government to pursue such a policy.

The question that Head XX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXI—Science and Agriculture

Head XXI — Science and Agriculture—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXI stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Head XXIII (2)—General Hospital

Head XXIII (2)—General Hospital — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XXIII (2) stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to make a few comments as to the conditions existing at the General Hospital, conditions which, I think it is now being generally admitted, are becoming worse. The situation today has deteriorated to a point which would be almost unthinkable in the old days when the Institution was run by a Board. There seems to be little, if any, discipline in the place; people cannot get any treatment at all and, generally speaking, nobody seems to know who is the controlling Authority. I am not referring to the fact that on more than one occasion recently you have actually had people giving birth to children in beds occupied by other patients, although that is bad enough in itself; but what distresses me is that people are suffering all day and all night without getting any proper medical attention. It is common knowledge that recently a woman who was giving birth to a child in the middle of the night, died because the doctor refused to come to her when he was called by the nurse on three occasions. Only yesterday a boy who got one of his fingers crushed at one of the printing offices in the City, went to the Hospital at 8 o'clock in the morning and waited until 4 o'clock in the afternoon without getting any attention; he was not given any injection against tetanus until last night when somebody in the City telephoned the Hospital and insisted that he be given such an injection. The General Hospital is a place where the majority of people have to go for attention, and if the administration has broken down to the extent that the Institution is running itself, it is time to cry halt. It is not merely a question of congestion or lack of adequate space so as to deal properly with people who go to the Hospital, but an important Institution which deals with life or death is apparently running itself. Far be it from me to suggest that we should go back to the old days when Administrative Boards ran the Hospital, but it is either a question of the Minister of Social Services devoting more time to the Hospital or relieving himself of the responsibility and let us create a new authority for its control. We must not allow the present state of affairs to go on at an Institution on which we spend large sums of money every year; the entire administration is being rapidly reduced to a farce. For the money which we are spending on the Hospital we deserve a better standard of things and the taxpayers deserve better treatment.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The note to item 93 "Surgical Instruments & Equipment" says this:

"Due to the increase in the number of patients and the essential and unforeseen replacement of X-Ray Developing Unit, the amount of \$29,800 provided has proved insufficient. Supplementary provision of \$4,200 is required"

I envisage the hon. Minister for Social Services telling us that very shortly we will get a Report on

sion or a gratuity based on that service, then I am all for it. However, to just say that Government has received a signed affidavit from Mrs. Haynes to support her case, is not enough in my opinion, for Government to accept this as a principle. Government should be prepared to say whether it is going to accept this case as a principle whether any person in similar circumstances produces an affidavit or not. All the affidavit can mean is that the person was fortunate at the time to be working with some particular person at some particular part of the Service when they were erroneously given to understand that on marriage they had to resign. Sir, how many school-teachers can you get now to swear to such an affidavit? This is a matter of principle and I maintain that before this House agrees to this Bill, and before I can vote for it, the Government must be prepared to say that it is going to establish this case as a precedent and will give people who were under the same impression and in similar circumstances as Mrs. Haynes the same treatment.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, as far as I can glean from this matter, Mrs. Haynes was erroneously informed when she was in the Service at first that she would have to resign should she marry. It appears as if she did get married and sometime after her marriage, she rejoined the Service and then gave 25 years of continuous service and from such circumstances is entitled to receive a pension. But with regard to pension being computed on the first part of her service which was broken off, according to what the honourable member who has just sat down has said, it would be a matter of principle first, and then an obligation to personalities and everything else afterwards. The honourable member also drew to the knowledge of this Chamber the name of a Mrs. Skeete, who he states has a case in similar circumstances as Mrs. Haynes. I do agree with the honourable member that if you pass this Bill that you will have to pass many more because there are many a school teacher and many other persons who were in the Service somewhere that are going to come and knock at the door and ask that they be treated along similar lines as Mrs. Haynes as their cases are similar and you will have to open the flood gates widely. I know of many policemen and other persons who retired from the Service when their salary was small say that their pension is too small. Obviously, if anyone resigned anytime before 1940 their pension would not be worth much today.

This Bill is only a question of going beyond the provisions of the Pension Act to give Mrs. Haynes a pension on her service prior to 1925 on the higher scale. The question is whether we should correct the pension which she now enjoys and give her one based on the time she spent in the Service before in accordance with the Government's belief she erroneously left voluntarily. I personally do not think Government is morally bound to do so. I will be the last person to try to prevent any person from getting what is morally due to them but my attitude has always been that of a matter of principle first and then anything else afterwards. That is the way how I approach most matters. I would like to get some assurance in the matter. Certainly, Mrs. Haynes is entitled to a pension on the 25 years of her service in the Government after her marriage on the higher scale but I do not think that it will be any injustice if it is not computed on the time she spent in the Service prior to the marriage.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me after listening to the remarks of the last two honourable members that this Bill if passed will be creating

a precedent and I have always warned that we should be very careful when creating precedents. I however feel that if the honourable junior member for St. Peter were still on the Government Bench his remarks would be entirely different to what they were.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I object to those remarks.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: I counsel the honourable senior member for St. John to keep all such references relating to the honourable junior member for St. Peter out of his speech.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—There were things which many honourable members considered were more wrong than this that were sent down for consideration when the honourable junior member for St. Peter was on the Government Bench and the honourable member has always been . . .

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: Will the honourable member sit? I rule that the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. ALLDER: Nevertheless, Sir, I am much impressed by the points made by the honourable junior member for St. Peter and I want him to feel that I agree with what he said. I feel similarly to him. We should be reminded of the past history of the University College of the West Indies with its financial commitments that were demanded of us and of the other things which we committed ourselves to from time to time, and it is well known now that the total expenditure of the local Government towards the University College has assumed tremendous proportions within a short space of time.

I am saying that we should not create a precedent like this. I cannot remember a former case in which we have been so generous. I am throwing out the warning that we should be very careful how we approach this matter. As I am told, there are hundreds of former servants of Government who have been retired under similar circumstances and they have had to go into retirement without any consideration by Government. What is more, we should not allow ourselves to appear as if we are inclined to be partial to certain individuals however efficient they might have been as servants of the Government. We should not discriminate when it comes to considering cases of this sort. As I have said, I heartily support the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. If I may give an explanation to the remarks of what the honourable senior member for St. John said with reference to if I were still a member of the Executive Committee, I would say that I owed a collective responsibility to the Executive Committee when I was a member of that body; but I no longer owe that responsibility.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I know that honourable members will not take the remarks by the honourable junior member for St. Peter that he no longer owes a responsibility to the Executive Committee to be in any way sound and proper. As a matter of fact, the conventions are just to the reverse. I will say no more than that. To say that when you were in the Government you had a collective responsibility, you had to agree with all the others, but should the Government lose power or you be out of it, you then turn and say: "I never agreed with him," in whatever it might be, how can there be any sanctity of the oath of secrecy when I am a member of a body and am sworn to secrecy I accept collective responsibility and say I would reveal nothing but then when I cease to be a minister I can tell the whole world all that I said on that body?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I said when I was a member of the Executive Committee I owed collective responsibility to that body, but today I have no more responsibility to that body. That is what I said.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say this: I began by saying that this matter was hanging fire for some time. The Executive of which the honourable member was a member though it has since been slightly changed, was persuaded when the decision was taken with the honourable junior member for St. Peter as a member that the other writer to the affidavit would have to be a perjurer if it believed that Mrs. Haynes voluntarily resigned or else it must believe that Mrs. Haynes did not voluntarily resign but resigned erroneously through what she was given to understand.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What the honourable member is saying is not true. This decision was not taken with me as a member of the Executive Committee. The honourable member knows that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable junior member for St. Peter ceased to be a member of the Executive Committee on the 31st January this year.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I was in Costa Rica on that day.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have no desire to have any row with anybody. I will only say that if the bringing in that your oath of secrecy ceases when you cease to be a member of the Executive Committee, then it would be better if the paper on which it is written is torn up.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is to cease when you cease to be a member.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: A matter of this sort was actually discussed on the floor of the House of Commons. The House will pardon me for reminding them again that it is not a matter of whether a person is out of the island or not, or as long as you approve of the association of which you are a member, as long as you are bound to an association by oath, your oath of secrecy remains until death.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,

His Honour THE SPEAKER: I will have no more of this.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,

His Honour THE SPEAKER: The honourable member will sit. The honourable member is breaking the rules of this House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, The Government members of this House, that belong to the Executive, not now that some of them are ministers, in bringing this Bill down to the House said when looking over the affidavit, that it was proof that there was not, strictly speaking, voluntary resignation because the person who resigned had resigned under a mistaken impression. Is it not our duty in any single case in which it can be established that a person resigned, by not knowing that they were not obliged to resign, to bring down a similar Bill? How can this House dream that the Executive would not bring down a similar Bill for somebody else under similar circumstances?

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to tell the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that if he did not wish to believe somebody voluntarily or involuntarily resigned, it would be a very difficult case to prove. You can get somebody to sign an affidavit but if you do not wish to believe the affidavit, it would be very difficult to prove. Let us say that there is this prevailing opinion and Mrs. Haynes resigned from the Service as a result of this prevailing opinion and by certain information given, and this is the legal opinion that is given; what next person taking her case as a precedent would not quote it as law? Do you think that they would go through the same process as the first person?

They will say that a case is established where you understood because you were getting married that you had to leave the Service, therefore, you did not voluntarily resign. If you take this case as a logical conclusion, in any case that is brought after this, the person is going to say: "I am not going to be asked this question because it has been decided by the Government in the case of Mrs. Haynes. It would be stupid to bring it up."

Sir, to do justice, you cannot look for this affidavit from any other case that is brought to your attention. So long as the person can satisfactorily prove that they were under this impression, but they cannot find it in writing, this Government must make redress. I sincerely hope that it would be done and this Government would not open the individual to look around for an affidavit and things of that sort. It is known that the Government feels that it owes something to the people who work in the Income Tax Department. It will be remembered that that Department started not as a department of Government at all. Its Commissioners were of the old Hospital Board and the Highways and Transport Board. Later when the Government decided to take over the Income Tax Department, it had to pass bills to give pensions to the people who were working in it. Sir, what has also happened is that some of these people whom we have passed bills to give them better pensions have gone out of the Service and accepted better employment in private concerns. Some of them have gone out and advised people how to avoid income tax yet we are very diligent in putting together all these scraps of service which they put in with the Government. I am against people taking up employment after they have retired from the Government.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

It reads as follows:—

2. The Accountant General is hereby authorised and required to pay from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Marjorie Lee Haynes, formerly Inspector in the Department of Income Tax and Death Duties, a gratuity of eight hundred and twenty-nine dollars and fifty-cents, and during the term of her natural life pension at the rate of two hundred and forty-eight dollars and eighty-five cents per annum in equal monthly instalments as from the first day of February, 1953, in addition to any gratuity and pension to which she is at present entitled.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, Speaking on this Clause, I wish to point to the honourable Premier saying that the Executive is prepared to consider any subsequent cases similar to this. I do not want the statement: "prepared to consider" I want it to be clearly stated that similar cases would be given pension rights. I have quoted a similar case. What is the position today? If you leave this "prepared to consider" saying by the honourable Premier to the Government to consider, you have no authority that the Government will ever send down anything similar to the House. We have no authority that this precedent will be granted

to others. Sir, Mrs. Haynes has no right to this because a similar petition by Mrs. Skeete was refused. People have asked for this consideration before and the Government has refused to give them. Since Government has decided to give this consideration to Mrs. Haynes without stating anything that it is going to be established as a precedent, I am forced to vote against this Bill.

Sir, there is another aspect to this question. You are passing a Bill in which you are saying that Mrs. Haynes resigned on the erroneous idea that if she married she would have to resign the Service and that would also mean that it was illegal information. If this is so, what of the others who retired on their getting married prior to 1925? Are you going to consider the service that they put in before they retired? Surely, you are not going to ask them to get the dead to sign an affidavit for them. What about Mrs. Skeete who was teaching for the past 35 years and whose position is similar to that of Mrs. Haynes? Where can a woman in her position find somebody that could sign an affidavit for her? I think the honourable Premier as a matter of principle should postpone this matter for further consideration until the Government has given some consideration to those people who have gone out of the Service under a similar idea as Mrs. Haynes.

It is too vague just to say that you are prepared to consider any person who may send in a similar application. As I have said, Mrs. Haynes' case is not different from that of any other schoolmistress who has retired before. With regard to a person who wants similar consideration as Mrs. Haynes must be able to furnish an affidavit, I am saying that there is no principle in that. The principle must be that we have decided on this thing already and because we have decided on that, we will give this same consideration to others. We must give them the same consideration as we have given Mr. Douglas Haynes who worked for the Parochial Service before he worked for the Government. Sir, as the Objects and Reasons of this Bill is worded, any schoolmistress can come here and say that she retired from the service because she was erroneously given to understand that female Officers were required to retire from the public service on marriage. Anyone can use those words.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am making a speech on Clause 2 of this Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Clause 2 deals with gratuity and pension to Mrs. Haynes. It does not say anything of her marriage.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is exactly why Clause 2 is in the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is also mentioning a Mrs. Skeete. I do not see it in the Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: With due deference to Your Honour, I hope you are not trying to hinder discussion on this Bill. We are dealing with some person who has retired and are making provision to pay her a pension and I am not afraid to mention a name of some other person whom I think is entitled to the same consideration.

Sir, under the 1947 Pension Act, Mrs. Haynes would not be entitled to the gratuity and pension which is proposed under Clause 2 of this Bill. This is a special Bill to grant pension to Mrs. Haynes. Clause 2 of this Bill states specifically what that pension should be. I am saying that this Government has refused such consideration to people who

petitioned it under similar circumstances prior to Mrs. Haynes and one of the persons whose name I am not afraid to call is Mrs. Skeete. Mrs. Skeete retired from the Service under similar circumstances as Mrs. Haynes to marry a schoolmaster. Unless the honourable Premier is prepared to give every person retired under similar circumstances as Mrs. Haynes the same consideration, I am not prepared to vote for this Clause.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, it is absolutely immaterial to me how the honourable member votes on this question. I will only say that if any case comes before the Government in which a person under similar circumstances as Mrs. Haynes wishes to be granted the same consideration, obviously, the Government is bound by this precedent. I will however say this: suppose a case comes before Government in which a school mistress said; "I did not wish to resign, but I came out because I got married. I changed my mind and went back into the Service a few years afterwards. Inasmuch as I went back in after I got married, I am asking for the same consideration as Mrs. Haynes." If any person say that, could the Government dream of bringing down such a Bill? I have already given the House the undertaking which I repeat: If a case to give under similar circumstances comes before the Government, obviously, the Government is bound by this case as a precedent.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: I am very glad to hear the last statement by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. In my experience in the teaching service, I know that there were many female teachers who were under the impression that they would have to give up teaching on their getting married. It has been no fault of theirs that they have resigned; hundreds have been erroneously led to believe that it was a law and I do not think the Government has any means at its disposal to know the number. I do feel that the assurance must be given—and it has been given—that women in the teaching service and probably in other departments of the Government Service who left the Service on this erroneous idea and those who have re-entered the Service after having left under the same conditions would get their pensions computed in like manner as Mrs. Haynes. I will say again that it went down in me for several years that this mistaken idea was more than a law of the island. It was quite misleading.

Mr. Chairman, I consider this lady, Mrs. Haynes, is very lucky to get an affidavit because there are many people who would not have thought of getting an affidavit. I say again that I am glad to hear the last sentence which fell from the lips of the honourable Premier. I only hope that the honourable member's statement would not embarrass the Government. The Government is in duty bound to give persons under similar conditions as Mrs. Haynes this same consideration. The honourable Premier has pledged that the Government on future occasions, when matters of this sort come up—no question of an affidavit—this case will be taken as a precedent. If this Committee has no faith in the last words which the honourable Premier let fall from his lips, they would be in duty bound to vote against this Bill. I myself would vote against it, and I think I would be doing nothing wrong because I think this lady is rather fortunate in having a case brought before the Executive Committee and which has been given such very fair reception. I do believe that there are many people who retired from the public service under similar circumstances as this lady, but who never even dreamt that they could have got any consideration—affidavit or no affidavit. Mr.

Chairman, unless this is a precedent, I must vote against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support what His Honour the Speaker has said on this question. I was a bit worried on this matter in the light of what was the person's intention when they more or less resigned. Let me say that the Pension Act of 1947 is an administrative act; it is not a criminal act.

Section 8 of the Pension Act of 1947 states:—

"It shall be lawful for the Governor to require an officer to retire from the service of this Island—

(1) at any time after he attains the age of fifty-five years, or

(2) in special cases, with the approval of the Secretary of State at any time after he attains the age of fifty years, or

(3) in the case of a female officer, on marriage; and retirement shall be compulsory for every officer on attaining the age of sixty years."

Anybody doing anything voluntary means that the mind must be directed to the act. As far as I have heard, it does not seem to be anything like this at all in this instance. I feel that some statement should be made now, once and for all, so that females in the public service would know where they stand on this question of marriage while in the Service. As I have said, I am glad that the honourable Speaker has spoken in that vein because I have heard of some female teachers who have left the teaching Service after they got married because they thought they had to do so. I need not say that many of them would not be in the fortunate position as this lady to get an affidavit. As a result of this whole matter, I hope the Government would decide one way or the other over this question and let the few women who are in the Government Service know if they get married, what would happen. As I have said, my attitude to any question has always been that of a matter of principle first and anything else afterwards.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I agree with what has been said by His Honour the Speaker. I am not prepared at this juncture to say anything more than that I think it will be wiser for the Government to postpone this question on this Bill. I feel Government should make a statement of policy on this matter; it should not be taken on a vague pledge by the honourable Premier. I would say in passing that the assurance by the honourable Premier does not in itself create a pledge that if similar cases come before Government that the Government would consider them. We are not in the position to know of anything that may come before the Government. Everything that comes before the Government does not come before the House of Assembly. It does not necessarily mean that we will know when any private person may bring any such thing before the Government. I do think that it should be a broad statement of policy and I do not regard any responsible government should make any statement of policy unless it makes it in the normal and conventional manner. I consider a statement of policy as a White Paper. The honourable Premier cannot say offhand that this is the policy of the Government. If it is to be a policy of the Government, it must be gone into and made in the proper way.

This Clause gives money out of the Public Treasury. I am not against this lady getting a pension but I am prepared to say that if this lady gets a pension in this way that there should be amendments to the Pension Act of 1947 so that people who served in the Public Service prior to their getting married and leaving the Ser-

vice under similar conditions as this lady, would get a pension based on that service: This is a matter which affects the security of members of the Public Service. We feel if we pass this clause we are passing on the instruction to the Government that this is a matter of principal and that all cases similar to this will be brought down. The government should consider this matter, therefore I feel that there is no harm in postponing consideration of this until Government decides whether it will make this a matter of policy. It can do no harm to Mrs. Haynes if this matter is postponed. Mrs. Haynes' position to-day is one in which she is not waiting on this Bill to get a pension. Mrs. Haynes retired from the Public Service since the 31st January last year and had preretirement leave. She did not retire on the 31st January 1953; she retired since the 19th September 1952, so Mrs. Haynes would not be embarrassed by not receiving this money. She is entitled to receive a pension under the Pension Act 1947. If we do not pass this Bill this afternoon it makes no difference to her. Government should be prepared now and at all times not to make *ad-hoc* statements, but should be prepared to make statements of policy which would not only bind its members but would bind any other members who may become members of future governments. No minister of the Crown should commit the Government to a broad statement of policy. As a matter of fact they are not entitled under the conventions to do so. Any statement of policy must be a matter for the Executive Committee as a whole to decide. Unless this matter was discussed in the Executive Committee before, I maintain no harm can be done in postponing this particular section for a while. If you are going to say that you are prepared to do this should similar cases arise, that in itself would necessitate an amendment to the Pension Act. There is no point in making a broad statement like that without making an amendment to the Pension Act. I am not a lawyer; I am a layman. Of the 220,000 people in this island the majority are laymen; the lawyers cannot be counted on more than the fingers of one's hands. The little few that the lawyers are confined to the little narrow circle of the Law Society if such a society does function. Again I would say no harm would be done if we postpone this clause for a while. It is true someone may insinuate that I am saying so because I am not a member of Government. Whatever anyone may think does not matter to me. I am free now to discuss any issue that comes before this Chamber and in the way that it appeals to me. I owe no collective responsibility to any person.

Mr. LEWIS: The results of certain marriages might have prevented several females who formerly worked in the Service from re-entering and if the Government is to do justice, it should go through the lists of people who were formerly in the Public Service with the view of discovering how many women left under this impression. Sir, I do feel that the ones who are living should be entitled to some gratuity after the years that they have rendered to the Government. Even if it is five or six years, that they have put in, there should be found some method under which they could be given some gratuity. I do not think that you will get all cases on all-fours and I would counsel the Government not to let rejoining the Service be a condition for entitling one to receive this consideration.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I see the honourable senior member for St. John wants to say something, but before the honourable member speaks, allow me to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is no question of

general policy. The question of general policy has nothing to do with this case. I know personally of a case in which a person in the Government Service—I do not quite remember the Department but I think it was in the Colonial Secretary's Office—at the beginning of the last war, asked the question if should he get leave to go to the front and went, if he would be re-instated in the Service. He was told "No". He eventually resigned under that knowledge. He has not returned to the island, but if he came back should this Government bring his case down saying that under the circumstances this man was a former Civil Servant but left and went to the front. We are going to give him a pension although he was told that if he went, he would not get back his job. Should we ask you to decide: here was a man who risked his life for us all and as he has asked us to reconsider his case and give him a pension or gratuity for the former years that he was in the Service, we have come down here with a Bill to that effect. Would not that be absurd if the Government brought down such a Bill? Would any honourable member suggest that we pass such a Bill?

What does this Bill mean? It means that as soon as this lady resigned voluntarily, her case could not be dealt with administratively. Therefore, considering the circumstances under which she resigned, this Government feeling that a case had been made out, brought down this Bill to cover the particular case. I repeat, for the last time, the very bringing down of this Bill is proof that Government has established this particular case as a principle and that any other person who resigned under similar circumstances would be dealt with similarly. The Government is establishing the principle that it will consider cases where resignation was not technically voluntary as is this case where the lady voluntarily resigned but under a mistaken idea; therefore it was voluntary only in the sense that she wrote the letter of resignation. Sir, this lady went further. As far back as 1943, she pointed out that Mr. Loftly who was Colonial Treasurer, told her in front of others this thing. Under the circumstances, the Government says: "If we believe that Mr. Loftly told you this thing and that you did not voluntarily resign in the literal sense of the word, only in the legal, therefore, the only thing to do is to have a special bill sent down to the Legislature. Since Government has done this thing, I did not think it would need my giving any assurance that Government was establishing a principle that if cases of a similar circumstance come up for consideration that the persons would be entitled to the same consideration. I repeat Government will bring down any subsequent case which is on all fours with this one. You must bind yourself when you do a thing like this. Let me say that all cases may not be on all fours with this one. Suppose a female school teacher was about to get married, but because she was tired of school teaching she gave it up at the time. Would you say that person is entitled to a pension?

Sir, I hope I have made it as clear as any human being can understand. This case has established a principle that persons who only technically resigned voluntarily, that is they resigned voluntarily under a misapprehension, are entitled morally to this same consideration and this Government by means of a Bill will legally do it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable Premier has taken the promise which he has just made seriously. I am going to say this . . .

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am making a formal objection to the remarks by the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable Premier said

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member is making offensive remarks to which I am objecting. He is suggesting that I made a promise that I do not intend to keep. I object to that.

Mr. ALLDER: I am wondering if the honourable Premier is quite serious. I asked the honourable member whether he has taken seriously the promise which he has held out to this Committee. I would like to know that because it does appear as if, for the sake of stopping temporarily dissension in the ranks of his party and to ensure a safe passage of this Bill that the honourable Premier has extended the scope of the pension scheme and this might have serious financial implications in the future.

Sir, the honourable Premier does things which in my opinion are purely for the purpose of successfully getting anything pass this Chamber. It is known that the honourable member will do something which he even might have to retract. He would go as far as making this statement of promise. But what I am more against is that the statement of promise which the honourable Premier has just made, may cause many retired Government servants to feel that they are within the ambit of the pension scheme and therefore, they can come back and be treated as generously as this lady is about to be treated. This is where the difficulty comes in. The question is whether the honourable Premier should take on the responsibility of committing the Government to the paying out of large sums of money which might be the result if this demand is met. I personally do not agree in making the pension scheme so attractive as to drive many Government Servants from their jobs into early retirement. For the past couple of years, every other month, we have been getting Government servants sending in their resignations because the widening of the pension scheme has permitted it. The pension scheme as it now stands, permits a Government servant to retire when a certain age limit has been reached although he can go on working for another five or ten years before he reaches the compulsory retiring age limit. As a result, most of the Government high-salaried officers have been running away from their jobs at the permissible retiring age and drawing two-thirds of their salary as pension and then taking employment outside of the Government. Sometimes, the jobs which they do outside clash with the policy of Government. I think all this is wrong and I will say again that I am firmly of the opinion that the Honourable Premier made this promise because the honourable junior member for St. Peter raised an objection, and quite rightly so. The object was also upheld by His Honour the Speaker. Mr. Chairman, what is the sense of trying to appease the minds of two honourable members to commit the colony to something greater than its financial position affords it to meet.

(A VOICE: You should do justice to Government servants.)

What does the honourable member know of doing justice to Government servants? The question is that while the difficulty of this amendment to the pension scheme may not be felt at this time, in the future when it may be felt, it may be too late to amend anything which the honourable Premier has done to-day.

Sir, I cannot see why on such a frivolous pretext this Committee should be influenced to agree to the extension of this pension scheme. This voluntary resignation through a mistaken idea is not limited to one individual or two. It involves hundreds of individuals and the more individuals it involves, the more money would have to be drawn

from the Treasury to pay them a gratuity and a pension. If such things are permitted to continue, I wonder what would be the outcome of the colony. Everybody knows that the public is crying out over this burden of taxation for these frivolous things.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think I have given the honourable member sufficient latitude in speaking on this clause. The honourable member has strayed as far as to be bringing in the public. I do not see at all what the public has to do in dealing with Clause 2 of this Bill.

Mr. ALLDER: I am sorry that it does not appear as if I am speaking on Clause 2. I was saying that the public....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again asking the honourable member to deal with Clause 2 of this Bill.

Mr. ALLDER: In dealing with Clause 2 other honourable members have been allowed to talk about many irrelevant things.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again asking the honourable member to deal with Clause 2. Do not tell me about what other honourable members have been allowed to do.

Mr. ALLDER: I was saying, Sir, that while the principle in this woman's case might appear to be good, on further analysis it does appear that we should not establish it as a precedent. The honourable Premier has admitted that it is a precedent and that he is willing to grant similar consideration to other cases which are justified. I am trying to point out the difficulty if we agree to this decision. I have in mind the discrimination which this statement of policy places against those who have had to retire under similar conditions and I also have in mind the many dangers which might be the outcome to this colony as a result of those teachers who have left the colony to do service during the last war. At that time it was very difficult for those teachers—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Again, I must stop the honourable member. Are you now making a second reading speech?

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Clause 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to sit here and allow the honourable member to stray in his remarks from pillar to post.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking under Clause 2. You will see that clause involves a certain amount of money which will come out of the Public Treasury. Clause 2 reads as follows:—

“The Accountant General is hereby authorised and required to pay from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Marjorie Lee Haynes, formerly Inspector in the Department of Income Tax and Death Duties, a gratuity of eight hundred and twenty-nine dollars and fifty cents, and during the term of her natural life pension at the rate of two hundred and forty-eight dollars and eighty-five cents per annum in equal monthly instalments as from the first day of February, 1953, in addition to any gratuity and pension to which she is at present entitled.”

I presume, Mr. Chairman, that you will agree with me that this clause implicates a financial burden on the colony. Having the interest of the taxpayers at heart, I am pledged to express my feelings on what I believe is the feeling of thousands of taxpayers who cannot come here to say the things which they would want to say. Therefore,—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member should have said all that he is saying now on the second reading of the Bill. I will tell the

honourable member that Clause 2 deals with the granting of a gratuity and pension to Marjorie Lee Haynes. Do keep to that. You can talk on that point until morning and I will say nothing.

Mr. ALLDER: I am keeping to that point, Mr. Chairman. I am observing that the granting of this gratuity and pension is a wrong step, and to create a precedent as this Bill seeks to do is something which should not be indulged in at this time.

(A VOICE: Again, the honourable member is making a second reading speech.)

I am saying, Sir, that the case is one which because it will create a precedent I feel would—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do deal with Clause 2. If the honourable member is not in agreement with the Clause, move an amendment to it. If the honourable member is not desirous of retiring to bed, I have one and would like to rest in it before dawn.

Mr. ALLDER: I think Your Honour's sarcasms are unnecessary.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There is one thing this Committee must realise and that is, this is a democratic country and in any democratic country there is freedom of speech. It is no use my going to St. Peter and you, Mr. Chairman, going to St. Joseph and asking the people to vote for us and when they do so and come in here, we are prevented from debating the problems which are before us. Debating a question is the essence of democracy. What I would admit now is that with all that has been said against this clause, I doubt whether it has any effect on the people responsible for it. However, I do not want to embarrass the Government now; I would like to support it in a measure like this. It must be borne in mind that some things which are done are things which we do not agree with, but we do not have the guts to let other people know that we do not agree with them.

(A VOICE: That is a rash statement to make).

It may be a rash statement to make, but it is true.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, You will forgive me if I say that you are again giving some latitude to the honourable junior member for St. Peter, and it makes me feel that you were trying to thwart me in my remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What latitude am I giving the honourable junior member for St. Peter?

Mr. ALLDER: You will observe that the honourable member has mentioned—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the honourable member to sit. You are out of order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, what I want to suggest is this: This Bill—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not the Bill, but Clause 2, stick to that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am dealing with the postponement of Clause 2. You will remember that the honourable Premier said there was no need to make a statement of policy on this matter that what was in this clause represented a policy. What are the terms in this clause?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is going back to “statement of policy.” I do not want to hear anything more on that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I know Your Honour does not want to hear certain things.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am ruling that out now.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: But I am dealing with Clause 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with what the honourable Premier said.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am going to challenge that remark. If you think I have no right to make

that statement, you can call His Honour the Speaker to determine it. I am quite prepared to wait until you call Mr. Speaker.

The honourable Premier said that to make a statement of policy on that would be similar to the making of a policy on giving war pensions to people who had joined the Service after the war had ended.

comes to this, Mr. Chairman. This is what the Government has decided to send down; this is not an enactment; this is nothing under the Pension Act; if it were, it would not be here. The mere fact that it is something on which the Government has to make a decision is the reason why this Bill is here. The honourable Premier is a lawyer and in that position he is better able than you or I to speak on the finer points in this Bill. From my viewpoint as a layman, there is nothing in this Bill to make this Government decide that if this Bill is passed, they will send down another Bill to give Mrs. Tom Jones that has retired from the public service to marry or Mrs. John Brown, who has also done the same thing, treatment similar to what it is giving to Mrs. Majorie Lee Haynes. The five ministers would have to decide on those cases again; the Crown Law Officers cannot make them decide as they have done in this case. This is a Bill which the Government decided that they should bring down in view of all the circumstances connected with the person to whom it concerns. If the Government believes that the circumstances connected with somebody else are not on par with this, it is not supposed to bring down any measure; that is to say, if another lady has not done what this lady has done, the Government is not obliged to bring down a similar Bill to this. Let me say again that I know of a case similar to this. It is that of Mrs. Skeete who now resides in the parish of Christ Church in this island. Her husband was a former headmaster of St. Mark's Boys' School and she has a stepson who is the Headmaster of the Boys' Foundation School. I can tell honourable members that she brought a similar case to this to Government and she was refused consideration. I do not want to make any invidious comparisons, but it may be because she was not *persona grata* with every member of the Executive or because she was not able to get an affidavit like Mrs. Haynes.

Mr. Chairman, You as Chairman of Committees, are a guardian of our democratic rights and if you feel like challenging the democratic rights which should be mine, you can do so. You must realise that this House of Assembly is no state committee that is called on to decide on the Majorie Lee Haynes Pension Bill. Not very long ago, this House passed a Bill to give a pension to a Mr. King who worked with the Highway Commissioners of St. Michael for a very long time and then with the Central Road Board, and it will be remembered that his application for a pension was refused to be considered because of the ruling of a former Speaker. Therefore, if you are going to say that because the Government has brought down this Bill to give Mrs. Haynes a pension that it is obliged to bring down bills for every school mistress that resigned erroneously, you are entirely wrong.

I am saying again that the honourable Premier knows better than I do that this Bill creates a precedent and if it is a statement of the policy of the Government, the better way to carry it out would be by making an amendment to the Pension Act, 1947. You cannot in the face of that Act say you are going to ignore it and do something. You must do something within the provisions of the Act. It is unfortunate that this House has to discuss this matter as it has done because it can be very embarrassing to honourable members. It is embarrass-

ing because this is a small island and we are dealing with middleclass people. As I have said already, I have been made to understand that Mrs. Haynes was one of the most efficient officers of the Government therefore nothing I have said has been made with the object of protesting against this lady getting a better pension. I do not know her personally. What I have said has been said as a means of assisting the Government from hastily doing something which would not pay it to do. There are many people in like position as this lady. As a matter of fact, Government has not yet stated its policy on all those persons who are eligible for war service pensions. I am not asking at this stage that similar consideration should be given to Mrs. Skeete because I am aware that her case has already been refused and I know it would be embarrassing to members of the Government. The honourable Premier is aware of all these anomalies that exist and that is why I personally regret that the honourable member is forcing this through.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I give the assurance that if the Government breaks its promise in this matter that Government would be departing from its policy and honourable members would be utter fools if they did not pass a vote of "no confidence" against the Government.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

PREMIER APPOINTED TO COMMITTEE TO REPLY TO MESSAGE NO. 6.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, At the last meeting of this House a Select Committee was appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's Message, No 6/1954 relating to fire protection for the City of Bridgetown. I am asking leave that Your Honour do now include the name of the honourable Premier on that Select Committee.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member and Mr. SPEAKER included the name of the honourable Premier.

FIXING OF ORDER PAPER AND ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: In fixing the Order Paper for the next meeting of the House, I am asking that Item No. 1 should be the motion under the name of the honourable Premier: To move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with the two resolutions of which notice has been given earlier. I also wish to remind honourable members that Government intends proceeding with the Estimates for 1954-55 on Tuesday next, and is setting down that as Order No. 2. The four Bills standing in the name of the honourable Premier, of which notice was given earlier should be set down as Items 3, 4, 5 and 6 respectively.

With that, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I want to say here now that it is not fair to ask honourable members to come here next Tuesday to deal with the

Estimates for 1954-55. As you know, these Estimates were being considered by the Executive for several months. I want to raise objection to the consideration of them next Tuesday as I want a longer time to go through them. Sir, how can the Government push such an important item as Estimates in honourable members' hands today and ask them to come back here next Tuesday to deal with them intelligently when Government knows that it has taken four months to deal with the draft? We have to preserve this Chamber from being a Fascist Grand Council. This is not a parliament where members are called upon to agree to something without giving them the right and opportunity to express their opinions on the matter. The Government has been dealing with this matter not for a week or two but for months and is now asking honourable members to come here next Tuesday and make a speech on them. I work for my living, and I do not mind what anybody might say in respect of my objecting because I am not a member of Government, I must say that to push Estimates in your hand to decide in a week is not fair and it is not done in Great Britain. Sir, you will reduce this island to a pure dictatorship when you persist in doing this sort of thing.

We must not run this House to suit the performances of an individual. I know what is behind this. We must not allow this parliament to be subordinated to the wishes of the Leader of this House. By honesty and justice, you will prevail. I ask: Has the honourable Premier discussed this important matter yet with members of his party? This is no Fascist Grand Council. If this Chamber is a Fascist Grand Council, it must come to an end.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker allow me to say a few words. I am going to act in the role of a mediator on what is to my mind a burning and cardinal question. I am throwing it out as a hint to the honourable Premier. He must try to treat every honourable member in his party as a man. Already, the Government has found itself in some difficulty. It is not for the sake that the honourable Premier has not been warned. He can remedy the situation. If it is not remedied within the next three months, it is going to bring about more difficulty with the Government and it will serve the honourable Premier and the honourable Minister for Social Services right.

I do agree that this House should discuss the Estimates so that the Other Place would also get sufficient time to discuss them, but honourable members of this House should also get sufficient time to consider them because it is our responsibility. I have heard that the honourable Premier wants to go to Geneva during the month and because of that, he wants these Estimates passed before he leaves. Things in this House should not be done to suit the dictates of other people. The Estimates Committee met from November last to consider these Estimates and it took them until the early part of this month to complete them. I was hoping to devote a whole week to these Estimates but if I do that, I will be unable to do anything else if consideration must begin next Tuesday. I think it is impossible even in that time to go through them thoroughly. Human nature being what it is, you cannot expect to ask another

person for his co-operation to-day and because you get it, you go on and on to abuse it. The other person must resent it in the course of time. I am making that one passionate appeal to the members of the Government. In these Estimates, there might be several issues to question. The question of pensions may be one and I do not see how it is possible with a copy of them just being put into honourable members' hands to expect them to consider them thoroughly in one week.

I throw it out to the Government that if they find themselves in some difficulty, it would not be a question of their not having been warned. On the question of telling the public that one is insincere to the Party—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will not speak on that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I know the innuendos which will go around.

Mr. ADAMS: I have already stated in this House that if at any time my departure from this island as far as Trinidad would hurt the good government of the island or cause me to neglect my responsibility—just as I did not go to Geneva on one occasion because of the Domestic Sugar Agreement—I do not need to tell the people of Barbados that I would not put going anywhere before my duties in this island. We lived on threats when some people were still at school; when the honourable junior member for St. Peter suggested that when he was in the Government, there was a democratic Government but now it is a grand Council, I will remind the House that on the 19th February last year the Executive Committee approved of the Estimates, they were laid in the General Assembly on the 24th February and we passed them within a week. The 18th and the 23rd of February, 1954, is the same as the 19th and the 24th of February, 1953; we finished the Estimates last year on the 9th March because the members of the Other Place have been saying for years that it is not fair to send up the Estimates to them just before the end of March.

I took the trouble to look up the practice in the House of Commons and within a week of Sir Stafford Cripps bringing forward the Estimates they were debated. Sometimes when you come to deal with the Estimates the debate may be prolonged but as soon as the Budget is presented the debate takes place there and then. As soon as the Chancellor of the Exchequer sits down, the Leader of the Opposition gets up and replies and the back-benchers debate there and then. To say that it is extraordinary for us to lay the Estimates in one week and discuss them in the following week is just nonsense. Honourable members will have had a week's notice of what the Budget Speech will be because the Estimates are in their hands. Far from suggesting that we are rushing something when it is not rushed in England, the reverse is true; they have not got what we have in Barbados. As regards our getting into hot water, we live in hot water.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.