

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 11th May, 1954.

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

Present:

His Honour, Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., *Premier*, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communication, Works and Housing*), Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc. and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR CLERK

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the Honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Clerk of the House asking for extension of leave owing to indisposition.

The letter reads as follows:—

"Juleville,"
Maxwell Coast,
Ch. Ch.

His Honour,
K. N. R. Husbands,
Speaker.

Sir,

Enclosed please find certificate from my doctor recommending me for a further period of one week's leave. I trust your Honourable House will grant same, and permit Mr. D. A. Banfield to act for me as he has consented to do.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,
(Sgd.) D. LEE SARJEANT,
Clerk, General Assembly,

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the necessary leave be given to the Clerk.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk in place of the Deputy Clerk who would act as Clerk.

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

Mr. ALLDER, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. HOLDER entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

DOCUMENTS LAID

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st March this year;

Also Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. James for the half year ended 31st March this year;

Also Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Peter for the half year ended 31st March this year.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following: Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 31st December, 1953.

REPLIES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay replies to question by the honourable senior member for St. Philip regarding the allocation of quotas under the Token Import Scheme.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of a resolution to approve the Book of Reference of the

proposed extension of the Waterworks in the parish of St. Lucy.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

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

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House desire to draw to the attention of Your Excellency the intense dissatisfaction which obtains throughout the colony on the part of small cane farmers in respect of the unreasonably low advance payment they have received from sugar factories for canes reaped during the current crop, and the unsatisfactory operation of the Domestic Sugar Agreement, in so far, among other things, as it guarantees an equitable price for such canes.

The House desire to emphasize that indications are that the total price which small cane farmers will receive for this crop shall be completely uneconomic and respectfully request that an investigation be conducted into the matter in order to ensure that all sections of the sugar industry shall obtain a fair share of the sugar price.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Premier: Whether the Honourable Premier is aware that certain practising barristers are in the habit of making criminals and those members of the public who happen to be in court, to feel that Policemen are wilful liars and vagabonds, while prosecuting cases in the low and high courts of the island?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Honourable Premier take the action necessary to see that cases involving the Police are argued in a more dignified manner, and also to establish the principle that Policemen are not wilful liars and vagabonds?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Premier: Is the Honourable Premier aware that Petit Juries at the Court of Grand Sessions are capable of returning wrong and ridiculous verdicts in some cases heard, through the lack of legal training?

2. If the answer is 'yes', will the Honourable Premier consider introducing legislation to abolish the Petit Jury and provide three judges to adjudicate the cases set down for hearing at Grand Sessions?

Mr. BARROW: To enquire of the Minister of Trade: A. 1. Is the Government aware that consumers are experiencing difficulty in obtaining salted and pickled pork from the provision stores in the island?

2. Will the Government take steps to remove the import restrictions and subsidies on these commodities?

B. 1. Does the Government consider that the Office of Controller of Supplies serves any useful social or economic purpose?

2. Will the Government consider the removal of all controls and subsidies on imported articles and the appropriation of the saving affected thereby to the relief of unemployment and the development of local food production in the colony?

Mr. BARROW: To enquire of the Minister of Trade: Is the Government aware that monopolistic practices exist in certain manufacturing industries in this island?

2. Is the Government aware that such practices also exist in export and import of essential commodities and in the distributive trades?

3. Is the Government aware that such practices operate to the detriment of the retail shopkeeper and in the last analysis to the detriment of the public?

4. Will the Government consider instituting an enquiry into such practices and at the same time into the prevailing practices of monopolistic competition.

Mr. BARROW: To enquire of the Minister of Works: How many standpipes have been erected in the parish of St. George during the financial year 1953-54?

2. How many standpipes have been erected in the parish of St. Michael during the same period?

3. Does the Government intend to continue the policy of allocating funds for the erection of standpipes in the rural parishes?

4. If the answer to the above questions is in the affirmative; how many in each parish annually?

5. If not, why not?

REPORT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit a report by the Select Committee appointed to draft a reply to The Governor's Message, No. 9/1954 relating to the report of the Deep Water Harbour Scheme.

BILL TO AMEND INCOME TAX ACT, 1921

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The first order of the day stands in the name of the Honourable Premier; Second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act 1921.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the result of what was announced by the Government when consideration was given to the Annual Estimates with respect to the increase in allowance to married persons for the support of their children.

Section 20 of the Income Tax Act, 1921 at present provides that a married man shall be allowed as a deduction from his income the sum of \$1,200 if he has during the income year wholly maintained his wife, and that any person who, during the income year has had the custody of or has maintained at his or her expense any of his or her children or the children of his or her wife or husband shall be allowed as a deduction from his or her income the sum of \$240 in respect of each of such children if the income of the child does not exceed \$120. This Bill seeks to amend that section by increasing the allowance of \$1,200 by \$100 and by increasing the allowance of \$240 by \$30. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill implements what was offered at the time of the Estimates with regard to the giving of a greater deduction to a person from his income for the support of his children. We have already agreed to that and we do so again. We are glad to see that Government has seen its way to go a little further and give more allowances in respect of persons paying income tax. I do know that it is a beginning in the right direction because, undoubtedly, persons are finding it extremely difficult to meet their tax bills owing to the high cost of living bearing down on them more than ever at this time. When Government considers the income tax rates at the next Estimates, I do hope it will go into the matter of making an allowance to those persons who have extraordinary medical expenses. As honourable members know, sick-

ness falls on people rather suddenly and often it falls on them when they least can afford to meet the payment of a doctor's bill and hospital bills. It is nothing new for a Government to give allowances to a person for medical expenses; it is done in big countries and this Government should enquire into the possibilities of extending this concession to Barbados. I have heard many cases of distress and hardship by people who when they think they can hold up their head above water find that some member of their family is stricken with sickness and they have a long list of doctor bills to meet. That is the time when those persons need help more than ever. I do think it would be a step in the right direction if Government give some allowance to persons for medical expenses. I do know it depends on what Government can afford but I feel an enquiry should be made into that aspect.

Another matter which needs the attention of the Government is the question of whether a husband and wife's income should be joined together for the purpose of taxation. Today, we find many housewives having to leave their homes with little children through their seeking work to assist in paying the monthly bills of the family. In doing so they have to pay extra help for the infants they leave behind and I think that an allowance should be made for that. These housewives are working because the cost of living is very pressing on them and they are unable to meet their bills in any other way. I must say again that I am grateful to see Government giving a further allowance as contained in this Bill but am sorry that it is unable to do more than that.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I think that we should be thankful for small mercies but are we doing everything to make sure that we are going to be given these small mercies? Sir, the Bill in my hands reads that it will normally come into effect when it is properly signed by His Excellency the Governor but I think it is true to say that the interpretation of what the honourable Premier said in his Budget Speech on the Estimates was to the effect that these allowances would affect your income of 1953. If that is intended, well then, I think that a third clause is necessary to bring it into effect on the year of assessment of 1954. If it is not to come into effect from the 1954 Assessment year, then we should have some announcement that it will not take place. I do know that everybody got the impression that this tax allowance would take effect from this year of assessment.

If this bill is passed now, may be, it will benefit those people who get their income from abroad and who have not yet sent in their returns, but those people who have to send in their returns by the end of January will lose this benefit because their returns have already been made up and, as I have said, I think it is intended to give everybody this allowance on their 1953 income. Again, I say that we have to be thankful for small mercies, but as the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, in the case of sickness, just as it is with the education of children, there is a great burden on the persons so affected. It is true to say that tax allowance for sickness is given some consideration outside of Barbados and I hope that consideration will be given to this matter by the honourable Minister in charge of this Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there are, so to speak, three points which I would like to raise on this Bill. We all agree that these allowances are timely and will be very acceptable to the people who will benefit from them. Now, if you look at Clause 2, you will see that it amends sub-section 1 of section 20 of the Income Tax Act, 1921 so as to

give a married man an increase of \$100 on the allowance for maintenance of his wife and an increase of \$30 on the allowance for maintenance of children. But while you are given additional allowances for maintenance of your wife and children, you are not given anything more for the support of your family who are incapacitated. I still have to support a sick mother solely and I feel that if this Bill seeks to assist people with a wife and children, it should also assist people with families who are incapacitated.

With regard to the question of medical care, throughout the world, even in employment services, people regard it as necessary to give some allowance for sickness. It is so much regarded as a right thing to do that if an individual who is employed take ill on his job, the employer does not deduct anything from the person's wages. It is well known that our medical services cannot provide all the medical care that a person may need after a severe sickness and the person who is responsible for paying medical bills should be given some allowance of his income tax for sickness. I happened to be one of those sufferers who had to provide for medical care outside of Barbados for a member of my family and I know what it means to a person who has to make such provision. I feel that so long as a person can show that he has had to make provision for medical care for himself or some member of his family, some allowance of his income from income tax should be given. I also think that maternity care is one of those things which you must regard as something for which provision should be made. There are times when maternity care can be very expensive indeed. It costs some husbands when their wives are confined to bed through maternity something like \$20 or \$25 a day. I know of a case which cost a man \$200 and he was not a person who had any savings. We must also bear in mind that that sum cannot be said to be exorbitant if you take all charges into consideration.

Sir, matters like these deal with the social aspect of people lives. If we are providing for other things in other categories, then there is nothing wrong in principle in raising these points which I feel should be given careful consideration by Government. As I was saying at first, sub-section (c) of paragraph 2 of the Income Tax Act deals with members of your family who are incapacitated and for whom you are given an allowance for supporting them. I feel that there should be some review of that allowance. Then there is the question of medical care and maternity care which should be gone into very carefully with a view of giving some allowance off if a case can be made out satisfactorily. I really do feel that an allowance should be given for that under the same lines as you give an allowance for education of children.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Allow me just a brief moment to make a comment on the general question of revenue from income tax and income tax deductions. The Bill before us is concerned with deductions on income and we have quite recently passed legislation permitting new industries certain exemptions from income tax under certain conditions. To be strictly factual, the Aid to Industries Bill permits what is known as pioneer industries to deduct annually one-fifth of their capital investments for income tax purposes. We all quite appreciate that every Government is entitled to collect the maximum amount it can from tax, especially direct taxation, but at the same time, one has to bear in mind the effect which high taxation has on the community. Previous speakers expressed the point of view that the maximum allowance should be given to individuals

to maintain their family for medical care and other things. What I want to see Government give some consideration to—and it is something which I consider is just as important as that with which we are now dealing—is the necessity for extending to new industries the maximum exemption from taxation as it possibly can. All that we are doing now is to allow a pioneer industry to deduct one-fifth of its capital investments for income tax purposes annually. In other words, our Aid to Industries Bill—

HIS HON. THE SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has gone far enough from the purports of this Bill. I do not think I will give the honourable member any more latitude.

MR. CRAWFORD: I do admit that I have been given some latitude which I do not wish to abuse. I merely want to say that while it is important to give individuals every possible assistance you should also give pioneer industries every possible assistance by way of relieving them of the burden of taxation, providing that the money they get from that source would be of more benefit to the community indirectly. We must appreciate that individuals exist through the life of an industry and excessive taxation of an industry can also be ruinous to the welfare of the colony itself.

Sir, there will be, of course, more appropriate occasions for me to emphasize more fully on points which I have in mind but I am sure that honourable members on the opposite side are able to appreciate what I am driving at and I do hope that in the same way as they have seen fit to bring amendments down to afford increased allowances to individuals, Government will in the future take into consideration the Aid to Industries Bill in order to provide a more satisfactory allowance for pioneer industries which are seeking to expand in this colony.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

“Sub-section (1) of section twenty of the Income Tax, 1921, is hereby amended—

(a) by deleting from paragraph (i) thereof the words “two hundred and fifty pounds” appearing therein and substituting therefor the following:—

“one thousand and three hundred dollars”;

(b) by deleting from paragraph (ii) thereof the words “fifty pounds” appearing therein and substituting therefor the following:—

“two hundred and seventy dollars”.

HON. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part. In doing so, I hope Your Honour would give me indulgence to make a short reply to some of the points raised during the second reading of the Bill. I wish to assure honourable members that Government is considering every phase of income tax and income tax allowances and on the grounds of extending allowances according to what honourable members pointed out. Government has all those things in mind but it is only because of the complexities of what Government has to do that it is unable to get any further than what is contained in this Bill.

HON. DR. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion.

MR. LEWIS: I would like the honourable Minister to say whether the operation of this Bill

takes effect as from this assessment year or only from the date that it comes into operation. Would it be effective on the 1953 Income? As I have said already, that is what the honourable Premier said on the presentation of the Budget and my idea on reading this Bill is that some provision should have been made if that was intended. I do know that there are some persons who by law have not yet made out their returns and if this Bill become law shortly, they will benefit from it.

HON. G. H. ADAMS: It is the intention of this Government that the concessions in this Bill should operate on last year's assessment.

MR. LEWIS: If that is so, I am wondering whether the honourable Premier would accept an amendment so as to make it perfectly clear. I think that there should be an added Section reading as follows: “This Act shall be deemed to have come into force at the beginning of the assessment year commencing on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four.”

HON. G. H. ADAMS: I do not think it is necessary. One only has to tell the Income Tax Commissioner to make the further deductions when sending out his returns for the payments.

MR. LEWIS: Surely, the honourable Premier would agree with me that the rights of the people should not rest in instructions from the Executive to anyone. Mr. Chairman, I would like the honourable member to see what is operating in my mind. The notice says that you are to make returns in January, 1954 as to your income of 1953 and allowances applying to that income. There is nothing in the Act to say that the Income Tax Commissioner should remake your Income Tax Return. If the former allowances were applicable when you sent in your return, I do not see how something which came into force afterwards can be applicable. When we want an Act to come into operation on a particular date, we usually say so by putting it in the Bill. I suggest that we should at all times safeguard the rights of the individual. If the Income Tax Commissioner think it is too much trouble to make the adjustments—I am not saying he would—there would be nothing to say that he should. I repeat, the rights of the people of this colony should be safeguarded in laws and not in directives.

HON. G. H. ADAMS: I told the honourable member that as a matter of law, the concessions in this Bill would operate on last year's assessment. If that is the law, no matter what tax returns have been sent in before, the Income Tax Commissioner must abide by the law. I am sure the honourable junior member for St. James will agree with me when I say if an instruction is given to the Income tax Commissioner, he cannot say he may or may not. The Attorney General will say that the concessions of this Bill will apply to the 1953 income and the Income Tax Commissioner will abide by those instructions.

MR. LEWIS: I must tell the honourable Premier that while I accept his explanation, it is my duty to convey to this Committee the fears of those persons who do not understand the law as well as that.

MR. BAYAN entered the House and took his seat.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE INCOME TAX
(AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 1954.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Premier to move the passing of the following resolution: Resolution to approve the regulations entitled the Income Tax (Amendment) Regulations, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This resolution is to sanction regulations made by the Executive Committee on the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four, under Section 58 (i) of the Income Tax Act 1921 (1921-6) and they affect the Income Tax Act, 1921. As can be seen there are new regulations made for those persons making applications under 43A of the Act. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: So far as paragraph 3 of these regulations is concerned, I know it points to the regulations which refer to the form of P.A.Y.E. that has been lately instituted. I think provision was made under that Act for the income tax payer to vary the last few payments in such a way that he would get to the full payment of his tax as he wanted within the period. As I see it, these regulations cut across the provisions of the Act. As I have said, the Act particularly says that the income tax payer could vary his last two or three payments. That is to say if he were allowing his employer to deduct ten dollars per month to cover his tax and he found out that his tax would be less than was anticipated, he could vary his monthly payments to eight or nine dollars to cover it with the advice of the Income Tax Commissioner. It does seem to me as if the new Regulations cut across that although I do not consider that as a bad thing.

Sir, I was hoping that the Government would have regulated their income tax collections to suit the calendar year. Now that we are having the rates for personal income tax fixed yearly with the introduction of the estimates, I was hoping that the government would so regulate its business that it would be able to collect income tax over the twelve-month period of the calendar year, especially as we are giving permission for deduction from the wages of an employee to be made before the assessment is made out. What I mean to say is that if the rates are passed in March, the deductions can be made from January before pertaining to the year of assessment. These regulations cut across that and it may defeat what we hoped would be a smooth running. I do not think the Government should have made these regulations — at least, not yet. It is true, I am not aware of all the difficulties that the Government is up against in the operation of this Act and I have no doubt that these regulations are made to smooth out some of those difficulties.

I therefore would like to know if the honourable Premier can say today whether the form of P.A.Y.E. which has been instituted a short time ago has proven an excellent method and whether income tax payers are taking advantage of it. If they have not, has the Government any idea what has caused it not to be popular and if that is so, would Government take steps to popularise it? I think it would be of advantage to the Government and the income tax payer if that method of payment were adopted. I well remember that the way in which the Bill was dealt with, it got around that it was going to create a great

hardship on employers and as we had to preserve the right of employees, we had to leave a loophole so that too many of them would not throw the burden of collecting their tax on the employer, and that the employer might not know how much tax a particular employee might be paying, else the employee might find himself having to look for another job. I am not saying that it would be done, but in such things, one can never be too careful with employers.

As I have said, I feel this method of P.A.Y.E. is something which could be of benefit to everybody Government and the employer can both have the taxpayer's money for a longer period. When it comes to the employer, he would be able to keep it and it would be useful in the running of his business. For Government, it would mean that it would have the taxpayers' money long before it is actually due. I do admit that for the employer, while he himself stands to benefit by such collections, it is something that would entail some little expense on his part, but usually, employers have so many other things to deduct from their employees' salaries every month that all that would be necessary would be for them to add another column in their books for the Income Tax Department; therefore, looking at it from that viewpoint, I do not think it would entail any more clerkship to deal with the matter.

Sir, this Income Tax Act is dated 1921 and regulations to the Act seem only to have been made from 1942. Perhaps, the reason why we see that regulations were not made until 21 years after the act came into operation is because if they were made, they were repealed. I well remember that at one time, regulations were made for the collection of income tax but they never saw the light of day in this House. As Section 58 of this Act reads, it appears to me that the regulations need not come before this House for sanction. I hope I am wrong in my interpretation.

Mr. E. D. MORTLEY entered the House and took his seat while Mr. LEWIS was speaking.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot give the answer as to the number of people who have taken advantage of this new method for the collection of their income tax according to what they expect they will be assessed. I will bear in mind all that the honourable member said. As I have said in October last, no move was made by Government in bringing forward that Bill until Government was told that a substantial number of people wanted their tax collected in such manner. As I said, Government had nothing to gain by that Bill and what was eventually done in the Other Place could have been done in this place, if it were brought to the notice of the Government. Sir, this Government was not pushing or keeping it back. We were told that it was easier to get employers to deduct the tax of their employees and that employees would prefer it to be deducted in that manner than for them to be asked suddenly to pay it. If the Government were approached tomorrow with the suggestion that employers were squeezing employees by this method of deduction for payment of income tax, the Government would automatically come down to this House and ask for a repeal of that Act. I wish to assure the honourable member that even if there were no pressure—I say that deliberately because pressure makes no difference to the Government unless that pressure is pressure of what is right—and Government felt that income tax payers should be given more concessions, Government would grant them. Government does agree that you can help companies by granting them certain concessions and as a result, Government is contemplating the granting of some more concessions, but is considering how consistent with our commitments for expenditure, can we give relief of taxation of every sort. I again assure

the honourable junior member for the City that we would bear in mind what he has brought to the notice of the Government, and we would be grateful to him for bringing more of these sort of things to our notice. It can be said that these are the sort of things which he would know before members of the Government because he is what one would call a business wire of Bridgetown and it is known that members of the Government have many other things to be concerned with than listening to the rumours of the business world of Bridgetown.

Mr. GODDARD: Other than let it be felt that employees in the mercantile community are not taking advantage of this new method of payment of income tax according to this Act because employers have threatened them and employees would be disclosing what income they receive by the deductions that are made against them for income tax, I would like to reiterate that I have not found an employee in Bridgetown who asked the Government to bring down that Act. On my investigation of the matter at that time, I found out that the Civil Service Association was the one body that was asking for it for its members and no other body in town. I can say that quite a number of people who are employed in our firm pay income tax and I have not seen anyone of them asking for their tax to be collected monthly. I am also connected with other businesses and I am yet to hear of any employee so connected asking for this method of payment of their tax. I think it will be interesting to know how many Civil Servants have asked for this tax deduction monthly through their departments, because they were the persons that asked for it. As I have said, I know of no pressure by any employer against any of their employees forcing them not to use the terms of this Act for easy payment of their income tax.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to say that what was done in the Other Place with respect to the amendments of the Bill, was drawn to the notice of this House while it was discussing the Bill.

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

ORDER NO. 3 POSTPONED TEMPORARILY

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 3 temporarily and to deal with Orders No. 4 and 5 in that order next. My reason for doing so is because I understand that the debates of this Chamber are getting behind hand again.

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

REPORT ON BILL TO AMEND LEGISLATIVE DEBATES ACT, 1894

His Hon. The SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Minister of Social Services: To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Legislative Debates Act, 1894.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the report of the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on the Bill to amend the Legislative Debates Act, 1894 is as follows:—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise at a point of order. It appears to me that Order No. 5 is the best order to take and to let it be the instruction of the Committee to consider this report of the Select Committee on the Bill while considering the Bill.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: As I was saying, Sir, the Select Committee met on the 26th March, last, and after mature consideration recommended that

the proposed Bill be amended to provide in addition to the three wholtime reporters, two typists for the House of Assembly at salaries on par with stenotypists in the Civil Service of this Island. The Committee also recommended that the Bill should stipulate that the Clerks of the House and the Legislative Council should be responsible for having the debates edited and indexed by their respective office staffs. With respect to the debates of this House, the Committee stressed that the Clerk may delegate the authority to another member of the staff but the House was holding him responsible for the editing and indexing. Those are the salient points of the report and I beg to move that the report be now adopted.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I just tried to be helpful when I rose at a point of order just now. I do not know why I should have been ignored. Many bills have been read a second time and sent to a Select Committee by this House and when the House went into Committee on those bills, it considered the Select Committee's report on the respective Bill. I do not know why the House is adopting this way, as it would mean that when we have adopted the report of the Select Committee, it would be final. This does not seem to me to be the right procedure. When I vote for this report, I would be committing myself to put what is contained in this report in the Bill and I am not committing myself to putting everything that is in the report in the Bill. I really do not understand the procedure. I do not know if I am in order, but I beg to move as an amendment to the motion that when this House goes into Committee on the Bill to amend the Legislative Debates Act, 1894, the Committee be instructed to consider this report along with the bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am seconding the motion by my colleague. I think the honourable Leader of this House should have taken the hint which was given by my colleague because it strikes me as if it is the better procedure to deal with this report when considering the Bill in committee. If the honourable Leader of this House insist in taking the report first, I think it will put honourable members in a rather difficult position. I therefore second my colleague's motion for the sake of expediting the bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is not as difficult as honourable members are trying to make out; as a matter of fact, I think it is a simple issue. It is purely a matter of procedure and it can be done either way.

Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I just want to express my view on the report of the Select Committee.

His Hon. The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am speaking on the motion for the adoption of this report. I am doing so now in order to avoid prolongation of the debate. I feel that the question of providing this House with another reporter is absolutely necessary and this House should not hesitate with this matter because the present reporters have been working extremely long hours and under difficult conditions. It is the duty of this House to provide them with better facilities and with better conditions of service. There are two points in this report on which I would like to have some clarification. One is the question of employing two typists and it has been proposed that they should be paid on par with stenotypists in the Civil Service of this island. I want to say that if the body responsible for the appointment of these stenotypists expect to use the Government rates of pay for stenotypists as a means of attract-

ing competent stenotypists for the use of this House, I make bold to say that it will not be attracting people who would be of any use to this Chamber. It is true to say that the Committee need not bring in a person at the bottom of the scale but if the Committee go to the bottom of the scale, the quality of the work from those persons who would accept to come in at that scale must be poor and it would be the sort of work which would be of no use to the expediting of the debates of this House. If you want competent stenotypists, you will have to pay a salary in the upper scale of the rates of pay for Government stenotypists. If you fix the salary of these typists at, say, \$100 per month, may be, you will get good typists but if you fix it at \$50 or \$60 per month, you will not get people who would be of any use to this Chamber.

The other point is in respect of the Clerk of the House being responsible for the editing of the debates. I think that is going to present a practical difficulty for the Clerk to edit the debates. It is my firm opinion that if you want someone to edit the debates of this House, you want someone whose job or training has been to edit matter for printing. It is not a matter of having some person who only has a knowledge of English; it would need a person who has been trained in that sort of work; it would need a person who can see errors at a quick glance and who in that way would be of valuable assistance to the reporters. But that is if you wish someone to edit the debates. If you need someone to edit in the loose sense of the word, you only want someone to take up the transcribed notes of the reporters, put them together in correct sequence and submit them to the printer.

The Clerk of the House is a solicitor as well as the Deputy Clerk and I doubt very much and not so much from the ability or the intelligence, but from the practical point of view if either of them could edit the debates of this Chamber in a manner in which you should have debates edited. After all, it is a job that someone has to be trained before he can do it well. I heard some honourable member say that this job of editing would be delegated to the Secretary-Librarian of this House. I do not want to be hard on any person but honourable members know as well as I do that editing debates is not a job like indexing debates. I really do not want the Legislature to make a laughing stock of titles. If you want an editor of debates, you should recruit someone who can do that job in an expert manner. I am saying that although the Clerk of this House is a solicitor, it does not necessarily mean that editing is part of his line of work. Those are the two points in this report that strike me and I hope honourable members would view them carefully. I hope honourable members would agree with me when I say that if you recruit stenotypists at \$50 or \$60 a month to work in this House, you will be wasting precious time. If you recruit them at a salary higher up in the scale, you may be able to get people who have some experience, but I am sure you cannot use stenotypists for the kind of work which this House has to do as those who can very well do for the kind of work that they will be called on to perform in the Colonial Secretariat. We will not have such a large pool of them that we can train them; they must come here as trained typists and I maintain that you cannot get a trained typist at a salary of \$50 or \$60 per month. With regard to the point I raised in respect of the editing of the debates, if you say that this is to be the responsibility of the Clerk of this House but he can delegate the duty to someone else, it means that the other persons to do the job can only be the

Secretary-Librarian in the first place and then the Messenger in the second place. The Deputy Clerk is a part time officer and you cannot ask a part time officer to do this job. If you want somebody to edit these debates properly, it is going to take a person a considerable time to do so.

I am not saying for one moment that the compliment of your staff would not allow you to do it, nor am I saying that you should recruit somebody for this purpose. What I want to stress is that you are now introducing something new into your contract and you are asking your present workers to undertake another job which in itself is of a nature that the person would have to get a qualification to do it and something which you did not ask that person to get a first. You are now introducing something new into a contract; something which is against Trade Union principles. I am wondering if you can say that the Clerk is to be responsible and then say that he can delegate his responsibility to someone else. I am also wondering if you are assured that you have the people to edit these debates. Sir, I do not think I will have to repeat my points again.

Mr. MILLER entered the House and took his seat while Mr. WALCOTT was speaking.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I wish to make a few comments, but in view of the motions which are before the House, I would not say anything until they are resolved.

The question that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee on the Bill to amend the Legislative Debates Act, 1894, to consider the report of the Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER, I think the "Ayes" have it.

The question that the report of the Select Committee be adopted was then put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. Speaker, "I think the Ayes have it."

BILL TO AMEND LEGISLATIVE DEBATES ACT, 1894

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Premier: To move the House into Committee on the Bill to amend the Legislative Debates Act, 1894.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to take charge of this order.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"2. Section two of the Legislative Debates Act, 1894, thereafter referred to as the principal Act) is hereby repealed and the following section substituted therefor—

2. The cost of reporting the debates of the Legislature should be paid for annually on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this Committee will have to wait and see what Government intends to do by way of introducing the Select Committee's amendments to this Bill. I think it would be well if these clauses are read instead of being called or

that Your Honour take some time before putting the question. We have this report of the Select Committee before us but I do not know if all honourable members are perfectly clear over what is happening.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, what worries me is not the report of the Select Committee which this House has adopted but the question of the whole structure of the Bill. In the first place, we were not told if the number of reporters were thought to be too many or too few when the Bill was discussed in Select Committee, nor do we know if the reporters were called to give their views before the Select Committee. We do know that the volume of work has increased considerably. This Committee should be given some idea whether it was the intention of the Select Committee that these typists should be employed on a part time or full time basis. The whole question is one of structure. I am glad to see that the Government has decided to bring down the new plan with typists. Honourable members will remember that when ministerial system was discussed in this House, the Secretariat wanted to read the speeches that were made on it and it allotted two typists to the reporters in order to facilitate getting the debate in a given time. It greatly facilitated the publication of the debates. What we do want to consider is the structure of the new setup to suit the volume of work of this House. We should take into consideration how many actual hours it will take the reporters to transcribe their notes on reading them back to typists. If we have some idea of the volume of the work, the structure can be settled.

The other point which I am not at all happy about is the question of editing of the debates and the qualification of the editors. Their job would not only be cross indexing, but it would mean listening to the entire debates of this Chamber so as to get some sort of background knowledge of what took place. As I have said, what worries me is the question of the whole structure, such as how many typists should we employ and whether they should be employed part-time or full-time. I do agree that typists are necessary.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This recommendation with regard to the editing of the debates does not appear to me to be practical; to suggest that the Clerk of the House or the Clerk of the Legislative Council should, within three days, edit the debates which have been handed in by the Reporters and pass them on to the printers is impracticable, unless the Clerk has nothing else to do. Hon. members are fully aware of the voluminous nature of the majority of the speeches made in this Chamber and if the Clerk must edit the debates within three days, he can only do it at the sacrifice of his other duties.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Clause 2 of the Bill is before the Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are we not considering the Report of the Select Committee at the same time as we are considering the Bill? It appears to me that the correct solution in this matter would be to allow the Senior Reporter to assist in the reporting of the debates but his main duty would be to edit the debates under the supervision of the Clerk. The comments which have been made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter are perfectly defensible; it is more likely that the Senior Reporter being a trained Reporter and an experienced man, would be more capable of editing the debates than the Clerk of the House. Even allowing for the fact that under the terms of his appointment the Clerk has to be a legally trained man, because he is a legally-trained man it does not mean that he knows about the reporting

of debates: it is likely that the Senior Reporter who is properly qualified would do a far better job in editing the debates than the Clerk of the House. I am therefore suggesting that it should be the duty of the Senior Reporter under the supervision of the Clerk, to edit the debates and we should specify the time which the Senior Reporter should spend in actually taking notes in this Chamber, which would be less than the time which the other two Reporters would have to spend in note-taking. I do not know that there is any precedent for the Clerk editing debates; I suggest that that should be the responsibility of the Senior Reporter.

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The Government has accepted the recommendation of the Select Committee that two typists should be provided for the House of Assembly in addition to the three whole-time Reporters and I think that the proper place to include these typists would be in Sub-Clause (1) of this Clause. I am therefore asking leave to insert the words "and typists" after the word "Reporters" occurring in line 7; these typists will be paid at the same rates at which steno-typists in the Civil Service are paid, as was recommended by the Select Committee. There is an incremental salary scale for steno-typists in the Civil Service and, as is usually the case, these typists can be placed in the scale according to their experience; so that if they are well qualified they need not be begun at the bottom of the scale. I am quite sure that that principle will be observed when the appointment of these people has to be made.

As regards the Clerk being responsible for the editing of the debates, the Clerk has a staff and he can delegate to members of the staff the task of editing the debates. It was not so long ago that we had Reporters—I speak with great reserve for obvious reasons—who were capable of editing the debates and did edit them to a high standard; but nowadays the Reporters complain that they have so much work to do—we know that they have to work for longer hours—that they cannot be so thorough in editing the debates. This Bill envisages that the Reporters will have an office down here and they will come in every day and do their work; this office will be equipped for themselves and the typists. I see no difficulty in the Clerk appointing a member of the staff to see that the debates are put in good and presentable form so that they can be appreciated by all concerned.

The point was made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip as to the limit of three days as set out in the Bill in respect of the debates; but if we have three whole-time Reporters they ought to be able to present the debates in three days.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The limit of three days does not apply to the Reporters at all; the period of three days is that in which the Clerk must edit the debates and send them to the printers. The Reporters themselves have six days in which to present the debates.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: There will be three Reporters for this House and one for the Other Place. It was originally suggested that the four Reporters should form a queue, but the Other Place objected to that and we have to make this arrangement which is now before us.

There being no objection, the hon. member was granted leave to make the amendments.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The hon. Minister of Social Services has referred to the editing of the debates. I did not refer to that matter because I think the Reporters should be of such a quality that they should be able to present the debates properly. This question of editing the debates has been introduced in this Bill and it presupposes that somebody is not satisfied with the quality of the reports which are presented. We will have to tell the Reporters that we want a better standard of work; if we are paying Reporters salaries up to £500 a year, we should let them know that we want a better standard of work than what we are now getting. I do not believe in whitewashing the servants of the House because they are drawing public money; if we are increasing the salaries of the Reporters, let us tell them that the standard of their work needs to be improved.

As to this question of editing the debates, you cannot guarantee that the Clerks of the House are better able to edit the debates than the Reporters themselves. I should like to say that there are Reporters and Reporters; a man of five years' experience as a Reporter would not be the same as one of fifteen or twenty-five years' experience. The debates do not make any sense if they are not properly edited; I have read some of the debates and they are really not good enough. I have found that my name was used instead of that of the hon. junior member for St. James. I do not feel that we will get out of the difficulty by the method which is being proposed; it is of no use asking the Clerk to edit the debates and expecting that they will be any better. There is an idea that because a man is a lawyer or a doctor he can do anything under the sun well, but that is a mistaken idea. You must have people trained to do certain things and the field of editing is a specialised one. The editor of a newspaper sometimes does not know the first letter in shorthand; but he can edit reports and make them read properly.

I do not want to be uncharitable to the Reporters or the Clerk, but the hon. Minister should see that he is not jumping from one thing into the other.

When the Debates Committee appoint this additional Reporter, they should not necessarily start him off at the bottom of the scale. There is the idea that if you give a man a little more the others will be displeased; but if you can get the services of people who have experience and ability you cannot think of being parsimonious. I would rather start a man at £500 a year, if he is a properly-qualified man than start one lower down the scale and then wait for 10 years abiding with what he does. As to the steno-typists I am sure that if you want good steno-typists you will have to pay proper salaries so as to get them.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In Sub-clause 2 an amendment should also be made so as to make provision for the payment of the salaries of the typists, I ask leave to insert after the figure "(2)" in line 1, the following words: "by adding immediately after the word 'reporters' in line (1) the words 'and typists' and".

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

Mr. GODDARD: We have been criticised from all quarters as to the state of the debates and we are now attempting to keep the debates up to date. We are appointing an additional Reporter and two typists for this House and we hope that with these appointments the debates will be kept up to date. When we are recruiting our Reporters it is up to us to pay a sufficiently remunerative salary so as to

attract proper people; we must think of this House and of what we expect of the Reporters. When we give them this staff and the facilities with which to work here, we expect them to do their work and I am sure that they respond to all that. The Reporters have been working under handicaps; they have been getting out old debates which have been left behind by two Reporters who have passed on, but we hope that the debates will now be kept up to date.

I should like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the words "corrected if necessary" occurring in the last line but one of Sub-clause (1) of this Clause. I think that those words should be deleted; when the reports are handed to the printer, they should be correct. I would suggest that the word "by their respective staffs" should be inserted in place of the words "corrected if necessary". In their Report the Select Committee have recommended that the Clerk be responsible for having the reports edited but he has the option of calling on the staff to do that job.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I accept that amendment.

Mr. GODDARD: If that is done, I feel that we will have moved in the right direction. We can follow the Canadian Parliament in this matter, but that will cost us a lot of money. We hope that when this Bill is put into operation, we will have the debates at a very early date after the sitting of the House.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to say that, in my opinion, we should have a typist attached to the office; we should employ three typists, one for each Reporter, but the other two typists should be employed on a part-time basis. If you employ two typists on a part-time basis you will find that you will get far more competent people to fill these posts than otherwise, if you are aiming at getting out the reports in the course of a week or within six days. Another point is that when this House is adjourned for two or three weeks—and it should be adjourned for two or three months at certain times which is what far more important Legislatures than ours do—it will mean that you will have two typists doing practically nothing every day. In so far as the back work is concerned, let us employ five typists and get through with it, but I cannot see that two typists should be attached to the Legislature and there are very important offices which have only one typist in each of them.

The next thing is this: if you employ two typists on a permanent basis they will be transferred from this office outside. There are many people who are very competent typists and they may be able to give a day's work or two or three days' work per week and the work can be got off. If you have three Reporters you cannot tell me that you do not need more than two typists; when work is to be done you will have three Reporters waiting on two typists. Let us have three typists and let the Other Place come in the stride of the work; let one typist be permanently attached to the office and let the other two be employed on a part-time basis. They will come in after the meeting of the House and the work will be got through in two or three days' time; they will not remain here until there is another meeting of the House in order to have something to do. I say: let us employ typists on a part-time basis for getting off your backlog just as you employed people to transcribe the shorthand notes of a Reporter who has died. We cannot get here and say that a top-heavy service is being created outside and do the same thing ourselves; if we are aiming at keeping our work up to date and getting out the reports in six days' time, I do not see the necessity for employing two whole-

time typists unless you will lend them to some other office at times.

I know that at the time of the Estimates you cannot comply with the law at all—I mean when the House is sitting more than twice a week and sitting late at night. There will be abnormal times with which you should have a flexible establishment to deal; I do not know what type of amendment I could introduce to give effect to what I am saying now, but I must say if you are setting up an office you should have a typist in it. You want a permanent typist, you want to employ competent people on a part-time basis and you are far more likely to retain the services of competent people if they are employed on that basis. If these other typists are employed on a part-time basis you will get far more capable people than otherwise; if they are employed on a permanent basis they will be transferred elsewhere in the service, and just as they are learning to work they will be taken to some other office and you will have to begin training somebody else all over again.

The same argument applies to the competent Reporter. If you must have a competent Reporter you should offer a salary which will be an inducement to him. We are sadly lacking in creating a standard of reporting in this House; I do not know whether or not the standard was good when you had a meeting every month. We have not kept pace with our own requirements and as far as a standard for reporting debates is concerned, we have none to be proud of and we should see that some standard is maintained by the employment at a good salary of somebody who has had experience somewhere else. I do not think that this House should rule out the possibility of having a female Reporter who may be able to maintain a much greater speed in shorthand writing than a man normally does in this job, and she might cause our debates to be conducted on an even higher standard of decorum than obtains at present. We may discover that what I have suggested will produce greater efficiency where this work is concerned. I will give this Bill my blessing in the hope that due regard will be paid to the points I have raised. In the process of time we may want to introduce some mechanical means of speeding up the reporting of these debates; we should not, at this time, do anything which would prevent us from adopting in future the means that would assist us in reaching the goal towards which we are aiming.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I rise partly to agree and partly to disagree with some of the remarks of my colleague. I was a member of the Select Committee which considered this Bill and if I remember correctly many more officers were asked for. The Committee was very careful in the matter; through what would appear to be the untimely death of two of our Reporters honourable members, the Press and the public became panicky over the reports which were very backward. I opposed strongly the idea of an extra editor who, it was suggested, should be employed. It strikes me that the Reporters should have some knowledge of English; none of us can boast of being any Churchills and you have this habit of Reporters taking around members' speeches to them. (Mr. LEWIS: That is done all over the world). You make a speech; you do not want a Reporter to make a speech for you. We have a Clerk who is drawing nearly \$500 a month, you have a Deputy Clerk drawing one-half that salary, you have a Librarian and Secretary at a salary of \$180 or \$190 a month and I am the first to say that the Reporters should be properly paid. It strikes me that the most suitable persons to edit the notes which they themselves have taken down and

transcribed would be the Reporters. It further strikes me that if you have a Clerk he must be in charge of the office and it is his responsibility to see that the printers get the reports. The Clerk should be responsible for the work.

There will be times when there will not be sufficient work for the typists to do, but there will also be times when the typists will be called upon to work at hours during which people would not like to work, and it is for that reason among others that we decided that two typists should be employed. When you come to the editing of the debates, it is all right to give fancy titles to people; you have the Librarian and Secretary and can he not also assist in editing the debates? I like to pay people money, but really I do not like to think that you are just creating jobs for people, giving them fancy titles and just paying out money when there are hundreds of other people who would like to have something to do. I am supporting the idea of providing this additional Reporter for this Chamber because I must plead guilty to being among those who make long-winded and, may be, unnecessary speeches; but we are driven to make such speeches because of the hard-headedness of the Government whom you have to try and convince of something or try to prevent from doing something wrong. If this House sits at night and goes on until the small hours of the morning, I agree that we should have three Reporters. If the Reporters are doing their work I cannot appreciate the suggestion of appointing an editor to edit the debates. To my way of thinking, the Clerk of this House must be the person responsible for having the debates edited; he runs the office therefore let him call upon people in the office to do work because we are paying them money and big money too. It is no use trying to whitewash the employees of this Department.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this procedure should be given a trial and I hope that not later than two weeks after a speech is made in this House the public will be able to read it in the *Official Gazette*. Not only that, I suppose honourable members are aware of the fact that it is their right to call upon the Clerk to draft questions or any other matters which they want to bring before this Chamber. I counsel honourable members that if they want anything drafted they can go to the Clerk and get it done; the Opposition will see to it that we work this office.

I am supporting this Bill and I hope that the remarks made by the Minister of Social Services as to placing the stenotypists in the salary scale according to their experience and ability will also be applied to the third Reporter. I feel that the Reporter with the experience and ability should be placed somewhere in the incremental scale according to his experience and ability as in the case of the typists. I understand that when the last post of Reporter was vacant, the services of the best Reporter were lost because the salary was much below that which was paid by the "Advocate" and other newspapers. Of course, the Government knows that well and I hope that they will not be so parsimonious on this occasion. I feel that if you can get a good man you will not be doing anything wrong in starting him off at a salary of \$180 a month. We should call upon this office to see that the work is being properly done and I repeat that the best person to edit a speech is the Reporter who has taken the notes, if he is worth his salt. If honourable members were to see their speeches as they made them, if the speeches were printed as honourable members delivered them, they would not want to speak in public again. But the public will allow for all those shortcomings.

Mr. BARROW: I cannot agree with the honourable members for the City when they criticize the present standard of reporting in this House. I think they have fallen under a misapprehension due to the fact that our debates are now reported at such a long time after they have taken place, that honourable members take the expurgated, garbled and distorted reports which they read in the local newspapers to be the correct version of the reports of debates which take place in this Chamber. (Mr. LEWIS: You are very wrong). Apart from the complaint made by the honourable senior member for the City, there does appear to be some interference with the full exercise of discretion on the part of the Reporters as to grammatical corrections; with that one exception I find the present reporting by the staff of the House to be reasonable in the circumstances.

As regards the reporting which takes place by the Press of this island, the "Advocate" in particular, it is disgraceful that this House should allow the distortions, and I consider, malicious omissions and substitutions which take place without summoning the Editor of that newspaper to the Bar of the House. We know that their Reporters are hopelessly handicapped considering the nature of the work which they have to do; I am sure that the salaries which are paid the Reporters are not such as would bring out the best candidates in the field of shorthand reporting, therefore we do expect a few lapses from grace on the part of the Press Reporters in their grammatical constructions where the singular, plural, perfect, past perfect and so on are concerned; but we cannot overlook the distortions, expurgations and reckless substitutions which appear in the Press of this island when our speeches are reported. Any member of this House who is fortunate enough to have his name mentioned as having participated in a debate, would have to spend the whole of his working week in correcting the misrepresentations which had been made by the "Advocate" newspaper. If we had to write letters to the Editor of the newspaper we would not have any time to do any other form of work or engage in any kind of economic or social activity because all of our time would have to be spent in correcting the reports of debates.

When we come to the question of reporting here, I am quite satisfied that any deficiencies which may exist are attributable more to the fact that we have not got enough Reporters than to any original sin such as that which besets the "Advocate" Reporters, on the part of our Reporters. I can only say that the "Advocate" Reporters bear the taint of original sin just like any other members of the human race, but more markedly than any other members of the human race. I have divided the human race into two species—the "Advocate" Reporters and mankind. Mr. Chairman, I am very serious and I am fully responsible for everything I say here: I can only come to the conclusion that some of the Editors or Sub-editors of the newspaper maliciously distort the debates which take place in this Chamber to the great pleasure of some members of the community and to the absolute amazement of others.

I can give you an example of the lamentable display on the part of the members of that staff. On the same day I read a leading article in the "Advocate"—

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of order. I thought that we were discussing the reporting in this House, not the reporting in the newspaper. I have lost a glorious opportunity of saying what I had to say.

Mr. BARROW: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that on the same day on which I read what I can

only describe as a panegyric to one of the members of this Chamber in the leading article of this newspaper I read in an overseas magazine which has much wider circulation than the newspaper, that the situation in Barbados was more explosive than that in British Guiana: on the same day I read that, I also read that Barbados was fortunate in possessing the leadership it possesses and no title or honour would be too great to heap on the leaders of Barbados because of the responsibility which they displayed in the past.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is going too far; let us keep to the matter which is before us.

Mr. BARROW: Unlike the honourable junior member for St. John who was annoyed when his speech was not published in the newspaper, I think most of us rejoiced that we were not visited by the ministrations of the Reporters; when they leave us out we feel happier than when we are reported.

I agree with what the honourable junior member for the City has said about having a certain amount of flexibility where the staff is concerned. We are already overburdened in this Chamber; no one could accuse the office of this House of being any hive of activity at any time of the day. We have a lot of offices here in this House which should be purely honorary and reserved for persons who have contributed something to the well being of the Civil Service of this community. If I wanted to talk about that, I would have to move that the strangers leave the gallery as I did on a former occasion. We should have a flexible staff whose services could be utilised when it is necessary to utilise them; I would also say in agreement with the hon. senior member for the City, that I would like to see inserted in this Bill some Clause making it an offence to alter the debates except in so far as is necessary for the normal process of editing. If I say anything in here about anybody I can go outside and say it. I do not agree that substantial statements made in this House, during the course of a debate should be changed, although they may not be strictly relevant to the issue.

Another point I would like to make is that the Librarian and Secretary of this House should be made to index the debates, so that if we want a debate at a particular time he would be able to say: "You will find it at page so and so and section so and so". I am at a loss to discover what the Librarian and Secretary of this House does, apart from writing pamphlets, for 24 hours a day; he has not got enough work mapped out for him to do. I do not want to offer any personal criticism or attack anybody; there is no point in honourable members making suggestions on the floor of this House either to be attacked or to be ignored. This is a domestic matter; we would like to put our own house in order. I hope that the members of the Debates Committee and the Speaker will see that most of the suggestions made on the floor of this House are implemented.

As regards the time limit, I see no reason why there should be a hiatus of 21 days between the making of a speech in this House and its publication for the benefit of the community. If we are going to make our staff flexible, the correct thing to do is to experiment and see what number of Reporters will ensure that the debates will be in the stationeries within 48 hours of their having been made. The House of Commons meets nearly every day and you can get the edited and printed Hansard the next morning; here we meet on one day a week and it is only a question of employing adequate staff so that the debates can be transcribed and typed and sent to the printers within 48 hours. I do not see why the

debates should be shunted through so many channels—from the Reporters to the typists, then to the Clerk, then to the printers, from the printers to the proof-readers and then back to the printers and after the printers have kept them for six months, the long-suffering public will get an accurate copy of what took place in the House. Apart from the "Official Gazette" and the daily newspaper, there is no other means of disseminating the knowledge of public affairs in this colony and that is a very serious matter.

Mr. LEWIS: It would appear as if by implication I have criticised the standard of reporting in this House. When I say the standard of reporting, that will cover everything, the preparation of the debates and everything else. From my experience I say that the Reporters should welcome the assistance of somebody in the presentation of the debates; I can produce some debates which the Head "Notices of Questions" was put under a different Head altogether. I know that the Reporters are working for small salaries and they are working under difficult conditions; far from criticising them, I congratulate them on what they do. However, that does not mean that they do the best job.

The honourable senior member for St. George has been referring to the reports which appear in the Press. If you are criticising the standard of reporting in the newspaper, I would like to ask whence do we recruit our Reporters?—From the very newspapers. Therefore if you criticise the one, you automatically criticize the other. I notice that a standard has been set in other West Indian Islands but here, we have accepted a low standard; you just have to look at the presentation of the debates to see that our standard lacks something. We want somebody to take an interest and have some pride in the work which is turned out by the House and the position will be different. I feel that we should have an Editor of the debates and there is nothing wrong in an honourable member seeing his speech before it is printed. If I am not allowed to see a speech which I have made, I have a good memory and I can say; "I did not say this" and then we will have more debate. No honourable member has any right to interfere with the presentation of what he has said; I know that with the best will in the world a Reporter will write down something and later on he will discover that he has written that somebody has said "Yes," and "No" in the same sentence. I do not think that the Reporters would try to misrepresent what has been said; the Reporters are over-worked and I am not so sure that we are paying such handsome salaries that we have people who do not need any assistance.

I do not mind if what I say is taken down exactly as I said it; I have no College to disgrace; the people understand what I say and they elect me here. I would like what I say reported and I would rejoice in that. There is no question of hiding behind anything; this is a place where you come to represent the people and you cannot represent the people properly unless you can say in here things which you cannot say outside. You can say in here things which are true and if you said them outside you would be dragged into a Court; that is a privilege which we must respect. You cannot be muzzled from saying things outside and be muzzled from saying them in here too.

Clause 3 as amended was read.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to know why the words "with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee" have been inserted in Sub-clause (2); those words were not in the Act before. I do not like the Governor-in-Executive Com-

mittee to be meddling in the affairs of the House if that is not absolutely necessary. I hope that the introduction of stenotypists does not prevent us from engaging the services of good typists, because we only need typists. Perhaps one of the typists should be a stenotypist, but if you can get a good typist we should engage the services of that typist.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In answer to the honourable member, I should like to say that the salaries paid to these officers were originally incorporated in the Act. For instance, Sub-clause (2) provides that the salaries shall not exceed so much and so much. (Mr. LEWIS: That is all right).

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would advise the Minister of Social Services not to delete the word "stenotypists." If you merely appoint typists you might appoint people who cannot even spell correctly; a stenotypist is of necessity a better person than a mere typist because she has a better understanding of English. You do not want to appoint a person who merely knows the keyboard of a typewriter.

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. 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.

On re-assembling,

REPORT RELATING TO FIRE PROTECTION FOR CITY OF BRIDGETOWN

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: As I have understood the Leader of the House, the Government wishes to return to Order No. 3. The next order of the day therefore stands in the name of the honourable Leader of this House: To move the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee relating to Fire Protection for the City of Bridgetown.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this report deals with the much debated question of a Fire Station for the City of Bridgetown. The question of a Fire Station for the City of Bridgetown has been discussed in this Island ever since 1947-48 when Major Cox, Superintendent of the Trinidad Fire Brigade, came from that Island to investigate and after spending a few weeks here, he reported on the fire situation in Barbados and made certain recommendations for a Fire Station for the City of Bridgetown. His report was printed and circulated. In connection with Fire Protection, he recommended that there should be a headquarters and a few subsidiary fire stations. The Government of that time did not exactly accept his report, and the matter was deferred until Barbados had its own Fire Officer. In the course of time, our Fire Officer came on the scene and during his period of engagement for three years, he trained our local firemen in modern methods of fire-fighting. However, when it came to dealing with Fire Protection and Fire Stations, he did not agree with the views of Major

Cox. He felt that Bridgetown should have one fire station and gave as one of his reasons that one fire station would lend itself to better control and would entail less expense. I can quite see with that view because if you have more than one fire station, it will be a question of duplication of your equipment and machinery and would mean an increase in the number of fire fighters. As a result, the capital cost would be higher and the recurrent cost would also be higher. Another point of view of our Fire Officer was that a man would be better trained if there were one fire station.

The Government has therefore accepted the recommendations of Major Craggs, who was our Fire Officer. When he came here, Government had already bought Saint Cecilia and one of the reasons that influenced Government to purchase St. Cecilia was that it was thought by the then Commissioner of Police, Col. Michelin, that it would be a likely place for a Fire Station. It is true to say that Col. Michelin was no fire specialist, nor did he pretend to be one, but that was his view which he put to the Government and the Government accepting it, committed it to this House which accepted it also. It will be remembered that when Government came down to this House for a sum of money to build a Fire Station at St. Cecilia, it was passed by this House; therefore, it can be said that the House of that day accepted that view. I believe there was some scepticism about the plan, but finally the resolution was passed.

As I have said, Major Craggs objected to St. Cecilia for a Fire Station; first of all, because of the nature of the site, and secondly, because the exit on King Street was narrow. In connection with that, the Government decided it would buy two small properties alongside that exit in order to make the exit wider. Again Major Craggs objected because he thought King Street of itself was too narrow and as he said, journeying to a fire in the heart of Bridgetown, the fire equipment would have to go either along Baxters Road and Tudor Street or along White Park road and as they were both very busy streets, the amount of traffic to be encountered would cause some delay in the apparatus arriving on the scene of the fire. He said that the delay of one minute would cause irreparable harm in the early stages of a fire.

While Major Craggs did not accept St. Cecilia as a favourable site for a fire station, he favoured other sites that were suggested. He favoured the suggested site at Temple Yard as well as he favoured the suggested site of the Jubilee Gardens opposite the Parochial Buildings. As I have said, when the Government decided on St. Cecilia for a Fire Station, there were two reasons for coming to that conclusion. First of all, it was Government property, and secondly, it was bought with the intention of placing a fire station there. When that proposition came to the House it was passed after much criticisms but when the resolution was considered by the Other Place, members of that body had their objections and they sent it to a Select Committee. The Select Committee went into the matter and reported in favour of the Temple Yard site. Government did not proceed any further with St. Cecilia for one reason or another.

On examination of other sites recently, the Government acting under the advice of Major Craggs considered as suitable the Probyn Street site on which the buses are parked now. Accordingly, the Head of the Administration sent a Message to this House recommending the Probyn Street site and the House appointed a Select Committee to consider a reply to His Excellency's Message.

Now, Sir, why does the Government prefer the Probyn Street site? I am reminded that Probyn

Street some years ago was considered a suitable site and Major Cox also showed some preference for it. However, the Select Committee met a day and made a visit to other places among which was the Sanderson's place in White Park Road. Let me say that the price of that was prohibitive, it costing in the neighbourhood of £27,000. Miss Esterbrook's place was also suggested by another member of the Select Committee but there were one or two members of the Committee who felt that inasmuch as St. Cecilia was in the neighbourhood, just around the corner so to speak from this place, no advantage would be gained. One of the main objections still remained in the choosing of these two places was that they were still some distance from the heart of Bridgetown and the fire apparatus would encounter considerable traffic while proceeding to a fire in Bridgetown.

The Select Committee finally decided on the report which now stands before us and its recommendation is that one main Fire Station should be erected to the north of Trafalgar Square within the radius of one mile from Trafalgar Square and that a subsidiary station should also be erected somewhere in the vicinity between Worthing and Oistin in the parish of Christ Church. We asked Capt. Barron, Director of Highways and Transport, to attend two of the meetings of the Select Committee and he assured the Committee that he could find enough parking space within the confines of the old Railway Yard to accommodate the buses which are now parked on the Probyn Street site with the exception of the buses which ply to the country and which are parked on the strip next to Bethel. This means that all the buses which travel up and down on the various routes to Bridgetown half-hourly and quarter-hourly would be accommodated in the old Railway Yard.

Let me tell this House that there is sentiment against the adoption of the Probyn Street site. I know of one member of the Select Committee who feels strongly, as he describes it, that Probyn Street is becoming a Social centre and the Bus Stand should not be removed from that site. I cannot see the value in that argument; as a matter of fact, it is no argument at all; it is an expression of sentiment. Another member of the Committee also objected to the Probyn Street site because he considered that firemen would not be comfortable there owing to the noises from the nearby hotels on Nelson Street interfering with their rest. That member also expressed the view that there was also a lot of noises around the two theatres in the vicinity. Sir, I am assured by responsible members of the community and of this House who had talks with the firemen that those men would feel quite comfortable and happy if they were to be accommodated adequately on Probyn Street. I am assured that by members of this community whose word must be respected. I personally cannot see any objection to the Probyn Street site. First of all, the Director of Highways and Transport said he can adequately accommodate the buses which are now parked on that site in the old Railway Yard, and secondly, if the firemen say they would feel happy on that site, I think their feelings should carry some weight on our decision.

Another objection to the Probyn Street site by members of the Select Committee was the question of the approach to the City and the amount of traffic that will be encountered when the fire apparatus would have to cross the Victoria Bridge. Capt. Barron attended the meeting at which that objection was raised and he produced drawings which I think were accepted by at least one member of that Committee who knows something of engineering. Capt. Barron told the Committee that it was proposed to

add another span to the Victoria Bridge and alter the angles connecting the Victoria Bridge with Bridge Street and change the traffic in this neighbourhood he was sure that the fire apparatus would be able to pass freely.

The subsidiary fire station that was suggested by the Select Committee to be built in the vicinity of Worthing and Oistin is a very good idea and one which we should keep in mind for future reference, and probably, for future development, but first things must come first. The question of the erection of a fire station for headquarters should be proceeded with as speedily as possible.

Sir, I did not agree with the Report of the majority of that Select Committee and I expressed myself as adhering to the Message as sent down by His Excellency the Governor. There is one thing which I want to point out. I have heard it said that the honourable Premier agrees with the Majority Report. That is not correct. The honourable Premier attended one meeting of the Select Committee and could only stay for five minutes. I do not think he heard enough of the deliberations of the Committee to come to a conclusion in favour of the Majority Report. The question of cost was also taken into consideration by the Select Committee, and as I have said, the Sanderson place in White Park Road, if purchased by Government, would cost £27,000.

(A VOICE: How much land?)

I think it is between four and five acres of land. When negotiations were made with a view to purchasing the Sanderson place the owner said that they were only pricing the land but the house would be thrown into the deal. In the case of the Probyn Street site the land is already the property of the Government. If the Probyn Street site is agreed to for a Fire Station there would be an exchange of land between the owners of the Plaza Theatre and the Government for some land in the vicinity of the theatre and if the exchange is effected it would bring about a condition which would be favourable to the owners of the Plaza Theatre as well as to the Government. There are also three or four house spots in the back which the Government would buy. In addition we will not have to buy land for the parking of the buses as the old Railway Yard will be used for that purpose. It was told to the Committee that the reason why it was suggested to put the buses in the Railway Yard is because plans are afoot to ultimately build a new set of offices there for the Highway and Transport Department and also to house the Public Works Department. It is also proposed to build a Repair Shop in that yard for the repairing of Government vehicles and engineering works and when all that is done there would not be enough space to put a Fire Station there.

Sir, honourable members can read the report of the Select Committee and can take into consideration the short history of the proposal for a Fire Station in Barbados from 1947-48 until now which I have given them. As can be seen there is a report by the majority and one by the minority. Let me just say that the old Railway Yard can be converted to accommodate buses at a very small cost.

(A VOICE: Why could not that land be used for building such as the building owned by Messrs. Barnes & Company on the other side of the river?)

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I am advised by engineers that the old Railway site is not suitable for building a fire station and therefore I have to accept the advice of those who know more than I do about that matter. I beg to move that the Minority Report be now adopted.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of that Select Committee and one who agreed to the Majority Report, I get up to move that the Majority Report be adopted. Before I open my remarks generally I would like to say that this is more of a business matter than a political matter, therefore, it calls for sanity on all sides in deciding this issue because it is for the expenditure of a large sum of money to provide this community with an essential service. It is very important that you give this matter the serious study it deserves because when we finish the construction of a new Fire Station it should be something not to last for the present but for the future. Sir, I think the Committee went very carefully into this matter. It met on several occasions and the findings are just as have been set out in the reports. Speaking personally I have taken sufficient trouble to investigate members of the travelling public and members of the Fire Brigade department as regards the suitability of the Probyn Street site to erect a Fire Station and I will give this House a summary of my investigations.

I will start off by saying that it was in 1942 when the Government acquired a set of buildings over at Probyn Street which was then occupied by Mr. A. E. Taylor for the purpose of putting down a Fire Station. The Government after acquiring that site felt that it was unsuitable to erect the Fire Station, and as a result, the programme was discarded and the area of land was converted into a bus stand eventually. The public appreciates the removal of the buses from Trafalgar Square to Probyn Street. As the honourable Minister of Social Services has said, it is used not only as an area for people who are awaiting transport but parents have become accustomed to waiting there during the day to collect their children coming from the various routes where the schools are situated and generally it is used as a social hub of the City. It is my opinion that while everybody feels that firemen are forced to remain in the unhealthy area of Coleridge Street yet their removal to Probyn Street would only provide them with five or ten percent better ease from present congestion and that is not sufficient. We have the opportunity of giving them ninety to one hundred per cent improvement in their environment. What I am trying to point out is this: if they are removed to Probyn Street instead of their getting ninety or one hundred per cent improved conditions to what they are now getting in Coleridge Street, they would only be getting five to ten per cent. Firemen have to work hard and they must rest comfortably during the day so that in case they are called out at night they can be fit to fight a fire. Everybody knows pretty well that Probyn Street is not a suitable place for men to live. And why? The heat during the day around that area is tremendous and the traffic is extremely heavy. The quarters which will be constructed for them will be cornered on one side by the tall building of the Plaza Theatre and the galvanized warehouse aside of that, to the front by the Empire Theatre and looking at the matter from another point of view, aback of Jessamy Lane and on Nelson Street there are about eight night clubs which produce much noise throughout the night, plus the fact that there are many tenement houses in Jessamy Lane and thereabouts from which you get a conglomeration of noises so everybody but the last Fire Officer, who seems not to be interested in his men, feels it would be definitely an unsuitable site for a fire station. I have questioned the firemen myself and they have told me that they would be glad to be removed from their present location to anywhere else, but if a better site than the Probyn Street could be found, of course they would prefer to wait a little.

longer instead of going there. That is contrary to the statement which the honourable Minister said just now. The firemen went as far as to say that they would go anywhere so long as they would be removed from the present site. If they were forced to accept going to Probyn Street they would consent, yet they would prefer to go somewhere more congenial than either of the two places.

We must also bear in mind that if we remove the bus stand from its present position we will be throwing away the money which we have already spent to surface the area and when the buses are removed from there, they will not be carried to a place where they can all be accommodated, because the proposals are that the country buses will continue to occupy the area alongside Bethel while the City buses would be carried to the old Railway Yard. That is not a complete programme inasmuch as you are not providing for the accommodation for all of the buses in one compound; you are having a group of buses here and another somewhere else. Buses should be grouped in one orderly area and it can be said that it exists now excluding those which are parked in the Lower Green, and those are buses which ply to the Leeward districts.

Be that as it may, when it comes to the question of St. Cecilia for the erection of a Fire Station, I want to make a few suggestions to Government, I want the Government to bear in mind that any expression of opinion by me should not be taken as my being opposed to the St. Cecilia site for opposing sake or because I am opposed to the policy of the Government, but my expressions of opinion are based on my little business knowledge and common sense and after a lengthy discussion with those who should know something about the siting of Fire Stations. When St. Cecilia was to be bought I levelled some criticisms against it and one of my principal reasons was that if it were to accommodate a Fire Station, first and foremost you had to think of the accommodation of the fire engine and its exit from the place as speedily as possible. I suggested to the Government spokesman who was handling the resolution at the time that St. Cecilia was most unsuitable for the reason I have just given. In my opinion, Passage Road is too narrow a street for a fire engine to travel quickly and besides that Passage Road as well as King Street are always congested with traffic and pedestrians. As the honourable Minister of Social Services said, a Committee was set up comprised of members of the Other Place and they turned down the St. Cecilia site. Well now, St. Cecilia is occupied by the Police Band and I can tell you that the Band regrets having to occupy such a large place because its members have to take care of it; they have to clean it and keep it in order and that takes up a great deal of time. It is more land and property than they can use and it is proving very costly.

Sir, I did not attend the first meeting of the Select Committee but for the next meeting I was circularised requesting me to meet the Committee at Mrs. Sanderson's place in Whitepark. I did not know how the Committee came to consider the purchase of Mrs. Sanderson's place but before I say anything further on that I must say this to members of the Government. Government business should not be run differently from private enterprise, the same principles are involved. You get keen, astute business men if they have made an investment and it does not bring them the profit they expect from it, they cease with that concern and start something else. Government must be bold and astute enough to adopt such methods when necessary. If Govern-

ment find itself saddled with St. Cecilia which is a property that will more than do for the accommodation of the Police Band and if Government has also the Garden House in Country Road which now house the Labour Welfare department and that is also too large for the purpose, Government should be bold and astute enough to sell one of them. As a member of the Committee, after being invited to see Mrs. Sanderson's place, I readily came to the conclusion that inasmuch as St. Cecilia was turned down from being a suitable site for the Fire Station that Mrs. Sanderson's place would be a more suitable site for the purpose. It contains about six and one-half acres of land and is about a quarter of a mile from Nelson's statue. It contains a substantially built dwelling house which is of great historic value and it also has out buildings. The arguments which were put up against St. Cecilia being used as a Fire Station cannot be used against Mrs. Sanderson's place. It is on Whitepark Road and I would suggest to Government that if it wanted to be successful in the present programme, it can sell St. Cecilia and the Garden House.

It is my point of view that if Government have two properties which are not fully utilised and neither can afford the facilities for which it is acquired that Government should release itself of them and seek to acquire one which would provide all the facilities. I can say from my inspection that the Sanderson's property contains several hundred times more accommodation than the two properties of St. Cecilia and "The Garden." The proceeds from the sale of these two properties would offset in a great measure the cost of acquiring the Sanderson's property if the owners of it and the Government can come to an agreement on the price. There are several departments of Government for which rent is being paid. The Government Electrical Engineer's Department is now being housed in one of the expensive offices of Plantation Limited Building. I think rent for an office in that building is not less than \$100 per month. There is also the Old Age Pensions Department housed in White Park Road in a rented property. If the Sanderson's property were to be acquired with its 6½ acres of land by Government and the several buildings on it, I am sure it would afford accommodation for the Labour Welfare Department, the Government Electrical Engineer's Department, the Old Age Pensions Office, the Police Band and the Fire Station. I am sure that if any private business man were faced as Government is faced in this matter, that he readily would agree with the suggestion I have put forward. Not only would it be an investment for the moment, but it would be a good investment for many years to come owing to the spaciousness of it.

Now, Sir, I do not agree with the argument of having your Fire Station in the heart of Bridgetown. That is a joke. Everyone knows that the City of Bridgetown is expanding and what is now considered as the suburbs of the City will in a short while cease to be such, therefore, when any new building is to be erected by the Government, that should be borne in mind. What is more, Mr. Speaker, the kind of fires which we generally get in Bridgetown according to past history is the kind which we would get whether the Fire Brigade equipment was in the same building in which the fire breaks out or in the building next door. It is known that when a fire is to be a must be, it will be. Bearing that in mind, the nearness of a Fire Station does not prevent a fire from taking place in the City. It is in the suburbs and rural districts where you get a hard-working woman having to leave her

small children in the house while the stove is burning, to run to the shop or the pipe and the children take it upon themselves to interfere with the stove so that it blazes up to catch fire to nearby blinds or linens to eventually catch the house afire that you get what may be termed undesigned fires. It is for fires like those that you should site your fire stations. The argument that you should have your fire station in the heart of Bridgetown falls to pieces by what I have just pointed out.

Again, Sir, I do not think we should at all times accept blindly any recommendation made by a Head of a Department even although he may be considered an expert in his field. I was not particularly impressed by the suggestions made by our late Fire Officer. He seemed to me as if he did not know very much about his business and seemed to care very little of the men that were under him. He may have recommended the Probyn Street site as a good place for a Fire Station, but I am sure that those who have recommended it as a good site would not go there to live unless they were unable to do differently. I am sure no Head of a Government Department would accept living conditions in Probyn Street especially if his duties made it incumbent on him to be there both by day and night, every day of the year.

As I have said, Sir, my aim is not to give firemen thirty percent improved atmosphere; my aim is to give them one hundred percent, and removing them from Coleridge Street to Probyn Street would only be giving them five to ten percent improvement in their environment. It must also be borne in mind that Probyn Street can be a bottleneck at times with traffic inasmuch as there are two large theatres and a church nearby. As I have said, it is a noisy place. I am sure every honourable member must have passed Nelson Street some time or other and heard the conglomeration of noises which emanates from those people whose business it is to entertain certain sections of the public. Sir, to go beyond those arguments and force these unfortunate firemen to live in Probyn Street would just be taking more advantage of them.

As regards the suggestion by a former Committee with respect to Temple Yard as a site for the Fire Station, I am told that Government has set a limit to the amount which it intends to spend on a new Fire Station and I am sure that the buildings and lands at Temple Yard would cost more than the suggested site in Whitepark Road and on top of that, would not afford any room for expansion in the future. What is more, that plan clashes with the proposals of the Market Committee of the St. Michael's Vestry. Temple Yard is one of the proposed sites for a market in Bridgetown. I do agree that Government should not pay an exorbitant price for any property it may wish to acquire, but I am as optimistic as to believe that the price asked for the Sanderson's house is not the bottom price. As a business man, I know that several prices are asked for in bargaining, but buyers scarcely accept to buy if too high a figure is suggested. Inasmuch as Government has its technical officers, like the Director of Highways and Transport and the Director of Public Works, who are capable engineers, they should know something of the value of properties, and I am sure that Government could set up a panel of such gentlemen to go into the question of valuing the Sanderson's property and making an offer to the owners.

Sir, I am saying that nothing should be done before Government makes an attempt to acquire the Sanderson's property. As I have said, I feel it would be an investment. As regards putting the bus stand

in the old Railway Yard the majority of the Select Committee felt that it was a most unsuitable spot. I do not share the view that you cannot find proper foundations on the area now occupied by the Highways and Transport Department to put down a large building but personally, I feel that neither the Bus Terminal nor the Fire Station should be put there. I see the necessity of keeping that area to accommodate the Highways and Transport Department. I also feel that the Public Works Department can be removed there in the course of time and, as it has been suggested, that there is necessity for Government to have its own mechanical workshop to service its own vehicles, I feel that area is very ideal for such a workshop.

I do hope that the House would support the views of the majority of the Select Committee. As far as I know, each member of that Committee did his best to arrive at a reasonable decision before agreeing to the Report which was finally presented to this Chamber. While I am on this matter, I am wondering if there is any useful purpose served in setting up a Select Committee of members of this Chamber and on the Committee presenting a majority report, and one of the members presenting a minority report, that the minority report must have pre-eminence over the majority report. If such a thing is to be permitted, then I consider that it is a waste of time setting up Select Committees.

I have an alternative suggestion to make to Government. In case Government does not wish to acquire the Sanderson's property, even although I was very strong in my opposition to the acquiring of St. Cecilia for the purpose of a Fire Station and Police Band Headquarters, I am willing to compromise and am willing to agree to the Fire Station being put there instead of at Probyn Street. My reason for saying so is due to the fact that I have discussed the matter with someone who has something to do with the running of St. Cecilia and as the person has expressed the view that St. Cecilia is too large a place for the Police Band Headquarters and the amount of work entailed in keeping the grounds clean, I feel it would be better to place the Fire Station there than to remove the Bus Stand from Probyn Street. However, although I am willing to compromise, it does not mean that I feel that St. Cecilia is the most suitable site; I still feel that there would be some difficulty in a Fire Station getting from that street. As I have said, it is my view that it would be far easier for a fire engine to traverse up and down Whitepark Road from a station on that street than to come out of some quarters into King Street and then to swing either up or down that street to get to either of the main streets.

Another point against erecting the Fire Station at Probyn Street is that so long as the fire engine must pass over the Victoria Bridge you are not sure that it will get over without being bottled up in the traffic that passes over that bridge and around the traffic lanes by the Nelson Monument. I agree with the suggestion of one of the members of the Committee that it should be stipulated in the report that the proposed site should be within one mile radius of the Nelson monument. While I agree with that stipulation, I am still of the opinion that there would be nothing wrong if the Fire Station were to be erected at Waterford. Of course, I do not mean at Waterford directly; I mean anywhere outside of the congested area of Bridgetown. It does not mean that because a Fire Station is in the City that it can get to a fire somewhere in the City easier. A fire engine may be able to get to a fire in Bridgetown quicker and easier from Bank Hall than if it were stationed in some part of the City. As I have said earlier, putting it

next door to a bond house does not mean that it will prevent that bond house from being burnt down. Sir, I feel that the Fire Station should be so strategically sited that it would serve not only those who get compensation from insurance companies in case of loss by fire, but also those whose position does not permit them to insure their small houses.

Mr. Speaker, I throw out those suggestions to Government. They are based on facts and arrived at after a thorough investigation has been carried out by me. I share the view that Barbados does not need one large Fire Station which would cost over \$300,000. I would prefer to have several fire stations strategically sited in the most populated areas than to have an elaborate setup bottled up in the heart of the City. I also agree with that part of the Majority Report of the Select Committee which states that one of the fire stations should be on the southern side of the City to guard against fires in the hotel areas in Christ Church. It is proposed that an amendment be made to that paragraph and instead of stipulating that the vicinity of that site should be between St. Lawrence and Oistin that the vicinity should be between the Garrison and Oistin. I would agree with that amendment.

As I have said, Sir, it is true to say that the Probyn Street site was bought in 1942 for the erection of a Fire Station but after buying the site, the proposal to erect a fire station there was turned down. The area is now being used as a bus stand and it is not sentiment, as has been suggested by the honourable Minister of Social Services, that the public like Probyn Street for a Bus Stand, but even if it were sentiment any Government that is reasonable will give some consideration to the sentimentality of the masses. Because of the suitability of Probyn Street for the Bus Stand, the travelling public would like it to remain there and I share their views and feel that all honourable members should share the views of these people. I do not look at this as a party matter. It is a question of putting down a public service which should give the greatest satisfaction to the greatest number.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable introducer of this resolution began by giving a resume of the proposals and indecisions to construct a new Fire Brigade Station but I notice that he skipped a lot of the comic opera which has been performed by the Government in this matter. Honourable members may have noticed within recent times that the people in this island are becoming more adopted to the theatre but I think that one of the best forms of amusement to be found in Barbados at the moment is to watch closely the antics of the present Government, especially the burlesque shows it puts on like the one in connection with the Fancy Molasses matter. While free entertainment can be provided by these sources, the only tragic thing about them is that they cost the taxpayers a lot of money; therefore, even while in themselves they may be amusing, they must be viewed with some concern since they involve such a heavy drain on the Treasury.

Now, the honourable Minister of Social Services suggested that the proposals contained in His Excellency's Message should be endorsed by this House. Briefly, His Excellency's Message agrees with the suggestion of putting the Fire Brigade Station on Probyn Street.

(Mr. Speaker left the Chair and Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair.)

I was saying Sir, that His Excellency's Message to which we are making reference, suggests that the Fire Brigade Station should be erected on Probyn

Street on the site which was originally earmarked for that purpose and Government says that it is much more centrally located than the site at Passage Road. In other words, in 1954, the Government has finally come to the conclusion that the site bought at Passage Road for a Fire Station should be discarded and the old Probyn Street site with the acquisition of more land as has been proposed to buy, should be used for a Fire Station. Sir, I refer to this whole matter as comic opera because when the Government was about to buy the Passage Road site, speaker after speaker said that it was not suitable for a Fire Brigade Station. The honourable senior member for St. John said at that time almost what the Government is saying now, that is, if a fire break out in the middle part of the City, it would be difficult for the fire engine to get from Passage Road quickly to the fire owing to the enormous congestion of traffic on the streets over which the fire engine would have to pass. Other members pointed out the impossibility of putting a proper fire station at Club Willow as the property at Passage Road was then called. But the Government was bent on buying Club Willow and the most convenient excuse that could be trumped up at that time was that it was wanted for a fire station and for a headquarters for the Police Band. It was the same type of excuse as when Government said that it was buying Enmore for the extension of the General Hospital, and now that Government has bought it, it is saying that it is not suitable for hospital extension but would be used for a health centre. As usual, Government is now making the excuse for buying this property after it has squandered the taxpayers' money in acquiring it.

Sir, when Government was about to purchase Club Willow, the resolution was introduced into this House by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and he clamoured that the Government was acquiring a most excellent bargain. Government paid £3,500 for it. The debate on the matter took place on the 23rd January, 1951, and if you were to read the flattering remarks made about Club Willow by the Government spokesman, you would come to the conclusion that the Government was buying the whole of Broad Street for nothing. I pointed out to the introducer of the resolution that Government was paying through its ears for it because the Chinese gentleman to whom it belonged had only bought it for £2,000; it was closed up for most of the time when he owned it; and when it was rented out, he could not get the rent. When it was rented out as a night club, he never got the rent for it. Like the Good Samaritan, Government gave him £1,500 on his investment which was actually a 75% increase on his investment and the Government increase on his investment and the Government spokesman attempted to tell this House that we were lucky to pay £1,500 more for the property than the owner had bought it. With regard to its acquirement as a Fire Station, the introducer of the resolution said at that time that a Fire Brigade expert, Major Cox, had come here and advised the Government instead of having one large Fire Station located centrally, it should have three Fire Brigade stations centred around Bridgetown. The Government felt that if they accepted Major Cox's advice, Club Willow would become a site for one of the three fire stations. You would probably recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker.—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Was I present?

Mr. CRAWFORD: You were not only present but you opposed the resolution. Sir, this House was told at the time that it must consider the resolution immediately as Government could not afford to lose

the bargain and, of course, the resolution for acquiring Club Willow was passed.

Now, Sir, even if the Government bought Club Willow on the pretext in the first place, that it was a bargain, and in the second place, that it would serve as one of the sites for a new fire station, Government was not sure that it would be used as a fire station. In other words, Government bought Club Willow because the expert, Major Cox, who passed through here and made a report said that we must have three fire stations, but Government particularly made it clear that if the new Fire Officer that was then appointed to come here said that this island did not need three fire stations, Club Willow would not be used for a fire station.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

As I said at the time, this whole affair was highly amusing, that the Resolution was an emergency one to acquire a "white elephant" which has been on the market for several years and not a single real estate agent in Bridgetown would decide to handle it. Other people condemned this property and said that it was impracticable for conversion into a fire station, but the Government bought it. The curtain goes up on another scene in this burlesque. In 1952 the Government brought down a Resolution for the sum of \$305,700 in order to erect a new Fire Station in Bridgetown and one in Speightstown twelve months after they had bought "Club Willow" where one of the fire stations was to be erected, and we did not hear anything more about three fire stations. The Government now says that Major Craggs' objection to the fire station being put at "Club Willow" was because the streets were too narrow and when a fire broke out the Fire Brigade would want to get to the scene as quickly as possible. Major Craggs now tells us that it was not possible to put a fire station at "Club Willow" because of the difficulties of the fire engine getting out to go to the scene of a fire, and when the Fire Officer did not agree with the Fire Export, the proposal to put a fire station at "Club Willow" was shelved. It was an absolute waste of money to have bought "Club Willow"; of course, having gone through the transaction they now say that the Fire Officer does not want the Fire Station placed; at "Club Willow" and they will go back to the Probyn Street site which was originally bought for the purpose of erecting the fire station and they will buy more land there in order to get the space they want. They will buy 8,750 square feet more land at Probyn Street so as to extend the area which they owned there since 1952.

It does appear to any reasonable person that if the Government had realised what the Fire Officer told them, namely, that we could have saved the money which we spent in buying "Club Willow", we would have the money to acquire this land now. We bought "Club Willow" also for the purpose of putting the Police Band there, and now we are told that the Police Band is most uncomfortable there. The proposal now is to erect one central fire station at a cost of \$200,000, and I should like to ask what has become of the decision to erect two or three fire stations? In 1951 reasonable people bought a site for the fire station, in 1952 they changed their minds to something else and now in 1954 they again change to something else; it is safe to assume that at this time next year we will have different proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is the desire of the House to have a short adjournment at this stage. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

On re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— I promised to allow the honourable senior member for the City to proceed with some Vestry Bills.

Mr. BARROW: I wonder if the honourable senior member for the City would mind giving way to me: I would like to get the Vestry Bill in respect of the parish of St. George done first.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I will give way to the honourable member.

ST. GEORGE'S PARISH (BARBADOS) LOAN BILL, 1954

Mr. BARROW: I thank the honourable member. I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 5 under "Private Members' Business" as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George—To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. George to raise a loan not exceeding £6,000 to carry out repairs to Parochial Buildings and to erect a Communal bath and latrine.

Mr. BARROW: In moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to explain that the parishioners in my constituency have been waiting for a considerable time for this communal bath and latrine which it is proposed to erect in the vicinity of the Parish Church. The sum of £750 out of the proposed loan will be allocated to the erection of a new bath and latrine. I might point out that there is no existing facility of this nature in the whole of the parish of St. George, which is one of the largest parishes in the island. The sum of £750 is needed for carrying out extensive repairs to the Rectory and the sum of £4,500 is needed for the extensive renovations which are to be carried out to the building which is to be occupied by the Parochial Medical Officer at Buttals. I have been informed that various schemes have been examined with a view to effecting a saving of money: consulting engineers have been called in and after long and considered opinion they have decided that it would be better to expend this sum of money on the repairs to the existing building than to build a new residence for the Parochial Medical Officer. The present arrangement is that the Parochial Medical Officer has to reside with the Parochial Treasurer of the parish, which we consider as a highly unsatisfactory state of affairs and causes a measure of great inconvenience to the parties immediately concerned and also to the parishioners. I have visited the building at Buttals myself and my personal opinion, which I have no hesitation in voicing, is that this building was a bad investment in the first place; but having expended the taxpayers' money in the purchase of such a building it would not be in the best interests of the parish to abandon the building because it is unsuitable for a private residence, and I doubt very much whether it would find a purchaser at an economic price in the present-day market.

Some honourable members might feel that it is bad business to spend \$20,000 in repairing a building; the Building Committee have arranged to put

the building in good condition and they have undertaken to relieve the situation where patients of a certain strata had to occupy a building in the yard and if the rain were falling they would have to walk through the rain to the Surgery. The Building Committee have given an undertaking that they will sell or otherwise dispose of the board and shingled building which was the Waiting Room, and that a Waiting Room will be incorporated in the new plans which their engineers have submitted to them. The building in its present state is a hazard to life; it is a fire hazard and it is ridden with wood ants; the new Parochial Medical Officer was appointed on the 22nd December, 1953, and he has not been able to carry out his duties in the building which is there.

I feel that the only objection which honourable members may have to this Bill is the amount of money involved in carrying out the repairs to one building; however, I would like to remind them that recently we voted money for carrying out repairs to the St. James's Rectory and we voted over \$2,000 for repairing the roof alone of the St. Joseph's Rectory. It seems to me that it is the natural propensity of Vestries to allow buildings which are entrusted to their care to run into a state of dilapidation to which no normal businessman would allow his premises to deteriorate; it appears to me that it is only now on the advent of a new Local Government set-up that the Vestry have decided to spend this money. That is a reservation which honourable members might have against this Bill; I would like to point out that the present Vestry was elected and then the Building Committee was appointed, so that the people of St. George had it in their power to alter the state of affairs if they so desired.

The Almshouse of the parish is also in a very disgraceful state of repair, but I do not think that at this stage, when there is a proposal for the setting up of Cottage Hospitals under the new set-up, the Vestry should come to the House and ask for permission to borrow money for repairing this Institution. The Vestry have decided that something should be done and it is better to spend some money now so as to ameliorate the condition of the poor people of St. George, than allow things to deteriorate further, because we do not know when the new Local Government Bill will come into force. I would remind honourable members that this money is not a charge on the Public Treasury of this island; it is something which will be borne by the ratepayers of the parish.

The details of the Bill have been circulated, the Bill has been duly advertised and I hope that honourable members will not delay by any acrimonious debate in supporting this Measure which is for the relief substantially of all the inhabitants of the parish which I have the honour to represent. I beg to move this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: As the honourable senior member for St. George has said, this sum of £4,500 is a lot of money to be spent in repairing a building. It is true that this decision was made by the Vestry elected by the taxpayers, but we, on this side of the table, take an economic view of the matter, and we feel that we should not agree to the spending of £4,500 in repairing a building. It would be very much better to give permission to the Vestry to raise a loan of £6,000 for the purpose of erecting a new building. As I understand the position, even this amount of \$4,500 will only patch up this building for a while and that it cannot be satisfactorily repaired for this sum of money.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I can assure honourable members that the report of the engineers have been submitted and the building will be in a proper condition when it is repaired. The patching up has already been done.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: In short, we feel that it is uneconomic to spend this money on this building; we would prefer to support a loan for erecting a new building rather than expend this money on the repairs of the existing building.

Mr. MILLER: I did not second the motion for the second reading of this Bill because honourable members are aware of what I said when this Bill was first discussed. I was awaiting some remarks from the Government in connection with this money which is to be spent on this old building. Honourable members will probably remember that a two-hour debate took place on this question as to whether permission should be given the Vestry of St. George to raise this loan for the purpose of spending £4,500 on the repairs of this building. Thinking of the remarks of the honourable Leader of the House, this is an old type of building and to repair it at this cost is abominable in this age; I felt in the first instance that it was wrong to do that and I was criticised by the Vestry for making my speech.

Some years ago I raised the question of the erection of a bath and latrine and when the plan was submitted I was told that it was too expensive; the suggestion was made that a bath and latrine should be created similar to what obtains in St. Peter. I made another drawing and sent a letter to the authorities stating that if they thought the erection of this bath and latrine was too costly I would build a bath without any charge; my anxiety was to get these amenities started in the parish. I was told that the Rector of the parish had decided to give a portion of land near the cholera grounds for the purpose of erecting this bath and latrine.

I think it was the honourable Leader of the House who suggested that we should ask my colleague to take the petition relative to this Bill back to the Vestry so that we could have a specific amount as regards the loan set out in the Bill. The whole question is whether or not honourable members would be willing to give the right to the Vestry to borrow money and spend £4,000 in repairing an old dilapidated building—whether or not this money should be spent on a building on which you could do very little in the way of improvement. As the honourable Minister has said, I would prefer to allow the Vestry to make a fresh application for a loan for the purpose of erecting a new building; I know that it will be a devilish job to get this building repaired for £4,000.

Mr. LEWIS: I am always asking honourable members to try and tell us what are the outstanding accounts against these Vestries up to the time of the bringing forward of these Bills: we want to have some idea of their liabilities when we are considering such Bills. That may not mean anything to all honourable members, but it may mean something to some of us; it would be a good idea for us to have that information. We pass these Bills and the only occasion on which the liabilities of these Vestries were gone into was when we had the Report by Sir John Maude. I really think that these Vestries should present figures as to their liabilities when they are asking us to increase their liabilities to the respective parishes. This liability is very likely to be spread to the surrounding parishes; I do not know what will emerge from the Local Government Bill, but if the parish of St. George is joined to some other parishes, and we hear that the "Maude" Bill has been passed by the Other Place with 57 amendments, this liability will

be spread to those other parishes. This building on the repairs of which it is proposed to spend £4,500, might be a good old building which withstood the last hurricane, but buildings of this sort are more or less out of date. We have heard that a governor has said that Government House is too big and that we can have a much smaller place; in the case before us the idea would be to provide a good bungalow for the Parochial Medical Officer and a good clinic attached to it for the accommodation of the patients. I must say that the Vestry of St. George should feel ashamed that they have allowed this building to reach such a state of disrepair that it is now almost impossible to repair it.

As to the communal bath and latrine, to make provision for only one of these amenities for a whole parish is the most absurd thing I have heard for a long time; that bath and latrine could only be for the benefit of a district or two in the parish.

To return to the building, the Vestry should have kept it in a proper state of repair with the expenditure of a small sum of money every year as time went on. The Vestry do not realise the amount of money which they are taking away from the taxpayers and paying in interest on a loan of this sort; in the first year the interest will be £300. It is not a question of beginning to erect a residence for the Parochial Medical Officer; they have a considerable amount of land and a house but they allow the house to get into such a state of disrepair that they have to ask this House for permission to borrow this large sum of money for repairing it. The Vestry have deliberately allowed this house to get into this state of disrepair so much so that the new Parochial Medical Officer could not inhabit it when he assumed office; I say that that is almost criminal neglect on the part of the Vestry. They are not managing their affairs properly at all and they would pride themselves with being first-class businessmen; they own one-half of Bridgetown from the investments they get. They pride themselves with getting wealth from their brains and this is the way in which they manage the affairs of their own parish—just leave this house there for the wood ants to carry it away. Now the taxpayers' money will be paid out in interest; I say that the Vestry should be ashamed to let a Bill of this nature come before the House. They should have been asking for permission to borrow sufficient money as would provide for the erection of several communal baths and latrines in this parish of St. George.

There is another comment which I would like to make and it is this; the Government appears to have adopted the method of scrutinising such Bills as are introduced by private members. In the same way that the Government expect private members to examine the Bills they introduce, the Government should take the Order Paper and decide on the order of these Bills as they are introduced and not wait until some honourable member has said that he would like to have an Order moved up and then say that they want time to consider it. They should scrutinise Private Member's Bills and be able to say that they are supporting such and such a Bill, and not wait until an honourable member says that it is time that such and such a Bill be got through to say that they want an opportunity to scrutinise it.

Up to a point this matter is a domestic affair with the parish of St. George, but when the expenditure of this money will be incurred, it is not a domestic affair; the taxpayers of St. George will not have to bear this loan. This Bill will keep this loan going for a dozen years and we hope that the "Maude" Bill will come into effect before that time. If the people of St. George agree that this loan

should be raised, then it would be right for this House to pass this Bill; but we have a right to discharge our duty by saying that we share the responsibility of burdening the taxpayers with this loan and we should say exactly what we feel about the matter.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I am on the horns of a dilemma; I want to support this Bill and I do not want to support it. (Laughter). I would like to know if this building is purely and solely the property of the parishioners of St. George.

Mr. ALLDER: I am supporting this Bill. If we allow Party politics and personal recrimination to enter everything—

Mr. BARROW: I am interrupting the honourable member and I hope the Chair will give him the opportunity to speak at some later date. I am asking leave to postpone the consideration of this Bill; I think I should go back to the Vestry of St. George and tell them what the feeling of this House is. I am therefore asking leave to postpone the further consideration of this Bill.

VESTRIES (AMENDMENT OF BORROWING POWER BILL, 1954)

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Vestries Act, 1911 as amended by the Act, 1948—14.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The consideration of this Bill was postponed on the last occasion because it was suggested that the Bill should be discussed in Executive Committee.

Mr. LEWIS: Is the honourable member replying now? I see that the second reading of the Bill has already been moved and seconded and the postponement was also moved and seconded.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I take it that in my replying honourable members would want me to refresh their memory. This Bill seeks to give the Vestry of St. Michael authority to borrow £50,000 instead of £20,000 to carry on the affairs of the parish until the rates have been confirmed. When the Act was last amended the expenditure of the parish was in the vicinity of \$600,000 and now it is slightly over one million dollars. This is only a question of paying salaries and so on until the rates have been confirmed.

Mr. LEWIS: The Government has changed the denomination from sterling to dollars and it is not right for us to pass some Bills with the denomination in dollars and others with the denomination in sterling.

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

On the motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1, the title Clause, was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: I want to point out to the honourable member that the substitution of "dollars" for "pounds" cannot take place with any convenience because in the Schedule to the Act all the other parishes have their quotas fixed in pounds. Therefore if we amend one part of the Schedule we will have to amend all the others as well.

Mr. LEWIS: As long as I do not alter the amounts, I can move an amendment to the whole

Schedule putting all the denominations in dollars and cents.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

PAROCHIAL EMPLOYEES PENSIONS (COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE) BILL, 1954

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act, 1944 as amended by the Acts 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This Bill is for the purpose of paying a Cost of Living Bonus to people who have retired from the Parochial Service. It will be recalled that parochial pensioners receive their pension in keeping with an Act: therefore, before the Vestry can give an increase of that pension they must have legislative sanction for so doing. This Act came into force in 1947; we made an attempt to place it in the Schedule of the Expiring Laws Continuance Act but the Crown Law Officer ruled that that could not be done because the Vestry was an annually elected Body. We are giving the parochial pensioners a Cost of Living Allowance similar to that given by the Government to their pensioners. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I have been suggesting that this Bill could be placed in the Schedule of the Expiring Laws Continuance Act; what has been said might be quite true but I do not see why that could not be done. Why can't the Vestry send a petition to the Legislature to continue an Act in force and save all this trouble? The Vestry is elected in the second week in January and we pass the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill in March; do you think they could not get the petition presented to the Legislature in time?

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

On the motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Preamble was postponed.

The four Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: There is a Clause which is usually added at the end of a Bill like this. That Clause reads as follows:

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty her heirs and successors or any person except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by from or under them."

I beg to move that that be Clause 5 of the Bill.

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

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

VESTRIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Vestries Act 1911—5.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This Bill seeks to increase the salary of the Parochial Treasurer of St. Michael and that of the Churchwarden's Clerk. It will be recalled that these are the only two parochial employees whose salaries are fixed by law. Last year when the Vestry reviewed the salary scales in keeping with the Government's revision of salaries, recommendations were made for increases in the salaries and wages of all parochial employees ranging from the sweepers to the Parochial Treasurer; but the Vestry has no power to increase the salaries of these two officers without legislative sanction. The Parochial Treasurer receives £900 a year and in this Bill the Vestry is seeking permission to pay him £1,000 a year; the Churchwarden's Clerk receives £350 a year and this Bill seeks to pay him £400 a year. All the other parochial employees were given increases in their salaries in keeping with the recommendations and this Bill seeks to bring these two employees into line. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that while I am not prepared to oppose this Bill, I raised the question some time ago in respect of the salaries of the Matron and of some other employees at the Almshouse. At that time the honourable member said that the salaries of all the employees would be reviewed and treatment would be meted out to these employees similar to that which was meted out to employees of the Government. There is no doubt that the Matron has to carry a great burden of responsibility—the number of patients at the Infirmary being over 500—and she is paid the paltry salary of \$120 per month. As far as I have been able to ascertain no increase has been given to this employee. It has always been an accepted principle by the Vestry that they would follow the precedent set by the Government where increasing the salaries of employees is concerned; that was done in 1949 when we had the Report of Commissioner Adams and also last year when we had the Dos Santos' Report. It is rather strange that the Vestry while claiming to be adopting the principle laid down by the Government—that principle is that whenever increases are being given each and every individual who works for the Government must get an increase in his salary—in this particular case and in a few other cases which have been brought to my attention the employees were not given any increase. I do not know if any explanation can be given as to why some of these hardworking people have not been given an increase similar to that given in other cases, more particularly in the cases of the Parochial Treasurer and the Churchwarden's Clerk; however, many of these parochial employees are looking forward to the day when the "Maude" Bill will be passed with the hope that much of this discrimination and victimisation will cease.

If you compare the salary paid to the Matron at the General Hospital and that paid to the Matron at the Almshouse, you will see that the former, who has a smaller number of people to deal with than the latter, gets \$240 a month while the latter gets \$120 a month. It is true there might be a difference in standing between these two people. I would like to hear the honourable senior member for the City say whether I am right or wrong in saying that the Matron at the Almshouse has not been given any increase; if this individual has not been given any increase I would like to hear the honourable member satisfy this House as to why this individual and some other nurses at the Almshouse have been overlooked when a year ago other people were given increases up to \$20 a month. I would like to know why the Matron at the Almshouse and some others were not considered for any increase in their salaries. It has never been the policy of the Government to discriminate against any person and it does not speak well for the Vestry or whoever is responsible for giving these salary increases to consider some people and leave out others. Even at this late hour I am appealing to the honourable senior member for the City to go into this question and see that justice is done to these employees including the Matron at the Almshouse, always realising that she has served in that capacity for many years and her work has always been of a high standard and the inmates have the greatest respect for her. We must bear in mind that these inmates are there through no fault of their own, they have given their toil and sweat to this colony and this is the last of these people who have contributed to the wealth of the colony for many years.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am no believer in special pleadings. What I would like to know is whether the honourable senior member for the City can tell us what is the basis on which these salary increases are given. The Parochial Treasurer has been drawing a salary of £900 a year and now it is proposed to give him £1,000 a year; the salary of the Churchwarden's Clerk was £350 and it is proposed to give him £400 a year. The salaries in themselves are not princely but I would like to know what is the basis for the increases. I am sure that the honourable member is quite willing to give information which will lead me to say whether the basis for these increases is a fair basis or not. In recent months the Government has taken the lead in increasing salaries and if the Government is a model employer the Government would not say anything against anybody who follows suit. I would like to know whether these salary increases have been based on the Turner Committee's Report or the Dos Santos' Report or on the Report of a Committee of the Vestry.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, before my colleague replies, I too would like to hear from him whether he is aware of the grievances that exist at the St. Michael's Infirmary as have been enumerated by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. Can he say whether those grievances are founded on fact or fiction? I do know that for a number of years, nurses at the General Hospital had to attend the St. Michael's Infirmary in order to be trained to become qualified midwives, therefore, I have no doubt that the nurses of the Almshouse at that time, especially the present Matron, must have given valuable assistance to the number of well-trained midwives who went through their course at that institution. Not only that, but I understand that the Matron is more or less reaching her retiring age and if there has been an oversight in her case, I too hope that it will be rectified so that in the evening of her days, she would be able to draw a decent pension instead of

having to depend on private charity. I know that Government has assisted employees in the Service by allowing them to fill a higher job than they were qualified to hold so that they could retire on a reasonable pension and, as far as my memory serves me, I think the Matron of the St. Michael's Infirmary has some qualifications. I, therefore, throw out that suggestion because I would like my colleague to know that I have heard those grievances voiced on two occasions by two persons and both have come to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that there is discrimination against this old lady by the Vestry of St. Michael. I hope it is not so and I hope any explanation of it would not be made to the detriment of the Matron.

Another employee of the St. Michael's Vestry whom I have heard discussed in the same manner as the Matron is the Building Inspector.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will you call his name?

Mr. LEWIS: I think the gentleman is known as Mr. Taylor.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: He is an employee of the Government.

Mr. LEWIS: I did not know that this gentleman is an employee of the Government but works under the supervision of the St. Michael's Vestry. At any rate, now that there is an opportunity of saying something about him, I will make mention of the matter for enlightenment. I have heard that his case is on all fours with the Matron's and I suppose my colleague can enlighten this House on the matter.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will begin by replying to the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. Peter. He asked whether the St. Michael's Vestry in arriving at salaries to pay its officers was guided by the Turner or the Dos Santos Report. I answer by saying that the Vestry was guided by both reports. The Vestry had to be guided by the Dos Santos Report when it was dealing with the rank and file and the Turner Report when it was dealing with the employees in the higher brackets. I think if the Vestry made any mistake in fixing salaries and rates of pay, it erred in good company because it followed the example of Government. The honourable junior member for St. Peter asked me with whose post in Government employ I compared the post of Parochial Treasurer. Originally, the Vestry compared the post with that of Colonial Secretary but it is now comparing it with the post of Comptroller of Customs and if you examine the figures carefully, you will see that the Vestry has dropped some £250 below that recommendation because the Vestry cannot afford to be as reckless in its expenditure as the Government.

I may not have been in public life as long as my colleague but with regard to salary increases, I realise, no matter how much my sympathy may be with somebody, I cannot think of giving them an increase in salary purely because it is getting near the time for them to resign. What would be said if that is done, is that Vestrymen are picking their friends out to give salary increases so that when they retire, they will go out on a high pension.

Mr. LEWIS: I did not make that the basis of my complaint. What I drew attention to was that the Matron would soon be retiring and hoped that if there was an oversight in not giving her an increase in salary that it would be rectified so that she would go out on a better pension.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I thought my colleague suggested that she should be given an increase so that when she would have retired, she would get a better pension. In answer to what the honourable senior member for St. Michael pointed out, I would say that I too have heard rumours but I would point out to him that he should get his facts correctly

before he makes a speech as the one he made just now which can only be termed as recklessly accusing Vestrymen of discrimination and indiscretion. The honourable member began by comparing the Matron of the Almshouse with the Matron of the General Hospital. I am sure the honourable Minister of Social Services will tell him that there is no comparison between the two offices. The Matron of the Almshouse gets \$120 per month and I will give the reason why she has not been given an increase on this occasion. If one follows the Vestry system, one will see that the Board of Guardians each year is the body which is responsible for fixing salaries for all employees of the parochial institutions. When the salaries were revised on the last occasion, the Committee took into consideration that the Matron of the Almshouse was not in the same position as the Matron of the General Hospital or the Mental Hospital. While the Matron of the Almshouse must be a qualified midwife, she needs not be a qualified nurse at all, and that was the reason for fixing the salary at that figure. I can definitely say that the Committee has nothing whatsoever against the Matron. The honourable senior member for St. Michael in his speech stressed that there was victimization, but I cannot see how he could have come to that conclusion, because the Matron of the Almshouse is a most admirable person to one and all and she has been a parochial servant for a very long time. Allow me also to say that under the Act, the Matron is pensionable on a salary of \$190 per month because besides her salary of \$120 per month, she is in receipt of other emoluments. As a matter of fact, she pays income tax on an income of \$190 per month. On the last occasion when the salary of the Matron along with that of the Nurses who were attending to the Children Wards were reviewed, the Matron's salary was carried from \$110 to \$120 per month and Nurses from \$65 to \$75 per month.

A VOICE: That was in 1948.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is not true.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member is not addressing the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir, as I have explained already, when the Committee was fixing the salary of the Matron of the Hospital, it took into consideration that there was no comparison of her post with that of Matron of the General Hospital because the Matron of the General Hospital must possess other qualifications than that of Matron of the Almshouse and the Matron of the General Hospital is responsible for a different kind of work. I am sure that the Minister of Social Services would explain that to the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

Now, Sir, the honourable junior member for the City enquired into the salary of another officer who is not a parochial employee. The officer to whom my colleague referred is paid by the Government at a salary which is in the Estimates. He is under the supervision of the Commissioners of Health, some of whom sat on the Vestry's Salaries Committee. They said that while they could not see their way to ask for more money for him for the work that he was doing with that Board, they felt that he deserved a better salary and recommended to the Government that they considered that the duties of Inspector of Buildings, the position which this officer holds, should be carried out along with the building scheme of the Housing Board so that this officer would have more work to do but for which he could be paid more money. Sir, I fully realised my sense of responsibility when I was a member of that Committee. Even if I were opposed to any person in public life, I would still see that justice is done. I realised that I was not on that Committee to make jobs for friends. Of course, I could have got up and

said: "Pay him \$200 per month," but I could not conscientiously do that knowing the work that the Building Inspector was called on to do. We consider that there is much to be done at the Housing Board and work that this officer can be called on to do. This officer has the ability to work for \$200 per month and that is the reason why the Committee recommended that he be taken over by the Housing Board and be given something to do in conjunction with the duties he performs for the Commissioners of Health. Again, Sir, if the Committee had recommended one cent more for him, it would have been said: "Look at the discrimination; look at the dishonesty."

I am inclined to agree with the honourable Minister of Communications that discrimination may have taken place on a previous occasion when salaries were revised. Looking through the report on the revision of salaries at that time by a Committee which was under the chairmanship of the Hon. Mr. Cuke who had been asked by the Vestry to look into the matter, it was observed that somebody took upon himself to disrupt the equilibrium of parochial salaries.

I hope I have satisfied the honourable Minister of Communications. I am fully aware that he is a taxpayer of the parish; therefore, he has every right to bring this matter up. With regard to the Building Inspector, I have discussed the matter privately with the honourable member along the lines which I have just stated. I have also discussed the matter with the particular officer. I do want honourable members to bear in mind that I had a duty to perform when I sat on that Committee and viewing the work done by parochial employees, I had to say that a job was either worth so much or it was not worth that amount. I did not see how the work done by the Building Inspector could be worth more than what he is getting. I will say again that that officer has the ability to work for \$200 per month, but not for the job he is doing for the Commissioners of Health. I think I have fully explained the points which were raised by honourable members and I hope honourable members are satisfied with the explanations. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: After hearing what the honourable member has said, I suggest in view of his reassuring statement that even although he may be opposed to anyone in public life he would still see that justice is done to them, that he should go into the matter again. I accept his suggestion, but I am asking him all the more, in view of what he said and his reassurance, to go into the matter again, and probably, he might find that the reasons why he came to the conclusion that those persons should not receive salary increases might only be rationalised by persons who have other reasons for not increasing the salaries of those persons. I can say without flattery that the honourable member is the most influential vestryman that this island has had for years, if not centuries, and I suggest that with his reassurance, he should still go into the matter again.

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

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were called and passed.

The Preamble was then called and passed.

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND VESTRIES (COST OF LIVING BONUS TO EMPLOYEES) ACT, 1947

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947 as amended by Acts, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, This Bill deals with Cost of Living Bonus for parochial employees of St. Michael. It is to enable the Vestry of St. Michael to pay to its employees a cost of living bonus for the year 1954-55 as it has been doing since 1947. As I think all honourable members are aware, the Vestry must get the permission of the Legislature to pay this cost of living bonus to two of its employees every year owing to their salary being fixed by law. I do not think I need to say more. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to know whether all Vestry employees are paid cost of living allowance.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All parochial employees of St. Michael have already been paid their cost of living bonus with the exception of these two officers. This Bill must pass the Legislature before these two officers can be paid it.

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

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were respectively called and passed.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: As in a previous Bill which this Committee dealt with, I am asking leave to insert a new section to be numbered Section 4. It reads as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors, or any person body politic or corporate, except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by, from and under them."

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Section 4 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to point out that this is not a Bill for the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael. So far as I understand this Bill, it can apply to all the Vestries in the island, therefore, there is no saving of rights of the Crown to affect. This is a public bill and I think the section introduced by the honourable Minister of Social Services is unnecessary. I do not think we should agree to it being put in. I think the Crown Law Officers are getting too sensitive on these small points.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member is now asking this Committee to look at him as an authority on the law. There is no doubt about it, the honourable member is always full of informa-

tion and knows a lot of things, but knows most of them wrong.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member knows that this Bill applies to all Vestries and that it is not a private bill by any stretch of the imagination. It does not apply to the Vestry of St. Michael alone, therefore, it is unnecessary to add that section to the Bill. The reason why, I think, that section has been added is because the Crown Law Officers made a serious blunder in a Bill which passed this House recently.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, one of these days, the honourable member will understand that the difference between a private and a public bill is that a public bill affects every man, woman and child in the community, while that is not the case with a private bill. The Bill before us is a private bill.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, every honourable member of this House can bring in a Bill without any petition or advertisement to change the Vestries of the island, but if a particular Vestry wants a Vestry Act to apply to that Vestry alone, that is a private Act and must be done by way of petition. The honourable member knows that. You do not need to be a lawyer to know that; you can know that by reading May on Parliamentary Procedure. I contend that this is not a private bill, therefore, it is not necessary to insert the clause for the saving rights of the Crown. I would appeal to the honourable introducer of that clause to withdraw it. If it must be put in, let the honourable Attorney General introduce it in the Other Place.

The question that Clause 4 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD.—13.

Noes: Mr. LEWIS.—1.

The Preamble was then called and passed.

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title agreed to.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 30 OF PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 30 standing in my name.

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

VESTRY LOAN BILL TO PURCHASE "FROLIC" WESTBURY ROAD

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City: Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. Michael to raise a loan to enable them to purchase the property known as "Frolic" in Westbury Road, St. Michael, for the use of the Westbury Cemetery Board.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, This Bill seeks to get the authority of the Legislature so as to permit the Vestry of St. Michael to purchase the property known as "Frolic," adjoining the Westbury

Cemetery for the use of the Westbury Cemetery Board. I do not think any person would object to this Board acquiring this property in order to provide for more burial ground. I may state at this stage that there has been a suggestion that a crematorium should be established here but the matter has not yet been finalised. This property contains by admeasurement four acres two roods or thereabouts with a dwelling house and other buildings and the price is \$15,500 which is considered very reasonable. As a matter of fact, the only buy Government has made as good as this is "Club Willow". The "Frolic" runs along Westbury main road and along Goodland and is owned by Mrs. Gale. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I know that Barbadians are a conservative set of people, but in all seriousness, I am making a suggestion to the St. Michael's Vestry to seriously consider the question of putting down a crematorium. Barbados is too small to be taking in more land as the years go by for expanding the cemetery.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want to assure the honourable member that the St. Michael's Vestry is not prejudicial to the use of a crematorium, but on examination of the scheme found that it was rather expensive for a Vestry to undertake. It is also felt that the establishment of a crematorium should follow the usual course as in the United Kingdom and the United States of America where it is established by private enterprise. I have no doubt that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph who is in that line of business would shortly be visiting the U.S.A. with a view to the establishment of such a scheme in this colony.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I suppose if this island continues with this form of burial as we are doing now, we would soon have all land being used as burial grounds. I have drawn to the attention of the Parochial Authorities and the Government some years ago that the cemeteries of this island were spreading as well as the almshouses and the Mental Hospital, and they soon would envelope the whole island. With the economic conditions of this island being what they are, I do think that it is worthy of consideration to keep our cemeteries within their present boundaries. It is a fact that the Westbury Cemetery and the Mental Hospital are increasing to such an extent that they soon would adjoin each other.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am not adding fuel to the fire but I know the argument of Barbados having a crematorium is bound up with the doctrine of the High and Low Church here. They feel that the establishment of a crematorium would cause them to lose face and the whole of their argument is built from the ethics of the Ecclesiastes. I happen to know the former boundaries of the Westbury Cemetery and it is a fact that it has more than doubled its size within recent years. By the addition of this land it would extend to Goodland. In view of land scarcity we should use our land to the best advantage. I am a Low Churchman and I am not worried mortal soul of mine.

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

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clauses 2 to 13 inclusive stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the rules of this House do not permit that to be done. It is not the right procedure and I am warning you—if you need my warning—that it cannot be done.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know if the honourable junior member for the City was in his place when the Public Health Bill was considered in Committee, but it was considered in junks. Why waste time?

Mr. LEWIS: This Bill is not in any parts. I do not see how it can be considered in that manner unless it was in the rules or was a special instruction to the Committee.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment to the motion.

The question that Clauses 2 to 13 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. Chairman: "I think the Ayes have it."

Schedule "A" was called and passed.

Schedule "B" was called and passed.

The Preamble was then called and passed.

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Bill which was reported to you as passed by the Committee was passed without the Clauses being considered separately. It has been passed contrary to the rules of this House. I merely want to draw that to Your Honour's attention.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have heard from the honourable Deputy Speaker that the way this Bill was proceeded with in Committee was irregular. I have warned the House on a former occasion that if this honourable Chamber wishes to waive the rules dealing with any matter in Committee, before the House goes into Committee, the procedure must be agreed upon. I have explained all that to the Chairman of Committees. I therefore, rule that this Bill be again considered in Committee.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Some sessions ago, a resolution was moved in this House that the clauses of a Bill could be called instead of being read and there was a pronouncement from the Chair since then that sections could be taken together as read so long as the Committee agreed to such action. Just as Government has told honourable members that before discussing a private measure, the Government should be given seven days' notice, which is no direct rule of this House, so is this matter of taking sections of a bill together if the Committee so agrees. I therefore cannot see how it is wrong procedure.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable Premier knows very well that formerly, the Clerk read the contents of a clause before it was moved and passed. This House moved a resolution that a clause could be called by the Clerk instead of being read. All the clauses of a bill must be called separately before being considered in Committee; that is the recent rule of the House.

HIS HON. THE SPEAKER: The Deputy Speaker is entirely correct. Whenever the House wishes to depart from this procedure, it must ask to waive the rule.

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill again, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 8 were called separately and passed.

Clause 9 was called.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. F. C. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

HON. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I have not heard the Acting Clerk give the number of the Clause. If you are going to be straight, you must be straight in everything.

The question that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 10, 11 and 12 were respectively called and passed.

Clause 13 was called.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind the honourable mover and seconder of the clause that there is a rule which says that an honourable member must be on both feet when moving and seconding a motion, else it is not properly put.

The question that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Schedule "A" was called and passed.

Schedule "B" was called and passed.

The Preamble was then called and passed.

On motion of Mr. E. D. Mottley, seconded by Mr. Goddard, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. E. D. Mottley, seconded by Mr. Goddard in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title agreed to.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, at this late hour, it now being twenty minutes to twelve o'clock, I am sure honourable members on the other side are just as tired as members of the Opposition. Not only that, but many honourable members have already left the Chamber. I am therefore asking the Government to see fit to adjourn the House now until this day week.

I therefore move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Allder seconded the motion.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock in the afternoon was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: MR. LEWIS, MR. CRAWFORD, MR. ALLDER, MR. GODDARD, and MR. F. D. MOTTLEY.—5.

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 and MR. WILLIAMS.—10.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT ON FIRE-PROTECTION RESUMED

HON. DR. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to resume consideration on Order No. 3 of Government Business.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I propose to be relatively very brief, for the simple reason that it is fairly obvious from the attitude of the honourable Minister of Social Services, who was Chairman of the Select Committee that looked into this question, what we have to expect from the Government on this matter. The Chairman of the Select Committee was the only person of the Committee to disagree with the Majority Report. He presented the Minority Report and has come in here today and suggested that this House agree with the Minority Report. Under the circumstances, what is the point of appointing Select Committees on these matters? It is a waste of the time of honourable members attending meetings of a Select Committee because even although the greater part of the members of the Select Committee may represent one point of view and the Government is still determined to push its own point of view, the point of view of the majority of the Select Committee will be worth nothing. Under the circumstances, it is a waste of time any honourable member leaving his business to go and sit down on a Select Committee to discuss a matter. This Minority Report has been signed by one person and at least five persons have signed the Majority Report. Now the House has been asked to ratify the Minority Report.

Sir, apart from what I referred to as the comic proceedings of the Government on the Fire Station, I want to ask honourable members seriously if they feel that the Probyn Street site across the Victoria Bridge could by any stretch of the imagination be the correct place for a single Fire Station to cost over \$200,000. Bear in mind that all of the built up area of the City is on the next side of the carenage. Broad Street, Swan Street, Tudor Street, Baxters Road, Roebuck Street and even the proposal for your Deep Water Harbour are on the next side of the carenage. How can you then think of putting your single, expensive, Fire Station on the other side of the carenage? What will be the case if there is a hurricane of such proportions as to render your bridge impassable and a fire breaks out in Broad Street or some other street on that side of the carenage? Would you expect the Fire Brigade to fly over the river? There are only two entrances to the northern part of Bridgetown from that side of the City—over the Chamberlain Bridge or the Victoria Bridge. If there be any unforeseen disaster to render one or both of these bridges impassable, the Fire Brigade will be unable to get across the river with its equipment to the more valuable part of Bridgetown. If honourable members cannot see the inadvisability of erecting a single Fire Station on that side of the river, it is a waste of time saying anything more. As I have said, I think it is a waste of time prolonging the debate because the Government is determined to buy more land in Probyn Street, therefore, what honourable members may say against the proposed site would be immaterial to the issue. What mystifies me about this matter is that in 1951, the same Government agreed that it was advisable to have two or three small fire stations in Bridgetown. The Government brought a fire expert here from the United Kingdom—of course, he came with the blessing of Colonial Office—who recommended that there should be three small fire stations instead of the present one. He was Major Cox. He was sent to the West Indies by the Colonial Office and he came here from Trinidad. I believe if Major Cox had recommended that fire stations should be erected on Culpepper and Pelican Islands, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would have said: "Let us do it." (Laughter). Some honourable members seem to laugh at that statement, but it is a fact.

Let us refresh our memories with what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said at that

time. I am quoting from his speech on the 23rd January, 1951 on the matter. He said:—"We have had the benefit of one who has been said to be the 'greatest expert in the British Empire as regards advising as to the placing of Fire Stations. We have been unfortunate in not being able to get through the Secretary of State for the Colonies a Fire Officer to carry out the suggestions of Major Cox, the expert to whom I referred." According to the honourable member, Major Cox was the greatest expert to advise on fire and the placing of fire stations in the British Empire. Major Cox told the Government not to erect one large fire station but to erect two or three small fire stations. This has been the opinion of Major Cox whom the honourable member referred to as the greatest expert in the British Empire. If this is so, what in the world could have operated to make the honourable member now act contrary to the decision of this great expert?

Again, Sir, when Government bought St. Cecilia in Passage Road, the honourable member said that it would be one of the sites for the two or three fire stations that were proposed to be erected. Now, tonight, Government is determined to buy more land in Probyn Street, although it then said that Probyn Street was unsuitable for a site for a fire station and because of that, Government is now suggesting that Probyn Street is the most suitable site for a fire station. I am suggesting to honourable members that we would be making a serious mistake if we agree to the erection of this single fire station at Probyn Street and on that side of Bridgetown.

In 1951, I asked some questions in this House about Fire Stations. I enquired: (1) whether the Government was aware of the acute discomfort experienced daily by members of the Fire Brigade at Coleridge Street in consequence of structural and other defects in the building which they occupy; (2) does the Government propose to construct and equip a new Fire Brigade headquarters; and (3) arising out of the fact that the Probyn Street site long regarded as the likely area for a new Fire Brigade headquarters has now been converted into a central bus terminus, if the answer to Question No. 2 be in the affirmative, will the Government please state the proposed locale of the new Station.

I was told in replies by the Government that (1) the Government was aware of the unsatisfactory condition of the barracks occupied by members of the Fire Brigade; (2) that the construction of a new Fire Station had been deferred pending the selection of a Fire Officer by the Secretary of State, who had been asked to expedite the matter; and (3) that the site of the new station had not been decided because the Government was awaiting the expert advice of the Fire Officer, particularly as to whether there should be one station in Bridgetown or a number of stations.

In 1951 the Government could not state in this House what was its policy with regard to the construction of a Fire Station because it was awaiting the Fire Officer who had been appointed. The Government was left in a quandary when the Fire Officer arrived and made his recommendations.

Since Government has refused to accept the decision of the fire expert, Major Cox, a humble lay man like myself can afford to question the decision of the Government. Government now proposes to erect a large Fire Station at Probyn Street and as far as I have been made to understand it will have a drying tower and fire-proof doors. Can you tell me, Sir, what need there is for fire-proof doors or a drying tower for a Fire Station in the tropics? Barbados is not England where you have snow and hail; this island is in the tropics where there is sunshine every day of the year. Must we have an elaborate unneces-

sary drying tower and a fire-proof door to our Fire Station because the last fire expert said that we must get them? I must say that the Government has perpetrated the most excellent farce within the last three years with respect to the question of the erection of a Fire Station. It is real comic opera. I will risk to bet that if for some reason or other this matter is delayed for any length of time, you will get entirely different proposals for this Fire Station by the same Government. Again, Sir, I really want to ask honourable members if they feel that this House should agree to the proposals in His Excellency's Message of spending over \$200,000 on a new Fire Station to be erected on Probyn Street which is the wrong side of the City to erect it.

I think it is better to accept the original idea which was to have two or three small stations in built up areas and one large fire-fighting unit. If even you use Probyn Street as a site for a fire Station, my humble suggestion is that you should put a small station there and put another small one on the other side of the town. The majority of the Select Committee recommended that the Probyn Street site should be abandoned and that there should be one main fire station on the northern side of Trafalgar Square and a subsidiary station to be erected in the vicinity between Worthing and Oistin. Is there anything wrong with that suggestion? Could there be anything wrong with the suggestion of erecting a main fire station to the north of Trafalgar Square and a subsidiary station somewhere in the Hastings-Rockley-Worthing area? Don't you consider the suggestion of the majority of the Select Committee far more reasonable than what is contained in His Excellency's Message, apart from the inconvenience that would be meted out to the travelling public who now use Probyn Street and apart from the unsuitability of Probyn Street from the point of view of the discomfort which the Fire Brigade men will have to undergo by sleeping there during the day and the early hours of the night. I am one who agrees that the Probyn Street site can hardly be regarded as a suitable place for men to rest during the day or the early hours of the night owing to the activities within the immediate area.

Sir, as I have said, it is a waste of time for a Select Committee by a 6-1 vote to agree to a certain line of action and then to have that action entirely ignored and the recommendation of the single member of the Committee to be put before the Legislature and carried after midnight against the wishes of the majority of members. The Government is fully aware that if this matter were to be decided at a proper and reasonable hour, it would have no chance of the Minority Report being carried. Sir, it serves the Government's purpose to pursue this debate at this unholy hour for speech-making; probably, it will be another two hours before the debate comes to a conclusion when the majority of the Opposition, like respectable people would have gone to their beds. It might be parliamentary tactics to debate this matter at this hour but it certainly is not acting in conformity with the best interest of the colony and the responsibility which devolves upon honourable members.

Mr. LEWIS: This fire station is to be erected in Bridgetown for the protection of persons and property in the area and therefore it is of particular interest to me; however, it is necessary for me to go into a little history in giving some idea as to how we must look at this matter now that it has reached this point. We have had a Fire Expert who recommended that we should have more than one fire station; we are told in this House that experts come out here and give us the best possible advice and then when we come into the House with that advice

every member of the House turns himself into an expert. The opinion of a lesser expert has been accepted and the value to be placed on his opinion might be taken from something which he did just before he left here. He remained here for the term of his employment and it was only when he was leaving that we were told it was wrong to pay anybody for reporting the occurrence of fire. Why did he only then come to that conclusion? What sort of Fire Chief or Fire Expert is he?

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES took the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, the next unfortunate item in the history of this matter concerns this House more particularly. When the last Resolution for a colossal sum of money was before the House for building a fire station, honourable members criticised it; I did not object to the site in Passage Road because it struck me that we were getting an entrance from King Street, it was near a fire station which we already had and with the construction of a Deep Water Harbour, we would have warehouses with food for the population stored in them and I felt that, in the event of a fire, the fire engine leaving Passage Road could reach Fontabelle as quickly as possible. I had no objection to erecting a fire station at St. Cecilia, but not a fire station for \$300,000. I think that the hotel industry being so close a second to the sugar industry, the people in the hotel industry should feel secure if the Government erected in the area of the hotels a fire station which could render them quick assistance. Hon. members will remember that when that Resolution came before us, visitors to this island had just had the misfortune of being burnt in a fire at Oistin, and the criticism made was that the Fire Brigade got to the scene late and they had no ambulance or anything like that. At the same time the Fire Chief thinks that we can erect a fire station in Bridgetown and he would guarantee that in so many minutes he could get the fire engine at Oistins; that did not happen when he had to put it into practice.

We find that this scheme was severely criticised and no notice was taken of the criticism; it was when the Resolution reached the Other Place that the Government paid it the attention which should have been paid to it in this House. The criticism was repeated in the Other Place and the Government saw fit to accept the action which was taken on the Resolution up there. These people own some of the biggest properties and they prevented the fire station from being built; I am opposed to the erection of any massive Central Fire Station for the City of Bridgetown and the island of Barbados.

We now come to this particular site; fancy our asking that the buses be removed to the yard of the Department of Highways and Transport so as to put the Fire Station just a little way from there and you have all your property in a densely populated area! You have to buses leaving Fairchild Street and going to the various routes and you will have some congestion there. The Government members know that they are putting this Fire Station just where there is likely to be a block and yet they insist on putting it there. I have not seen the plans for the fire station, but on the last occasion the plans were elaborate. As I have said, our Fire Chief felt that the fire engine was mobile enough to get from Bridgetown to Oistins in a few minutes, but he failed; that would ruin the tourist industry in that people cannot get here the protection which they can get in other places.

I think that at any time a fire takes place on that side of the water the fire engine on this side would make its way there, and the one which could easily take care of the built-up area in the hotel

and guest houses section should come down if necessary. Both of these fire engines should converge on the fire from different angles; but to tell me that we should have one fire station and spend all our money to build it where our streets are narrow and where the traffic is increasing, is not a long-term view of the matter at all. In order to put out a fire you should get to it as quickly as possible; with more than one fire station we will be able to offer protection not only to the warehouses and the stores in Bridgetown, but to the people who are complaining that they are paying Highway Tax and Fire Brigade Tax and the fire hydrants are nowhere near their homes. We want to offer these people some protection and I do not think that by erecting a Central Fire Station we will be offering them the protection to which they are entitled.

The next thing is that we are proposing to spend a large sum of money on a project of this sort and we do not want to erect any monument to any Public Works Department or architect or Fire Chief; we must consider the best possible means of offering assistance. I think it is time that this Government go into the suggestion which I made some long time ago, that is, that a special levy should be made on the Fire Insurance Companies for the upkeep of the Fire Brigade; that is really a good protection for the householder but the fact remains that it is a good protection for the Fire Insurance Companies. I have heard nothing of the suggestion that the Fire Insurance Companies should pay this special levy; I think the Government should pay some attention to this matter.

I have heard people who have visited big countries say that they did not see any elaborate fire stations; rather, they have seen several small fire stations situated at various points. After all, if you can get a place big enough to house the Fire Brigade comfortably, their living condition should be improved and if they are given some land around the Fire Station for having a moderate measure of recreation, I think that that is the thing at which we should aim. I do not think that a fire station with all these doors is necessary: we want an open ground floor for the housing of the fire engines and they should be able to get out from there at all points and go in any direction, and the second floor in a building of that sort should be properly equipped for the comfort and convenience of the men who have to do a difficult job when a fire occurs. I say: let these men have an open spot at the back of the building for recreational purposes and for sham fires.

For the reasons I have given, I cannot support the erection of an elaborate Fire Station in preference to the erection of two or more fire stations and have them at convenient points so as to give instant protection. It is of no use having a big Fire Brigade who will get to the scene of a fire late rather than have a small one who will get to the scene of a fire in time. Another point is that the time is either ripe or we have passed the stage when we should control the traffic on our roads. It is not a case of going against a Report because it has been made by some expert or because it was turned down in the Other Place: in applying my commonsense to this question I think I have very strong reasons for keeping to the conclusions at which I have arrived in this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I think that this matter is the result of a Resolution which was passed by this House some time in 1952. This affair has had a rather long history and it is unfortunate that it has been bound up with the opinion of too many experts because we are no wiser than when we first started. I will begin by saying that I do not think the honourable senior member for St. Philip has really

given a true indication of what was said when the property known as "Club Willow" was bought. The honourable introducer of this motion has said that they have the Probyn Street property which has been converted into a bus terminal: but that property had been earmarked for a Fire Station. I think the honourable member went on to say that the Government was still considering the question as to whether we would have two fire stations or not, and he ended by saying that we should accept the new Officer's advice instead of that of Major Cox. Experts can give their advice but we, as Barbadians, should use our commonsense. We know that the population is on the increase and as I see the position, it is only a question of experts having confused the Government.

We had before us a Resolution for the conversion of "Club Willow" in respect of the Fire Station and the Government also had at their disposal the opinion of Major Cox that we should use the Probyn Street site. I should say that Major Cox considered that this site was too small for possible development. Then we had the conflicting opinion of Major Craggs; this Officer did not strike me as an officer of any great calibre when he said that the main consideration in having two or three fire stations was a question of discipline. In England there are about seven Sub-stations: everybody knows that the fire services in England were amalgamated and now they have been separated.

As a member of the Select Committee, I can say that the Committee considered that we should have more than one fire station and that is the line which Major Cox adopted. Major Cox has furnished the Government with a Report; he is an officer who knew what he was doing. I should like to know whether the honourable introducer of the motion can tell us if, in view of our finances, we cannot have more than one fire station, leaving out any fire station between Hometown and Bridgetown.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—I draw to your attention the fact that there is not a quorum present in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell having been rung, a quorum was again obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I would like to know whether, having regard to the finances of the colony either this year or next year, we cannot afford to have more than one fire station. If we can have two fire stations I think we should consider the erection of one on the western side. If we cannot afford to have two fire stations, the question would be whether the Probyn Street site is the best site for the Fire Station. In his Message to this House the Governor states this:

"The Government has accordingly considered alternative sites which would entail no, or comparatively little, acquisition of land, and has finally selected the site at Probyn Street, which was originally earmarked for this purpose, and is much more centrally situated than the site at Passage Road, but had been discarded on account of inadequacy of space."

I do not think that we should adopt any cheese-paring policy in this matter. On page 11 of his Report Major Cox says this:

"It is fortunate in many respects that Barbados has now reached the position where adequate fire stations are indispensable. With the availability of the Town Planner and technical Fire Brigade advice, the opportunity can now be taken to

plan the siting of Fire Stations in relation to existing and potential developments. Other Colonies are suffering today from delayed attendances at fires due entirely to the fact that fifty years ago or more, large structures were built to provide one Fire Station which today is geographically in the wrong place to ensure speedy attendance.

The determining factor on the position of a Fire Station is to ensure that any built-up area, and more particularly in any High Risk area, a fire appliance shall be in attendance at a fire *within 3—5 minutes of a call*. Broadly speaking, this policy means the siting of a Station in a built-up area every two miles."

It is true that Major Cox was thinking of a highly built-up area and a very important matter which I would like to draw to the Government's attention is this paragraph:—

"Notwithstanding these requirements, elaborate structures are not required. In the days of plenty it may have been very desirable to have a structure which can be regarded with some civic pride. These facts are not present today, and whatever our wishes may be, a building must be kept on utilitarian lines. Sub-stations need to be no more than a ground floor structure as indicated in the sketches attached in the appendix."

As I see the plans, I think that the Probyn Street site is a rather elaborate structure although I agree that the surroundings of the Fire Station should be better. What Major Cox has said about elaborate structures should be borne in mind. If we could cast our mind in the direction of Roebuck Street, Westbury Road, Bush Hall, Bank Hall and right around to Government Hill, if we look at the map we will see that high risk lies in that area. Major Craggs has never given us the area from which he got the most of his calls; assuming that the Government gives me the answer that our finances cannot afford more than one Fire Station I am addressing my mind as to whether it would be right to put that Fire Station at Probyn Street. When we considered the Resolution in respect of the fire station some time ago, most honourable members passed over the question of the siting but the Other Place, whose Report I have before me, considered this matter very thoroughly. In respect of the Probyn Street site we have had the assistance of the Colonial Engineer and the Director of Highways and Transport in whom, I would say, we have very good officers; Major Cox has recommended that it might be a good thing for the Public Works Department and the Department of Highways and Transport to put their heads together as to what is the best site.

I do not see that the Probyn Street site would be a good one; even if you dealt with the traffic, there is still the question of a big thoroughfare. Even if you can provide sufficient facilities for the buses, you will have to consider that sooner or later, the whole policy will have to be reviewed; if the Government were to insist that the concessionaires should put more buses on the roads it will mean that the service provided is inadequate.

Major Craggs's idea of having more than one fire station was above all things, a question of discipline and that is all tommy rot; the question is one of having small units rather than large ones and we want to think in terms of potential development. I do not want to tire the House, but the points I have made are those which we have to consider in this matter. You will find that the countries in which there are small fire stations have reduced risks because they have passed a lot of ancillary legislation so as to keep down the occurrence of fires to a minimum. The structure of the Fire Station having been

decided upon, legislation should be sent down for the purpose of making safety regulations as regards fire.

I should like to hear some reply from the honourable introducer of this motion as to what prevents us from having two fire stations instead of one. As a member of the Select Committee many people have come to me and stated that to erect one Fire Station is not the correct thing to do. As I have mentioned, there are only two questions to be considered in this matter. If our finances cannot afford our having two fire stations, then we cannot have two fire stations; but if our finances can afford our having two fire stations then I do not see why the Government should not change their attitude and provide these fire stations. In his Report Major Cox gave an estimate of £119,000 in respect of Fire Stations and appliances provided that certain equipment could be made locally; otherwise his estimate was £132,000 and we would probably have to add 20% to that now. We need not spend all that money in one year because we might be committed to other things. It is getting late and I shall now sit and await the answers to the questions I have put to the Government.

Mr. GODDARD: It is surprising that the Government is still proceeding with this proposal in the face of strong opposition from this side of the House but the Government is determined to pursue its idea. If there is one thing which the Fire Brigade should have, it is mobility. No one could argue that having one big Fire Station in the centre of the City is better than having two or three fire stations; you might need a sufficiently large Fire Station for the training of personnel, but as I have said, the greater the mobility the Fire Brigade has, the better it is. I heard Major Craggs say that every minute lost in getting to a fire was equal to an hour's start of a fire. The Government is determined to pursue their idea of putting this Fire Station in Probyn Street where the congestion on the streets is getting more and more, but I feel that they should consider erecting a Substation in the Hastings district. It is unfortunate that the Government did not buy the entire site where the Fire Station is situated now; I know I will be told that that site would cost a lot of money, but if they had bought that whole lot they would have had an excellent site for the accommodation of our main Fire Station. As regards the Hastings district, we not only have the hotels up there but we have the Cable Station and the machinery, which we have up there needs to be protected. I do not wish to prolong this debate at this late hour; we will wait and see this matter through.

Mr. MILLER: I hardly imagine that what I say here will have any effect, but I still feel that it is my duty to say what I have to say in connection with this matter. It is unfortunate that the honourable Minister of Social Services should decide to pursue this proposal when he sat at all the meetings of the Select Committee and found that the majority of members were not in favour of it. The honourable Minister alone was willing to fall back on the terms of the Message from the Governor and he wrote a Minority Report. I feel that some honourable members would hardly be in the House at this late hour unless they wanted to push this matter through; however, I am appealing to the Government to postpone this matter and give it further consideration. I have had a discussion with the honourable Minister for Social Services and I know that the Government is unhappy about spending further sums of money in respect of the purchase of land in other areas. I think that the Government should take into account the fact that we are not all happy over their decision in this matter. There is Mrs. Sanderson's land at White Park—

At this stage, the CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: I was saying Mr. Speaker, that the Government should acquire some of Mrs. Sanderson's land at White Park and there is also Mrs. Esterbrook's land. If you are destroying the bus terminal, I think the time is ripe when a District Market should be erected there, since the Government has committed itself to the provision of these Markets. I am making a last appeal to the Government, but I see that they are determined to carry out their proposal. I am convinced that they are sceptical about spending more money and I am also aware of their commitments in the Five Year Plan. I should like to say that the use of the bus stand for the erection of a Fire Station cannot be justified then the buses are to be removed to the yard of the Highways Department, which will add to the traffic hazards there. The bus stand is now considered to be a social area and I feel grieved that nothing that I say will have any effect, but I am sure that the Government will not find any solace in this matter.

I think that the hon. Minister for Social Services should give this matter further consideration; there will not be any fires taking place in the City tomorrow and we will not need the new Fire Station immediately. We have gone on for centuries with the old Fire Station and we can go with it for another decade; of course, I know that the Government want to erect monuments to their memory. We know that opinion was divided in the House as to this matter and it was decided to refer the matter to a Select Committee; now we find that the Committee has made recommendations which are thrown to the ground and the Government decides that the Minority Report submitted by the hon. Minister of Social Services should go through. I am asking honourable members to realise that in the near future we may be reproached and I shall have to help them shed their tears. I say; let them just postpone this matter for further consideration and see if the hearts of members of the Government will not rest in the knowledge and comfort that they did the right thing. I know that the shedding of tears will not move some honourable members, but I will have it in my soul and in my conscience that I asked them to realise that the people are not all fools. On some day honourable members will be bound to take notice of what has been said.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: The point has been made that the Minority Report should not be acted upon, but what am I to do? Because the majority of the members of the Select Committee favour one thing and I do not agree with it, must I ignore my own feelings and go along with the opinion of the majority? In all communities when there is a difference of opinion, a Minority Report is submitted.

The honourable senior member for St. John has said that the firemen are not willing to go over to Probyn Street; on the contrary, while the debate was taking place, I was informed that Sergeant Stuart who is a member of the Fire Brigade wanted to speak to me and he told me that the firemen were all willing to go over to Probyn Street.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip referred to the purchase of "Club Willow" and suggested that the price paid for it was too great. However, it was said over and over again in this House by the honourable senior member for the City that this property was bought at a reasonable price; the honourable senior member for St. Philip wants to make the public feel that the taxpayers' money was thrown away. I really do not think that there is any further point to which I need reply.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I should like an answer to my question as to whether the finances of the colony could afford our having more than one fire station. (Hon. M. E. COX: He is not bound to reply to that).

The question that the Minority Report be now adopted was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN and MILLER—9.

Noes: Messrs CRAWFORD and ALLDER—2.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: In consequence of that decision, I am asking leave to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: This Address reads as follows:

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 6/1954 dated 26th January, 1954, relating to fire protection for the City of Bridgetown.

The House of Assembly agree with the erection of a fire station on the site selected in Probyn Street and to the acquisition by Government of an area of land from various owners to the east of the existing cinema car park.

The House of Assembly also agree to the removal of the City bus terminal from its present site in Probyn Street to a site to the west of the offices of the Department of Highways and Transport.

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have much pleasure in seconding that motion.

The question that this Address do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, a division being taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN and MILLER—9.

Noes: Messrs ALLDER and CRAWFORD—2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, nine honourable members voting "Aye," and two honourable members voting "No." I declare that the "Ayes" have it. I ask the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to present this Address.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 18th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX seconded the motion, which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.