

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

(Tuesday 14th August, 1956)

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*);
Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*);
Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M.,
(*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. M. E. COX,
(*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*);
Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*);
Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*);
Mr. O. T. ALLDER; Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A.,
Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN.

Prayers were read.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a copy of the account of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the financial year ended 30th June this year.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$5,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57 Part I—Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 19 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to Supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I—Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57 No. 18 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

In connection with this Resolution, Sir, I want to state that it is my intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 to deal with it today. It is rather urgent but on account of the paucity of honourable members I cannot do so, now. It may be possible to do it later on.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$2,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I—Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 21 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$43,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part II—Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57 No. 20 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Factories.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address to His Excellency the Governor:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House is deeply concerned over the position of the owners of fishing craft with sails who in cor-

sequence of the availability of mechanised boats, are finding it impossible to obtain crews to man their boats at sea.

In view of the past contribution made by these craft to the economy of the country, the present distress of many of their owners and the fact that these boats which represent a considerable investment on the part of the owners are at present rotting on the beaches, the House is of the opinion that some assistance should be rendered to them to enable them, wherever practical, to convert the boats into mechanised units.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Factories was read a first time.

CHAMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, before the business of the House proceeds, I should like to draw the following to the attention of honourable members:—

For sometime now my attention has been directed towards the provisions made to ensure the maintenance of dignity and order in and about the precincts of the Honourable House, especially with reference to the conduct of strangers in the gallery, and the need for revision of those provisions with a view to upholding that dignity and enforcing the order usually associated with Chambers of this nature.

2. With regard to the conduct of honourable members and provision as to decorum generally within the House, this has been assigned by the Honourable House to the Rules Committee which, it is hoped, will shortly report on the revision of the Rules of the House.

3. After consultation with the Honourable Premier, the Honourable Leader of the House and the Commissioner of Police, I have made certain regulations touching the conduct of strangers in the gallery, the mode of entry of strangers into the precincts of the House — made especially to avoid unnecessary loitering — and the easy availability of honourable members to their constituents during sittings of the House.

4. In this connection it has been thought advisable to create a post of Deputy Marshal and to place the additional duties created thereby upon the holder of post of Messenger and Library Attendant, who will be the means of contact between honourable members and persons desiring to see them, and who for that purpose will be allowed to enter the House during session and be generally at the convenience of members.

I have thought it desirous to inform the House of these proposals which are given in greater detail in the attached appendix.

APPENDIX

1. It has been established by long standing custom that the control of the House and its precincts is vested in the Speaker.

2. The precincts of the House include the following:—

- (a) the House of Assembly Chamber;
- (b) the Speaker's room;
- (c) the Lobby;
- (d) the two corridors leading from the Chamber to the landing at the head of the stairs;

- (e) central stairway and landing to the House;
- (f) the office of the Clerk of the House;
- (g) the luncheon room;
- (h) the Library of the House;
- (i) the portion of the corridor which borders and adjoins the Library of the House.

3. Under present Police regulations, it is the duty of the constable stationed at the House to ensure that, after the public seats are filled, no other members of the public except members of the House are admitted except on the instructions of the Speaker. The constables are also responsible for keeping the stairs and corridors free of loiterers.

4. It is proposed to keep three (3) constables on duty during each session of the House, one to be placed at the foot of the stairway, another on the landing, and the third inside the visitors' gallery.

5. No stranger will be allowed to enter the precincts of the House after the public seats are filled save for the purposes hereinafter set forth.

6. A stranger may enter the precincts for the purpose of interviewing a member of the House. To do so, he shall make application for entry to the constable on duty at the foot of the stairs who shall issue to him a coloured card upon which shall be written the name of the member he desires to see. The card shall be presented to the Deputy Marshal, or the constable at the head of the stairway, who shall show the stranger into the Lobby of the House where he shall await the member.

7. Members of the Press and the caterers will be issued special cards to ensure their admittance.

8. The following are exempt from these instructions:—

- (a) Members of the Other Place;
- (b) the Clerk and other officials of the Other Place;
- (c) officers and staff attached to the office of the Clerk of the House;
- (d) members of the Public Service attached to the various Ministries entering the precincts upon official Government business.

9. A constable shall be posted at the landing of the House on every day of the week between the hours of 9 a.m. and 3 p.m.

(Sgd.) K. N. R. HUSBANDS,
Speaker.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If I may be permitted to ask a question, Sir, the Appendix states: "It has been established by long standing custom that the control of House and its precincts is vested in the Speaker." May I ask of you, Sir, whether these Regulations have been referred to the Rules Committee whether Your Honour is the sole author of them? And secondly, without questioning Your Honour's prerogative in drafting these Regulations, I should like to enquire what machinery would be utilised in the case of a divergence of views between honourable members and Your Honour and the matter before us.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall most gratefully respect any divergent opinion by honourable members, but it is still within my province to make such regulations; and as far as the Rules Committee is concerned this matter is out of their province.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I should like to know in paragraph three (and I do not question Your Honour's prerogative because if you have the prerogative: I presume you should use it,) why is it necessary in a matter like this, in an old established custom, to have the Commissioner of Police, the

Premier and the Leader of the House? I wonder whether something has gone wrong to cause this to be done? I would like to know if this is any attempt by you or any of these members concerned to restrict the freedom of the strangers entering the gallery, because I will take it it is an old tradition and we have not reached the stage in Barbados where so many people entering the House come by cars for many purposes. There are many open seats as you can now see. Any restrictions on the conduct of the members in the gallery come under your prerogative and yours only, and not the Commissioner of Police or anyone else. I would just like to know in these things whether you have not the prerogative to act without consultation with anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member reads further in the Appendix, and I hope he will, he will find that no attempt whatever has been made to restrict strangers entering the House; it is only for the purpose of controlling order within the House.

ORDER PAPER

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with Order No. 1, I am awaiting the arrival of another member in order to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can the honourable member not proceed with another Order in the mean time?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. Speaker left the chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, this is quite a straight-forward and non-contentious Resolution for the sum of \$5,000 to meet any further claims which may arise under the Workmen's Compensation Act out of death or injuries sustained by any Government Servants. As honourable members will see from the Addendum, the amount of \$2,000 was provided under the Estimates for this purpose, and so far \$1,373.98 have been paid out in charges under the Act. This Resolution seeks \$5,000 to meet the present contingency of \$1,800 and any further amounts that may be due owing to injury or death sustained by Government employees.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, it is quite a straight-forward Resolution and I beg to move that it do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this honourable Committee will remember that this question of Workmen's Compensation arose some time ago; and it was stated then that any amendment to the Workmen's Compensation is a charge against the Treasury and therefore could not be proceeded with; but I am sure that I am expressing the sentiment of organised and unorganised workers in this Island by saying it is extremely painful that nearly two years after Professor Richardson has made a Report on the question of Workmen's Compensation, we find that up to this day no Legislation has been passed, and we are still labouring under the Workmen's Compensation Act that was passed thirteen years ago. Now, it is evi-

dent to everybody concerned that the money values have changed since thirteen years ago, and it is clear to everybody that a workman injured under the present circumstances is far worse off now than he was when the Workmen's Compensation Act was passed. Moreover, a man injured at work today happens to be in a worse position than a man who takes sick with influenza or pneumonia where the employee decides to give him full pay. The Trade Union pointed out to Government for over four years that the time has come to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act in order to provide greater benefits for workers. Professor Richardson indicated what had already been indicated by me and other persons: that the amount of money being sent overseas from this Island for Workmen's Compensation should be created into a fund to pay people better benefits and provide a better fund for them.

3.35 p.m.

Each time we have an instance like this, it brings to my mind forcibly the question as to what is the delay in dealing with an amendment to the Act in order that the workers could have greater benefits. It is within the province of this Government to do that; they have been asked to set up a Committee for this purpose, because this is not a matter which can be dealt with by one man; it is the sort of thing in connection with which you should have a Committee of employers, workers and independent people. I find that the workers are protesting over this matter all the time; it is only last week that we had the instance of a man who was taken ill, and his maximum payment was 11 days' pay for an illness of three weeks. Do you realise, Mr. Chairman, what a hardship it is on a workman to receive payment on a half-pay basis? Nobody has seen fit, because it does not affect them, to see the necessity of implementing something in the interest of the workers.

Professor Richardson made his report some two years ago, and somebody should ask: why should the workers be deprived of this benefit after two years? After all this time, you are actually depriving workers of this benefit when they are taken ill. The employers are not paying the full wages, because they are paying insurance premiums; can you not see that it is time for us to start a fund in order to provide the workers proper benefit by way of Workmen's Compensation? I should like to say that Barbados is not lacking in people of goodwill and ability to see that it is time that we deal with this matter. Each time that an instance like this comes before this Chamber, I must voice my feeling that it is a lack of interest which has caused this matter to be kept on the waiting list for so long.

On the last occasion, it was the question of the Labour Code; but something must be done because you do not know what the Labour Code will provide. You have people sitting down, and no attempt is made to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act which has been on the Statute Book for the past 13 years. In Trinidad—as a matter of fact, in nearly every progressive territory in the West Indies—they have seen fit to make a change; but we have allowed the Act to remain as it is since it was passed in 1943, based on the Act of 1925 in the United Kingdom. Why is it that Barbados must lag behind in a matter like this, and meanwhile the workers are suffering? Those of us who have to do anything with the Workers' Organisation, know that we have people in industry who, whenever they are taken ill, are the worse off because of the antediluvian methods of the Workmen's Compensation Act in Great Britain, when there was the idea that you

are just giving a man a pittance. These people are not getting any social security benefits so that you could say that it does not matter where the amount of the Workmen's Compensation is concerned.

I do not think that there could be any reasonable excuse for not regarding Professor Richardson's Report which contained a recommendation on this matter of Workmen's Compensation, which recommendation has not yet been implemented so as to give the workers the benefit of a more liberal Act, in order that they might be able to get proper benefits. I do hope that this will be the last occasion when we will have anything concerning Workmen's Compensation coming before us, and no attempt made to amend the Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is —

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that these anomalies and injustices which are possible under the prevailing Act, are due more or less to the fact that when we passed this legislation, we refused to accept the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1938—39, and to introduce the Ontario system of Workmen's Compensation rather than what we have at present. Under the Ontario system from the beginning—the slightly injured, or partially disabled, or people who were killed—in such cases, their dependants would be entitled to infinitely larger sums of money by way of compensation. Even although when we passed the Act, the Government of that day had refused to consider the introduction of the Ontario Act, there is no reason why the present Government should not have done so long ago. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has made reference to the Richardson Report on Workmen's Compensation, and all things being considered, I do not think that he should be excused for having wasted the time of the House. He knows, as well as we all know, that the Government had no real interest in Professor Richardson; they did not intend to pay any attention to Professor Richardson, and they only brought him here because he happened to be in the area. He was in British Guiana, and because it would have appeared to be negligent on the part of the Government not to take any notice of him while he was in the Caribbean area, they brought him here. He made a comprehensive Report, not one item of which the Government intended to implement or take seriously.

A few weeks ago, the hon. senior member for St. George attempted to deal with a Bill, under the provisions of which an injured workman would have been entitled to far greater compensation than what is proposed here. For instance, in the present Resolution which is before us, in respect of the man who died as a result of an injury sustained while working for the Government, his dependants are only entitled to \$1,800. As a matter of fact, the Act as it now stands says in respect of fatal accidents, the compensation is a lump sum equal to 156 weeks, or \$1,800 whichever is the less. For example, this workman was working for no more than around \$12.00 a week, so that rather than pay him 156 weeks' wages, they are paying him \$1,800, which is less than what the weekly payment would have amounted to.

Now, under the provisions of the Bill which was introduced by the hon. senior member for St. George, the compensation payable to the dependants of a fatally injured worker would have been, as far as I recollect \$5,000 or \$7,000 to which according to what he said, the workers in Antigua are now entitled. There is a vast difference between \$1,800 to which the Barbados Act entitles the dependants of a fatally injured worker, and the \$5,000 or \$7,000 to which such a worker in Antigua in the same position is entitled. Therefore, there cannot be any

excuse either for not introducing the Ontario system or amending the Act along the lines proposed in the Bill of which notice was given by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is straying from the Resolution. This Resolution is asking for a certain amount of money by way of Workmen's Compensation, but the hon. member is now dealing with the Bill which was given notice of by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am doing nothing of the kind. This Resolution is a money Resolution, and a certain amount of latitude has to be given to deal with the policy surrounding the matter in this Chamber. I hear the Hon. Premier asking the Chair to call me to order on this matter, but, if he wants to be the Chairman of Committees let him go in the Chair.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is straying. I only want to draw to your attention that this is a money Resolution with which you are dealing; not with the Ontario Acts and other Acts.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a Money Resolution for compensation and charges under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943. I am expressing my dissatisfaction with the amount of \$1,800 which falls due to the dependants of workmen who are fatally injured. I am taking it that I am entitled to say that the present system is wrong and that in the interests of workers it should be abandoned at the earliest possible date. Rather than being accused of making wild, non-constructive suggestions, I am suggesting what should be done. I am suggesting that the Workman's Compensation Bill which was given notice of by the honourable senior member for St. George should be allowed to become law, or to use the Ontario Act, or to endorse and implement the recommendations made by Professor Richardson to which the attention of this Committee has been drawn by the honourable junior member for St. Peter. Professor Richardson recommended that under the present Workmen's Compensation Act the system of lump sum payments should be replaced by a system of monthly payments for life to workers who are totally and permanently disabled or who are partially and permanently disabled to the extent of thirty per cent or more, according to the scale given in the Schedule to the Act of 1943. He also made a recommendation in regard to increasing the compensation because of that fact that it was small, and medical attention and appliances required by way of accidents had at present been taken from the sums which the dependants of those workers now get.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter has said that the Government should give consideration to operating its own Workmen's Compensation fund to which employers would pay premiums; and in the body of the report by Professor Richardson itself, he (Prof. Richardson) drew attention to the appreciably high premiums charged by insurance companies and suggested that the Government should provide its own Workmen's Compensation Fund at a low rate of insurance charges. The overall result would be that they would be able to pay higher premiums and higher compensation to the workers who are injured or to the dependants of those who were fatally injured. May be, it is a matter on which the Government prides itself with smug complacency that the dependants of the workers who are injured are only entitled to the small amount of \$1,800 and feel that that is all that a worker's life is worth to them. Even if at the time when the Act was originally passed, the sum of \$1,800 appeared an appreciable sum, it is not so today. Since the Government itself is apparently convinced that \$1,800 represents an ap-

appropriate amount, it is not the view of the considerable opposition from this side of the table and this is an attempt to draw attention to its inadequacy.

The cost of living in Barbados today is between 280% and 300% to what it was at the time when the Workmen's Compensation Act was placed on the Statute Book; so for all practical purposes all that we are giving these workers today is about \$600 or \$800. That is what it means today. When the Legislature fixed the sum of \$1,800 as the amount for a worker fatally injured, the prevailing circumstances were such that the amount would be worth \$5,400 today and that is the reason why I said earlier that in the Leeward Islands -- the colony of Antigua and possibly elsewhere in the Caribbean -- the amount fixed is between \$5,000 and \$7,000.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter is quite right. No one who sits here will agree with Government's views of merely awarding \$1,800 to the dependants of workmen who were fatally injured and feel we are discharging our responsibility towards them. There can be no excuse for Government's actions in view of the fact that over two years ago, the Government had the specific recommendation of Professor Richardson on the matter who stated that the present reward for injury or in case of fatality is infinitely less than what it should be.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to go into the point relative to the amount given for total disability; I think that ought to be left to the statisticians who know exactly how these things are worked. My point is relative to the amount of money which goes out of the Island from this matter. I am wondering what is Government's attitude toward this matter: I am wondering if Government realises what a tremendous amount of money goes out of this island annually on account of the enforcement of Workmen's Compensation, -- money which I feel should remain in Barbados. I am not saying that it should not be enforced but I am wondering if it is possible for Government to either start a Government insurance scheme which would bear all the premiums, and any profits made would go to the Treasury.

I am told that the amount of money which goes out of the Island through the enforcement of insurance for workmen's compensation is really fantastic. I do not like to quote figures but I am told that it is a sum between \$50,000 and \$60,000 a year which go out of this country in premiums. It would be better if that money was circulated in Barbados, but it now goes -- and quite rightly so -- to those who take the risk. I maintain that this Government is in good financial position and it would certainly be better if they take on the scheme of Workmen's Compensation Insurance just as the Government in England takes on the scheme for health insurance in England. In that case all the money would go back into the Treasury instead of going into drafts to those big co-operations who can well afford to do business otherwise. Let the Government keep these funds in territorial waters.

3.55 p.m.

I was only speaking, Sir, to throw a suggestion to the Government as to the importance of it, if they understand what I said.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has made a very constructive suggestion, but how could the hon. member expect Government to carry out what he suggested since the same Government exports millions of pounds of the workers' money through the Savings Bank to Kenya and South Africa and places of that sort?

The Government would first have to put its house in order and call back in such moneys for local investments before they could succeed or set about to prevent Insurance Companies from collecting it here and dumping it over there.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to rise again but when you see the smugness of people when they are dealing with something particularly to better the position of people, you are appalled. I am going to put it to you as a business man; if you are to comply with the law in your business, you make a rough calculation to see what it is. If you have twenty workers insured, the incidence of insurance may be something less than 10%: which means, with the amount of money on Insurance Premiums, less than 10% accidents is going to occur. You will see how many years it will take for twenty workers to be insured. These hon. members who know about it know that the amount of money you pay in insurance premiums is taken out of your business; the Income Tax Commissioner is going to write it off as expenses, but it is still coming out of the business. It cannot be distributed to you in profit or the workers do not get it in wages, but the benefits which accrue on your workers are infinitesimal. What we are suggesting is this. Professor Richardson said if the money were funded now -- and the amount of accidents for Workmen's Compensation of this island is small -- it would go to reduce the premium, and if you compelled more people to insure the fund would become larger; if you did not reduce the premium, then you should increase the benefits to the people. Take the case of a man working for \$10 or \$15 a week in Barbados! Can you imagine his plight if he is insured and gets injured? For the first three weeks he gets \$7 a week -- and not only on a casual basis, it is on an average, this means that if he has been accustomed to working for \$15 a week for the last twelve weeks, he is going to be paid on an average; and you get this smugness as if everything is all right in Denmark! Sometimes you wonder if any of the characters in the Bible mean anything to people. [A VOICE: Those characters are fictitious!] We know it is fictitious for those people who are atheists, because some people only believe in the Bible when they are dying, but if the characters in the Bible are fictitious, the moral is not fictitious and the moral is, "are we our brother's keeper?" Those of us who have some responsibility think there is no smugness about it and it is too long now you have to wait before you can get things like this done. We are going to deal with a Resolution to bring a Prison Administrator from British Guiana here to go into the prisons, and you say this is more urgent. You get people to go into the administration and then you do not adhere to it; that is the sort of thing you get. But for the people who are injured now, there is no attempt made to give them better benefits or even to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, but you continue to allow people to work under the quite inadequate Workmen's Compensation Act passed in 1943 and there is this smugness that people feel pleased about it. That is the sort of thing we have to endure.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier today that I intended to ask leave to suspend Rules 88 & 89 in order to deal with a Resolution for \$600. It is an urgent matter, Sir, and I will briefly give the history of it. A few days after our prison disturbance here, you may have noticed in the local papers that a Prisons Officer from the United Kingdom was shortly going to British Guiana to investigate the Prisons there and the Government here had contact with British Guiana and asked whether it would be possible for that Officer to visit Barbados. We were told that probably on his return from British Guiana he would stop here which would have given us time to deal with the Resolution in the ordinary way, but we were informed on Thursday that he would be coming here on the 20th for six days. I just mentioned that so that hon. members will see the urgency of the Resolution and the 20th I believe, is Monday. That is my reason for asking leave to suspend Rules 88 & 89.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in a matter like this that is urgent, is it urgent because they had a disturbance at the Prison a couple of weeks ago, or is it urgent because the gentleman happens to be in British Guiana? The British Guiana contingency has nothing to do with Barbados. How can it be urgent so far as the Officer coming here to investigate the Prison is concerned when Government has set up its own Committee to go into the Prison disputes? And I don't think I can be accused of starting the strike at the Prisons because I happened not to be in Barbados at the time, and I was not one of Her Majesty's inmates at that institution. But what I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is why are we today called upon to pass a Resolution to bring a Director of Prisons here to go into this question of the administration when we have not been given an opportunity to know what the local Committee has said about the Prisons? Is that Report going to be published or given to the public? In other words, how can this matter be so urgent when this Committee has not been given the opportunity of knowing what the local Committee has reported, so that we may know what is required? There is a lot more we can speak about on this Resolution.

4.05 p.m.

I would like to know what is wrong with the present administration of the Prison before we pass a vote like this. Unless the Hon. Minister of Social Services is prepared to give that information to this House, we cannot deal with this Resolution as a matter of urgency. I think that a full-dress debate on the recent happenings at the Prison should be allowed today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member objecting to leave being granted the Hon. Minister?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There has been no indication given by the Hon. Minister that he intends to allow a full-dress debate on the present administration of the Prison.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not before us now.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am objecting to leave being granted.

Mr. CRAWFORD: *rose to speak.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Whenever an objection is taken, the question has to be put. There is a Standing Rule that when I am on my feet, the hon. member must sit.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had risen before Your Honour rose.

The question that leave be granted the Hon. Minister to move for the suspension of Rules 88 & 89 was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Messrs. BRYAN, J. C. MOTTLEY and HAYNES.—8.

Noes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, CRAWFORD and ALLDER.—3.

Mr. CRAWFORD: May I remind Your Honour that a vote of 12 hon. members is required for the suspension of a Rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what motion is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister to withdraw his motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I presume that the Hon. Minister is desirous of withdrawing his motion now, so as to bring up the matter later on. That would not be playing the game.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will be in control of that matter.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 16

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone the consideration of Order No. 2, and to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 16 ORDER"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of Hon. Premier:—To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1956"

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will see, this is a Resolution affecting the Barbados Regiment. From the Addendum to this Resolution, it will be seen that according to the Volunteer Act, 1909—6 as amended by the Act, 1948—11, the posts of Staff Officer, Local Forces and Adjutant, Barbados Regiment, and of Instructor, Barbados Regiment, should be filled by members of Her Majesty's Regular Forces. It is, therefore necessary that the salary and conditions of service of these officers should conform to those applicable to persons of equivalent rank in the Regular Army.

It is therefore a customary thing that when these salaries and conditions of service are changed in Great Britain, we have, because of the Act, to comply with them. This is just a simple matter, and the sums are set out here. In respect of the Staff Officer and Adjutant, the total emoluments will be \$7,005 instead of \$5,940; and in respect of the Instructor, the total emoluments will be \$5,344 instead of \$3,996. It is proposed that these revised conditions of service should be made retrospective as from the 1st April this year, the date with effect from which the improvement in Service Emoluments in the United Kingdom became operative. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

4.15 p.m.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 17

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment Order No. 17.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Resolution, Mr Speaker, is to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 17 Order, 1956. The object is two-fold: (1) to increase the staff of the Public Trustees Department by the additional post of Deputy Marshal at a salary of \$720 x 48—\$1,152; and (2) to add the additional post of Secretary at a salary of \$888 x 72—\$1,392 x 96—\$21,160 and a Long Grade Clerk at the General Hospital. I do not propose to say anything on the medical side, may be, the Hon. Minister of Social Services will give it.

As far as the legal side is concerned, the Public Trustee sometime ago brought to the notice of the Government that it is necessary to have the additional post of Deputy Marshal. I do not think hon. members, especially those on the opposite side, will question that because it is they themselves that raised the question over the great amount of work which the Marshals of what we should call the Supreme Court have to perform.

The Addendum shows the great increase of work and the number of executions and summonses sent out and since we have divorce legislation in this Island, there is also a great increase in the number of divorce cases. The divorce suits received from 1940-45 were 38; from 1952-55 there were 241.

As far as the medical side is concerned, I repeat that if there is any extraordinary detail which hon. members may proffer, the Hon. Minister of Social Services doubtlessly will give it. It is sufficient for me to say that to deal with the confidential correspondence of the Surgeon and Physician Specialists of the General Hospital the services of a Secretary are needed. The Secretary will also relieve the lone Stenographer-Typist in the office who is already finding it impossible to cope with the growing volume of work resulting from the considerable rise in the number of out-patients.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT ORDER NO. 18

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of the following Resolution.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order 1956.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1956 which seeks to abolish the post of Plant Diseases Inspector. The post of Plant Diseases Inspector was created thirty years ago when it was necessary to do quite a lot of going around to advise peasants and others on the question of mosaic disease. As hon. members know, we have succeeded in reducing the disease by the planting of a resistant type of sugar cane; therefore it is no longer necessary to have that post. The object of this Order is to delete that post from the Civil Establishment. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the Hon. Premier that mosaic disease is not prevalent but I think this is an appropriate time to ask the Government a question on another important disease which is worrying the sugar-cane. I must ask the Hon. Premier the question because I see that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in his place. It is common knowledge that mealy-bug has not been eradicated; it is still prevalent in Barbados and although there is not the need for a Plant Disease Inspector, the eradication of the mealy bug needs an active entomologist with modern ideas to carry out a campaign for handling that disease. To my mind, one of these days this country is going to lose a lot of revenue by not having a fully staffed Agricultural Department, especially an entomologist.

As I have said, we do not want a Plant Disease Inspector anymore; we want an entomologist to tell us what to do with the canes when they have mealy-bug. The present entomologist comes and looks around and tells us he does not know much himself about the disease. He is retiring finally now.

I am sorry that the Hon. Minister is not here but I would like him to interest himself in the matter. However, I am sure the Hon. Premier will see to it for me and will tell him all about it. The mealy-bug disease is a very serious thing in Barbados. I repeat we do not want a Plant Disease Inspector; we want an officer who would become like a doctor to a sick patient and tell us what to do. I drop these few remarks in the hope that some effort will be made on the part of the Government to meet the situation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I apologise if I did not hear the hon. member correctly and I hope he will get up and correct me if I am wrong. I understand him to say that he feels that the post of Plant Disease Inspector should still remain on the staff of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. HAYNES: No, Sir, I said I did not think so. I said we do not want a Plant Diseases Inspector but we want someone to come around and remedy the mealy bug disease for us.

4.25 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Of course, if there is anything that we cannot ourselves cure we would get somebody, but I thought the Barbados Planters knew all the answers to everything! I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was referring specifically to the Mealy Bug. If something like the Mealy Bug to which we are not accustomed should arise and we have difference of opinion among the planter community, we will do as we did with the Mealy Bug; that is, try and get expert advice from outside, but we do know as in so many things that experts differ considerably even on the Mealy Bug which is prevalent in other parts of the world; but I do appreciate the point the hon. member is making. If perchance something new should arise, it is necessary for Government immediately to try and get the best advice possible and I am sure the hon. member knows that the Department of Agriculture only has to whisper to the Government and it gets everything done; at least that has been my experience for more than twenty years in this House.

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

CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is comparatively simple. This Bill seeks to implement certain terms of the International Convention which has been followed by the United Kingdom Government in order to facilitate the importation of commercial samples of negligible value. The Convention allows certain countries to grant exemption to these samples from Customs duty. We have decided to come into line with this convention and follow this recent practice since these samples are of little or no value and there is therefore no real loss in revenue from following this convention, and this Bill is to give effect to this decision. Hon. members know that at present samples of no value at all do get through Customs without paying duty, but as I said already this does not entail any or perhaps just a slight loss in revenue. It does help as far as trade is concerned and falls into line with other countries in these things.

I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses (1) and (2) were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded in each case by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title agreed to.

MAGISTRATES' PROCEDURE BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to go back and take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the day and unless there be any objection leave will be granted the hon. member.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to resume Committee on a Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to the jurisdiction of and the practice and procedure before Magistrates' Courts and appeals therefrom, and to matters connected therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the proposed words be inserted stand part.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before you do that, Sir, we were discussing this last Tuesday, and certainly you ought to remind us about what the words are.

The Clerk read the words which are as follows: "And in any event not later than 48 hours." 4.35 p.m.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows.

Ayes: Messrs F. L. WALCOTT, J. C. MOTTLEY, CRAWFORD and E. D. MOTTLEY—4.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS and Mr. BRYAN—5.

The question that Clause 66 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 67 was called and passed.

Clause 68 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, during the second reading of this Bill, objection was taken to this Section. I am perfectly willing to meet the wishes of the Opposition by saying that we should postpone the consideration of this Section. The House is not as full as it might be, and hon. members may have views to express on this Section. I understand that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is objecting on the ground that you cannot trust the Police as regards the destruction of fingerprints. As the hon. member is not now in his place, and I have no desire to get this Section through in his absence, I am asking leave to postpone the consideration of this Section.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I quite appreciate what the Hon. Premier has said. He has said that the House is not as full as it might be, and he is willing to postpone the consideration of this Section. However, I am wondering if the Hon. Premier is sympathetic with the points which have been made. I have often heard the Hon. Premier say that the Magistrate —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member opposing the leave being granted for the postponement of this Section?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes Sir, I am doing so in order to get the opportunity to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak on the question of the leave being granted.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not think that we are actually against the taking of fingerprints, but this Section is rather wide. Sub-Section (1) of this Section says this:

"Where any person not less than fourteen years old who has been taken into custody is charged with an offence before a Magistrate, the Magistrate may, if he thinks fit, on the application of a police officer not below the rank of inspector, order the fingerprints of that person to be taken by a constable."

It is rather wide to say that for any offence at all the fingerprints of a boy of the age of fourteen years must be taken. I wonder if the Hon. Premier is in sympathy with the suggestion that this Section could be so amended so as to confine the taking of fingerprints to certain offences. There may be a highway offence committed—a bus conductor might have overloaded a bus; and do you mean to say that that would be an offence which would warrant the taking of fingerprints? I am not opposing the request for the postponement of this Section because we are pleased to see that the suggestion has won the favour of postponement from the Hon. Premier.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you in favour of the postponement then?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have not yet finished speaking. I am saying that as far as the legal luminaries of the Opposition are concerned, they would be in a better position to propose an amend-

ment to this Section than I am. I do not know what is the idea of postponing this Section, if it is for further discussion.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am one of those hon. members who felt very worried about this Clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you objecting to leave being granted the Hon. Premier?

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Sir. [Laughter].

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well if you are objecting to the leave being granted, allow me to put the question.

Mr. ALLDER: Will the Hon. Premier allow you to Rule?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are objecting to leave being granted; therefore, allow me to put the question please.

Mr. ALLDER: I must give the reasons why I am objecting. What I am trying to do —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What you are trying to do I do not know; but as long as you are objecting to leave being granted, allow me to put the question.

Mr. ALLDER: What I am objecting to —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you are objecting, then let me put the question.

Mr. ALLDER: The Hon. Premier has given the impression that he is willing to take out this Clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier has asked leave to postpone Section 68 and you are objecting

The question is that leave be granted to postpone Section 68. Hon. Members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No." I think the 'Ayes' have it.

4.55 p.m.

Clauses 69 to 150 inclusive were called separately and passed.

Clause 151 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that this be Clause 151.

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

Mr. J. O. MOTTLEY: Clause 151 here reads thus:

"Every person who, being duly summoned to appear and give evidence upon any appeal neglects or refuses without lawful excuse to appear at the time and place specified in the summons, or who, having appeared, refused without lawful excuse to give evidence or to answer any question put to him by the Supreme Court, shall be liable, on the order of the Court, to a fine of one hundred dollars, or to imprisonment for three months."

Is that in order? Is it on all-fours? Is that the usual procedure? Because I think it is a bit harsh. I do not know but it sounds very drastic to me. If you refuse to give evidence you will be fined \$100. What do you think about this? I really am a bit fearful over that clause. It may be in order and I am not competent, Sir, really to question the legality of it, but I would like a little information as to whether it is in order.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is perfectly true it is not now the law in Barbados. It is the law in Trinidad, but I do not think hon. members should mind that too much. If you have a lawful excuse that you cannot appear in Court that is alright; but if you refuse to give evidence, that is worse. If you do not appear in Court the Magistrate can send for you; but if a man refuses to give evidence and you can prove he knows everything about it and he says he does not know about it, that is perjury.

If he says he cannot remember, then it is a different matter; the Court may allow hostile witnesses to be cross-examined by lawyers; but I do not think there is any hardship. Is the hon. senior member for St. John in order? I cannot see his face!

I do not think it can work any hardship because if he has an excuse he has an excuse.
5.05 p.m.

The question that Clause 151 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 152 to 156 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 157 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 157 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, when a motion is being made and seconded is it not the practice of hon. members to rise to their feet?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order. Can an hon. member ask the Chair to answer a question?

The question that Clause 157 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 158 to 165 inclusive were called and passed.

The six Schedules of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman that you do now report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Resolution for \$5,000, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

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

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee of Supply was read first and second time and agreed to.

5.15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for the day and I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until next Tuesday, 21st August, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is really amusing to hear the honourable member after finishing Government Business and before asking other honourable members if they have anything to do and they want to go on, move the motion for the adjournment of the House until next week. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to go on with the first order of Private Members' Business which stands in my name.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion moved by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, —

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion must be put. A motion for the adjournment has been made. If there is no other motion, I am going to put the question. The honourable member will not be allowed to go on speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am speaking against the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Speaking against it is not enough.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am speaking against it. The matter which I want to speak on is a matter of Private Members' Business. Without any honourable member having the slightest idea, the Hon. Minister of Social Services put the motion for the adjournment. It is now 25 minutes after five o'clock and the Hon. Minister just said that that concludes Government Business and straight away moved the motion for the adjournment before he sat down. That is far from being democratic. Any honourable member for that matter can get up and move the adjournment of the House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like an amendment to the motion that the House do now adjourn until Thursday. I have done what every body in my position should have done. I have given opportunity to members of the Opposition who are opposing a certain Section of the Bill dealing with Magistrates to speak on it by postponing it for further consideration. I have given them the undertaking that I will be prepared to come back on Thursday to deal with the points which they may wish to make on it and that is the reason why I moved in Committee that the Committee report progress and ask for leave to sit again. I am therefore moving an amendment to the motion: I move that we meet on Thursday.

As regards the \$600 Resolution which was given notice of today by the Hon. Minister on my immediate left, (Hon. Dr. Cummins) whatever be the political views of honourable members, I wish to say that whenever you are investigating matters as we are doing with the Prison and you can get someone to help you, you should do so. We have a unique opportunity of getting a super Prison Official from the United Kingdom who happens to be in the West Indies at the moment and he will be coming here on Monday: but he will not come unless we have the money. We have only discovered in the last couple of days that he is available and can come on Monday provided this Money Resolution to bring him is passed. It would be monstrous if any of us, whatever political views we may have, would do anything to prevent us from getting the opportunity to get this Prison Officer to come and advise us on Prison discipline. For that reason, I am appealing to honourable members to come back on Thursday. It would be rather hard for the Opposition to object now.

The reason why Government is asking for the adjournment of the House until Thursday is because Government is trying to meet the Opposition to express their views on one of the Sections in the Magistrates' Bill and to deal with this Resolution for \$600. I therefore beg to move an amendment to the Hon. Minister's motion that this House do now adjourn until Thursday this week—the 16th instant.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking against the adjournment of the House. You stopped me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was trying to accommodate the honourable member. I was hoping that one of the honourable members would have got up and moved an amendment that the House proceed with Private Members' Business.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: So far as the vote is concerned, it does not interest me one bit.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not questioning the interest of the honourable member on the vote. I am

only questioning the honourable member on what should be done.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Leader of the House was allowed while speaking on Government Business to move the adjournment of the House before questioning other honourable members on whether they have anything to do. I am saying that that is a dishonourable thing to do. No honourable member had any knowledge that the whole House was going to be adjourned until next Tuesday, but there and then he took advantage of his position to move the adjournment of the House at this time of the day. How can any honourable member get up in here to adjourn the whole House at this time of the evening without giving other honourable members the opportunity to discuss Private Members' Business? That can only mean that any of us can come in here any day and ask Your Honour for permission to move the adjournment of the House and then ask that the whole House be adjourned and you do not get any Government Business done.

If the Government is afraid of my amendment to the Trade Union Act which is making provision for peaceful picketing at houses, they may vote against it. [Hon. R. G. MAPP made a sotto voce remark]. You are the Minister of Labour, so you can vote against it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may not address the Hon. Minister of Labour; he should address the Chair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am saying how can you agree to any situation like this. The matter on the Order Paper standing in my name was there since the 8th May. What is the point of trying to deprive any honourable member from doing it particularly as Government Business has finished at this time of the day? Are honourable members of the Government going to a funeral or a party that we cannot remain and do this or are they going canvassing? It is true they are not interested in what happens to the Trade Union; they are only telling the people to get out the traitors. 5.25 p.m.

It is true they do not know, but they can come to the Trade Union and tell the people to get out the Traitors. I have the answers and some of them will come in due course. That is the sort of thing they do and I would challenge them by saying they want to prevent me from doing my business because they want to adjourn the House at 5.30. You are afraid of it going down in my name, because you know that peaceful picketing is in the English Act, and when workers go to the United Kingdom or Great Britain they can enjoy these privileges but in Barbados you cannot; and to prevent me putting it on the Statute Book you try all sorts of devices to prevent it from going there; but whether you do it or not the answer is in the hearts of the people. All your tricks do not work.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am voting against the adjournment and the amendment because I see no reason why the House should come here on Thursday. We have been told that the Government has endeavoured to meet the position in the matter and are prepared to give members a chance to express their views. When that happens, Sir, you know that the Government has been impressed with the reasoning in the matter of the points raised by the Opposition on the Judicial Bill. [Asides] After these debates I will proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may continue.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposing the amendment to come here on Thursday to deal with this Resolution to bring a Prison Administrator here. The Government has appointed a Committee to investigate the causes of the disturbance at the Prison, their own Committee.

The Prison Superintendent had been sent to the United Kingdom on Study Leave to learn how to administer the work of the Prison. Why then should we spend \$600 to bring this gentleman here merely because he happens to be in the West Indies? Two years ago Professor Richardson was in British Guiana and we spent some money to bring him here to investigate the possibilities of the institution of social security in Barbados. He came here, spent a long time, made an exhaustive report which was circulated, and the Government has done nothing about the Report since then. It is an absolute waste of money. Now we have a disturbance at the Prison, a disturbance springing from simple reasons, and if the Minister of Social Services were discharging his responsibility. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has been given some latitude; he will not now be allowed to go into the merits of the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Anyhow Sir, there is no justification for the House being called here on Thursday or on any other day to vote for this Resolution to bring this Prisons' Officer here. There is always some expert from the United Kingdom knocking around the corner on whom we can spend money to bring him to Barbados for no purpose at all. If Mr. Speaker, this gentleman were not in British Guiana, he would not be here and we would have done without him. I hardly suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they would have sent to England for him. They could not have been so bare-faced. If we want him, then their Committee was no use at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is discussing the justification of the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am opposing the motion. You have finished the Magistrate's Bill and there is time enough to deal with this Resolution; and there is no justification for coming here on Thursday to do it because the principle is completely wrong and represents a complete waste of money. He will come here and drink a few free beers about the place, go to the prison and find what the Committee has found wrong; that is, if it has done its work. In my opinion, neither he nor the Committee is necessary in this matter. All that we need is for the Government to see to it that the prisoners get food fit for human consumption, and that the prison officers do not take advantage of the situation by mis-spending Government funds and money allocated for prison diet in the wrong manner. I should like, Sir, and I propose myself to go through the Resolution. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will not be allowed to go through the Resolution at this stage.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not going to do it now. I propose to do it in order to present the House and public with an idea of the amount of money we have spent within recent times on bringing experts here to no advantage. They come and write Reports which are sometimes worthwhile, but so far as advantage to the community is concerned they need not even write because Government pays no attention to them at all. If we want somebody to come here and white-wash the Government's failure, and efficiently to control the affairs of the prison, say so. If the Government want to bring them here, Mr. Speaker, without cost to us or at the expense of the Ministers, they can come.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not debating that yet. The honourable member is now dealing with the merits of the Resolution. I have already spoken to the honourable member and I shall not be speaking to him again. I have been very tolerant. Will the hon. member sit? I have told the honourable member at this stage he cannot enter into any of the merits of this Resolution. The honourable member will know he has already been given a great deal of

latitude, and he will not be allowed to make any reference in connection with the justifiability of the Resolution which is not now before us. It is not now before us.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Your Honour can rest assured that I am taking your pronouncement very seriously; I have paid almost as much attention to it as to the Holy Writ, but all I am saying is this: I will vote for the amendment to come here on Thursday, if the Ministers will pay the cost of bringing this man here. I am not voting for the amendment to come here on Thursday if the taxpayers will have to pay the cost of bringing this man here. It is a waste of time, and the necessity for bringing this man here, is because the Government has not discharged its responsibility.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am sorry that I was out of my seat when the motion was made for the suspension of the Rules, because I would have voted for it. One can vote to give permission to deal with something and then you can vote against the Resolution. [Mr. CRAWFORD: Be practical and realistic. Who is here to vote against it?] I reserve my right to vote, but whether there are sufficient members of the Government to vote for the Resolution is another matter. I am not coming here on Thursday; I have something else to do. I appeal to honourable members to let the Hon. Minister put forward the matter; I should like the opportunity of discussing it today, because we have not got anything much to do, and we are in a talking mood. [Laughter].

As far as I am concerned, I would certainly like to appeal to the Opposition to give the Government permission to deal with this Resolution; but whether I would vote for it, is an entirely different matter. For those of us who have to work for our living, we cannot just come here for the purpose of entertaining people, because a lot of what we say in here is entertainment for people, you know. [Laughter] I say: let us give the Government permission to deal with this Resolution today. There are some things which you can give the Government permission to deal with. This is how I feel about it; honourable members must be realistic as the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said, but when you refuse to grant the Government permission to deal with this matter today, and then next week when the Government members are here, they will still get it through.

I will support the honourable junior member for St. Peter in allowing him the opportunity to proceed with his Bill under "Private Members' Business," but I am opposing this question of "Peaceful picketing," at people's private homes. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: All the Conservative people vote against it; they voted against it in England too.] I say, I will vote for this Bill being dealt with but I will oppose this question of "peaceful picketing" at people's private homes. I say again; let the Government deal with this Resolution, and let us oppose it; let the Government suspend the Rules and deal with this Resolution. I give notice now that I am not coming here on Thursday; let us deal with this Resolution now, and if we like, vote against bringing this person here.

Mr. BRANCKER: On the subject of the adjournment, this is how it appeals to me; I agree with the postponement of the further discussion of the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Bill, because I realise that the only two Practitioners in the Island who are members of this House besides myself would find it very difficult, if not impossible, to attend here tonight, because of a certain very important professional commitment. For that reason, I support the postponement of that Bill.

I would like to mention apropos of that subject matter, something for investigation by the Hon. Premier. It is sometime now since he had to work for his living in the hard way, I mean as a Practitioner at the Bar of this Country. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that there was a violent difference of opinion between us last Tuesday on this question of the granting of bail being left entirely to the Police, and only last night, I had the experience where a Police Corporal, who happened to be the Police Officer in charge of a Police Station, said that, in his opinion, the offence with which a person was charged, appeared to be serious, and Mr. Speaker, the offence with which that person was charged was one under Section 54 (1) of the Highways Act, 1900—5, for which the maximum fine was 40/-, but the Police Corporal said, that no bail would be granted!

I will let the Hon. Premier know the name of the Police Station and of the Corporal if he wants to know. I feel that the Corporal did that in ignorance. [Mr. SMITH: Which Station?] A Station within the metropolitan parish. The wife of the person who was charged had to find herself at my place, and produce a Lawyer's fee for Counsel to be retained in order to take every possible step to ensure that bail was granted her husband. However, she should not have been put to that expense, much as my creditors would appreciate it; it ran through this Corporal's mind that this Bill was the law of the land, and he would not grant bail. Counsel had to get in touch with a Superintendent of Police and show him how asinine he would make the Police Force and himself look in this refusal to grant bail.

Those of us who live on Mount Olympus do not know what happens in the bye ways and hedges. That is the good fortune of the Hon. Premier because he no longer has to work as he used to before he made his livelihood. There are matters of Private Members' Business standing in the name of the honourable members and myself and I do not see any reason at this very early hour why we should agree to the motion for the adjournment. When the motion was laid, there was not the usual parliamentary pause after the Hon. Leader of the House announced the conclusion of Government Business. There was the absence of that pause to which we have been accustomed by the Hon. Minister to see if any honourable member was going to ask leave to proceed with Private Members' Business.

The question that the House do now adjourn until next Thursday 16th instant was put and resolved in a tie. The House voting as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. M. F. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. SMITH and Mr. BRYAN.—6.

Noes: Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, and Mr. HAYNES—6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question having resolved a tie, I cast my vote with the "Noes".

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next the 21st instant was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER "I think the Ayes have it".

5.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.