THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 9th March, 1954.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., (*Premier*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. Cox, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade Industry and Labour*), Messrs. F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, J. C. MOTTLEY, E. ST. HOLDER, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), and L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 19th and 26th January, 1954, respectively, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

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

PAPERS LAID

Papers were laid as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX: Statements of Post Office Advances for Payment of Money Orders to 30th September, 31st October and 30th November, 1953.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1954.

Mrs. BOURNE and Mr. SMITH entered the House and took their seats.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. M. E. COX: Bill to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make regulations for controlling certain areas of the public wharves and highways adjacent thereto and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1949.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of $344 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54 Part 1—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1953-54 No. 44, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution in connection with refund of Customs Duty to the Board of Poor Law Guardians of St. Michael.

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

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make regulations for controlling certain areas of the public wharves and highways adjacent thereto and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, was read first time.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949, was read a first time.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES FOR 1954—55

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Estimates for the financial year, 1954—55.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates for the financial year, 1954—55, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

HEAD I—GOVERNOR

Head I—Governor—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head I stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is well apprised of the fact that honourable members would like to know why, since a State Car has been given to the Governor of this colony, we should still provide the travelling allowance. Last year we put in the item "Upkeep of Car" and the honourable member

assured us that on the purchase of this State Car, the travelling allowance would be cut out of the Estimates. I would like to know if the honourable member can explain why both the items "Upkeep of Car" and "Travelling Allowance" are in the Estimates on this occasion. I think an explanation is necessary.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Unfortunately, the debates are not up to date and we cannot get the official debate, but I could not have given honourable members such an undertaking. Last year we came down to the House for a new car and travelling allowance and it would be difficult to see how we could have done that and give an undertaking that we did not want travelling allowance when we asked for it. The Governor has to travel and therefore he gets travelling allowance. I repeat; I am sorry that the debates are not up to date and I cannot take up an "Official Gazette" and quote what I did say; but I could not have given such an assurance. The ownership of a car by an individual in the Civil Establishment could have no bearing on travelling allowance; this travelling allowance is the ordinary travelling allowance to which any Civil Servant who has to travel on Government business is entitled. He either comes within the schedule for the payment of travelling allowance or, in the case of the Governor, he comes under the Governor's vote: the use of his own car is utterly immaterial in the matter of travelling allowance.

Messrs. HAYNES, VAUGHAN and E. D. MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took their seats.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to recount exactly what took place. The Estimates came to us last year without the item "Upkeep of car" in them and since we were providing this car, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph introduced the item "Upkeep of car". We were told that since you expect to get a car during the year you would provide for the upkeep of the car; but niether the car nor the upkeep of it was put in the Estimates as printed. The honourable member said that not only would the travelling allowance be taken out this year but it would be stopped during the year when the car arrived. The honourable member knows that the item "Travelling Allowance" is a recent addition to this Head; the upkeep of the car and the price of the car were put into the Estimates during the consideration of this Head last year. I am not arguing that the travelling allowance should come out or not; the fact remains that last year the honourable member said he would put in the price of the car and the upkeep of the car and the travelling allowance would be stopped on the arrival of the car. Now we find that all three of the items are in the Estimates; we provide the car, we give travelling allowance and we must pay for the upkeep of the car as well. If this is a case in which the honourable member feels that the salary of the Governor has not been increased in recent years and he would like him to get $870 more by way of travelling allowance, the best thing to do is to say so; but in the light of what took place we have been given inconsistent explanations. We are now burdened with all these things.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am speaking for the last time. Item 19 "Upkeep of car" is purely for maintaining this car in good condition and to cover the monthly check by the Department of Highways and Transport and insurance. That is nothing to do with the everyday gasolene and oil. I am sorry I have not got the "Official Gazette" with the debate but it is utterly inconceivable that I could have said that we will stop the travelling allowance when we get this car; you want travelling allowance when you have a car. This travelling allowance is the same as that to which any other Civil Servant is entitled if he is using a car whether it is his own private property or the property of the Government; the gasolene and oil consumption is the travelling allowance. The Department of Highways and Transport check Government vehicles as well as this State car; they check every month and item 19 covers that; but if any real mechanical fault appeared it is not intended to cover that. I cannot say anything more; travelling allowance is travelling allowance which anybody gets for gasolene, wear and tear, oil and so on. Before I sit down, I am asking leave to delete item 22 "Office Equipment, $115" because since these Estimates were made up the stuff has arrived and it has been paid for.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I know that the honourable member is in an awkward position. I would like to know how long has the Governor been using a car and how long has the travelling allowance been put in the Estimates? If the two things should go together, why was the travelling allowance only given within recent years? The honourable member is now bringing up some new theory to explain what he has got caught with.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I recall that when we voted for the provision of the car we were given the impression that we would not have to give any travelling allowance. I am sure about that. Speaking for myself, it looks to me that when you give a car you give gasolene. Whatever the Premier might say today, I recall well that we were given the impression that with the provision of the car we would not give any travelling allowance; but if you give a car you have to put gasolene in it. This item "Travelling Allowance" should not have been put in here at all. I am not opposing the amount of money; I am opposing this item being called travelling allowance. It strikes me that if a car has been provided at all, you must give a gasolene allowance; that is what this item should have been.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I accept that suggestion because that is exactly what this item is intended for. I will change it to "Gasolene and Oil Allowance."

Mr. MILLER: I am asking the Premier whether he would be willing to add to the cost of this Head by bringing about an immediate end to the use of prisoners at Government House. I think we have reached the stage where the use of prisoners at Government House is unpleasant and undignified. I do not think that is wanted.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I might agree with the honourable member but I would suggest to him that he bring up the matter under another Head. Sometimes I feel that this should not be so and sometimes I feel differently; but I think the matter should be raised under another Head.

Mr. MILLER: I hope that the matter will be considered, but it will certainly entail an increase under this Head since you will have to pay for the gardeners. I hope the honourable member will give an assurance that he will increase the amount under this Head rather than cause that unpleasant atmosphere which honourable members see and feel. I do not think we should give a bad impression to visitors to Government House who happen to see these people.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that there has been some change in this matter under the item "Unestablished Staff."

Mr. MILLER: Only two hours ago some honourable members would bear evidence to the fact

that regardless of any change in the Estimates, prisoners were still working at Government House. This is the fifth time for the year that I have been making this request in respect of the prisoners.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member had the Estimates in his hands longer than today and he could see that the item "Unestablished Staff" has been increased and that gardeners have been included there.

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

HEAD II — SECRETARIAT

Head II—Secretariat—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head II stand part.

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

HEAD III — ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head III—Accountant General—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head III stand part.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: In connection with item 13, "Travelling Expenses", last year we questioned this matter and I think we should question it again. The amount of this item is $100 and the note says: "Provision for travelling expenses of Accountant General and staff on Departmental duties." I am wondering whether this item should be left in the Estimates; I think it is a recent addition in recent years. If the Premier can tell us about the travelling in respect of this Department, we should be glad to hear.

Messrs BARROW and F. L. WALCOTT came into the Committee and took their seats.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Accountant General has to travel to the country periodically and make checks at Seawell and the Agricultural Stations. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY. The Auditor General). When the office of Accountant General was established, the Accountant General undertook the duties of checking periodically; from the time we had an Accountant General he has been making checks at these places. He insists that he himself should go unexpectedly and visit these places and that is the only effective way of checking up at these places.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Charlton wanted some money to run around with and he was just a nuisance; he went around and met people who allowed him to check the cash. He went into the Treasury on a Bank Holiday and he had to make an explanation as to why he went there. This going around and checking of cash by the Accountant General is an encroachment on the duties of the Auditor General of the colony; if the Accountant General is checking the books, that is all right, but you cannot have two people checking the cash. So far as the duties of the Accountant General are defined in the Act, he would have to institute a new system of bookkeeping: and if he sees that the books are being kept, that is all right; but it is the Auditor General's job to go wherever money is kept and check the cash and the books as well. It would be an untenable position for the Auditor General to have some other Head of a Department going around and making this check; it is inconsistent with the correct attitude towards this matter. Let the Accountant General stick to his duties.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Neither the Government nor the Auditor General agrees with the honourable member who has just spoken.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not mind who agrees with the honourable member. I said last year that the Colonial Secretary should have travelling allowance if he had to go to District "F" and call for the books or cash and check them. I am sorry to hear that the Auditor General has become so stupid as not to agree with us and agree with the Government. I think that the least said in connection with this matter is the better; I am going to move that this item "Travelling Expenses, $100" be deleted. Last year the Government did not agree with the Opposition, but sometimes when you do not agree with the Opposition you should try to convince them at least about a matter. If the Government can give the real reason for this expenditure then I would say that this Officer should be given travelling allowance just as anybody else is given under the Act. If you just say that this $100 is for the travelling expenses of this Officer, I will just say that merely because an officer says something and the Government agrees with it, it is not necessary for honourable members to agree with it. I beg to move that this item be deleted.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As a Government we not only have to go on what the House has approved of before, but we also have to act according to the best information and advice we have as to the organisation of the Civil Service. We have been informed and we are convinced that it serves a useful purpose for the Accountant General to do what he does at present; we have come down to the House with this matter and the House approved of it in spite of objections. But what is the Government's position? The majority of the House agree with the Government and the expert tells the Government that it is right; there is no complaint where the Officers are concerned and we are asked today to drop this matter merely because the two honourable members for the City object to it! There was a time when there were certain officers who had to travel occasionally and they were allowed travelling expenses under the ordinary travelling allowance rate. You hired a car from Johnson's Garage and that was paid for; it was spasmodic. I repeat that if we are advised that it is expedient for the Accountant General to make these periodical checks and there is no objection raised that somebody is doing something which duplicates somebody else's work, what is the Government to do but put this item in the Estimates? I appeal to honourable members to show us when we are wrong, but we are not wrong in this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: If you refer to the Act you will see that there are certain duties which the Accountant General has to perform and the Governor-in-Executive Committee has to impose other duties. If the Government has asked the Accountant General to go around and see that a certain system of bookkeeping and accounts is being kept up to date, I do not think the House would object to that; if you say that he is the Accountant General and he is looking after the accounts, that is all right; but when you say that he has to check cash as well—the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has just said so, and that is what the Accountant General has done.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I said so, that is a slip; I have not heard that the Accountant General is checking the cash. I cannot say whether he checks the cash or not; what I did say was that whatever checking the Accountant General does is not objected to by the Auditor as interfering with his duties. The Governor-in-Executive Committee always leaves the Auditor General to himself; we used to make sure that no money is spent willy-nilly; if the Auditor General felt that you are doing something which

you should not do he would have to inform the Government about it.

Mr. LEWIS: It would have been better for the honourable member to say at the beginning that he does not know what the Accountant General does when he goes around; if the Accountant General is checking the cash and the Auditor General agrees with that, he is wrong in doing so, because the officers in the country would not know who has to check the cash. The Accountant General should see that the accounting system is kept up to date, but not check the cash because that is a dangerous thing. The next thing is that we should make a distinction between travelling allowance and travelling expenses; what we have here should be travelling allowance and what we had just now should have been travelling expenses. Travelling allowance is to be paid according to a scale or the honourable member has got caught there again.

As regards item 14 "Furniture, $400", I think it is performing a miracle to purchase a desk, chairs and filing and storage cabinets with $400. That is a marvellous thing and I must certainly congratulate the Government or the Accountant General on getting these items for $400. I am wondering if in respect of other Heads we can insist on their doing the same thing. Last year they only asked for $200 and I have the word "joke" written against it; even the increase makes it a joke.

Mr. BARROW: On the last occasion the Government asked for travelling expenses for the Accountant General—the departed Mr. Charlton—the amount asked for was $50 a month. To the best of my recollection that is the amount which the Government required at that time and which they attempted to explain away. Both the honourable members for the City and I adopted the attitude that it was only the thin end of the wedge and that the next thing which would happen would be that they would be giving him a motor car. Since then apparently the new Accountant General or the person holding the office, considers that $100 would be sufficient whereas $600 was the amount demanded before. If the Government were always well advised it seems to me that there would not have been such a great disparity between the two amounts and it is not good enough for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to tell us that they have been well advised because——

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Where does the honourable member get this $600 from? In the year before and last year the amount was $100 the same as it is this year.

Mr. BARROW: If the honourable member would check back he would find that they did come to this House for an allowance of $50 a month for the Accountant General. Unlike the members of the Administration who advise the Government, I myself am not infallible, but I notice that the Premier and the Ministers have moved over to positions formerly occupied by members of my Party————

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the honourable member keep away from that.

Mr. BARROW: It all concerns this item.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Keep to the items under Head III of the Estimates.

Mr. BARROW: Now that the Premier and the Ministers have swung further to the right I thought that they would have been imbued with the wisdom which emanated from colleagues and myself, but apparently, that has not been the case. To tell the House that they have been well advised means that we must accept everything which has been put in the Estimates; I thought the Premier would have said that they have examined the matter themselves and they are in a position to give the facts. I must join issue with the Government on the matter of the Accountant General, whose duties do not normally call for travelling, asking for an allowance which he could use *carte blanche* whenever he feels disposed to go into the country allegedly on business or to take a drive. It is not normally within the province of the Accountant General to go around the country and examine, we do not know what, because the honourable senior member for St. Joseph cannot tell us what the Accountant General is going to examine. I think that that is usurping the functions of the Auditor General, except we are setting up an elaborate spy system in the Civil Service where we have one Head of a Department spying on the other to see if he is doing his job properly. I do not think we should encourage Heads of Departments to think that at any time they allocate certain functions to themselves we will necessarily approve of it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I need not go further than 1952—53 when we asked for the sum of $100 and it was granted. The Accountant General has been going to Departments to see that proper accounting and the custody of Government funds have been carried out, and in addition clerks who draw money from the banks are told that they should get a taxi rather than walk. That is a part of these travelling expenses. I have no information as to the actual checking of cash by the Accountant General, but he goes goes to Departments to see that proper accounting is done and that the custody of Government funds is such as, normally, speaking, is not likely to lead to a leakage of Government funds.

The question that item 13 be deleted was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. HAYNES, E. K. WALCOTT, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—4.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, BARROW, LEWIS, MILLER, WILLIAMS, F. L. WALCOTT, BRANCKER, C. C. MOTTLEY and VAUGHAN—16.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the criticisms which have been made as to furnishing have been carefully gone into and I must say that honourable members who may have had the misfortune to see about furnishing must realise how comparatively expensive it is to furnish. The question of giving jobs to one person or a couple of people has been carefully gone into, the accusations made in some previous debate about furnishing have been kept in mind by the Government and it is not accurate to say that some favourite gets the money. As regards item 14, the desk costs $230, the chairs $82 and the cabinets, $88. If honourable members want more information I can give them privately, as to the different people whom we have approached and the figures which we have been given; the Government is perfectly satisfied that, with the cost of labour and mahogany being what it is, these figures could only be improved upon if you make the furniture out of fir or birch.

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

HEAD IV—AUDITOR GENERAL

Head IV—Auditor General—was called.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS: Some time during the current financial year I think questions were asked about the holding up of certain work and there was the inclination to blame the Auditor General's Department for it. I heard from an outside source that there was no such state of affairs and I am wondering if the honourable member who asked the questions would not take the opportunity of saying whether he was wrong or not, or that the number of clerks there be increased. I think the questions were in respect of pay sheets for the teachers; if this Department has too many people or too few people in it, this is the opportunity for honourable members to say so. We have the opportunity of reviewing the whole Civil Establishment now so do not let us sit down quietly and give the impression that we are perfectly satisfied, and then raise grievances either real or imaginary afterwards. I think that some statement should be made in connection with this matter: I am informed that it was not the fault of this Department that the backpay was kept back. If this Department is doing a good job it should be defended.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have not had the time to go, as thoroughly as I should like to go, into the working of the Auditor General's Department. The Report of Mr. Foster so far is pretty exhaustive. What was said about the backpay was that it was physically impossible to do the work any faster; it was not suggested that the Auditor General's office was slackening. As far as the Government is concerned, there is no thought that this office could have done better and did not do any better. We have continued for years without any Organisation Officer telling us how things might be speeded up and things like this might happen where extra work is thrown on an office.

Mr. GODDARD: These questions were asked by me on behalf of the teachers who wanted their money and they could not get it; I do not know if they have got it yet. Christmas was coming on and I was told that the Department of Education had worked out the amounts and sent them to the Auditor General's Office and the matter was resting in that Office for somebody to apply his attention to it. I was told that the teachers could not get their back pay by Christmas. To me that was a very unsatisfactory state of affairs and I do not know even now if any attention has been given to it. Whenever anybody approaches me and makes out a case such as that. I am prepared to ask questions in this House about it. I do expect that in future replies to questions will be given much more speedily than they have been given in the past; what is more important is that a proper system of giving replies to questions by honourable members should be implemented, we should have a proper Question Time and an Order Paper should be made out in respect of questions and when they are to be answered so that members of the public can come in here when they are interested in any question and hear the replies given by the Ministers; that is what the public has been asking for. I hope that when the Rules are revised care will be taken of that matter.

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

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

HEAD V—HARBOUR AND SHIPPING MASTER

Head V—Harbour and Shipping Master—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head V stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: In connection with item 20, "Training of Apprentices", I would like to know how the selection is made and by whom it is made. It seems to me that only a special clique of apprentices is selected for this training.

Hon. M. E. COX: The selection is made by a Board; these people are dealt with under the Bursaries Act.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Is this matter known throughout the island so that people in the country can apply for, and get the benefit of, this training?

Hon. M. E. COX: This is an island-wide matter; it is published in the Press and anybody from any parish can apply for this training.

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

HEAD VI—CUSTOMS

Head VI—Customs—was called.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to pay tribute to the holder of this office of Comptroller of Customs who is on contract. This officer has done a lot for this Department; he has put it on a good basis. However, I am hoping that in the future when the Head of this Department is to be appointed, a local officer will be the holder of the post. I am conscious of the fact that there are some persons in this Department and in the Government Service who are capable of holding this post, and in view of the fact that Customs Union is one of the things which have been accepted in principle, we can look forward to our own people holding such posts. I am not against expatriates holding posts, but I think of the aspiration of our people and I say that a person like Mr. Evelyn could hold the office of Comptroller of Customs with distinction and ability. I hope that the claims of our local people will be pressed as against those of expatriates.

As regards item 21 "Drawbacks General" I see that the amount of this item varies from what it was last year. The last sentence of the note to this item states:

"Also includes $8,000 for *ex gratia* payments which have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Last year the note to this item did not carry anything like that. The Act gives the Governor-in-Executive Committee authority to make drawbacks and rebates on certain items and I would like to know something about these *ex gratia* payments for which this $8,000 is provided. These payments need not be *ex gratia* payments at all; if it is a case of a drawback, the money is given. In some cases the Governor imports articles for himself and he is given the drawback; but I would like to know something about this extra provision of $8,000.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to know if the salaries set out here are in the right column; I would has considered the question of the washing of bottles also like to know whether the appropriate Minister in the Rum Bond and whether the Government will permit that to be continued. The amount of this item "Water Rates" has gone from $300 to $550. As to the item "Rent of Warehouses", we see that the amount is recoverable under Revenue, Head VIII, but that is not entirely true; in some cases you will never recover a certain amount; only a part of it will be recoverable. The amount of this item is nearly $14,000 and the Government could really have built a bond by now; it is time to consider this question unless you expect that the rum business will be dropped altogether. If that is the case, what

is the point of appointing somebody in England as Trade Commissioner for the purpose of selling sugar? I would really like to get some information on that point.

I am hoping that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas can supply the figures in respect of these different bonds and see if the Government is really recovering the rent; the rent for one of these buildings is high and you could only recover this money if you keep the bonds full of rum. We have been told on one occasion that the bottom had fallen out of the rum trade; I should like a check to be kept on each of these bonds and see if it will not pay the Government to build a rum bond. We are not against people having their own bond but let it be subject to Government supervision.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would like to draw attention to what is a hardship on some people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the item on which the honourable member is speaking?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on an item and the Chairman will not tell me when to mention that item, because I will be speaking on all the items. I would like to draw the attention of the honourable Minister to———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are items which are fixed by law and there are items which are not fixed by law. I should like the honourable member just to mention the particular item on which he is speaking.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on Head VI of the Estimates and I am speaking on all the items to be voted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: How am I to know on which item the honourable member is speaking?

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order. The honourable member on the right of the honourable senior member for the City ought to tell him that it is courteous to honourable members to name the items on which he is speaking. I am surprised to see that the honourable member is trying to argue with the Chair when he knows that he must not do that. The honourable member on his right could tell him the same thing.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I thank the honourable member for his advice, but he should really appreciate that one can hardly do any better when he follows the example set by people on the other side. I will never try to do anything which would conflict with the ruling of the Chair. I started off to say that I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour a grievance which has been brought to my notice; if I mention one item you, Mr. Chairman, have the right to say that I cannot speak on that item, therefore I am speaking on all the items. In other words, I am touching on all these items but I am not going to make any second reading speech. I was only saying under this Head that it was drawn to my notice that since the inauguration of the Five Year Plan and goods are paid for on the c.i.f. values, poor people who have articles sent to them by relatives in the United States of America have had things made very difficult for them because the freight and so on, came to much more than the cost of the articles which the relatives sent; consequently, many articles had to remain in the warehouse. Seeing that the honourable Minister cannot even pretend not to know what I am speaking about and how this state of affairs must affect the ordinary people who must depend upon their relatives in the United States of America for foodstuffs, I am sure he will make an investigation into this matter and see what can be done to relieve the situation.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to support the enquiry made by the honourable junior member for St. Peter as regards these *ex gratia* payments for which the sum of $8,000 is provided, and I would also like to enquire from the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour as to whether the sum of $20 in respect of item 22 "Allowances for Shortages" is sufficient to cover the deficiencies which the Government knows have occurred in the Spirit Bond sometime within the last 18 or 20 months. We have not noticed the Government making any provision for reimbursing the owners—I understand that they are not reimbursing the owners—but I am wondering on what basis the Government arrives at the decision not to reimburse people who put their rum in the Spirit Bond and due to negligence or lack of proper accommodation they suffer a loss or deficiency through carrying out their obligations to store rum in the Government Spirit Bond. I am wondering on what basis they arrive at the amount allowed for shortages; if the Government has no intention of storing people's rum properly and of not reimbursing them when the rum is lost or stolen without any explanation from the Government at all, I am sure that the merchants will make representations to the Government that they should be allowed to store their rum in their own bonds rather than in the Government Spirit Bond because there will be a liability which neither the merchants nor any self-respecting people would like in this matter.

We should be given some breakdown of this $8,000 and an explanation as to the basis on which these *ex gratia* payments will be made in future or have been made in the past. I feel it is entirely unsatisfactory that the conditions which have been exposed at the Government Spirit Bond should have existed at all and no reassurance given by the Government that these conditions are not existing now or will not continue in the future. That is a situation which can only spread despondency and alarm among the taxpayers and members of the mercantile community.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As to the first point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I think he will agree that it is the policy of this Government that where you have local people who are fit and suitable for posts, these people will be preferred above any other applicants from anywhere else. I quite agree with the honourable member that all suitable local applicants should be considered favourably as Heads of Departments wherever these vacancies occur. The honourable member also raised the question under item 21 relative to drawbacks and he was supported by the honourable senior member for St. George. As to the question of including under this Head this amount of $8,000 in respect of this item, I must confess that I have not got the break down; when I got on the Estimates Committee this Head had already been concluded, and I am therefore suffering from a general drawback in that respect myself. (Laughter.) However. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the honourable junior member for St. Peter could not assist me in that respect because he must have considered this matter in Executive Committee and on the Estimates Committee. The note says:

"Also includes $8,000 for *ex gratia* payments which have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

I have no knowledge of any such approval; they were not approved in my time and I can only assume that they were approved when the honourable junior member for St. Peter was a member of the Estimates Committee.

I can only say what I know. I say again the note was written before I was appointed to the ministry. I take it that these *ex-officio* appointments have already been approved by the Governor. As regards the point raised by the honourable junior member for the City, I have enquired into the matter and am told that the figures there are for general expenses. They are payable to the Waterworks under the regular water rates. I do not know, but it appears as if it is not an easy job to make a charge to these rum exporters for mere washing of bottles in the bond, but the Government loses nothing and the charges are really recovered. A point was also raised by the same honourable member with regard to recovering the sums incurred by paying rents on bonds. I quite agree with him on that point. If you rent bonds, you should make sure that the rent is recoverable.

The honourable senior member for the City raised the point that parcels coming into the island from overseas for charitable organisations should come in duty free. I too agree with that point, but it must be proven satisfactorily that the contents are only for charitable organisations. If that is proven, you should not pay duty. I, however, believe that the honourable member will agree with me that it will take a lot of examination to make sure that there are no 'escapees' and people do not try to take advantage of the system. It is known that there are people who would take advantage of such a situation. It is not a matter which can be worked out easily; the question will take going into very carefully. I will however promise the honourable member to investigate it and see what I can do about it.

So far as the question raised by the honourable senior member for St. George with regard to conditions at the Spirit Bond, I will look into the matter but I must let the honourable member know that no complaint about the matter has yet reached my ears. Now that he has raised it, I will look into the question.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I expected the honourable Minister would have answered my question but he has not. I asked the question in all good faith but instead of answering it, the honourable Minister is trying to associate me with a decision that has been raised in the Executive Committee. Some honourable members seem to be smiling because I say so, but they can smile. Let me tell this Committee that I have not attended a single meeting of the Executive Committee dealing with these Estimates; therefore the suggestion that I should know something of it is unkind to me. What I want to stress is, if that decision were made when I was a member of the Executive Committee, I know nothing of it. Again, I have not attended a meeting of the Executive Committee since the 5th January when I left the island for Costa Rica.

The note with regard to that $80,000 is as follows: "Also includes $8,000 for *ex-gratia* payments which have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Now, Sir, I have only learnt basic English. We get insinuations that we cannot speak it too well but I do not consider that is our fault. Here it is you have Clause 57 of the Trade Act of 1910 telling you for what you can make a refund. It reads as follows:—

> "It shall be lawful for the Executive Committee, by order of the Treasurer, to refund "any duties, dues, fees, tonnage dues, rents or "other sums of money which may have been "paid into the Public Treasury under provisions of this Act, or any other Act, relating to "trade and navigation, any error, or on demand "by the Comptroller, or any excess of what was "due, or as duty on articles not arriving by "the ship for which the duty paid warrants "are passed."

The amount of $80,000 is set down as money "authorised by law," therefore, you must of necessity pay out of it for anything authorised by law. What I do not understand about the note to that amount is if you are authorised by law to pay out of it, why put the words: "Also includes $8,000 for *ex-gratia* payments which have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee." Does this mean that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has agreed to pay for something that is not authorised by law? I want to know. What is the item? Why suggest that I was a party to it? Even if that were so, is it not in my power to ask the question so that this Committee might know the answer? The stupid suggestion that I am asking a question that I should know is out of the question. I may say that I did not expect a different reply from the honourable Minister Trade, Industry and Commerce. The honourable member said he became a member of the Executive Committee only at the beginning of last month. I admit to that, but if the honourable member would look carefully and compare the note with that in last year's Estimates he will see that what I am speaking about is something new that has been put into it. Surely if he cannot say, some other minister who was a member of the Estimates Committee should be able to say. I resent and repudiate the suggestion that I am asking a question to which I should know the answer.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the question is really under the portfolio of the honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, and as every hon. member knows, the honourable member has done the best he could under the circumstances to answer the question. I could have stopped him, so to speak, and answered the question. I should not use the word 'stop' because the honourable junior member for St. James has on an occasion hinted that I should not use the whip on the ministers. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas under whose portfolio is this department said no more than what honourable members would have thought themselves and that is that the honourable junior member for St. Peter should be able himself to give the explanation. Sir, it is no longer a secret what is the attitude of the honourable junior member for St. Peter towards this Government and I know that I must keep a tremendous hold of myself not to take any notice of what the honourable member says when he gets up to speak in this Chamber.

This matter is nothing new as the honourable senior member for St. Thomas pointed out. The expression "*ex-gratia* payments" has been used in the note. The Law Officers of the Crown have used that expression in reference to the drawbacks that can be granted under Section 57 of the Act. I have the figures of those drawbacks for the last three years. There are as follows: 1950-51, $11,150.91; 1951-52 $7,004.78; 1952-53, $6,217.98. These amounts came under the same item as is this $8,000. The Executive Committee knows all these things because they come before that Committee. Sometimes, the Committee has to turn down some of these things and the honourable member knows that. Let me remind this House that this Government came down last year with a resolution which included some similar drawbacks to Messrs R. M. Jones & Co., Ltd., and this House turned down those drawbacks. I say again that the Crown Law Officers for a long time have used the expression "*ex-gratia* payments" in refer-

ence to these drawbacks. Any layman can read that section of the Act and see what happens. You cannot pay out for anything unless it is under the Act. The Law Officers, as far back as May 1951, have been dealing with this matter and have been pointing out that the Act says that you can give these drawbacks, therefore, why go to the House with them and waste time? But that has been the practice although it seems absurd. That has been the decision of the Crown Law Officers for years. They feel that what comes under this note should go under the ordinary vote and that there should not be the necessity to come down for a vote for the specific drawback. Sir, I apologise for not giving this explanation earlier to this Committee and leaving the matter to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. Again, I did not want a row.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, What in the name of heavens can anyone want to make a row about if he is asking a question on the inclusion of this $8,000 for *ex gratia* payments. The honourable Premier has got up and pointed out that there is some difference between the members of the Labour Party and myself. There is no such difference; all the difference between the party and myself is because I would not accept what the honourable Premier tried to do with me. I will always suffer for righteousness' sake. However, the honourable Premier should not say that because one does not agree with something which the Government is doing that the person is out for a row with the Labour Party. The honourable member is speaking as if he is the whole of the Labour Party. Sir, if I am to accept dictatorship in this House, I will return to my constituents and say to them that this is no place for me. I would not come back to this House of Assembly if I must bow to any man and allow him to do something which I consider he knows is wrong. Sir, I asked a simple question without any malice. I have not attended a meeting of the Executive Committee which dealt with these draft Estimates, therefore, you cannot say when this item was put in, I knew what it was for. The honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour says that I knew when this item was put in these Estimates. What kind of man would I be to agree to this item and then come into this Committee and ask a question? How can I be accused of knowing what it is for or the suggestion can be made against me that I knew about this item and what it is all about? What row have I started? It is a usual technique to say the other person started the row.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I hope that in the future, we will have the Estimates laid earlier so that ministers will know the answers to questions long before the subject is debated. I do hope that this new change in Government will bring into practice an earlier laying of the estimates—by next year at least. What I would like to know is if this amount of $8,000 was put into these Estimates this year because the House refused to vote money on a previous occasion for some similar matter. If that is so, it is a serious matter, because this House disagreed with the principle. By this amount being put in these Estimates, it means that those sort of things will not be coming before the House for consideration in the future. That is commonsense. If you vote for this $8,000 being put down in these Estimates and the *ex-gratia* payment for Messrs R. M. Jones & Co., Ltd., comes up again, it will not be necessary to come back to the House to ask for it. I do not want any row, but this House particularly told the Government in no uncertain terms if it refunded the money to one of the people who took out gasolene, it would have to refund it to all. It should not refund it to only the one or two people who asked for it. It does seem to me that because of that, some people have got around this thing to take away from the people's representatives the right to judge a case on its own merits. If you put in this lump sum in the way you are doing, all that you will have to say when monies are wanted for these *ex-gratia* payments that this House has agreed to them already. It does seem to me that the reason why you are asking for this lump sum is because you wish to do as you like.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know but I do not think all those persons who were interpreting the Act before, were interpreting it wrongly. The honourable junior member for St. James was a former Attorney General of the island and I daresay that this question must have come under his opinion. Evidently, according to the Act, there are other things for which refunds can be given. The Government is here to see that all persons are taxed fairly. Even when our Highway Commissioners bring in a road roller and are taxed for it, they come for a refund. Once upon a time those matters came before the Legislature but they are now decided by the Executive Committee. It is right that this House should review such matters but there is no law for it. As a matter of fact, the cases of these occurrences are not many. These cases come before the Legislature mainly because it may be said that the Executive Committee refunded Mr. A because it was a friend of Mr. A but did not refund Mr. B because Mr. B did not have a friend in the Executive Committee. Let me repeat, if a matter does not come under the Act, the Legislature will have to decide.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I am convinced that this note should be deleted from the Estimates. It does look as if the Government has a blank cheque. There are numerous items under which a Comptroller of Customs can refund money and there must be good reasons why they have not left it to his entire discretion to refund money in all the circumstances that may arise. I say: let the Legislature decide on those matters which do not come under the Act; let the Legislature say what is to be refunded.

I am going to move that Item No. 21 for the sum of $80,000 be amended by deleting the sum of $8,000 from it to make it $72,000. Whenever there be need for refunds from the $8,000 set down here, let the Government bring the facts before the Legislature. I think it will be to their own interest. If Government refunds money to somebody as it sought to do on the last occasion, somebody may say that their case was of a similar nature and Government did not give them back anything. These cases of *ex-gratia* payments should come before the House of Assembly.

Mr. BARROW: There are certain drawbacks which are authorised by law under the Trade Act of 1910, so as it appears to me, of the $80,000 under Item No. 21, the sum of $72,000 will cover those specific items which the law authorises the Executive Committee to give by way of draw backs to people who have paid money erroneously or otherwise. Since these specific items and conditions are mentioned and set out under the separate Acts I do not see how *ex gratia* payments are covered by the Act. As is known, *ex-gratia* payments can cover a multitude of sins, therefore, I think members of this House are entitled to know from any member of the Government of the specific items to which this amount of $8,000 for *ex-gratia* payments is made up because we would be in a position to approve of them or to say whether the matter is *ultra vires* to the Executive Committee. It seems to me that it would not be necessary for the Government

to pick out $8,000 if it were for items of the same class as those which are specifically authorised by law. I second the motion made by the honourable junior member for the City.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I am of the opinion that when this House meets at 12 (noon) it should adjourn for lunch at 2 p.m. As far as I remember, the rules of this House were only changed in so far as to allow this House to adjourn until 3 o'clock p.m. instead of 12 (noon) for lack of a quorum; therefore, whenever this House meets at 12 (noon) we should abide by the rules.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, it is true that according to the rules of this House we should adjourn for the luncheon interval at 2 p.m. I therefore beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. LEWIS seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

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

RESUMPTION

On re-assembling.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee on the Estimates for the year 1954-55.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee reported progress, Head VI was being considered.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour has refreshed himself during the interval on this item of draw backs because this Committee is only asking for some information on this specific grant of $8,000. I do not want to say anything further; I feel by now the honourable member will be willing to give us some kind of information on this matter. I may say here now that I am not surprised that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas did not answer my question as to the intention of the Government in making allowances for shortages which have occurred at the Government Spirit Bond and for reimbursing those merchants who suffered loss through the inefficient method of supervision which pervaded at the Government Spirit Bond. I am, however, glad for the assurance which has been given by the honourable member that he will see to it that these conditions do not continue.

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to say—and I am only doing it because the honourable senior member for St. Thomas who is the Minister for this portfolio has just come into Government—that this $8,000 is an average of what we think we may have to give back in *ex-gratia* payments because of the figures for the past three years. How can you know how much you will have to give back? You cannot know that, therefore, you put some sum in. Under the law, people are entitled to get back duties on anything on which they have paid in error. If we have to spend any of that $8,000 and it was not there, we would have to come to you with supplementary Estimates and that is the only reason why the $8,000 is there. Over the past three years the amounts paid out in that respect were as follows: $11,150.91 for 1950—1951; $7,004.78 for 1951—52 and $6,217.98 for 1952-53. I have not got the figures for 1953—54. You will therefore see from those figures that $8,000 is a reasonable sum. Again I ask, how can you pass an Act authorising payment for something and then you do not put in the Estimates some sum to cover it?

Mr. BARROW: Where does the principle of a general average come in? If honourable members examine the Estimates for 1953-54, they will see that no such step is taken. The general average of $72,000 is not in dispute. What is in dispute is the $8,000 for *ex-gratia* payments. I do not like the term ex-gratia and the explanation according to the note is that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has already approved of this $8,000 for ex-gratia payments. As I have said, under the same head and item in last year's estimates, there was no such explanatory note of ex-gratia payments. I will therefore say that either the note is bad or the reason produced by the Minister of the Government is bad. I do not know which is worse. We, therefore, are asking for an explanation.

Sir, I do know that goods are sometimes landed in this colony and the consignee does not have certificates of origin, nor the Bank may not be in possession of them, but the consignee may be allowed to take the goods out of the bond provided he pays the highest rate. When he receives the certificates of origin, the rate is then adjusted and he is given back the difference. That is what this $72,000 is for. I ask again, why is it that the explanatory note is so written: "The Executive Committee has approved of the $8,000 for *ex gratia* payments?" Why is it that that amount is set aside from the $80,000 as *ex gratia* payments? I say again the explanatory note is not satisfactory.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Why is it that the honourable member continues to suggest that the explanation is inaccurate? Obviously, the note could be better worded and the English could have been better. I have already told the honourable member that you are authorised by law to make these drawbacks. You do not know what will happen this year, — or any year for that matter — therefore, you put down a sum on the average of the last three years. We assume that $8,000 is a reasonable sum for that purpose. I hope the honourable member does not want to say that I get up in this Chamber and tell untruths. Since that explanation is given, obviously, it would mean when those items would have been approved, or as the Trinidadians love to say "when they shall have been approved of." I have told the honourable member already that the law says that you can give these drawbacks. We do not know what would be these drawbacks, therefore we put down a sum which we feel they would amount to, taking the last three years as a guide.

As I have said earlier, I do not know why the word *'ex-gratia'* has been used. I do know, however, that it has been the opinion of Attorney Generals for some time that you need not come with resolutions for these sums all the time. It is clear that instead of coming with a separate resolution for a particular sum that a sum has been put in the estimates out of which such things could be paid for. As I have said already, as soon as the Act authorises the Government to give rewards for certain things, such as cane fires or matters affecting crime, obviously, you must put something in the Estimates out of which those rewards can be made. Again, I say I do not know why the Crown Law Officers say *'ex-gratia'*. I hope honourable members will be satisfied now.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I never said that the honourable Premier is dishonest or untruthful; I said that the explanation was unsatisfactory. I am glad that the honourable Premier admitted that the explanation was not what it should be and that the term *'ex-gratia'* should not be there, and when the note stated that the goods were already approved, that also was not true to some extent; it should have been worded: "when these should have been approved."

Sir, I was the first honourable member to raise this question and what the honourable Premier explained would be quite satisfactory to me if this note is struck out. The ways in which drawbacks can be paid out are specifically stated under the Trade Act, 1910, Sections 57, 104 and 105. Section 57 states:—

> "It shall be lawful for the Executive Committee, by order on the Treasurer, to refund any duties, dues, fees, tonnage dues, rents or other sums of money which may have been paid into the Public Treasury under provisions of this Act, or any other Act, relating to trade and navigation, any error, or on demand by the Comptroller, or any excess of what was due, or as duty on articles not arriving by the ship for which the duty paid warrants are passed."

Section 104 states:—

> "The Executive Committee shall from time to time settle and declare by notice to be published in the *Official Gazette* a list of articles as exportation to which a drawback of the duty shall be allowed."

Section 105 states:—

> "On the exportation of any such articles a drawback of the duty shall be allowed, provided the amount claimed to be not less than such sum as the Executive Committee shall from time to time settle and declare by regulation to be published in the *Official Gazette* giving due notice before shipment of the same and passing the export warrant at the Customs House in the usual form stating all particulars thereof and before payment of such drawback shall be made a certificate under the proper authority at the port to which such goods have been exported of the landing of such goods, etc. . . ."

What I am contending is that if you need $80,000, and you are guided by the Act, you need not say: "Also includes $8,000 for *ex gratia* payments which have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee." Certainly this note gives the impression that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has already approved of certain *ex gratia* payments and this sum of $8,000 is for that purpose. The honourable Premier must admit that this statement confuses the whole thing. As it appears to me, the original idea was to put in $72,000, particularly when you bear in mind that the sum put down last year was $53,000. I contend that you do not have to give that explanation of the $8,000 if you quote the Sections of the Trade Act as the authority. It seems to me,—and it is borne out by what the honourable Premier said—that no honourable member of the Executive reads every line of any estimates. I would be glad if this had been checked upon because I consider it as an unfortunate happening.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I entirely agree with what the honourable member who has just sat down said, that is, if you were working according to the Act, you would not have written that note. However, I think honourable members are fully aware that you cannot budget in next year's estimates for something that has been spent already; you must come to the House for the amount in the current year under supplementary estimates. Probably the note was put in because this House is always asking for more explanation. It has been proven that you can err in two ways; (1) by giving too little explanation; or (2) in your endeavour to give too much explanation, you create ambiguity.

Mr. LEWIS: The wording of that note can be taken to mean during the financial year or the ensuing year but that is besides the point; this $8,000 is for drawbacks which are entirely outside of the law and that is the reason why the note is there. I will give this Committee a few examples. Previously, you had no law to give Commissioners of Highways the duties which they paid on the importation of road rollers, and whenever you wanted to give them off something, you had to come to the House with a resolution, but you recently changed the law so that you would not be coming to this House in future with such things. It can clearly be seen by that example that this $8,000 is set down for things which may crop up that are not covered by any Act. It will also be remembered that on the laying of the Five-Year Plan, you increased the duty on gasolene. You made the law applicable to it. During the afternoon certain people took gasolene out of storage in bulk and one or two of them have since asked for a refund of duty. It should have been a secret that Government was going to increase the taxation on gasolene up to three o'clock that afternoon but those people took out some in bulk that day. As is well known, this House disagreed to your paying out to the one or two who put in claims for this refund of duty; this House said if three or more people were entitled to that refund; do not give it to the one or two who asked for it unless you intend to give it to all that are entitled. This House did not disagree with the principle of paying it back. Let me say again that this $8,000 is for something entirely different to the drawbacks which are authorised by law. The person who put it in, is trying to make it look as a law of the country and if this House passes it, they will be able to take it as a law of the country. The wording of that note is a law unto itself and I defy anybody to find a law for it.

Sir, every conceivable method by which you pay duty and can receive a drawback is covered by the Acts set down, but this note is slipped in to rob the people's representatives of discussing any matter that is entirely outside of the Customs Act or any law controlling or regulating or amending the same. I do not mind the amount set down in the Estimates against that item because they can only use it for the items they can justify to the Auditor General. I think this note has been put in so that they can go to the Auditor General and tell him that this House agreed to something which was not exactly covered by the Act. Let us delete the note. If we delete the note, the money will only be paid out for drawbacks which are covered by the Acts.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Sir, if the Executive Committee attempts, because members of it may be friends of somebody, to pay refunds to such persons on their own accord, honourable members of this House would be traitors to their country if they did not expose the Executive Committee. I am surprised at that statement coming from the honourable junior member for the City. Under the present ministerial technique any honourable member getting up and asking any minister a question with regard to his portfolio, the minister is bound to reply.

(A VOICE: But how would a member know of such refunds?)

I say by asking a question. I do not know why the honourable junior member for St. James is conspicuous by his silence, but the honourable member was once Attorney General of this colony and he knows that particular point very well. He knows that it has been the opinion of Attorney Generals for some time that you need not come with resolutions for these sums all the time. Again, I would admit that the explanatory note is not as accurate as it should be, but what has the Auditor General to do with these notes? The Auditor General has to see that anything which he pays out is paid out through legal authority. There is nothing to say that an Auditor General must pay out according to what is written in these Estimates.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do agree with what was said by the honourable junior member for the City. It is no mistake that the note is put in the Estimates. The honourable Premier has said that the note does not make sense or words to that effect, but honourable members know, whether the honourable Premier realises it or not, that the person who wrote that note in the Estimates knew that they were about. That person was not under any misapprehension about the law; he was under the impression of putting $72,000 to be used under the various sections of the Act but wanted the $8,000 to be used for *ex-gratia* payments. I would like the honourable Premier to bear that in mind. I wonder if the honourable Premier thinks that Civil Servants do not know sufficient English to know that the construction of a note like that would have no effect on the interpretation of the Acts themselves but that it was written to make provision for *ex-gratia* payments or for drawbacks which did not exactly come under the Act. The honourable Premier has the sheets to see how the notes were constructed and how the Draft Committee arrived at the $80,000. He would see from those sheets that $72,000 for general drawbacks this year was derived from figures of last year and that this $8,000 was to be used for these *ex-gratia* payments. I am convinced that the person who constructed those notes did so with the clear understanding that $72,000 is to be earmarked for the general average and the $8,000 to be used for *ex-gratia* payments. The words to that note were not put there by mistake. I am thoroughly convinced in my mind about that. Again, I would say that this document on the Estimates of Expenditure contains around 126 pages and I do not expect any minister can sit down and check back every figure and every note that is in them because that is not the job of a minister. The honourable Premier may be explaining what the law says, but I quite agree with the honourable junior member for the City, therefore, I will tell the honourable Premier that so far as the law is concerned what should be done with respect to the note and the $8,000 would be purely a matter for the Auditor General and the Governor as to how they interpret it.

Sir, I am convinced in my mind that what is written in the note, was not written by mistake. I am not accusing any minister for writing it or even knowing it was there, but I am convinced that the person who constructed that part of the Estimates knew that $72,000 was put down as the average for general drawbacks and the $8,000 was for ex-gratia payments. I may also say that the Auditor General need not approve of the last amount because it does not come under the Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As far as I am concerned. if I think anybody can use that note as an authority for suggesting a refund which would not be covered by local statute, I am as willing as any honourable member to cut it out, though I do not see any virtue in it. I do not see how members of the Executive Committee from this House can be accused of having friends in the mercantile community to whom we would help in a matter such as this. If there is the slightest danger of this note giving the appearance that the Executive Committee will be giving ex-gratia payments on something that is not authorised by law, I have no objection to the House marking its disapproval by cutting that note out. Even if you do not delete that note, how can the Auditor General mistake the feeling of the House on this matter? However, to be on the safe side, I am suggesting that you delete it so as to make it abundantly clear that the money will be only paid out for what the law sets out. But there is no danger about it, because the Auditor General is there to see about the interpretation of the law and to see that no voucher is paid out unless there is local authority in the Statute Book for it. Rather than give the impression that the Executive Committee is messing about with money that is not authorised by law, I am perfectly prepared to let that note be cut out.

Mr. BRYAN: I would like an assurance from the Minister in charge of this Department that he will go into the question of overtime fees for the staff of the Customs and have them settled before the next Estimates are prepared. I am referring to Item 11 under this Head—Customs. For a long time Government has been paying to Customs Officers, 4/- per hour on any day that they may be called upon to work overtime, and for Sundays and Bank Holidays on which they may be called out to work, a sort of retainers' fee of £1, plus that 4/- per hour overtime. The merchants in Bridgetown used to pay similar fees to their warehouse clerks but due to representations made by the officers of the Barbados Workers Union on behalf of the said clerks, the merchants of Bridgetown have raised the retainers fee from £1 to £2, and the fees for overtime from 4/- per hour to 5/-. An additional increase of 10% has also been given on the 5/- bringing it to 5/6. There is a feeling among Customs Officers that their fees should be increased, at least to that level, in view of the cost of living; and I think they have already by means of a letter approach the Governor-in-Executive on the matter, but up to now, they have received no reply. I would therefore like the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour to investigate the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: In view of what the honourable Premier has said, I am withdrawing my motion for the deletion of the amount of $8,000 from the $80,000 against Item No. 21. So long as that note is deleted, the $8,000 that is set down along with the $80,000 cannot affect the Estimates in any way.

Mr. BARROW: I seconded the motion made by the honourable junior member for the City, but I do not understand the situation now. Is the honourable member for the City right when he says now that it does not matter whether the amount is $80,000 or changed to $72,000? If the explanatory note means nothing then we are in effect giving the Executive *carte blanc* to spend $8,000. Having arrived at this *impasse*, the Government seeks to retrench, as it appears to me, but not as far as to amend the amount which is set down against the item. Sir, striking out the note means nothing and I do not see how the honourable junior member for the City has fallen into this trap. I am not concerned with the note; it does not worry me at all; I am worried about the taxpayers' money. I would support any new motion made by any honourable member if he moves that the amount be amended

to read $72,000 because I am not satisfied that Government needs $80,000 to spend for that item.

I do not like to put a bad construction on anything done by the Administration but I am naturally inclined to be suspicious of this amount. I am not accusing the Government necessarily of anything but to have the note struck out will not be a solution to the problem; it will be a compromise. After all, this is not a battle which we are fighting. As I have said, I am only concerned with the money; I am not concerned with the English grammar of the note. I am not concerned as to whether it should be written as it is or with the past future or pluperfect tense.

Mr. LEWIS: I will tell the honourable member that I do not care what amount is set down against general drawbacks because they can only use it for what is set down in the Acts and if they use all of it, they can come back for another $80,000. What I care about is that the $8,000 should not be put there to be spent in accordance to what was written in that note. I can assure the hon. member that the money cannot be spent except for what is stated in the law. I feel so long as the note is cut out, the Auditor General will have the assurance that he can only expend the money according to the law.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I accept the deletion of the note.

Mr. GODDARD: Unlike the honourable junior member for the City, I am concerned about the amount of money voted, because that affects the estimates. After hearing the debate on the question, I am convinced that the amount of $72,000 was the average arrived at to meet the specific purpose and the $80,000 which is set down is $8,000 over and above that amount. For that reason, I am going to move that the amount be reduced by $8,000.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will support the Government now. I raised the question of this $8,000 on the ground of what was written in the note. Now the note is deleted I am satisfied. I would not have asked any question over the $80,000 had it not been for the note, because the law is there to say how it is to be used. Now that the note is removed, my mind is at rest because I know no Accountant-General can go and push anything at the Auditor General about this matter with the saying: "I have put this to the Executive Committee; you have to sign it." I know that you can get that technique; that is why I was worried. I think the honourable junior member for Christ Church would agree that there is no question of what the amount is because you cannot tell what that would come to. It is not if you set down $80,000 they will be spending $80,000; they can only spend it on what complies with the law. I agree with what the honourable junior member for the City has said now and I will support him on it.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: As the honourable Premier has said, the note does not furnish any new guide on the point of how drawbacks are to be given on trade and does not affect the Auditor General. As a matter of fact, the Auditor General does not always read these notes. We must bear in mind that we do not pass a resolution here to approve of Estimates. What we pass is the Appropriation Bill and in the Appropriation Bill, all you would have before you is so much for general drawbacks; therefore, if the $8,000 was intended for what was set out in the note, that is, *ex-gratia* payments, it would have to be controlled by law for it to be paid out that way. You just could not say that you are paying it out according to the note. This whole row can be settled very easily. All that the honourable Premier would have to do is to make one telephone message and ask the Head of the Department to ask the Collector of Customs what it means; whether it is for payments authorised by law or whether it is for *ex-gratia* payments, and that will settle the whole row. Let me say that you cannot move in the Committee to take out the note because the note is only a written explanation as to what the Minister who is in charge of it should say in respect of the vote. If the Minister who is responsible for this note says that he will have it removed from the Estimates because it only means "authorised by law," it can be taken out that way. If the Executive Committee wants to pass something which is not authorised by law, they would have to put it under another sub-head and simply state "*Ex-gratia* drawbacks." Because that note is there, it does not mean that you can spend any of that money unless it is authorised by law.

So far as the information is concerned, do not let us fool ourselves, we will never know; nor is there any chance of our knowing whether it is used for another purpose.

I must support the honourable junior member for Christ Church in his statement that if you are asking that the note for $8,000 be taken out, you have no right to include the amount in your estimates because you are making correct estimates, but when you let that amount remain, you are making incorrect estimates; you are more or less including something that was meant for something else.

Last year, you provided $53,000 for general drawbacks. It does seem extraordinary that you should need $80,000 this year for the same purpose and according to the average over the last three years paid out, it does show that the $53,000 has moved up to $72,000, but that you have put in the extra $8,000 to get certain sums to avoid either unnecessary delay by this Committee or to allow it to be the privilege of the ministers to do that which it was thought they would be allowed to do.

I suggest what the honourable Premier should say is that the motion cannot be put; all he has to say is "I will instruct that the note be taken out and will give the necessary order to the Auditor General that no money is to come out of the Public Treasury according to the way which the note purports to do." I think we all will be happy over that statement. It is peculiar, but it is so, although a thing may be fixed by law or authorised by law, you still have to come here for it. I may also tell you if a person who is to receive anything that is authorised by law does not get it, he can sell your tables and desks to fetch the money that is authorised for him to receive; therefore, it means that we have no option but to grant it. To get back to the point of the $8,000 being retained in the Estimates, I would say that your Estimates should be accurate; it is no use making Estimates when they are not accurate. However, the $8,000 can remain against the vote so long as the honourable Premier has given the assurance that it will not be spent as we thought it was going to be spent. It does not make any difference whether you vote it except from the point of view that your Estimates would not be as accurate as they should be.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do agree that any amounts for *ex-gratia* payments should come before the floor of this House by resolutions to be decided because what this Goverment may be accused of may take place with any other Government; that is, the accusation of helping your friends. Using the word *ex-gratia* in its real sense, it is reasonable to give persons draw-backs on certain payments. It is for this reason that I agree with what the last honour-

able member has spoken. As I have said, I do not agree that the power of granting *ex-gratia* payments should ever be made by the Executive Committee without ratification by the House and I give honourable members the assurance that it will not be done.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I entirely agree with the honourable member.

Mr. LEWIS: I entirely agree with what has been said; that was put in here with the same trick with which the lights were put in.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I cannot agree with that. That has been going on for quite a long time—I mean the making of these *ex gratia* votes.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am glad to see how the debate has ended. If the honourable Minister had given what I had asked for this unpleasant episode would have been avoided.

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

HEAD VII—POWDER MAGAZINE

Head VII—Powder Magazine—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head VII stand part.

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

HEAD VIII—LEGAL

Head VIII—Legal—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head VIII stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to draw item 12, "Travelling Expenses", to the special attention of the honourable Premier. I notice that travelling expenses have to be paid to the Solicitor General, but from the distinction which we have had to-day as between "travelling allowance" and "travelling expenses," I think that this item here should be "travelling allowance." The difficulty about this matter is this; whereas if an officer of the Department of Science and Agriculture leaves his office and goes on Government duty, he has to take the nearest route and the travelling is calculated at so much a mile, the Solicitor General, who is a new whole-time Officer, can leave his office on duty and say that his expenses are so much. If you are giving this Officer only such expenses as are in keeping with the Act, then he should be given travelling allowance. I do not see why the Government should not assist the Solicitor General in getting a car; let him have a loan for getting a car and let his travelling allowance conform to the rate.

Mr. WILLIAMS: In respect of what the honourable member has said about travelling allowance, I think the Government has a way of talking about travelling expenses when they mean travelling allowance. Mr. Field has his own car and they are really not giving him travelling allowance. The item on which I want to speak is item 10. "Purchase of Law Books." I do not know if it is the Government's intention to have a complete set of books for every judicial Officer, but the present Chief Justice experiences difficulty and on several occasions Counsel have had to come to his aid. Although on one hand there will be a larger volume of works for giving opinions and so on, yet I do not think it is good enough to administer justice in the manner in which the Chief Justice has to do with the small library at his disposal.

Mr. BARROW: I am dealing with all the items that are not fixed by law because I want to deal with the organisation of the Attorney General's Department. I notice that in respect of item 12, the explanatory note says that the amount is "to meet the travelling expenses of the Solicitor General to country courts which were formerly payable to the part-time Solicitor General from Head XIV, item 36—'Fees to Counsel authorised to appear by Crown'" I think what they probably mean is "Fees authorised to Counsel who appear on behalf of the Crown." I feel that the time has come when the Crown Law Officers in this colony should be brought in line with those in other colonies in the Caribbean area. Their salaries have been brought into line and there is no reason why the general re-organistion of the Department should not be brought into line with that in other colonies. We have Crown Counsel in the Attorney General's Office and the volume of administrative work which has to be done by the Attorney General has grown out of all proportion to the size of the Department which he controls. I should like to say that the situation in the Law Courts to-day is entirely unsatisfactory because a lot of the prosecutions are done by Police Sergeants to the best of their ability and admirably in many cases, but the time has come when the appointment should be made of Crown Law Officers to assist the Attorney General and the Solicitor General with the work which has to be done in the Courts.

When we come to the Judiciary, I am sure that honourable members, like myself, who have to work in the Law Courts from day to day and in close proximity to the Judiciary, will have many more comments to make on the organisation of the Judiciary in Barbados as a whole. I hope the Premier will have some comment to make as to how near the plans which the Government has been contemplating have come to fruition and when we will see some change in the organisation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That last question is somewhat difficult to answer. Those who are dealing with the Bill in respect of the Judiciary have found it difficult to attend the meetings. On one occasion only I turned up and on another occasion only the honourable junior member for St. James turned up. However, the Bill has been put in draft; we have not been able to get the Select Committee together although I think the Attorney General has spoken to each of us separately and got general approval; but we have not yet met as a Committee and I hope we will soon be able to do that.

I was surprised to hear the honourable member suggest adding to the Crown. I should like to see the Bar nationalised giving barristers a fixed salary and having a Minister of Justice who will decide cases; I can see the honourable junior member for St. Lucy absolutely at home defending Police Inspectors.

Mr. BARROW: My views of nationalisation are not entirely consistent with those of the honourable member; I think that when you nationalise the Bar you close the gates of democracy. The honourable Premier who has withdrawn from the conflict probably looks with envy at the contest which is going on; I am sure that when he was an active member of the Bar he would not suggest that the Bar should be nationalised. The principle of democracy in respect of the nationalisation of the Bar has not been altered since the honourable member has not been a member of the Bar.

Mr. BRANCKER: With regard to this item "Purchase of Law Books", it might well be that the Government thought that the Attorney General's Chambers are more in need of good laws than anywhere else. I think that these books should be sent to the Law Library to be available to the Chief Justice, the Puisne Judge and the barristers; if these books are kept at the Public Buildings they will hardly

be accessible to the legal practitioners. A point might be overlooked by the Attorney General and it might be spotted by a legal practitioner and brought to the attention of the Court if these books were available to Counsel. The note to this item says that the increase is due to the purchase of new editions of certain publications and I wonder what has become of the editions which are being replaced. Perhaps the honourable member can tell us whether the old editions have been returned and a rebate given thereby saving money on the new editions; or, if that has not been done, I am wondering if the old editions have been turned over to other Government Departments such as the Assistant Court of Appeal or the Magisterial Courts. I feel that the Assistant Court of Appeal could well do with some law books; I should like to know what happens to the editions which have been replaced.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Judging from the reception which the remark about nationalising the law has been greeted by legal practitioners, one can well see that any attempt to nationalise the law in Barbados will meet with as much opposition as that offered by the British Medical Association in respect of their services. By the time this proposal becomes a reality, the honourable member may not be Premier and he may be leading the fight against nationalised law. I am suggesting to the honourable member that as a test of his Socialist theories he should provide assistance for litigants. Like everything else, lawyers' fees have been increased and the British Socialists have taken steps to assist litigants by providing assistance for them over and above the ordinary assistance which is given in *forma pauperis* if you have to submit your grievance to the Law Courts yourself; people who have to fight for justice in the Courts can receive legal assistance provided by the Crown or at the most nominal cost. There has been a case in which workers who were unable to obtain legal assistance, and not being able to rely on their Trade Union to provide this assistance, have been forced to submit to unfair compensation or let their compensation "go by the board". It appears to me as if the Government might well consider as a step towards the nationalisation of law the granting of some legal assistance for persons who need it but who cannot afford the luxury of retaining the eminent high-priced Counsel in Barbados.

Mr. BARROW: In answer to the honourable senior member for St. Philip, I would like to say that legal aid and nationalisation of the legal profession are two different things. I deplore the fact that we have not got some system of legal aid in Barbados because the legal practitioners would not charge the Government any exorbitant rates for legal aid if there were such a scheme in existence. In the United Kingdom at present anybody whose income is below £400 a year is entitled to legal aid if he choose to use it, but I would hate to think that the legal profession was nationalised and we would have to appear for the honourable junior member for St. Andrew without any extra emoluments accruing to us. I am sure that if the Government does consider introducing any system of legal aid in this colony it will have the unflinching support of both branches of the legal profession in this island: the practitioners would be willing to co-operate and the question of remuneration would not be the paramount consideration at all. I envisage a scheme in which there would be lawyers to whom people with certain types of cases would have to go so as to get advice and that would be some test of income. I cannot think of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew making use of my services when some poor person was waiting outside for them. I do hope that the Government will have some scheme for legal aid; and there is no point in saying that we cannot afford it.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not mind whether they nationalise or subsidise the legal profession; I am asking the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to tell me the advantage or disadvantage of giving travelling expenses and not travelling allowance. We can understand the case of the Accountant General, but this officer would definitely have to be going out regularly on visits to the country districts. Why was this distinction made?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The only thing I would say is that just as you thought it *infra dig* to be checking up and you give the Ministers a lumpsum, so it is *infra dig* to say that the Solicitor General must look at the mileage. Suppose the Chief Justice had a circuit Court in Holetown or Speightstown; you would not ask him to keep a record of his mileage. I think that that is the only explanation; the sum was fixed on what, over a period of years, was roughly what the Solicitor General had put in for his travelling expenses.

I should like to say that for years and years I believed in the nationalisation of lawyers; it is not because I have left the Bar that I want to do that. I did not intend to start a debate when I spoke about the nationalisation of the Bar, but honourable members have taken me seriously and have run down all the avenues behind an invisible hare. Honourable members must have seen where a person lost a case because a lawyer was on the other side and he did not have one. Lord Darling said that the law is there for the rich and poor alike; if your pocket is deep enough to employ the honourable junior member for St. James, you may win your case, but if your pocket is not deep and you employ somebody who has just been called to the Bar, the jury may say: "We decide against you."

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I have been successful, thank God, all my life. It might be all right for lawyers to think of the poor clients, but think of a man who is charged with murder being defended by a nationalised lawyer! In the case of the medical profession, the patient who paid got attention and the one who did not pay got an aspirin. You cannot nationalise brains because you cannot tell when a man is giving only 10% of his value; nationalised lawyers only suit the insignificant and in some cases you do not need a lawyer at all because the judges have decided the case before you get there.

I really rose to say under this Head what should come under the Judiciary. The Premier spoke of some new Bill; I have not done my duty to my Committee because I do not enjoy good health, but this Bill is going to meet with opposition from me. When we get to the Judiciary it may be so late in the night that some of us will be asleep; however, we need a different Court for the Puisne Judge and a different Court for the Assistant Court of Appeal and let the shifting system be stopped. I would not like that point to be overlooked; the only substitute we have for a Court is a room black as pitch with a lot of books surrounding and insufficient light; about one quarter of the light we have in this Chamber would be a little better. That Court is most unsuitable and the only use to which it could be put would be a Court for non-contentious matters. The result is that you get your cases lying down; you do not want to have two carpenters and one saw and you do not want to have two Judges and one Court. The Puisne Judge and the Judges of the Assistant Court of Appeal cannot work together except when they sit on appeals because there is only one room. You

have the system of the senior Magistrate acting as Judge of the Petty Debt Court and the Judge of the Petty Debt Court acting as a Judge of the Assistant Court of Appeal and so on; when you have to wait until the man who has climbed the ladder gets back down, that causes a terrible lapse in the work of the Court. One complains of the practitioner, another complains of the Judges and another complains of the witnesses when the solution is that you want a different Court; you want to have a proper building and then you can make the proposals you want to make. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to make those remarks under this Head when they should have been made under the Head "Judiciary".

Mr. LEWIS: I regard it as being peculiar that because a man is legally trained it would be *infra dig* for him to account for his travelling when you have the Director of Agriculture, the Director of the Public Works Department and the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department accounting for their mileage. That does not cut any ice with me, but if it is something new and if it does not work out cheaper, that is where I hope that travelling allowance will be given.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I forgot to reply to the hon. senior member for St. George about legal aid. The Legal Society or Bar Council had a provision for giving legal aid and some of us worked for people for nothing. I do not know if the Government goes into the matter, but the practitioner works for nothing and he is not paid out of the taxpayers' money. I would be surprised to hear the hon. member fighting strenuously in Court and remembering the size of his fee; I cannot see any practitioner remembering whether he has been paid or not. (Mr. LEWIS: He will ask for an adjournment). You ask a lawyer something and if he is in a hurry he will tell you anything; but in a Court you do not remember if you are appearing for Rockefeller or "Tal-a-la-la." (Laughter).

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: We barristers have to be paid before appearing in a case because we cannot sue for fees. I do not know of many barristers who, in the past, would go into Court without the little pocket over their shoulders being rather full. They could go into Court without any charge because the Bar has many members who are willing to do something for somebody; sometimes they are fighting more than hard and with a junior and they have no fee.

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

Head IX—Public Market—was called.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: In connection with item 23, "Expenses in connection with the running of Refrigerating Plant," as far as I know that plant is generating with about 20% of efficiency and I would say that the sooner the Government gets on with the new abattoir the better the position will be. I think they will find that these running expenses which are now at the figure of $5,104 can be appreciably lower.

Mr. ALLDER: I am speaking on items 14 to 18. I am wondering if the Government has not seen fit to substitute the use of natural gas at the Public Market instead of continuing with the present out-of-date method of providing for the slaughtering done down there. I feel that there is much difficulty in the preparation of hot water in the slaughterhouse and we know that the use of natural gas is more up-to-date and, I presume, more economical. Another point is that the administration of the Market has fallen to such an extent that you have absolute chaos down there. It seems as if nobody is responsible for the running of the Market. I do not know if the Government has not seen fit to make the appointment of a Superintendent; it seems as if the Acting Superintendent is not sure of his position and there is a glaring lack of interest on the part of the employees there. In the past, when you went to the Market you would see nothing but law and order being carried out, but to-day when you go down there you have to be dodging from stones or cocoanut shells or bones which the employees throw at each other. I feel that a Department like that which costs us a tidy sum to run it, should be brought up to date.

I know that a refrigerating unit might be something beyond the capacity of the Government to instal, but I have no doubt that making sure that law and order is maintained should be within the province of the Government so that people who go down there to purchase their goods will not be open to any danger of getting their heads knocked off. It has been some time now since the Government said that a new refrigerating plant has to be installed, but I have not heard anything about the appointment of a qualified Superintendent. In the case of this promise which has been made over a long period, nothing is done and things are getting worse. I am told that the butchers and meat vendors have to make use of a private refrigerating plant; that is because the plant at the Market is so bad that it is safer to pay for the transportation of the meat to the private plant and pay more for the refrigeration than to take the risk of carrying that meat to the Government plant and having it spoiled. You cannot expect a condition like that to be maintained because while the standards at the Market have been broken down the cost of running it is going up year after year. I hope that the Minister for Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries will investigate the situation down there and restore to us the orderly conditions which obtained at the market in the past.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would like to assure hon. members that the question of the appointment of a Superintendent at the Public Market and that of the provision of cold storage facilities are receiving the active attention of the Government. In so far as the cold storage facilities are concerned, information has been given to the Government quite recently by one of the officials who visited the colony, to the effect that a cold storage plant of a capacity of 800 tons will cost in the vicinity of $93,000 and one of a capacity of 400 tons will cost in the vicinity of $70,000.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like the Government, possibly with the expenditure of a few shillings, to have that Report printed so that the public can read it. This gentleman came down from British Guiana in connection with making a survey of what is needed and a report involving the expenditure of $93,000 is, in my opinion, worth being printed and laid on the table of the House. The hon. member should give an undertaking that he will see that this Report is made public. We should not merely be told about this matter; the public should see the Report.

Mr. MILLER: As the hon. junior member for the City has said, I would like to see that Report. I hope it will be printed and we will be given an opportunity of reading it before any legislation is brought before the House in this connection. I am very anxious and concerned about refrigeration in this colony because there is need for refrigeration

here. The scheme for refrigeration at the Market has been discussed in so many letters that it is something great. We have heard quite a lot about the refrigeration at the Public Market and I think I will not say anything more now but rather look forward to having the opportunity of reading and studying the Report about the cold storage plant.

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on item 18. "Hot water supply". I entirely agree with the honourable senior member for St. John; you cannot slaughter a pig and clean it without hot water. I do not like the idea of people puffing and blowing before the public can get their meat. The pipeline containing natural gas runs alongside the Public Market; it is only a question of supplying a few feet of pipe to get the natural gas in the Market and I am sure that my colleague would be willing to instal the pipe if the Government will supply the labour. We will do the manual work of laying the pipe. In the 20th century the idea of people having to puff and blow before open fire with the pot being liable to fall on them is abhorrent to me, and this amount of $756 for imported fuel could be spent more economically within the island. I think we should spend $50 for natural gas rather than $700 for wood and coal.

As regards the refrigerating plant. I am sure that honourable members are very interested to know that the gentleman whom we got down here from British Guiana has at last made a report as to this plant; that is a matter for congratulation.

Whether the Report will be acceptable to the tax payers and to this House is another matter altogether, but the Government should find some practical scheme for improving the conditions of refrigeration at the Public Market. I think the laws and regulations relating to the sale of fish particularly, should be more stringently enforced. My colleague will be able to tell us that it is a common practice when fish are brought in late at night and the price of them has dropped, for people to take them to an ice factory and on the next day they are mixed with fresh ones and sold at the maximum price. The only way in which we can by-pass that practice is to have efficient refrigerating units at Bridgetown, Eagle Hall and Oistin so that the fish will be more fit for human consumption when they are put into these refrigerating units.

The Eagle Hall Market has been turned over to the Vestry of St. Michael. I have no brief for the Vestry but they are doing the job fairly efficiently and that Market is better equipped than any other market in Barbados and almost in the Caribbean. It is almost a social centre at Eagle Hall; the next thing would be to have a band moving in. Up to 9 and 10 o'clock at night the market is a source of jubilation in the hearts of the people at Eagle Hall and the surrounding districts. Since we have seen how this market works in the hands of the Vestry, I am wondering if it would not be a good idea to turn over the other two markets to the respective Vestries of St. Peter and Christ Church. The honourable Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries is himself very nationalised when it comes to things pertaining to Christ Church, and I am sure he would like to see the Christ Church Market run by the people in Christ Church and that would not be a bad idea. I do not see why the Central Government should be called upon to support a market which they have erected and which is largely used by the people of Speightstown or Oistin as the case may be.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to my feet to move a vote of thanks to the honourable member for being so generous as to offer to do some work in the City, that is, to lay this pipe at the Public Market; but I think a shoemaker should stick to his laths and let this work be done by the people who are accustomed to doing it.

Mr. MILLER: I should like to say that the hot water which is used at the Public Market is not used for cleaning but for dissolving the substance which is found in the hide of the pigs. I agree that the system of providing the hot water is out of date and the apparatus used in this connection at the Market should be relegated to the Museum; however, if the honourable member is willing to lay the pipe at the Market I would be willing to help. I think that at this Market there should be some means of sterilization as obtains in big markets.

I believe that the Government is particularly anxious to see that district markets are erected all over the island rather than carry out the original idea of having a Central Market as was the case when the Public Market was built. That was unfortunate; it was thought that this Market would be there for people's benefit, but it has been referred to as a "White Elephant" and a dozen other things. I am very happy to learn that the question of having a new abattoir and cold storage facilities especially in respect of fish, is being considered.

Mr. LEWIS: I am wondering if we will hear anything about the inspection of weights and measures being taken from under this Head and placed into the hands of the Police. I still find that the matter is under this Head and I should like to know what progress is being made in this connection.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: For the benefit of honourable members I would like to say that the figures to which I referred are not contained in Dr. Fulton's Report; they were obtained from another source—the Fisheries Adviser to the Colonial Office—Dr. Hickling. The public of this island—I do not refer to those who own refrigerators because they will realise the benefits to be derived from the use of their refrigerators—seem to have a certain amount of fear of using fish which has been put in cold storage. We will have to try and educate the people along these lines and in doing so we will have in the first instance to consider the setting up of ice-boxes in the various fish marketing centres. The ice boxes which are used in other colonies cost about £200 each and the use of these ice-boxes will be the first step towards the installation of proper refrigerating units. We have to educate people to the fact that fish which has been put in cold storage can be used; we cannot go from one stage to the other unless we see that the public will appreciate using fish which has been put in cold storage.

The question of the marketing and distribution of fish is receiving the active consideration of the Government; we have in mind parishes like St. Thomas and St. George as places in which marketing depots could be established, not only in respect of fish but in respect of other commodities as well. The aim of this Government is to reduce the importation of large quantities of cod fish and to use some of the money which is spent in that direction to assist the fishing industry on a larger scale.

Mr. MILLER: I would hate the honourable Minister to feel that I am overriding the idea of experts. However, when it comes to putting fish in cold storage, I do not think that the use of an ice-box costing £200 would be the correct thing. I do not know what conveniences you would have in dealing with the matter, but, I repeat, the idea of using an ice-box at that cost is not the correct thing. I make no attempt at overriding the advice of experts but fish would deteriorate at probably ten degrees Fahrenheit. If you hope to use fish which has been put in cold storage you have to

think in terms of sub-zero which is not obtainable in any locally-made ice-box.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN reported and 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.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE ESSO STANDARD OIL S.A. PETROLEUM OIL STORAGE STATION BILL, 1954.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the House resumes Committee on the Estimates, I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill intituled an Act to authorise Esso Standard Oil S.A. to construct and maintain a Petroleum Oil Storage Station, with amendments which are shown in the Bill.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to deal with these amendments forthwith.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The amendments are trivial amendments and the first one is in Clause 7. Apparently somebody discovered that the Act which is in existence today says not only the "importation storage and sale of petroleum and petroleum products" but also the "discharge or escape," and the Other Place has inserted those words after the word "sale". With regard to the other amendment, that occurs in Clause 8 where it says that "the rights, authorities, obligations and liabilities of the company so transferring under this Act shall be transferred to and vested and be exercised by and be attached to the person or company to whom the same shall have been transferred", the preposition "in" was left out after the word "vested" and it has been inserted by the Other Place. Those are the amendments and I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be now read a second time.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I think it would be well to refer to the Bill as passed by this House; if a Bill is returned to us we should be in a position to tell whether we have made any mistake or not. If we pass a Bill with something in it, then there should not be any amendment coming before us if it has been left out; we should refer to the actual Bill which we passed and see if the mistake is ours or not. The Clerk should be in a position to tell us that.

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter has already had the certification of the Clerk.

The question that these amendments 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. M. E. Cox, the amendments were agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES FOR 1954—55.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

HEAD IX—PUBLIC MARKET

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were last in Committee on the Estimates, Head IX was being considered.

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

HEAD X—FIRE BRIGADE

Head X—Fire Brigade—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head X stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS 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.

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

HEAD XII—REGISTRATION OFFICE

Head XII—Registration Office—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head XII stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: When the matter was discussed on previous occasions I could not get any definite answer, but I should like to know if any member of the Government can say to-day whether the gentleman who is dealing with the organisation of Departments has made any recommendation so far as this Department is concerned, telling the Government whether they can speed up the work so as to give better service and cut down storage space and things of that sort. I wonder if this Department has come under this gentleman's scrutiny. I would like to know if the method of dealing with things in that Department is out of date and if so, whether any attention will be paid to the method of writing out things and recording them.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not think that Mr. Foster will be anything to do with that matter; I mentioned to the House the Departments he is looking after and the Registration Office is not one of them. All the Registrar needs is a special typist; at present he has to walk around and try and borrow a typist when he wants one. On the last occasion a Judge in the Assistant Court of Appeal had to wait so as to get a typist. The only organisation which could be done in the Registration Office is to provide a typewriter and a typist; what we are providing for here is an adding machine. Speaking from memory I feel pretty sure that there is no question of Mr. Foster dealing with this Department; the Registrar has been complaining about the lack of his own typist.

Mr. LEWIS: It is regrettable that that is known and no provision is made for it; at least the Registrar should be able to make provision for somebody in his office to be a typist.

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

HEAD XIII — LEGISLATURE

The Head and the total amount to be voted under it were called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $20,768 be voted under this Head.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I see under this Head, Item No. 28, Accommodation and office equipment for reporters and the amount of $2,200 is set down against it to be voted. The note to its says: "Cost of providing and furnishing a room at the House of Assembly for the reporters. Includes provision for the purchase of furniture and filing cabinets, typewriters and a fan." I cannot say exactly, but I hope that the Minister in charge would explain where this office is going to be put for the reporters. It has been drawn to my attention that it is going to be put in a most unsuitable space, that is between the hall-way leading into this Chamber and the lobby. I think we have a Bill before this House to provide an additional reporter for this Chamber and if the place where I mentioned is the place which will be converted in an office for reporters, I cannot see how three reporters can be accommodated in that limited space particulary in a tropical country like this. It seems somewhat peculiar to me how the thought ever came about of converting that hall-way into an office for three reporters when there are no windows and the space is so limited there. If you are going to make these reporters permanent employees you should give them proper accommodation. I feel that better accommodation can be provided for these servants of the House under the present circumstances. I feel Mr. Chairman that this Legislature should do nothing different from providing the best accommodation at its disposal for the servants of this House. It these reporters are required to work on a whole time basis they would have to spend eight hours of a day in this office. As I look around this Chamber I feel better accommodation for these reporters can be provided elsewhere and you can do so without in any way depriving the Clerk of his prerequisite to the finest office. You will find that he is provided with commodious quarters and I do not grudge him as Head of this so-called department for having such quarters. You will also find that the Librarian and Secretary is in another wing of this building which seems palatial when compared with what you are providing for three reporters. I do not feel it is fair to reporters to coop them in that space as if it were an afterthought of yours. I say that because I feel whenever we have to make accommodation for any of our officers we should try our best to provide them with offices as good as any other office in the Public Service. In my view reporters cannot give of their best if they are called upon to work in that room which according to the note is to be artificially lighted and to be fitted with an electric fan. I am not saying that what is proposed to be done is proposed by any particular Minister but I feel that that part of this building next to the lobby is the most unsuitable place to put three people to work. I have been one of those persons, who from the time I entered this House as a member, said that a proper office should be made for the accommodation of the reporters and that they should be whole-time officers. I have always considered that it was unsatisfactory to have them working at their homes. Now that we have reached this stage I feel that we should look into the matter most carefully. We should try our best to put these workers in an office that would be worthy of any legislature.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on Item No. 2—Chaplain of the House of Assembly. I feel that a good case could be made out in favour of an increase in salary for the Chaplain of this Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That item is fixed by law.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I think that law should be changed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the honourable member to speak on it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item No. 16, — Allowance to messenger, for which the sum of $48 is to be voted. This is an allowance given to the messenger in respect of late sittings of this Assembly. Honourable members are aware that the last time we met, we remained until after three o'clock in the morning.

(A VOICE: That is coming up in a Bill which is before the House).

I will desist from saying anything more until then.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: As far as the reporters are concerned, I do not know if they have been told about the new arrangement. I take it that His Honour the Speaker and the Clerk have got together about it. I really do not know anything of the proposals. I would suggest to His Honour the Speaker and the Clerk to get hold of the reporters and it may be possible to use another inner room.

Mr. HAYNES: Now that consideration is given to accommodation for reporters, I think it is the appropriate time to try out air conditioning process because if it proves successful, this whole Chamber could be air conditioned. As most of us know, it is very difficult now that the ministers are in their present situations to hear what is being said, and the only way to solve that difficulty would be to air-condition this room. Like anything else, we should make a small trial somewhere and I think it would be an excellent thing if it is tried out in a small space like the room which is proposed for the reporters. If it proves successful, then we could extend it to our legislative chamber.

The question that the sum of $20,768 be voted under the Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XIV — JUDICIARY

The Head and the total amount to be voted under it were called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $51,528 be voted under this Head.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am repeating what I consider is an hardy annual. It is in connection with Item No. 31—Jurors and Marshals at Grand Sessions. This question has been drawn to the attention of the Government over and over again and on this occasion I am again going to draw to the attention of the honourable Premier that the people who are called upon to serve as Jurors are complaining that the $1.54 per day which is allowed to them is what can be described as bare lunch coppers. That amount was laid down since 1891 and has never been changed. I know that it may not present any burden on the few estate owners and overseers and people of that sort who are called upon to attend that Court, but you can well imagine the blow it is causing to the poor carpenter and even agricultural labourers who are called upon to

serve their country in this way. It is nonsensical to say that this is something in which a man is called upon to serve his country and he should take it as an honour. There was a time when members of this House were not paid but we are paid now. As we all know, there are few things which can be done free of charge nowadays.

I think that the Government should give the question of increase in allowance to jurors who attend the Court of Grand Sessions serious consideration. This question has been brought to my attention again yesterday morning. As I have said, the allowance per day of $1.54 was laid down in 1891 and while it has not changed since then, the value of money today has changed. A commensurate amount to what that amount should be today would be 18 shillings. That amount today is only worth about two shillings. I hope the Government will see fit to amend the Act so as to bring this allowance more in line with present-day values.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have a note on this matter and it expresses in similar vein what the last honourable member has said but it would probably add more emphasis on the subject. I am not directly a believer in the jury system so you will see that anything I say would be just taking a broad view of the matter. I believe it is stupid to ask a layman to act as a judge with others of his type to take somebody's life in his hand but it is a law of the country and legal experts say that it is better that somebody's life should be in the hands of a jury than in a judge's. I have heard it said that if you are guilty, it is better if you are tried by a jury but if you are innocent, it is better to be tried by a judge.

What we have to question ourselves when we are looking at a matter as this is:— and this is what the honourable Premier should do — how does $1.54 of 1891 for something relate to something of the same relative value in this year of 1954? To be realistic, if that Act of 1891 has not been amended, it means to say in that respect that there has been no particular change in the relative value of money since that time. But we know that is not the case because we have seen in our lifetime that Government has changed its fees in certain things pertaining to the courts and that being so, I would say that the fee for jurors attending the Court of Grand Sessions does need revision. I would say that the jury system today has reached the stage when a man does not bear in mind that he is serving his country; he bears in mind how the fee he gets would relate to the inconvenience he has to undergo. I feel that the fee should relate to something that it related to in 1891. I do not mean that you should pay them a princely salary, but do not leave them to lose by service to their country. We have just finished a somewhat lengthy discussion on an amount of $8,000 that was put in the Estimates for some purpose which was not authorised. The amount set down against this item for jurors is $4,800 and the actual amount spent in 1952—53 was $5,975. I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that if the Government gives serious consideration to this item that it can do no harm to the expenditure of this colony if the fee is raised to 12 shillings per day. Increasing it to that amount would not put a man who is called upon to serve as a juror in a better position than the fee placed persons who served in that respect a couple years back. When the fee of $1.54 per day was allowed to jurors in 1891, an agricultural labourer was getting one shilling per day; he is now getting six shillings per day. I am sure that if the amount of money over which we had a debate today is not used, and we even have to make supplementary provision of $5,000 by our increasing this fee to jurors, we will still have remaining in the Treasury $3,000. Mr. Chairman, I think if we increase this fee payable to jurors at Grand Sessions it would bring a measure of relief to the people who serve and would prevent many of them from suffering great embarrassment.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—Again, I must ask the honourable Premier whether the public of Barbados can look forward to any re-organisation in the judiciary within the not distant future. From the reply given by the honourable minister, when we were discussing Head VIII—Legal, I gather—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member tell me what he is speaking on?

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking under the whole Head and on all the items which are not fixed by law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You should state what item you are speaking on for the Committee to be guided.

Mr. BARROW: It may be a matter of courtesy to the Committee but it may be inconvenient for me to pick out anyone separately. If I do so, I may mislead the Committee. I am merely saying that Head XIV—Judiciary, stands part of the motion and speaking on that motion, I would say that from the reply by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, I understand that a Committee was set up comprised of the honourable junior member for St. James, the former Solicitor General of the colony and the honourable Premier himself to look into the question of the re-organisation of the Judiciary. Well, from the activities of these three very learned and industrious members of the legal profession, it seems to me an improbability for the three of them ever to meet together and if they do, the chances are slim that they will arrive at the same conclusion. I do not think that the public of Barbados should be held up because of the composition of a committee that was appointed by somebody else. I feel that a Commission should be invited to look into the matter with a view to having something done as quickly as possible. I am not not detracting from the ability or the integrity of any of the members of the Committee that has been set up, but I feel that the machinery of justice in Barbados is at present creaking at the joints. A lot of the Acts on which we depend are sixty and seventy years old and I feel that there should be some Revision Committee or some special commission set up for revising the whole set up in the Judiciary of Barbados.

Sir, it is not sufficient to ask three busy men like the honourable Premier, the honourable junior member for St. James and the former Solicitor General of this colony to give up their valuable time, especially when they are already so overburdened with public duties, to sit on this Committee. In England, the Haldane Committee was set up to look into the judiciary of that country and it took six years before it could arrive at something which could be called a workable solution at all. From time to time, the Lord Chancellor of England has set up different committees on matters of this kind and they take a lot of consideration and detailed study. The litigants in Barbados and members of the Bar are suffering terribly owing to the conditions which prevail in the courts of the island.

Some of the Courts in this colony are peculiar to Barbados and some of them are unknown to any part of the British Empire, and, needless to say, these courts are a law unto themselves. That is not

satisfactory enough. I think our judiciary should be brought into line, in so far as is worthy of emulation with the other colonies of the Caribbean at least.

When it comes to the question of books I notice, Mr. Chairman, that under No. 57, Books, Stationery and Office Expenses, that there is no allocation for the Law Library at all. I am sure that any member of the West Indian Court of Appeal or any practising barrister will tell you that the Law Library as exists today, is totally inadequate for the needs of a modern community and I am rather shocked to see that there is allocation for books for the Attorney General's Department, but no allocation for the Law Library. In my humble opinion, it would take between $3,000 and $5,000 to bring the Law Library up-to-date and that would be only for such books as would bring it to working efficiency. Sir, when you consider that the administration of justice is one of the important cogs in machinery of the body politic, that sum is not too much to spend for its proper administration; therefore, I say again that I am rather surprised at the amount allocated by the Government for books, stationery and office expenses.

As regards the office of Registrar of Friendly Societies, we have a Judge of the Assistant Court of Appeal serving in that capacity. One wonders if the office of Registrar of Friendly Societies is really one which is considered in its proper perspective; one wonders whether sufficient weight is attached to the work of Friendly Societies. I think the time has come when one of the officers of the Court should be taken from there and put in some other department,—whether it be the Auditor General's or the Accountant General's I am not prepared to say at the moment—to look after the working of the Friendly Societies in the island. I also feel that this Legislature should discuss the report on Friendly Societies by Mr. and Mrs. Wells which I am sure was published more than twelve months ago.

Perhaps, due to the very bad reporting which we get here in Barbados, both of the legislative debates and the current events, the general public is not aware of the enormous amount of litigation which goes on in the law courts from day to day, nor is it aware of the general difficulties which confront both practitioners and the number of people who use the law courts from day to day. The Administration seems to adopt the attitude that the Judiciary in Barbados is the equivalent of an ugly sister which should neither be seen nor heard or something which you do not want to mention. It is true that the Judiciary is not dependent on the Administration, but I feel more attention should be given to the organisation of the Judiciary and more publicity should be given to the tremendous difficulties which exist today in it for members of the public. One of the things I would like to see come into force is a separate traffic court and a separate family court. I would also like to see a nursery department in the Courtyard or in one of the buildings for the numerous illegitimate children who have to be brought into the law courts from day to day. I would like to see two nurses in charge of that nursery. I would also like to see a proper waiting room for witnesses who attend the courts.

I would like to draw to the attention of members of this House that the very place where the sanctity of the principle of equality of all under the law should be observed first and foremost is in the law courts of Barbados, because of the fact that they are the first theatres of privilege in the island, but that sanctity is observed in the breach. I shall give an illustration which if I am wrong, I would like honourable members who have occasion to practice in those courts to tell me that I am wrong. It is this: if a witness of a certain social or economic class comes into either of the law courts, he is not allowed to sit in the well of the court; he sits in the compartment of the court reserved for members of the legal profession and that practice is encouraged by Police Magistrates of this island. In other words, if a manager of a plantation or a director of a Broad Street Store goes into the law courts of this island to give evidence, he would sit in an exalted position, but if the same person was called upon to give evidence in a court in England, or the United States of Americaa, or even in Trinidad, he would either stand outside until he is called, or sit in the waiting room, or go into the court and take his seat on the back bench along with the other people there. Of course, the privilege which certain people receive in the Law Courts of this island is also granted to Civil Servants. I well remember a former Attorney General of this Island would not allow a student lawyer to sit in the barrister's compartment at some sitting of the High Courts of this island. I do not know what were his motives for doing so—but—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think I have given the honourable member a lot of latitude; the honourable member is doing even more than making a second reading speech now.

Mr. BARROW: I am not speaking on any particular item, Mr. Chairman; I am speaking on the head generally. I am discussing the Judiciary of Barbados. Whether you like to hear what I am saying or not, whether you agree with what I am saying or not, is immaterial to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am saying that the honourable member is making a second reading speech and you will have to confine your remarks to some item.

Mr. BARROW: I said in my opening remarks that I proposed to touch on all the items to be voted under this Head,—Judiciary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow you to go so far. Other honourable members will want to do a similar thing. You must confine your remarks to some item under this Head with which we are dealing.

Mr. BARROW: I did not know that I could not discuss the Judiciary of Barbados without my speaking on a particular item. As I have said, I am speaking on all the items to be voted. I have nothing but the highest courtesy for the Chair but in the interest of the public of Barbados, if needs be, I would have to be discourteous. I am speaking on the question of the Judiciary and its set up in Barbados . I am speaking on the motion that the Head, Judiciary, and the amount to be voted stand part.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I did say earlier in referring to the honourable junior member for the City that it is a matter of courtesy for an honourable member to let Your Honour know what head he is speaking on. Obviously, I agree with Your Honour that the honourable senior member for St. George is making a second reading speech and it is for you to rule whether he is making such a speech. I have been a member of this Chamber for many years and I have never heard any member speaking on the whole head of expenditure when the House was in Committee. I have never seen it for all my years in here.

Mr. BARROW: I do not want to quote anything because what rule of debate there must be, depends largely on the Chair. As I have said, I am speaking on the motion that Head XIV—Judiciary,

stand part. I am talking about witnesses. I am saying the witnesses ——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the item you are speaking on?

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking on the items, Nos. 37, 38, 40, and any other item which has anything to do with witnesses. I am saying that witnesses go into the law courts of Barbados and of all places, the law courts of this island are used as a theatre of discrimination. It does not happen in any part of the world except South Africa. I am saying that the Police Magistrates of Barbados should not encourage that sort of thing. How can litigants feel that there is equality before the law when one party who is sitting in the well of the court sees the other party sitting in the barristers' compartments and being smiled on by the Magistrate. Well that state of affairs happens in every court in Barbados. I do not mind your having separate bibles for witnesses to kiss while taking the oath because in the parish which I have the honour to represent, they have separate confirmations. Sir, in the Court of Grand Sessions when an accused is charged with bestiality, housebreaking, murder or any criminal offence, he is allowed to sit down after answering the charge until the judge is about to pass sentence. In the Police courts, even if the defendant is a woman, and the trial lasts for three days, the poor woman must stand all the time, leaning on the rail looking in the eyes of the magistrate. It is only in some circumstances such as if a lawyer appeals to a magistrate to allow his client to sit down that the person is given such opportunity. Sir, you cannot name one court in America where a prisoner has to stand up five or six hours at a time.

Sir, what perfection can there be when you allow certain sections of the community to have special privileges in court while other sections of the community are hounded about the place. With some sections, if there is no room in the well of the Court for them to sit down, they are sent out of the Court in the hot broiling sun. Sir, you do not have to be a Socialist to know that this is wrong. If I am saying one word which is not true, there are four others in this Chamber to say whether it is so or not.

Sir, I happened to be in Nuremburg and had the honour of seeing one of the biggest trials of war criminals taking place. Each of the persons on trial was allowed to sit, and as a matter of fact, one of them put his feet up on the rails throughout the trial. When they gave evidence in the witness stand, they were also allowed to sit down. That was a court in Germany and the persons charged were Fascists and Nazis. I can tell you something of the courts in the Mother Country, Trinidad, St. Lucia and St. Vincent. I cannot tell you anything of those in South Africa; probably, the honourable senior member for St. Lucy who is an expert on that part of the Commonwealth can tell you something of the courts there. I would only say that when you compare our courts with other places, the conditions here are barbarous and it seems as if we are encouraging it, either because we do not know better or because we do not care. We have no inspector of courts; we have no commission coming out to see how justice is administered; therefore, we who are the watchdogs, we who have to come into contact with the people from day to day should see that something be done to bring about a better state of affairs. As I have said, I want to see a nursery for the many young children that are brought to court from day to day with their parents. I want to see cribs for them and two nurses looking after them instead of having them standing up in court besides their mothers. We have a Social Welfare Officer. What recommendations has she made to Government on this score? I believe if the last Commissioner of Police were still down here, he would have made recommendations on it. He was noted for assuming duties which he was not called upon to perform, but it might be said that those duties were sometimes to the benefit of the community. I am not accusing him.

Sir, when it comes to the country courts, they are ridiculous. The first thing which should be done is to stop calling magistrates by the title of Police Magistrates. In England that practice has ceased long ago. By your calling magistrates, "Police Magistrates," the Police feel that magistrates belong to them and they are strengthened in that conviction by the courts being held in the various Police Stations, particularly in the case of the country districts where the courts are held in a little room allocated by the Police Inspector. Even when cases of a domestic nature are held in them, such as cases between husband and wife, the atmosphere prevailing in them pertains to that as if you were in Glendairy. Sir, a law court should be a place where you could feel as comfortable as if you were in the Plaza Theatre or any other cinema. It should be a place where a Civil Servant, if he had a few minutes to spare could go into, either for education or entertainment. There is nothing in the courts of Barbados which would encourage any person to go more than once.

As regards to the fees for jurors at Court of Grand Sessions, I am sure that the honourable senior member for St Lucy would not fail in saying something about that. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy as well as the honourable junior member for St. Peter spoke about the question already and there is no point in my stretching it out any longer. I will say no more on the question than that I have urged long ago for greater compensation for jurors who attend the Court of Grand Sessions. They should be paid more, because you should not have people disinterested when they are sitting to pass judgment on their fellowman. These are different days to those gone by. What was good in 1154 is not good today and to say that the office of a juror is one of honour today is not strictly correct because more people regard it as a duty which they should not do. People nowadays have nothing to do with anything which they would lose by. The honourable Premier performs a public service for which he gets remuneration and yet greater honour is heaped upon him than any juryman. Why should you tell a juryman that he should feel it an honour to serve his country in that respect and use that as an argument for not giving him adequate remuneration? I regard theirs as a duty of honour but they should also be adequately compensated for the time spent in the performance of that duty.

Another new arrangement which should be made in the law courts of this island is for civil costs to be awarded to an injured party if he is successful in a criminal case, in the same criminal court which tried the issue. I think it is high time that we adopt the practice, both from the point of view of saving the public from the expense of opening another court to try the issue all over again and from the point of view of saving time to the parties concerned. In Trinidad, if you were to be attacked by desperadoes and you took them into court and you got redress, not only would a fine accrue to the Crown, but the Magistrate would also give costs to you sufficiently to cover compensation for the injuries you received. You would not have to pay a lawyer another fee in a civil court to obtain such damages. In Barbados, after your getting redress in a Criminal Court you would have to put them in a Civil Court and pay a lawyer and probably

wait two or three years before you got compensation. We do not like to consider that Trinidad is more advanced than we are even in judicial matters, yet a Magistrate of Trinidad decides both of these cases at one time. I think the work of Police Magistrates and the Judges of the Assistant Court of Appeal would be proportionately reduced if we adopt similar legislation in Barbados. I am rather surprised that we lag so far behind Trinidad when we should be leading in every department of the body politic.

I notice the sum of $8,400 for registering officers. Unfortunately that item is fixed by law; however there is a note showing that the amount has increased by $720 recently. Perhaps the Minister in charge could give us some indication as to what that is for.

(A VOICE: Increases of salaries).

I do not understand how the registering officers come under the Judiciary. It is very peculiar setup that the people who register the voters of a particular parish should be under the Judiciary. Anyhow that is a question which is fixed by law and I will not dwell on it. I would only say that I am very surprised to see that item under the Head Judiciary.

As regards to Item No. 43, Interpreter, I do not think the sum of $24 to be voted against the Item is adequate because we are getting more and more foreigners coming with litigation in the law courts of the Island. At any rate, if more money will be necessary, Government can always come back with a supplementary vote.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman I am dealing with Item No. 46—Travelling Expenses for which an amount of $2,500 is to be voted. It is to pay travelling allowance to acting Police Magistrates and to seven Magistrate's Clerks in accordance with the Travelling Regulations. It is an item which should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. The question of travelling is always a sore point. You are now paying travelling to acting Magistrates and you do not pay travelling to Magistrates who are appointed. At the moment you have three Magistrates who have been acting for quite a long time and I am sure each of them would like to be appointed and it appears to me that they have been kept back from such appointments for no apparent reason. In the case of one, I understand it is in regard of health but to me his health seems very exuberant. There is absolutely no reason for keeping people like Magistrates acting for a long time. If you keep them acting for a long time, how can they have the courage of their convictions in giving decisions? That is so obvious that it does not need stressing. As I have said, it is not fair to the public or to the administration of justice that acting appointments should be allowed to continue indefinitely, particularly when there is available material worthy of such appointments in the island. I understand that an appointment has been made to the office of Registrar, and if that is so, I would like to know how long that announcement would be withheld before it is publicly made.

On the question of Item No. 31, Jurors and Marshals at Court of Grand Sessions, it is one that I have been making reference on from the first year that I had the honour to be a member of this Chamber. Sir, jurors attending the Court of Grand Sessions are paid to-day the same thing—$1.54—as that which was paid in 1891 and every year we are told that it is a great honour to sit on a jury and that people should be pleased to be granted that privilege of sitting in judgment on their fellowman. Mr. Chairman, these are different days; these are days of the greater the honour, the greater should be the remuneration. As a matter of fact, unless the remuneration is as great as the honour, the person does not like the honour. The dollar is more almighty today than it ever was and the person who is not in a position to pay out for anything he wants is powerless; he is not respected. It is empty honour to-day to a man who is summoned to be a juror because in time past when a man was sitting for three to five weeks as a juror at $1.54, he would be receiving something worthy for his time, but to-day that is not so. The amount of $1.54 was fixed at a time when a dollar was worth a dollar and when a mason or carpenter or painter was working for 40 cents a day. Probably, in 1894, they were working for less than that.

Sir, it will be remembered that the question of Ministerial status was not settled until the remuneration of the executive side was fully settled. Even if it is a high honour to sit in judgment on a fellow human being, there is no justification for a perpetuation of this scandalously inadequate remuneration to the persons who are called upon to receive that high honour. Certainly, the question that it is a honour to do so does not hold water any longer to-day.

I see that the sum of $480 is to be voted for jurors and marshals who attend the Court of Common Pleas. It is the usual amount that is set down. I would like the Minister in charge of justice to take note that it is time to consider seriously and to take some steps to abolish the question of a special jury in Barbados. This amount is to compensate the people who sit as jurors at Common Pleas and the persons who are selected to form that jury are the last of the Barbados Bourbons. When these persons are selected to sit in judgment, they come from their feudal halls fully decided as to their opinion of the two parties. They come fully decided whether A or B should be given their verdict. There was never a time in the history of special jurors that the verdict was not decided beforehand having regard to the family relations, the political standing of the party, from the point of view of affiliations and other various circumstances by means of which a Barbados special jury arrives at its verdict. I would like to see the special jury system dispensed with as soon as possible and I am sure that the administration of justice in these parts would be enriched and enhanced through the means of a common jury. I do not mean to abolish the jury system because it is my belief that there is nothing as good as or as fair as trial by a jury in matters affecting the liberty or the life of the subject; but trial by special jury in Barbados is a pure farce.

The honourable senior member for St. George dealt extensively and exhaustively with the practices obtained in the local courts and I support him to a large extent. It is really amusing when one returns from England after one's student days are completed to see how some witnesses kiss the Book Even when a witness in Barbados kisses the Book, one sees the discrimination in Barbados. One sees that a person of one class kisses one type of book while people of another class kiss another type. The Testament kissed by a certain class is new and very clean while the Testament kissed by the general public is kept on the witness stand and it is without covers and its pages are dirty. It is also amusing to see how police witnesses are sworn. If one is a private or corporal, he kisses one of the testaments that is on the witness stand; but if he is a sergeant or an inspector, he stretches forward to the Police Magistrate who hands him a new and clean testament and if he is not handed one of the clean testaments, he picks up one of those on the witness

stand and turns to a very clean page; but even then, instead of kissing the Book, he kisses his right thumb. I am not blaming present-day magistrates. You can only blame them for lack of the pioneering spirit by they not departing from what their predecessors have been doing from time immemorial. At the present, we have a first-class magisterial Bench and had it not been that some have the fear that the sword of Damocles is hanging above their heads—bear in mind, it has happened all too recently that one of their colleagues has been despatched into oblivion without offer of gratitude—one could not help saying that these magistrates have the material in them to be able dispensers of justice.

But, sir, I was dealing with the practices of witnesses and there is another aspect to that matter. Sometimes you have six witnesses who are called to appear in a particular case and the court crier after calling them will send some into the Magistrate's private room to sit until their turn comes to give evidence while with witnesses who look like some honourable members on the extreme left of this table, he tells them to go down the steps and await their turn. This is a practice obtaining from time immemorial and it is a great pity that the present-day magistrates do not have the courage to alter this state of affairs.

I also notice, Mr. Chairman that the amount of $1,200 is to be voted against the item, West Indian Court of Appeal, and I trust that Their Lordships are not waiting to learn that this money is voted before making the necessary arrangements to conduct an urgent case, because one cannot hear a word of the likely date of Their Lordships' arrival to conduct this case. I hope that they are not waiting to be sure that we vote this money before they set foot on the soil of Barbados.

Under Item, No. 58, Purchase of books and publications, I see that the sum to be voted is $385 but that sum is inadequate. I do not know how many Law Reports it is proposed to put in the Law Library, but humble practitioners like myself know that $385 to be spent annually on Law Reports for a Law Library to suit the needs of the Bench and Bar of this colony is a very inadequate sum.

Sir, I trust that the criticisms which have been made on this Head would receive the careful attention and the ready ear of the honourable member who is minister for justice. I hope he has allowed nothing to distract his attention from the words which have been said in the course of this debate. One other matter which I would like to reach the ears of the honourable, learned and gallant member for St. Joseph and which was mentioned in part by the honourable, learned and gallant member for St. George, is that of seats and chairs for witnesses in the police magistrates' courts. I would say that whenever one applies to any of the present-day magistrates for a chair to be given to a witness to sit down, the magistrate unhesitatingly sees to it that one is furnished. They looked upon it is but fair that some witnesses or even defendants should not be allowed to stand during the whole of a trial, and as I have said, it is only because they have found themselves in an establishment where there has been a certain system that they have tolerated it. Sir, I feel that as a result of this afternoon's debate on the Judiciary, matters which if they never occurred to the Minister in charge and others connected with the administration of justice, now that they have been brought to light will be fully discussed by them with a view to remedying them. With regard to seating accommodation in the Police Magistrates' Courts, it is very difficult for Counsel to find a chair which is whole, because in three out of four of them, one has to sit very equally and be careful when one rises out of them. I think I have called attention and have emphasized what appear to be the most pressing points that want remedying and I trust if I am still here next year that I would not have to refer to them again.

Mr. ALLDER: If I were a professional man and had something to do with the law courts of the island, I would suggest at all times and places an increase for jurors and those who give evidence before the courts but as an impartial observer of what goes on and one who is interested in the bringing about of an ordered state, I deprecate any suggestion for increase of pay for jurors or witnesses, especially when that suggestion tends to create a disgruntled state of mind in those who must sit in judgment on their equals. I am saying that what a juror gets by way of allowance so long as it covers travelling expenses and would defray the cost of his lunch is sufficient. Nobody knows that better than the legal minds in this Chamber. Under the old Roman policy, citizens were expected to sit in judgment on each other and the fundamental reason underlying that was the perpetuation of a safe and stable state. Mr. Chairman, the evil comes in attendance. No individual having responsibility for maintenance of his family should be asked to attend Court of Grand Sessions on days that he is not required to sit. Each juror should know the day he is expected to sit on a jury even if he is not allowed to know the case which he has to determine. That would relieve a lot of the difficulties which jurymen experience now. No sooner than the few legal luminaries who are politicians say that they should be increased pay for jurymen every potential citizen feels he is a potential juror, therefore when he is called upon to sit in judgment on his fellowman he should receive the pay of a judge. It must be borne in mind that it is service which one is doing oneself. It is just as sitting on a Council and saying how your household as a small unit of a locality must be run. When you are urging for this increase in pay for jurors you are causing a man to feel whenever he is called upon to serve as a juror that wrong is being done to him, and as a result, you are liable to get miscarriage of justice. As I have said, every individual should feel proud when he is called upon to sit as a juror at a Court of Grand Sessions. That is the small amount that is expected of him in the running of the community. The next thing to that is the exercising of his vote. Those are the two principal factors which apply to citizens of any community. To say that a juror is not treated well by not giving him an increased fee is definitely not realizing one's responsibility to the community. As I have said I do not agree that jurors are so poverty stricken that their families or dependents have to wait on their earnings from the service they render to the community. What I would say is that they should not be asked to attend Court everyday for two or three weeks when most of the days they are not asked to sit at all. No juror should be asked to sit on more than one case and when that case is over he should know that he is excused for the balance of the session and can go back home and do his job. We have enough people in our community from which sufficient jurymen can be drawn so that a juryman would only be called on once for a session, but of course, this idea will be severely criticised because for the past few years you see the same faces acting as jurymen and it does seem to me as if a few of those people use it as a means of livelihood. This has been a criticism which I have heard on many occasions. If the regulations were to be modified along the lines of my suggestions,

I am sure the hardship would be relieved on those who have to travel from St. Joseph to Bridgetown and back when called upon to act as a juror. Mr. Chairman, I hate to know that suggestions are made for an increase in this respect. I do not want my statement to be misunderstood. I do not mean those who give service in a productive capacity to increase the wealth of the community should not be given adequate remuneration but in this particular respect, I feel every individual owes it to the community to serve. It is merely one's contribution to the perpetuation of a safe and stable community.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The honourable member forgets that he is now a member of the House of Assembly and this House has recently agreed to increase members, salaries to $160 per month. I call a spade a spade and he who is called upon to administer justice is performing as equal service as any member who is in here. I am looking at the matter from the point of view of what relation $1.54 bore in 1891, to what it bears in 1954. I would suggest that the question be gone into as a matter of principle and it is on that score that I am taking it up. A point has been raised by the honourable senior member for St. John to the effect that you can possibly prevent a juryman from spending the whole of four weeks or the length of a session in attendance at Court. The honourable member is not a lawyer, therefore he does not know that a juror is being challenged, therefore, you cannot tell a juror beforehand that he is assigned to a particular case because the accused has the right to challenge him and the prosecutor also has the right to ask him to stand by.

Mr. ALLDER: I did not say that a juror should know the case on which he would be called to sit; I suggested that a juror should know on what day he must present himself at the Town Hall.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Even on that suggestion it would be very difficult for the administration, because the person summoning people to be jurors would have to summon partly the whole Island and would have to do so everyday. The honourable member must bear in mind that you have to present 48 persons from which an accused has the right to challenge in the selection of twelve to be empanelled. One has to look at this question from the point of view of justice and fair play. One has to look at the question from the point of view of the poor artisan who may be called away from his work as a mason to get $1.54 a day when he could be working for $3 a day. The honourable member must put himself in that particular person's shoes. Even overseers at plantations who are getting $200 per month and prerequisites are groaning at their earnings in these days, far less the poor artisan.

Mr. ALLDER: If the odious comparison had come from any other source I would have forgiven that person but the honourable member should know even more so than many of us, because he has been trained as a lawyer, that to make comparisons with the payment of jurors and a salary which a landlord gets is definitely not on all fours and is not necessary; and further, it is very embarrassing. It is a fact that as a legislator one has to spend many hours of the day in saying how the colony's affairs should be conducted therefore, one would have to expect some remuneration for the time and sacrifice which he makes in so doing, but if the same individual should be called to sit in judgment on one of his equals he would not, or should not, expect to be paid equally as if he were employed in another capacity. The honourable member knows that. To sit in judgment on one's fellowman is one of the foundation stones of democracy. It was practised for centuries, and allied to that is the rallying of the individual in defence of his community. I do not have to practise cheap politics. The statement of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy may be popular and some people would agree with it, but it is cheap to let the people feel that is the best policy; it is not the best. There still remains today some semblance of community spirit, therefore, one owes some service to the community in which one lives. To compare the salary of a legislator with what we pay a juryman or whether you should pay him is beyond the point. If the honourable junior member for St. Lucy wanted to enter the debate, certainly he is capable of entering it on a higher plane than he did just now. I still say that you should not increase the compensation to jurors who attend sittings of the Court of Grand Sessions. You should not even compensate those who give evidence before the Courts because you are pointing the community to a system of Licence.

Mr. WILLIAMS: What I wish to draw to the honourable member's attention is this; when I cited what is, to my mind, a very bad example, I never chose that in any personal way. What I was trying to bring home to the honourable member's mind is that we can pay a man for six weeks' work on the basis that he is called upon to do a part-time job for six weeks. Nobody is trying to push any juryman's case; we have to try and let justice appear to be done. I was only asking if this is a fair figure to give in view of the fact that the post is a part-time post; we have to ask what should the figure be in 1954 considering the fact that the value of money has been changed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think it is time that we sound a note different from that in connection with jurors. I notice that this Head is not in charge of any Minister, therefore it is a question of the collective responsibility of the Legislature. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you will permit me just to make one observation. Some years ago, the law was amended giving the right for the appointment of a Puisne Judge; the Premier pointed out that this appointment was particularly for the purpose of dealing with a backlog and now I observe that the appointment is fixed by law. However, it seems to me that instead of putting money in the Estimates in respect of a Puisne Judge, the time has come when we should appoint a Puisne Judge, realising that there is an increase of work in the Courts. There is no point in having a Puisne Judge and a Chief Justice and then saying that the Puisne Judge must act as Chief Justice in case the Chief Justice is ill or is away. I am sure the honourable Premier will make a note of these remarks; there is no point in having an acting man and not having the room so that the acting man can do the job. If you are paying a salary to the Puisne Judge, the Government should provide some proper building where the Puisne Judge can work along with the Chief Justice and let justice be swift. There are many cases which have been pending for a long time and, in some instances, to delay justice is to deny justice. I hope that this matter will be dealt with in the right quarter.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I agree with the points made by the honourable senior member for the City to the extent that although when we appointed a Puisne Judge about two years ago, it was due to the backlog of work which we were told had accumulated, yet it is true to say that with the regularity of sittings of the West Indian Court of Appeal, the number of cases in the Court of Error and the num-

ber of cases occupying the Court of Grand Sessions, this appointment should be made a full time one. At the same time, there is no good in making this appointment a full-time one unless you are making certain changes in the structure of the Courts. This appointment should be made a wholetime one having regard to the amount of work which has to be done. I do not agree with the honourable senior member for the City when he says that justice has been delayed in respect of the Superior Court: it is more true to say that in case of appeals to the Assistant Court of Appeal. I know of a case which was pending for a year before it reached the right quarter; a person got two months' imprisonment after waiting for a year.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to include under this Head a new item, "28 (a) Inspector of Friendly Societies, $2,280." As a result of the Wells' Report, the Government has decided to appoint an Inspector of Friendly Societies for a short period at a salary of $2,280, the same as that of a clerk in the Long Grade; we want to have an experienced person. The insertion of that new item will cause an increase in the amount of item 30. "C.O.L. Allowance," to $8,886, and the amount of item 61, "Furniture and Office Equipment" will also be increased by $360, provision being made for a typewriter, $335, a chair, $15 and repairs to two wooden presses for the storage of records, $10.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have no objection to the appointment of an Inspector of Friendly Societies, but I would suggest that there cannot be any great urgency to include that item without a proper examination of all the relevant facts. The Wells Report has not been studied by the House and I would say that the whole structure of the friendly societies is still a matter which has not been debated in this House. The salary proposed for this Officer is $2,280 and he is regarded as a man who is at the top of the Long Grade Service, but for this post I think we need an experienced man, one who is in the category of an Executive Grade Officer. The Secretary of the Public Service Commission is an Executive Officer and he is above $2,280. Thousands of dollars are collected by friendly societies and I personally feel that no harm would be done if this post were not created today. There is no honourable member who would refuse to have a proper investigation as to the working of friendly societies carried out, but I think we should appoint a Select Committee of the House to deal with the Wells Report. If the Government elected to act on the Wells' Report lock, stock and barrel, then the friendly societies would have to be folded up like a concertina. I do not believe that it is the intention of the Government to work on the Wells Report without given the Legislature an opportunity to discuss that Report. I would like to have more time to look into this matter.

The post of Inspector of Friendly Societies would be comparable to that of Co-operative Officer; the salary proposed for this post is $2,280 and you will see that the salary of an Executive Grade Officer is above that. I repeat; I think the House should be given the opportunity of discussing this matter with a Select Committee before the matter is proceeded with. In my opinion, the proposed salary is low considering what this officer will be required to do and we have not got the ramifications before us. I would ask the honourable member to postpone the inclusion of this item in the Estimates; if you want this officer as part of the Establishment the matter should be dealt with by way of a Civil Establishment Order.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not saying that the consideration of this matter should be postponed; I am really surprised at the lack of knowledge on the part of the Government in suggesting a salary of $2,280 for this Inspector. What the honourable junior member for St. Peter has said has a lot in it; if you read the Wells' Report properly you could not begin to think of having this officer at this salary. The friendly societies established in this Island affect about 20,000 people directly or indirectly and I feel that nothing less than $250 a month should be paid for this post if you want an officer who is going to do effective work and who must be in a position to do his work. This Officer must also be given travelling allowance because the friendly societies are scattered all over the island. An honourable member has suggested *sotto voce* that the books should be brought into the office, but according to the Wells Report, you want a man who can commandeer the books of a friendly society at any time and without notice. I counsel the Government that the Inspector of Friendly Societies must be a person who is trained in figures, who must have a very good knowledge of bookkeeping and a sound knowledge of the Act. This officer will have a very responsible job and you cannot begin to suggest paying him $190 a month and a Cost of Living Allowance. I suggest to the Government that they discuss this matter more thoroughly and go into it very carefully; to offer $190 a month for this job of Inspector of Friendly Societies, something affecting a large part of the population of the country, is not good enough.

I want to assure the Government that if they want a man to carry out his duties efficiently, they must pay him. What would be the position if in the Wells Report a recommendation was made to the effect that you must bring out a man from England for this post? I wonder if the Government would say that they are going to pay his $190 a month! They would tear up all the books in front of them first. Who will you get to do this job for $190 a month if he is worth his salt? But if this were a recommendation from the Colonial Office you would have the Government coming down for $4,000 a year. It all shows a lack of knowledge on the part of the Government as to what they are doing. When the honourable junior member for St. Peter says that they have not studied the Wells Report he is absolutely correct; from the criticisms in the Wells Report the inference is that you must have a well-trained and efficient man for this post.

I saw in the Five Year Plan that provision was made for the appointment of an Inspector of Friendly Societies and without any idea of postponing this matter at all, I say that I do not believe that the Minister of Social Services could say, on his own, that he will increase the figure he has suggested; but I ask him not to let it appear to the general public they do not want this job to be done properly. The Examiners in the Auditor General's Department go up to $3,000 a year and how could you expect to get this job done properly at a salary of $2,280? I am sure that the Auditor General of this colony would tell you that this work would call for an officer in a higher grade than one who is getting $190 a month. While we cannot increase any amount in the Estimates, I am asking the honourable Minister for Social Services if, in view of what has been said. he would postpone the consideration of this Head of the Estimates until later on, because it is infinitely better to do that and come

back to it later on in the Estimates when this matter has been discussed with the Auditor General and when we have had a little time to consider the Wells Report. I am suggesting to the honourable Minister that he should not press this matter now.

Mr. MILLER: I am appealing to the Minister for Social Services to postpone the consideration of this item rather than press it; I am hoping that he will not let this matter go to the vote tonight. This Report by Mr. and Mrs. Wells is a tremendous document and I am therefore asking for a postponement of this matter. I suggest that, as mentioned by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, a Committee should be appointed to consider this matter. There is so much in this Report that I am asking the honourable Minister to agree to the postponement.

Mr. LEWIS: I am in agreement that this matter should be postponed and I would also like consideration given to the question as to whether this is the right Head under which this item should be put. You do not want an Inspector to put people in jail; this matter affecting the friendly societies is something for the Social Welfare Department to look after. You want to help people to have a proper method of bookkeeping so that the Auditor General can audit the books as quickly as possible.

I hear honourable members being criticised for not knowing something about the Wells' Report; I would like to let the public know that it is through a member of this House that this Report has come to the House at all, and that member had to walk to the Colonial Secretary's Office for a long time so as to get this Document. This Report by Mr. and Mrs. Wells is here as a result of the pressure for months of an honourable member of this House. I do not know if the Government has anybody in view, but I would look at this matter from the point of view, of certain people getting assistance. I say; let this work be done by the Social Welfare Department and let it not be mixed up with the Police and the Judiciary. When these friendly societies are having their meetings you will meet the entire membership of the Committees and that is the time for the Inspector to go and see the books; you only want to have somebody who will give assistance by way of helping these people to produce the best results from their efforts and give satisfaction to the members of these friendly societies. I do not feel that this item should be put under this Head of the Estimates.

Hon Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In answer to honour able members I will say that it was no easy task to decide on the question of salary to be paid for this post; several Heads of Departments were consulted in this matter. We do not know if this appointment will be a permanent one; this is only a trial just now. However I will agree to a postponement of this matter; I can very well see that travelling will have to be done and therefore I will agree to the postponement so as to consider the question of travelling expenses.

As far as the Wells' Report is concerned, that has been laid in this House fully two years ago and those who are interested in that Report should have read it and should know by now the recommendations in it. (Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Government certainly does not know). I should like to say that one of the Judges of the Assistant Court of Appeal is Registrar of Friendly Societies and until the law is changed, this is the proper Head under which this item should be put. I ask leave to postpone the further consideration of this Head.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE ON THE ESTIMATES FOR 1954-55

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply considering the Estimates for the financial year 1954-55.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Estimates, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Head XV—Police was called.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Under this Head I want to refer to items 30 and 43. In connection with item 30, "Cark Park Attendants", I would like to know if this Government is satisfied to use that expensive spot of land—the Central Foundry's site—for a free car park. This spot of land belongs to the people of this island; it was bought at great expense and I would like to know if it is only to be used for the benefit of car owners. I feel that it should be put to a better use. Not only is this spot of land being used for the parking of cars, but the Government is employing car park attendants. I, for one, do not subscribe to any such use being put to this spot of land and I am expressing my opinion in no uncertain terms. If the Government want to do something, let them erect a big garage there and collect fees for the parking of cars. We are voting over $4,000 in respect of this item and item 43. "Expenses of Car Park Attendants" and there are cheaper places which can be used for car parks. The use of this spot of land as a car park is irritating to right-thinking people in this colony and I draw to the attention of the honourable Minister that he should see that in the near future better use is made of this expensive spot of land, or otherwise report to the people of this island our incompetence in arriving at a constructive use of this land.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I entirely agree with what the honourable member has said, but we have been in the position of having fluctuating advice given us as to financial possibilities, otherwise what the honourable member suggested would have been done already. However, item 65 shows that we are providing for something else; we are providing for the purchase of tickets for machines used by Car Park attendants.

Mr. LEWIS: The fact that you may be printing tickets does not mean that you will use them in respect of this car park.

Mr. ALLDER: I am speaking on item 33, "Arms and Ammunition and Civil Defence Equipment". I have raised this question on several occasions but that has not changed the attitude of the Government towards it. I notice that there is still the usual amount of $2,880 to be voted in respect of this item and the explanatory note states that provision is included for tear smoke equipment. If in the past five years we have been setting aside the sum of $2,880 for the importation of this tear smoke equipment into this colony and we have not had to use any of it, I would like to ask the Minister

responsible if it is businesslike to continue voting the same amont of money in this connection from year to year. On no occasion since the introduction of this equipment into this colony have we had the necessity for using one ounce of it and I feel it is time that this matter be reviewed. I expected that the amount of this item would have been reduced but it continues to be $2,880. I notice that in another place provision is made for $5,000 and $6,000 respectively in respect of "Arms and Ammunition", so that we are voting quite a large sum in this connection.

As to "After Care of Discharged Prisoners", only $580 has been allocated to that item; we spend less on rehabilitating a prisoner than we spend on the purchase of ammunition to destroy him. I should like the Government to consider these things; I feel that we have reached the stage when these items should be reviewed and if that is done, a saving must be effected. We do not wish to have anything which will cause us to feel that there would be a possible uprising in the colony; we had better be in some South American Republic if we are spending money in preparing for something which does not show that it will happen at all. I hope that the Government will give some consideration to this appeal; the voting of this sum of money in respect of this item gives the impression that at some time or other the masses will start some revolutionary action.

As to item 37, "Forage", I think we have reached the stage when many of the animals at District "A" could be disposed of because, in truth and in fact, we have reached the stage when the use of motor vehicles is something which is accepted in Police Departments. Another point is this; why should we spend $2,500 on the upkeep of dogs and so on? There are about three or four dogs at District "A" and I am sure that many of the Sergeants and N.C.O's would be glad for the treatment which these dogs get. These dogs cause conflicting opinions in the investigation of cases and I would not like to know if I were incriminated, that a dog was instrumental in incriminating me. If it is felt that these dogs are used in big countries, let those countries enjoy that luxury; we have no forests where a dog would help you to find the track along which a prisoner had just passed. We are asked to vote $2,500 for "Expenses incidental to upkeep of animals" and before the financial year is ended they will be coming back with a supplementary Resolution. The joke has been given to me that the American Consul lost a pup and they carried the dogs and the 999 system to make a search for this pup; however, the dogs carried them eastward and the pup was eventually found westward in somebody's kitchen. (Laughter).

In connection with item 43, "Expenses of Car Park Attendants", I notice that the Government has arranged to supply these car park attendants with uniform. I notice that some of these attendants are very shabbily dressed; they complain that the Government has decided to give them uniform, but they are not given sufficient suits of uniform that will serve them. If the Government has decided to supply these people with uniform, then the Government should see that these car park attendants are decently clad or let them decide what is best for them. I am asking the Government to supply these people with the necessary clothing so that they can appear decently clad.

I also notice that the demands of this Department are making great inroads into our revenue. Captain Raison is doing a good job but we appear to be spending $3,000 on the upkeep of instruments for the Police Band and I want to know if we should continue giving the Band whatever they ask for, because you can readily imagine what the maintenance of this equipment will cost in five years' time. I believe that when the amount for the maintenance of these instruments was asked for, the Government gave it without any criticism and therefore it has become an annual custom to make increased demands for the maintenance of these instruments.

Another matter is that of the upkeep of cots; we have about 500 cots in the Police Department. A policeman is given a cot and he is also prepared to sleep at home if he gets a house allowance, but the Government continues every year to allocate the same amount of $1,000 for the upkeep of cots.

I notice that a mule-drawn cart is used for the conveyance of fodder and on the other hand we have to provide for the replacement of vans; in the same way that these vans are sold and then they are used in a more laborious manner than when the Police used them, why can't one of these vans be used to do the work which this mule-drawn cart has to do? While a van may not be good enough for the transport of policemen, it would be good enough for the conveyance of fodder used at District "A", for which the Government is purchasing a mule for $500. The Government is purchasing this mule and then it has to pay a man to attend to it; this mule has to be kept in proper condition and they must spend about $3 or $4 a day on it. If one of the discarded vans were used for the conveyance of fodder, it will cost less to run it per day than what this mule will cost. The honourable Minister might feel that this matter is too small for him to worry about but I hope he will give these matters the consideration which I feel they deserve.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am speaking on item 51 "Motor Transport", the amount for which is $15,000 and item 77, "Purchase of Motor Vehicles" the amount for which is $15,500. We have many Police Stations in this island and many of them were erected before the Government inaugurated the motor transport system; you can now travel more widely and more efficiently than when you had to use bicycles. I would like to know if it is necessary to maintain the Police Station at Crab Hill; I am convinced that that building could be put to a more useful purpose. You are spending $15,000 per year on motor transport; you have a Police Station in St. Peter and the farthest point you could get between Speightstown and St. Lucy would not be greater than 7 miles and you could operate motor vans quite easily within that radius; you could place policemen at the points at which you want to put them and return for them. In bigger countries they could not afford the luxury of having a Police Station at the point where we have the Crab Hill Police Station. I think we have passed that stage having regard to the purpose for which that Police Station was built; we did not have the motor transport which we now have. I would like an investigation to be made into the question as to whether it would be useful to continue to use this Police Station at Crab Hill; I hear from the two honourable members for St. Lucy that the people in St. Lucy live quite peacefully and therefore we could use that Police Station for carrying on more social services in that parish which, I understand, is not served, as well as it might be served by the Social Welfare Department. It does seem to me that we could could close down that Police Station at Crab Hill.

Mr. BRANCKER: The honourable senior member for St. John has referred to the items in respect of Arms and Ammunition and Civil Defence Equipment. I would like to say that before he was a member of this House this question used to be raised by the honourable senior member for St. Michael and I used to raise it even before then. One likes to see what a metamorphosis is undergone by persons when

they change their status and go into the councils of Government; either their point of view is altered or they decide to let the majority opinion seize them in arriving at their decision. However, before the night is ended one might hear the point of view of the honourable senior member for St. Michael. We had the Report of Superintendent Calver who was paid a considerable sum of money to report on the condition of the Police Force: that Officer strongly deprecated not only the use of military titles in the Police Force, but also the military character which is so dear to the higher-ups in the Force who feel that if they are not made Lieutenant-Colonels people will not click their heels to them. We want to have the Police Force as a civil Organisation as Superintendent Calver recommended; it is a question of whether the Government of Barbados for Barbadians accepts the principle that the Police Force should be a civil Body and that emphasis should be laid on the civil character of the Force and the military character eliminated. We have a firmly established Barbados Regiment and the Police Force should not be regarded as anything supplementary to that. This not inconsiderable sum which we are spending on Arms and Ammunition does not seem to be justified if the Government accepts the principle that the Police Force is pre-eminently a civil Body and should be regarded as such.

As regards item 77, "Purchase of Motor Vehicles," the note is delightfully vague. It says: "For the purchase of three station wagons and one prison van to replace existing units which are unserviceable." How many units is it proposed to replace? Are we to assume that they will replace four vehicles — three station wagons and one prison van? An honourable member has suggested that there should be one parish in this island without a Police Station in it; that is perfectly true because the parish to which he refers is recognised to be the most law-abiding one in the community. (A MEMBER: Ritual murder). When only one crime can be referred to in a particular parish in the whole history of the parish, does that not speak well for the law-abiding nature of that parish? And the person who was guilty of the offence was a relative of a big landowner of St. John, a memb r of a legislative Chamber. I would not more closely define a member of the feudal barons of Barbados; the individual charged was related to what is described as white and he was a relative of no less a person than a certain member of a colonial Legislature.

A policeman is not merely a person who detects crime; he should be there for the purpose of giving information. If you want some information and the encyclopaedia was not to hand, you could refer to a policeman. I remember that when a policeman reported a major a certain officer told the policeman that he would punish him by sending him to St. Lucy, but this parish is not only a place to which policemen should be sent when they overstep themselves and report senior officers in the Police Force. I do not think that any case has been made out for the abolition of this Police Station at Crab Hill: there might be various purposes in the mind of the proposer, but he has not suggested to what better purpose this Station could be put than the purpose which it now serves.

This matter of Police transportation is something which is very expensive; there is an amount of $15,000 for the upkeep of motor vehicles and there is an amount of $15,500 for the purchase of new motor vehicles. Perhaps the honourable minister in charge of this Department will be good enough to tell us the ages of these existing units which are unserviceable and which it is proposed to replace, and what type of vehicles it is proposed to purchase for this $15,000.

As far as forage is concerned, that is another big item costing $12,000, and I see that $500 is required for the replacement of a mule for hauling fodder. When these displays are held at District "A" and the price of a dollar for admission is charged, I am wondering if anything from the admission to these functions goes into the hands of the Government so that they might put it into a fund to offset the cost of the upkeep of these animals which is undoubtedly very high, I trust that the new Commissioner of Police will listen to what is said in this Chamber and not make the mistake of one of his predecessors of saying that a politician can talk but he cannot do anything more. Let him be prepared to account to this House for the revenue derived from these various displays. Some time ago this House was notified that after we had granted an amount to be spent on the upkeep of horses, the Commissioner of Police decided that the horses should be half-starved in order to reduce the cost to the Government and we were called upon to provide an additional amount to bring the animals back to the *status quo*. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the Commissioner of Police was Chairman of the Barbados Branch of the S.P.C.A. We find that a poor carter is charged for cruelly entreating an animal and yet the Chairman of the S.P.C.A. was requiring these animals to be underfed because he had decided that an economy had been effected. The honourable Minister says that that Commissioner of Police is not with us any longer; well, I have extended my sympathy to all of my Jamaican friends.

With regard to item 9. "Allowance to Detectives," there does not appear to be any note, but in connection with item 53, "Special Services," the note says: "For making rewards for information supplied to C.I.D. and for miscellaneous expenses of C.I.D. Limitation of amount to $500 in the past has proved to be a serious handicap." I think that note might read: "has proved to be a serious racket." We went into this matter thoroughly a few evenings ago, but it does no harm to emphasize that in cases in which this expenditure is necessary it should be put in the hands of members of the Police Force who are men of well-known honesty and integrity: it should not be left in the hands of the Inspectors or Sergeants or Corporals who are among the "black sheep" in the Police Force. This $1,200 should be distributed by persons who would use it merely in the interest of bringing some real criminal to justice, and not to encourage a new profession — the professional informer —or provide employment for some of the most notorious idlers, racketeers, scoundrels and profligates in this community. That is how this money has been used in the majority of instances in the past: there has been the type of people to whom it was not wise or safe to entrust this money. Sometimes deliberately the life of a respectable person may be at stake and when it is known that there is a reward for giving certain information certain people will give that information in order to get the reward irrespective of whose life is taken from him.

I hear a voice saying: "Tell me how to qualify for some of this money?" I can name a certain inspector and corporal who have qualified.

Now, Sir, under Item, No. 54, Training, the amount of $300 is to be voted for the purpose of purchasing articles and books for training purposes. So far as books are concerned, I have visited certain of the offices of senior officers and I have come to the conclusion that some of the books which are bought out of this grant are books which they do not un-

derstand. Some of the senior officers in the Force are most distinguished for their long service and as I see it, some of the books which are on medical topics would adorn the shelves of the Law Library much better than their present position or would be more suitable for reading by persons who have the necessary educational background to understand what they read. The amount of $580 is to be voted for the supply of newspapers to all Police Stations. I consider that as absolutely essential, but I am made to understand that there is certain discrimination in the purchase of this type of literature. Perhaps, the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and the senior member for St. Philip can assure us whether their respective organs are supplied to these Police Stations. I am told that not all of the newspapers published locally are supplied to the various Police Stations. I feel that every newspaper published locally should be sent to each Station and for the largest Station you will need more than one copy of each. I know certain officers do not want privates to read what is said in this House; they would like privates to be kept in the dark; therefore, I recommend that this vote might well be increased to ensure that every man in the Police Force will have the fullest opportunity of reading the various points raised in this Chamber and would also be informed of what is going on otherwise in this island. There is nothing of greater source of satisfaction to the rank and file that when they are called to board by senior officers to draw to the attention of their superiors that a report in such and such an issue would authenticate their case.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Without the view of prolonging discussion under this Head, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is our duty to go into every aspect of the life of this community, therefore, I would like to draw your attention to Item No. 9, Allowance to Detectives, for which a sum of $2,045 is to be voted. I would like to know whether it is due to the great increase of penal laws of the island or due to the people getting more licentious, and as a result, less law abiding than in the past, that we are voting this large amount of money for that purpose. I notice that the same amount was voted in the 1953—54 Estimates. Sir, it is a cause for worry to right thinking men of this community to note what it costs annually for the enforcement of law and order in this island. As I have said, the cause can either be due to too great an increase in the penal laws of the island or that the people are getting more licentious, and as a result, less law abiding. I think this retrogression in morals should be drawn to the attention of physiactrists to see whether they could find the cause and if they could remedy the situation. Sir, we are spending over two million dollars on education and only a month ago we passed $300 dollars under this same head for an increase to the sum of $500 which was voted for the giving of information to the Police Department.

Sir, there is something wrong somewhere; you cannot get away from the fact that something is absolutely wrong. I think we would do well if we set up a Commission to investigate into the cause, because with this increase in education, especially in higher education, I think the people of Barbados should so live that we could do away with many of the Police Courts in the island. I do not want to prolong this debate but I am throwing out this hint to the minister in charge so that he can look with a keen eye into this matter to see whether he can discover the case. It is a reflection on the integrity of the people of this island particularly now that we are spending so much to educate, enlighten and civilise them.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item No. 69, Cleaning, Water and Light. In view of the fact that storm lanterns are only used at the Belleplaine Police Station for lighting purposes, one can hardly see when one enters the sub-station. I would be very grateful if Government would consider spending a little extra money on this sub-station to provide better lighting facilities. The lighting system is so dull at this station that I daresay that it is the only station which is lighted by this method.

Mr. Chairman, you are also aware of the fact that we have not many telephones in the districts of the country where we reside, and in the case of an emergency, one has to travel to the nearest Police Station in order to send a message. I happened to be at the Belleplaine Police Station late one night in a case of emergency and it was only by means of a policeman with a torchlight that I was able to see what was in a telephone directory so that I could send out a message.

As far as this station is concerned, I have seen on several occasions policemen cleaning and washing the sides of the building. I do not know exactly if they do the painting themselves, but I can say that they are not happy over it. I personally feel that is not part of a police duty. I feel it is depriving some person from getting a day's work.

With regard to Item No. 77, Purchase of Motor Vehicles, it is a fact that in case of an emergency, a policeman on duty at the Belleplaine Police Station may have to travel to the farthest end of the parish and the only means of transport at his disposal is a bicycle. I know that honourable members will agree with me when I say that bicycles are of little use for transport in St. Andrew and St. Joseph on account of the terrain. It is a double task for a policeman to get over the hills in that parish when he takes a bicycle with him. I think it would be a good idea if Government would think of providing a motor cycle for the use of the police at this sub-station in case any of them happens to be called out on an emergency.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the question of travelling expenses and to point out that it is to be paid in accordance with the Travelling Allowance Act. Travelling expense is really travelling allowance. I would also like to refer to the cost with respect to the upkeep of motor transport of the Police Force. Sometime ago, we heard that the Government intended to get its own repair shop so that motor vehicles from Government departments could be sent there for repairs. I do not know if the idea has been dropped and it is the opinion now that these motor vehicles sent to some private repair shop is much better than having them done in a Government workshop. I would really like to know if that idea of Government having its own motor repair workshop has been abandoned. I think it is regrettable that these services have to be provided from outside. It is now costing us $100 per month in order that the Police may pay out to get information and I think it is very bad that the Police cannot get information unless they pay for it. I hope it is not a matter of paying false witnesses. Paying informers may be all well and good but I doubt very much if all the evidence you get that way is true and not false. Sir, you are paying the Police more now and yet increasing the amount to be paid out for information and for special witnesses. A person because he is too poor may not be able to be properly represented in court against evidence coming this way and cer-

tainly, he is at the mercy of evidence of that sort. I am sincerely hoping that this matter will be watched carefully.

There is another question on transport that I would like to hear something on. I think that three units of the Police motor transport have been put out of service this year. Previously, I have asked for information as to how long a motor van remains serviceable when used by the Police but it could not be supplied. I have been made to understand that the three units to be bought this year are to replace a van bought in 1943 and another bought in 1945, so I now have an idea of how long a van lasts and how a particular make of car stands up to the demands of police traffic. We know now that such information is given and I cannot understand why it took so many years to say that. Sir, I feel in view of the fact that you are giving the Police all the necessary transport they need, now that you are giving them high frequency communications, that they should be efficient enough as to cut down on the money which they pay out for information. If you are making them so up-to-date in mobility and communications they should have little cause to go outside and pay other people to do police work.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I too have a word to say on this Head of Expenditure. Speaking on the Item, No. 43, Car Park Attendants, I am left to ponder what is really meant when the honourable Premier said in this Chamber on several occasions that there is the possibility of using the car park site, formerly the Central Foundry land, for buildings and then to see that this site will still be used as a car park only. I was hoping that this site would be used for ministerial buildings and if advice has been given to prompt you to have controversial opinion as to the question of the foundations of that site I am left rather disappointed. I had been hoping for the longest while that some building would have been erected on that site and the need for it is felt more so now than it ever was before. I suggest that if a building is erected on that site, you can put the Registry in it along with other Departments of Government, probably an extension of the Post Office can be put in it. But what is worrying me more than anything else is the remark made by the honourable Premier that they have certain controversial opinion as to whether or not they can use that site for a building. I think the honourable Premier has travelled a good deal and have seen some of the largest buildings in cities. I think he has seen buildings on the brink of the Hudson River in the U.S.A. If the idea is that because of the nearness of the Central Foundry site to the shallow stream of the inner basin of the Careenage renders the foundations unsuitable, I do not think that opinion is sufficiently justifiable to make you question whether or not you should build on that site. I feel that it is time that this Government should realise that not only is there need for some building on this site, but it is time that they get some expert advice on putting up an elaborate building on it in memory of their administration. I am hoping to get some reply from the minister in connection with this point.

With regard to the establishment of the Police Force, it pains one when one bears in mind that Superintendent Calver in his report on the Force requested a reduction in its personnel, and instead of that, one sees that it is increasing. It may appear reasonable to some people to say that since your population is increasing that you will need to increase the strength of the Police Force, but, as a matter of fact, the reverse is happening all over the world. We are at the moment spending too much money on our Police Force. We do not need such a large Force and that has been borne out by the recommendations of Superintendent Calver.

I would also like to question the amount of $500 to be voted for the replacement of a mule. I think it is a high figure to pay for a mule and I would like some more information on it. As I am aware, the trend in the value of mules has been going down and their cost nowadays is half of that of a few years back. Sir, I am most unhappy about the Central Foundry site to remain as a car park. Three years ago, the noted architect, Mr. Anthony Lewis, planned to build a four-storied building on that site. I have heard nothing of that plan since We should have some definite information on this matter.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I shall briefly reply to the points raised. As regards the car park attendants, I would say that government has nothing to do with those employed by the Barbados Automobile Association. I may say that the machines for use by car park attendants are expected to arrive soon. The honourable senior member for St. John questioned about cots and I also made enquirites and got information in reverse to what he said. I was made to understand that cot covers do not last very long and are very expensive. As regards to the question of the Crab Hill Police Station, Government has considered the possibility of closing it but after a section of the people of St. Lucy made an appeal for its retention, Government is reconsidering the question of closing it. I do not think it is necessary for me to deal with the points raised over Item No. 53, Special Services, because I have exhaustively dealt with that question just a few nights ago. The only addition to the note is that it is stated that owing to the amount being limited to $500 in the past, that amount had proved a serious handicap to the C.I.D.

I do not think there is anything else for me to say than that I am not disclosing any secret when I say if there are two departments that for years the Estimates Committee has said "No" to everything put forward, it is the Police and the Government Electrical Inspector. And it is because our experience has been that the Government Electrical Inspector would want all sorts of things which are excellent in themselves but fantastic, not quite necessary except in times of war. The position with the Police is that from 1937, that department was asking for vans and radio equipment and it only got 999 by accident last year. I say that to show honourable members that although the Police Department asks for certain things year after year, Government does not necessarily accede to their requests. The question of motor vans for that Department has been turned down year after year but it is impossible to do otherwise than to give them the four that they asked for this year. Last year, they asked for four and we decided to give them two. This year we had to give them what we did not give last year. A Board of Survey was held in January 1953 with regard to the general condition of the motor vehicles and among its findings was that while the condition of a van was fair, it was not suitable for the purposes of a van. Another Board of Survey was held in November 1953 to report on the condition of a motor van and its findings were that it was 80 per cent unserviceable and ordered that it be sold at public auction. The motor van which was reported to be unsuitable for that purpose was purchased in 1947, but inasmuch as it is not entirely unserviceable it will be turned into a motor hearse to replace the old one which was bought in 1934—nineteen years ago. From

the report, I see that M-1082 and M-1084 were bought in 1947. M-1084 is to be dismantled and sold at public auction. There were also two Bedford vans which were bought in 1947 and the report says that they are in extremely poor condition, and are recommended to be sold at public auction. It goes as far as they say that they should not be allowed to be used on the public highway. Hon members can rest assured that as long as this Government has anything to do with this Department, it is going to see that expenditure is kept to the minimum and that it gets only the things which are absolutely necessary. This Government entirely agrees with what the honourable senior member for St. Lucy has been saying all along and that is that our Police Force should be a Police Force but not a military force. We have already started to make it that way. We have dropped the military titles. I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. John would agree that the use of tear gas is not only legitimate but legal in order that the Police should hot shoot at people. I do not think there is any other question to which I should reply.

With regard to the question of a central work shop for Government vehicles, it is still the view of the Government that there should be such a work shop and I am sure that the Minister for Communications will see after that question speedily.

Mr. LEWIS: Unless we expect these machines for use by car park attendants before the end of this month, it means that we would have to revote the money which was voted for that purpose in the last estimates. The amount set down was $700. I do not think we should get the tickets until we get the machines, because we might get tickets which might not be of the right size.

The question that the sum of $316,442 be voted under the Head was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XVI — PRISONS

The Head and the total amount to be voted under it were called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of $56,188 be voted under this Head.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to make some comment in some way on the Superintendent. It is understood that the present Superintendent will shortly be retiring and I see advertised in the newspapers a notice calling for applicants for the post. I do not know why there has been such a notice but I think we have a suitable officer in charge of the Government Industrial School who can fill that post ably and I feel he should be given the greatest consideration. He is in the person of Lieut.-Colonel O. F. C. Walcott and there is no doubt about it, he has made an excellent contribution to the Government Industrial School after the turmoil there.

I would also like to refer to Item No. 24, Disposal of Night Soil. I do not want to still the thundering of the honourable senior member for St. John on this question but I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services if it is contrary to present regulations to have a better system of disposal of night soil. I do not know if the report of Mr. Hallinan into the present administration has been gone through thoroughly nor do I know what suggestions Government intends to carry out. However, it seems extremely primitive that we should be continuing with this system of disposal of night soil. The cost is not heavy but I feel the Minister of Social Services who is a doctor should see to it that this primitive system is eradicated and some proper water-borne system be instituted at the prison. You are not making a person more than a human being when you do that at the prison. I do feel that this old and dilapidated system which cannot be regarded as pleasant should be removed and I would like to see at some early date some provision made for a waterborne system there even if it is done by piecemeal. I understand from some persons who know more of the district than I do that just behind the prison wall is in a very filthy manner and it is very objectionable to people who live in that area. Cannot something be done about that?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I see you are very quiet and I think that it is time for us to cease work. I understand the honourable Premier said last week that if we met at 12 (noon), we would go on until 10 o'clock. I think we have given more than half-hour grace but on top of that I see honourable members and even the genial honourable Minister for Social Services looking very tired. The time has come when this Committee should report progress.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, before you report progress I would just like to say that from reports I have received, there seems to be some improvement in the treatment of prisoners at this Institution. I very much appreciate that report, but I will still continue to suggest to Government the necessity of putting a motor vehicle at the disposal of that department. As I have said in the past, not only would it be more economical for the transport of goods and material by a motor vehicle but it would give a better appearance to the present practice. I notice that if a prisoner is ill and has to go to the General Hospital for treatment, even although he is ill, he has to walk all the way from the prison to the Hospital and a Warder has to accompany him. I am not saying that a Warder should not accompany the prisoner but we have reached a stage in our progress that a motor vehicle should be established at the Institution because not only would it be a relief for a prisoner and a warder who have to journey all this way by foot but it would also be a relief for the prisoners who have to pull the carts to and from the various Government Institutions where they go to work. The warders are also crying out about the laborious tasks which they have to endure while walking from Codrington to the Prison with the prisoners. Sir, even if you do not want to carry your stone and such materials which prisoners quarry from Codrington by motor lorry, the least you can do is to have a motor-van established there to come into town for your commodities and to take sick prisoners to the General Hospital whenever they have to go there. It is almost a daily occurrence for a warder to take a prisoner to the General Hospital. I do not expect you to treat them different from how you should treat people who have run foul of the law but there is still improvements which can be effected at the prison without in any way treating a prisoner better than what he is. I do not think I can get tired stressing the necessity for these improvements.

I would also like to make a few criticisms on Item No. 26, After Care of Discharged Prisoners, for which the sum of $580 is to be voted. I think everybody knows very well that the type of prisoner who commits himself on many occasions does not have anybody to take care of his possessions outside. If a prisoner is jailed for five or ten years, during the time of his incarceration, he loses all outside contact. I have known cases where prisoners

on their release from prison have had to walk for weeks looking to find their nearest relatives. Sometimes a prisoner on his release cannot find himself any relative and if he does not have the means to start himself again in society within a couple of days, he goes and commits himself again because of his lack of means of existence. Sir, the amount of $580 to be spent in a year for the rehabilitation of such persons is definitely too negligible an amount today to give benefits to such individuals. I do not know what our Social Welfare Department is doing about this. I would like the Government to consider this point very carefully. I would like Government to see to it that the Social Welfare Department has a reasonable amount of funds at its disposal so that a prisoner on release, if he has no where to go can be given a haven temporarily. It is not sufficiently satisfying to see so small an amount allocated for this purpose. I hope that the Minister of Social Services would look into the matter.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I desire to comment on general conditions at the prison according to what I have heard of it. I have always promised to take a visit there—not to commit an offence and be found guilty and sent there—but because I have heard of certain conditions prevailing there which I fear, do not exist in Colonies comparable to Barbados. We are very conservative people. As far as I can understand from what goes on in the Colonies of Jamaica, British Guiana and St. Lucia, Barbados has the worse prison conditions when compared with them. We must bear in mind that to rob a man of his freedom is a great punishment. Imprisonment of itself is a great punishment and you must not feel that because a man is sentenced for misdemeanour or any criminal offence that the person should suffer more punishment than what he is sentenced. I understand that sometimes a prisoner is confined to an underground cell, dark as midnight, and that person may be there for days and when that person comes out it takes a few days to recover his sight. That punishment belongs to the Middle Ages and if that is true, no man in this age should be subjected to such cruelty. I have just drawn this to the notice of the Government as I have not found out whether it is an actual reality but if it occurs I am asking Government to prohibit it. Sir, to treat a man as if he were out of the pale of human beings is not psychology of this age but of the Middle Ages; to have such conditions which existed before is utterly inhuman and I am giving orders to the Government or those responsible for the prison administration to desist from such practices.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your anxiety for an early adjournment, however, I want to stress the remarks to Government that some serious attempt should be made to humanize this department of Government. It is my view that it is unnecessary in this period to send a prisoner to the quarries to work even though the idea may be to give him the necessary physical exercise. I think it is totally unnecessary and undignified to have a prisoner pulling the ropes of a cart along the street. There is no point in causing undue embarrassment; as a matter of fact, you yourself should feel embarrassed when you see a prisoner crossing the streets. Earlier today, I wanted to raise the question whether Government was willing to remove the services of prisoners from Government House, and as I have had some intimaton from the honourable Premier that this Head will be dealt with today I have been waiting all the night to say a word on it. I will like to see even if it means the granting of additional funds under the Head, Governor, that arrangements be made to put an end to taking prisoners to Government House to attend to the gardens there and to do cleaning. There is no reason why in these days prisoners should suffer such undue embarrassment. We are treating prisoners today as if we were living in a mediaeval period.

I see the sum of $28,000 is to be voted to provide provisions for that institution. I understand that there is a certain amount of land suitable for agricultural purposes at the Prison. If that is so, certainly, you can grow food crops in it and provide these prisoners with a better diet.

Again, I am going to say that the worst punishment you can give to any man is to rob him of his freedom. To deny a man of his freedom is the worst thing that you can do him and to add to that with any other means of punishment is brutality. I would even like to know if Government—this being a Socialist Government—would be willing to take prisoners out of the unsightly clothes which they now wear as I consider such garments reduce the spirit of man to a very low ebb. I say let us remove them from that old outlook. It is undignified to treat another man in that way.

I will make one more appeal and that is to the Government now. I think the time has come to adjourn this House. I see a tired look on the faces of all honourable members.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I know that you are eager to put the question, but I feel that you should not put the question until the minister in charge reply to some of the questions raised. Speaking for myself, I do not share the same view as the honourable member who has just spoken with respect to the question about prisoners' attire and what they should do. I am one of those people who feel that so long as a prisoner is not performing work which is in competition with the work performed by members of the community, that he should do something. If a prisoner is called to work at Government House, cleaning up the roadway or the gardens, that is not what I would call productive employment and I see nothing wrong in his being allowed to do that type of work.

I too am quite anxious that the question be put, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to know from the Minister of Social Services first if it is contrary to present regulations to have a waterborne system at the prison. I would like to know from the Minister of Social Services his feeling in regard to perpetuating this primitive system of the disposal of night soil. I do not like the idea of members asking questions and getting no replies.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I have taken note of the criticisms, especially the question just asked by the honourable junior member for St. Peter, and shall give them due consideration.

The question that the sum of $56,188 be voted under the Head was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Committee has just completed sixteen Heads of Expenditure and I would like honourable members to note that there are forty-three Heads of Expenditure to be dealt with and then Capital Expenditure.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this may now be the wholetime job of the honourable member, but even were it not so, this is not a case whether the honourable member agrees to continue; it is a ques-

tion of whether this Committee agrees to it. The honourable member is really carrying things too far and he should be told so.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have not been informed by the Government when it proposes to meet again to give further consideration to these Estimates, but I would suggest that this House meet tomorrow, Wednesday, because some members of this Chamber would like to attend the Races on Thursday. I am quite prepared to come tomorrow and even Thursday if it comes to that, but so far as continuing today, I have been here for eleven hours and if it is the desire of Government to meet tomorrow, I think this is the appropriate time to retire.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am not at present regulating the Government business in this House, I can agree to meet at any time. I may say that the honourable junior member for Christ Church last week asked me whether in view of the House meeting early today whether we would close early and I told him that I could not tell the specific hour; it would be a matter for the House.

Mr. GODDARD: In conversation with the honourable Premier last week, I told him that we, the members of my Party, took it that if we came early today, we would end early and he replying said that if we come at 12 (noon), we could shut down at 10 p.m. and I took it that there was some agreement as to that time, and informed members of my party to that effect. I had every idea that this House would adjourn at 10 o'clock.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, — The position is this: we have completed sixteen Heads of the Estimates and we would like the entire Estimates completed this week.

(A VOICE: Why?)

Because the Other Place has to consider them.

(A VOICE: Not true.)

If honourable members are prepared to come tomorrow and perhaps Thursday, we could possibly take the adjournment at this stage. I do want to emphasize that Government wants to finish them this week.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, 10th March, 1954, at 12 o'clock (noon).

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am making an amendment to that motion. I move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 11th March, 1954, at 12 o'clock (noon).

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Thursday at 12 o'clock (noon) was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GODDARD—6.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. BRANCKER and Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY—13.

The question that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 12 o'clock (noon) was then put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. F. L. WALCOT, Mr. BRANCKER and Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY—14.

Noes: Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GODDARD—5.

His Hon. The SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.