

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st 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. Dr. 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. T. O. BRYAN, Mr. F. C. GODDARD,
 (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr.
 J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V.
 B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries*), Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENT LAID

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General of Barbados for the month ended 30th June, this year.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to 30th June, 1956.

Public Officers' Loan and Travelling Allowances (Scheduled Officers) (No. 2) Regulations, 1956

REPLIES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Reply to question asked by Mr. J. E. T. Brancker on 29th May, 1956, regarding the number of omnibuses used in the Public Transport system.

Reply to question asked by Mr. F. E. Miller on 3rd July, 1956, in connection with the installation of water standposts in the parish of St. George.

Reply to question asked by Mr. T. O. Bryan on 3rd July, 1956 regarding the Coast Road from Lands End to Bats Rock.

Reply to question asked by Mr. J. A. Haynes on the 24th July, 1956 respecting tenantry road reconstruction in the parish of St. Andrew.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$41,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1956-57, No. 22 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Resolution to authorise the Accountant General to make advances from time to time to the Postmaster General of such sums (not exceeding \$1,500,000 outstanding at any time) as may be necessary to enable him to pay Money Orders.

I should also like at this stage, Sir, to inform the House that it is my intention to ask for leave to deal with this Resolution today as it is a very urgent matter. Your Honour will remember that I sought Your Honour's permission to have this Resolution circulated before today in order that we may be able to get it through today.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

I am also asking leave to withdraw a similar Customs Tariff Bill which is Order No. 3 on today's Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked leave to withdraw Order No. 3 and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Department of Science and Agriculture Act, 1925.

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 consider the Resolution for \$41,500.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Officers of Assembly (Salaries) Act, 1912.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, be read a first time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. Talma, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to repeal the Department of Science and Agriculture Act, 1925, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Officers of the Assembly (Salaries) Act, 1912, was read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by the Hon. M. E. COX, the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

Visit of Prison Expert.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Last week, I gave an intimation of what this \$600 was for. As I said, there is a Prisons' Officer in the area who was on his way to British Guiana to do a similar job of investigating the Prisons there, and Government thought it would be a nice opportunity in view of the circumstances, to have an Officer of his experience, and at the same time, to go and look in and advise on our Prison here. He arrived here yesterday morning and will be here for five days; this \$600 is to pay the expenses in connection with this visit which includes his passages and subsistence allowance.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: It is seldom, I think, that this House has had a more nonsensical proposition put before it. In so far as this Resolution is concerned, obviously there must be certain things which puzzled hon. members and especially hon. members who are on this side of the House. Now I was not in my place last Tuesday, but I listened to the radio reports which dealt with our proceedings here, and also spoke to hon. members as to what had transpired. I formed the impression most distinctly that this person whom it is proposed to bring here and who has already arrived to look into our Prison system, could not possibly have come here unless he had been specifically invited to do so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was said that one of the reasons why it was felt necessary that this House should meet last Thursday instead of today, was that it was necessary to have this money voted on Thursday, so that the invitation could be sent to this gentleman in time for his arrival on Monday. That is what I was made to understand.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,——

Mr. TUDOR: On what is the honourable member rising?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He is rising on a point of correction.

Mr. TUDOR: But he has not said that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: So what? Nobody on this side of the House said that the money was necessary in order to send this gentleman an invitation. If the honourable member is quoting anybody, he should quote him correctly. Sometimes it is done inadvertently, but it always happens with him.

Mr. TUDOR: I would not have have anybody to draw any red herring across the trail. How did this gentleman come to be here? Are they going to tell us then that they took it up on themselves, without knowing where the money was going to come from, to ask this gentleman to come here? Who authorised them to do it? Do they think that this House of Assembly is at long last their rubber stamp, that they knew it was alright that they could invite this gentleman officially? Did not one of them say last week that unless the money was voted they stood to lose the opportunity of getting this man's services? That could only be their argument.

It was an honourable member on this side of the House who said that he was willing to meet last Thursday only if the cost of defraying the expense of this gentleman would come out of the pocket of the Minister themselves. But the point is this: I have not yet strated to argue the main issue, I am arguing first that the priveleges of this House seem to be going by the board. I have had it, in this instance at any rate, on the authority of their own mouths, that this person for whom they are now asking this money, arrived here yesterday, and they are asking us to believe that it is the merest coincidence that he is here and that all we can do now to straighten up the matter is to give them the money for which they are now asking. Who gave them the authority to invite this gentleman here? How could they tell beforehand that the House would be prepared to have him or to defray his expenses? And if he came yesterday, and if it is still alright to vote the money for him, why did they make such a fuss about wanting the House to meet on Thursday? With whom do they think they are dealing?

The next point is this: it has now come to the point that there are no words in the English language which can describe the utter folly and absurdity of the things which are being done by the Government, but certain facts stand out with respect to what they are now proposing. They are saying that an expert in Prison Administration from the United Kingdom happens to be in the Caribbean area, perhaps at the express invitation of the British Guianese Government, to advise on Prisons and Prison reform and conditions in British Guiana, and, according to them, it is a good opportunity for him to come here and assist them in similar matters. But, Mr. Chairman, everybody knows,—and they themselves must know it,—that they have appointed a Committee of Enquiry, authorised by them not only to go into the causes of the recent disturbances at the Prison, but also to go into all other matters connected with Prison maintenance and administration. Are they now telling us that before their own Committee have reported to them, and before they know exactly what

has been happening in an Institution which is Government run, they propose to ask the taxpayers of this Island to spend another \$600 to super-impose a one-man enquiry on a three-man Committee? Are they telling us that this gentleman, for the few days when he will be here, will be seconded or co-opted on the Committee of Enquiry which has already been set up, to give them the benefit of his knowledge and whatever assistance he can give?

I do not feel that we should any longer sit down under these snap-dash methods of doing things. What you would have thought in a matter like this where the Hon. Minister is introducing this Resolution, he would have treated the House with the courtesy of allowing it at least to know whether or not the present Committee of Enquiry is inadequate and the degree to which it therefore becomes necessary to make use of the services of this extra person. That is the outline which we should have been given; the Minister has not treated us with that courtesy because it has long become the custom of this House for Ministers and Government Members especially, not to give the House any information which it should have because they think that it is impertinence for us to ask for such information, and it is unnecessary for us to have any interest in the matter at all. But I am hard to satisfy in this respect.

3.35 p.m.

Before this Resolution can have my support, the Hon. Minister will have to tell this House what has happened. He ought to be prepared at least to give us an interim report of the findings, always supposing he is in a position to do so, and to say what difficulties, if any, the Committee which they set up is encountering, and therefore why it becomes necessary for this extra person to come here at Government's expense.

Now, only they, Mr. Chairman, would think that a person who is here for four or five days—which would cause the necessity of this \$600 to be spent—will have been here long enough to find out what is wrong with any Barbadian institution and especially any institution over which they have control. It is just their superficial way of thinking that in four or five days this man will be able to tell them, not to tell us, what is wrong. If they think, Mr. Chairman, that that is the way their business should be done, we do not think we need worry, grieve or sorrow for them. Why I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, is because there is a principle at stake. How comes it that in a matter which is judged by them to be of such paramount importance they can fail entirely to give the whole House the facts? But I am not surprised at all. It is well known that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is not at all inclined to favour this House with any vital information with respect to any department for which he is responsible. He assumes that what is known to him is known to the rest of us, and indeed if it is known to him it does not mean that it should be known to the rest of us.

With respect to the substance of the matter—the conditions at the Prison—no man should be rash enough to pronounce judgement until the Official Committee which has been appointed by them has reported. You may have your opinion; I may have mine; but they might not be the same opinion. With that we are to not now concerned; but to ask me Mr. Chairman, to sit here and allow them to get away with what I call nonsense by giving them \$600 to bring a man here after they have set up Committee which has not reported is encouraging them

in foolishness and that is what I am not prepared to do.

I am not convinced Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary at all to have this man. This whole thing is too snap-dash. This Government is comprised of the kind of people on whom you cannot rely to take up a serious suggestion at a moment's notice. Any Government that is made of responsible people, if they had trouble in a Prison or in any public Institution which they thought merited a public enquiry, would not set up a local committee if they did not feel that the personnel of the Committee were competent. One of the members of the Committee of Enquiry which they have set up is a member of the Executive Committee. He is one of their chief friends and supporters of the Other Place, so that they have direct knowledge of what the Committee is finding out, what it will find out, and what it will recommend long before the rest of us. Are we now being told that their colleague, the member of the Executive Committee, has suddenly discovered that the Committee of Enquiry of which he is a member is no longer competent to investigate the matter within the terms of reference and has recommended to them that extra help should be called in? If that is so, Mr. Chairman, it is silly to pretend that the visit for four or five days of a man who by chance is in Barbados would put right what has been going wrong. They cannot understand—and it is difficult to make them understand—that you just do not do things that way. If you feel that the conditions at your Prison are so serious as to warrant an investigation or an enquiry, then set up a proper Committee. You cannot set up a Committee of personnel members of the Government and have them report to you, and before the Committee makes known its findings you decide that you are going to bring in a man who is in British Guiana to do something which that Committee has been called specifically upon to do. Why should the taxpayers money of the Island be frittered away to bring somebody here who on the face of it can achieve nothing? Why should you give him subsistence allowance and all of that when you know beforehand that the scope and range of his activities will not provide the results you want? I do not agree with this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, and I do not suppose that many who think about it seriously will. It is a nonsensical waste of public funds and that it has come here is a disgrace.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you are well aware of the methods that are used in a matter such as this, because as a loyal member of the Labour Party you are one who subscribes to these *ad hoc* and chance-like methods of doing things which come up to be dealt with in the portals of the peculiar organisation of the Party; but when you find the same attitude of mind prevailing in things which are to be dealt with by the Government, those of us who respect proper methods of doing things within public administration have to speak against such methods being used in the public interest.

Now, Sir, it is not unusual that such a Resolution would come from the Minister who holds this portfolio, because his method of dealing with social matters has been one of using anything palliative or expedient in order to get something done, even if it comes to making a suggestion like the famous suggestion which was to make people pay more for operations and then to deny he had anything to do with it.

This is another instance of how this Government does things. What Government after agreeing to the setting up of a Committee of Enquiry to deal with anything arising out of a disturbance at the

ing on, my eyes began to spring water because of its use. Those are the injustices which this Government would perpetuate.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason for having the use of this man, regardless of how adept he may be at Prison reform, because whenever he makes his recommendations, he cannot compel the administration at the Prison that they should not withhold the latitude which warders must have if order must prevail at the Prison. He cannot prevent one section from working against one section. He cannot prevent one section from lining up with the prisoners and thus cause a break down in the discipline. He cannot compel warders to respect prisoners as they should, and that is why it is a waste of time if we spend this \$600.

The prisoners at present at Glendairy are for the most part between the ages of 18, 20, 21 and 22 years. They are young adventurous youths. That is all it is to that. They saw the opportunity for doing what they did. They heard the grumbings of those who were to keep them in order, and because of that, we saw some of them lined up on the side of some warders. As I have said, the opportunity presented itself and they said: "We are going on top of the roof." If the administration had any commonsense, it would have avoided using tear-gas and wasting water in trying to get them down, because they would have to come down. What has happened is that the use of such things has caused injury to residents in the area and without resulting compensation and apology. That is all that the administration has done because a hungry man cannot remain indefinitely on the top of a roof.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed certain Government members, on the same day and at the same hours when the disturbance was taking place at the Prison, passing by without stopping to see or hear what was happening. None of them, with the authority and responsibility which they have, stopped in to see if they would be able to bring about an amicable understanding between the staff and the prisoners. Members of the Government ignored what was going on although it was their responsibility.

Nobody can prevent the Government, powerful and authoritative as it is, from spending this money. If it were six million dollars that they wanted to spend, it would be passed: we have reached the stage in politics in Barbados where it would be passed: but we must blame the electorate. When you give individual politicians and parties absolute power and blind co-operation, that party of individuals will get so indiscreet in the practice of its politics that you will get anything happening. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that it would be better if this \$600 were kept unused or it would have been used for a better purpose if it were spent to improve the conditions at the Prison. It is now seven years since I have been fighting single-handedly to get a motorised transport unit for the Prison so as to avoid sick prisoners from walking from the Prison at Station Hill to the General Hospital at Jemmotts Lane, and from compelling them to walk with an able-bodied warder. It is a sight which is very humiliating to everybody except members of the Government who are the persons who could remedy it. Even those prisoners who came down from the roof very ill had to walk across to the General Hospital in a weak state of health. They had to walk every inch of the way. I do think that this \$600 would go a very far way in buying a small jeep or pick-up so that the sick can be transported to the General Hospital from that institution. You do not have any sympathy in things of this sort. You believe you can do as you like, and then remind the teeming masses of

what happened three hundred years ago and tell them that you brought them from slavery, and a lot of nonsense, and hand out to them a slogan which would get all of them to prance up and put you back into the House. Were it not for all of that we would not get this treatment from Government. I am saying that not one of the Ministers of the Government has the sympathy which should be carried by such a person in the important and responsible position which he is.

4.15 p.m.

Do not let the Minister for Social Services sit down there and sneer under his arms. I am serious about what I am saying, and if the Hon. Minister got away with murder for some time, it does not mean he is always going to get away with murder all the time, because I challenge him and any other of them, we will fight it out to the extreme whenever all will be leaving this place and going to the Electorate for the renewal of our mandate. It is regrettable and what I am saying is not only in connection with this case at Glendairy Prison, but the Hon. Minister holds an important position and is a member of several vital veins in this community, and the evils that are bound up with him cannot be removed unless the Hon. Minister of Social Services says they are to be removed. I am speaking about other bodies which the Hon. Minister dominates, and where his uselessness is forced on such bodies. He sits back disregarding every possible suffering while making the greatest claim for power and his return to this Chamber, and I believe that the people in St. Thomas kept him out so long before they sent him here, that now he is here, he is taking advantage of them. "They kept me seven years running and now I get in I don't care how you get by!" The electorate is too blind but some of us will teach them.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I think we are entitled to hear from the Hon. Minister of Social Services whether the Commission that has been appointed to investigate the conditions at the Prison is in favour or has asked that this expert who happens to be in the territory to be brought here to assist them in their findings. All the criticism that has been levelled at the Government I think would not have taken place had the Minister in introducing the Resolution given a fuller picture. We do not wish to anticipate the Commission's Report. We have an idea of what has happened,—some of us might be wrong—but we do not wish to put our finger on any weak spot in the administration there. I think we are entitled to know whether the Commission has agreed before Government decided that here is an expert and it would be of use to have him here; are we to learn later on that there are to be two independent reports? It may seem ridiculous my asking these questions and it is because that information should have been voluntarily given us. If it had been given to us we would not be asking for it today. I think the Minister will realise that he may have lapsed in not giving the full introduction to the Resolution, and I am asking him now if he can answer us on that point. How far or what agreement has been made with the existing Commission for the expert to come here?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Commission is still sitting. It has not concluded its labours and therefore it is not in a position to ask for any advice from any expert. That is my impression and they could only do it if in making their Report they could embody it in the Report. But what happened is this, and it was said here last week: We got the information, via the same newspaper as the hon. members, that this gentleman was on his way to British Guiana. This is an expert

on Prison Administration from the United Kingdom. The gentlemen here on the Commission are not experts, but they are enquiring into the facts, and when they are finished they will submit a Report on the facts; but they are not experts on administration. The Government, seeing this in the "Advocate", thought it would be a good idea on their own initiative, not the initiative of the members of the Commission, to ask British Guiana whether this gentleman could come to Barbados and advise us on Prison Administration. I am not in a position to say that the administration has broken down; I am not anticipating the Commission. I am not in a position to say one way or another; but what I say is that this gentleman is expert on Prison Administration from the United Kingdom on the way to British Guiana on a similar mission. He came here and somebody has asked: "what can he do in five days?" But he is accustomed to dealing with prisons with three thousand inmates and he could look around and put his finger on the pulse of what happened in the prison.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I do not care what kind of expert this man is — he could be a genius — we do not need him to investigate conditions at our prison with about one hundred or two hundred if so many in a prison here, with Barbadians in a small island like this: it is not necessary; and it is the incompetence and ignorance of the administration of the Government which has caused them to decide that an expert must be brought. This is not a prison in London or Dartmoor where you have scientists and experts too in the cells who want to turn over the prison, and where there are as good experts in the cells as you can get from the Universities or anywhere else. A couple of young boys up there get a chance to go on the roof and therefore you must bring in the whole of Scotland Yard to tell you how to handle them! Handle them like human beings; that is all you have to do. If they produce food in the prisons, let them eat it. As I have been telling you all along, if you make them grow carrots, put them in the rice and let them eat the carrots; do not let the people from outside buy them at half price. You do not have to buy them, and if you deprive a man of his labour that is a means of punishing him. Work them and let them produce wealth, but let them use part of the wealth. You do not need a man from overseas to tell you that. If the man were not in the area you would not have wanted him; you would have managed without him; and if common-sense was applied that problem could be solved. What is more, you say you have a first-class Superintendent at the prison, a man who has special training in prison reform, and we have seen his knowledge manifested in the small improvement up there at the prison; and he has just come back from getting additional knowledge on prison reform. This man has sufficient knowledge and it only wants the confidence of the Government now through the Minister of Social Services to make the Warders feel that Government is not willing to take advantage of them if they are offered an opportunity of improving their livelihood.

4 25 p.m.

That is what it wants. It is said that Mr. Redhead is a capable man. Since he has been there, many improvements have taken place and yet some of the recommendations which he has made, the Hon. Minister of Social Services has failed to implement. You put a man in a responsible position and then when he asks for tools with which to do the job, you refuse to give him; you prefer to spend any amount of money to carry out an investigation which is un-

necessary and fail to give the Superintendent what he feels would cause the Prison to be run on progressive lines.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I was not here when the Hon. Minister made his opening remarks, but I have made some inquiries. Judging from what has been said, this Officer is coming here for a period of five days and the cost to the Government will be approximately \$600. I wonder if the Hon. Minister would tell us something more about this matter. The Hon. Minister has said that this gentleman was in British Guiana and they have requested that he should come to Barbados. At least we should have been told how much money is for doing the job, how much is for his passage, and so on. I may think of how much is for his hotel maintenance and what his passage from British Guiana would be, but I would have thought that we would have heard from the Hon. Minister something more; that would have softened the shock which honourable members got by the appointment of this specialist, as the Hon. Minister terms him, to report on the administration of Prisons while you have a Commission of Enquiry going into the matter.

I suppose that human beings—and prisoners are included in that term—react all over the world to bad treatment. I say that this would have been a wonderful opportunity for the Hon. Minister of Social Services to have thrown some light on the matter because those of us who were shocked at the sit-down strike, as they call it, realised that something must have gone wrong; it would have been a good thing for the Hon. Minister to tell us that rumour has again been a lying jade. It was stated in the Press that the administration had broken down, and he admitted that he had gone through the—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I said that I am not prepared to say that the administration has broken down; I have to await the report of the Commission of Enquiry.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Then at least, the Hon. Minister should take the opportunity of saying whether 7 or 8 Warders have been dismissed or suspended or not. If you are bringing somebody to enquire into the administration of the Prison, and we see that these Warders have been dismissed or suspended, then something is wrong. The Hon. Minister's point is not that he cannot say what the position is, but he will not say what it is. What we think is that the Hon. Minister should realise that this is the first opportunity which the Government has had to do anything about the sit-down strike at the Prison, and therefore, this would have been a great opportunity for him to say what has happened.

If there is anything wrong with the administration, then let us know; I do not say that you could attribute direct blame to the Administration for what has happened, but they should come out and say something about the matter. The Hon. Minister must have heard as I have heard that one of the chief reasons for the disturbance was the serving of bad food; people have been taking food which has not been sold out, and which was purely fit for dumping in the Careenage, and have been taking that food to give to the prisoners. I repeat that this would have been a wonderful opportunity for the Hon. Minister to say that they are not satisfied, if that is so, and they could give a good reason why they are bringing this man here. It is not good enough merely to put in this Addendum: "The Director of Prisons Administration in the United Kingdom is advising the Government of British Guiana on prison administration. It is considered that the opportunity should be taken for him to visit Glendairy Prison

so that he can inspect and advise on its administration."

"They should have said a little more. In the same way that I have heard all these things, it is quite easy for the Hon. Minister to quell these rumours by saying that they are not true or otherwise. It is true that these Warders have been dismissed or suspended? We are asked to vote this money, but can the Hon. Minister say if there is any truth—"

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If this will satisfy honourable members, I will say that no Warders have been dismissed; they have been suspended.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Well, they have been suspended. There is no point in having to pull things out of the Hon. Minister. The Press is saying these things, and the hon. members are asked every day, up and down why the Warders have been suspended; it is time therefore that some reason for the suspension of these Warders should be given. This would have been a wonderful opportunity for the Hon. Minister to say here today whether the Administration of the Prison has broken down. The fact that the Government has agreed to the suspension of these 6 or 8 Warders shows that the administration has broken down, and it would have been infinitely better for the Hon. Minister of Social Services to be able to say not merely that they need to have a small Commission of Enquiry to go into the circumstances, but also to say that it is necessary to have this man. As soon as the Government agreed to the suspension of these Warders, then the administration has broken down.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I wonder if I knew that the administration had broken down, whether I would not have said it; that is something for the Commission of Enquiry to say.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think the Hon. Minister has made a mistake in presenting his case. Of course, the hon. member has his way of presenting his case; I suppose, if I were presenting it, I will have my way. You have a Commission of Enquiry sitting on this matter, and you are now asking for \$600 to bring this Prison expert to look into the matter for you. I would think, since you want this expert to look into the matter that the administration has broken down; and that seems to me to be the position of the case. All I am saying is that you must have the opportunity of presenting this to the public. I think this would have been a wonderful opportunity for your presentation of the facts so that the public would be able to see what is happening, and to see that the Government is doing its best. To say baldly what is in the Addendum to the Resolution, that the Director of Prisons Administration in the United Kingdom is advising the Government of British Guiana on prison administration, and it is considered that the opportunity should be taken for him to visit Glendairy Prison so that he can inspect and advise on its administration is not enough.

However, I hope the Hon. Minister would present his case. I do not think it is too late for him to do so. The rumour is that something has gone wrong. As a matter of fact, I have received letters from the prisoners. Although it is said that they are made victims for sitting down, it is common rumour that the principal reason for their sitting down is because the persons who were responsible for buying the foodstuffs of the prison are buying the worst kind of foodstuffs. I know years ago that the Government had a purveyor. I understand that that is not being done now and that we have persons going out and buying foodstuffs, and those foodstuffs are

very unfit for human consumption. However, Sir, I am sorry that the Hon. Minister did not present his case.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The hon. member knows something of the law. The hon. member knows that when a case is what we call *sub judice* that as little comment as possible is made. The hon. member knows very well that we have appointed a Commission to get the facts, and that Commission was appointed before we knew that this gentleman was going to be in the area.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I was saying that as a result of all those rumours which you have heard and which we have heard that to just present the case by saying what is in the Addendum to the Resolution is not enough. After all, we can think.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, valuable as has been the contribution by the hon. member who has just spoken, I think that there is much more to be said on this matter. How comes it that this gentleman is here? Obviously, he is here on the advice and at the request of the Government of this colony. But how did they know that they could take the risk of bringing him here when at the time of issuing the invitation there was no provision to bring him? That to me is their most serious crime. They have on their own responsibility so slighted the authority of this House that they could afford to put their necks out to invite him here to do what they want without their having the authorisation to pay the money to have him here; and it is indicative of the blunting of the susceptibilities of members of this House in recent years. A matter which is passing all of us without notice is that the House of Assembly can be so ignored that Government can take it for granted that it can ask a man to come here and undertake to pay him long before they have asked the House to pay the funds. Of course, knowing them as we do, they will find the money to pay him even if the House does not give them the money. They have their ways of expending public money which does not always come to the knowledge of this House because if it does come, it would not win approval. If they are saying that they asked him here well knowing in advance that the House would grant them the supplies, they are only saying in other words, that they can rely on their well tried supporters who are not required to think; and according to their own words, they know their party discipline so well that they know they are only required to support the Government.

Of all the balderrash that I have heard, I think the statement from the Hon. Minister of Social Services must easily rank first. Without explaining or attempting to explain how he happens to know of the Director of Prisons in the United Kingdom, he says he read it—and they read it—like anybody else in the newspapers. I thank them for small mercies and I say that it is a relief to know that some of them can read. However, you are asking members of this House to believe that on no higher basis than that of chance hearing or chance reading of an article in the newspaper that a major aspect of Government's policy has been decided on. Fancy, just by hearing that a man is in British Guiana or by reading it in the "Advocate" that a responsible Minister of the Crown decides that this person can be invited on hearsay evidence. That is his own admission. He may not have known beforehand either of the necessity for having the man or indeed of the qualifications of the man, and he is arguing foolishly as an after thought to bolster up this matter that the man is accustomed to looking into the discipline of prisoners in larger Prisons than Glendairy; and therefore

because of the large number of prisoners which comes under his notice, he is a fit and proper person to do what is to be done here.
4.45 p.m.

I am concerned more than anything else with the affront which has been levelled at this House, and it is probably only in this Chamber that a Minister could get away with what would be in other circumstances a most damaging admission—that they had actually invited the man without the sanction of the Legislature so far as the funds are concerned, and they think it a good thing to boast or imply that they have so much control over this Assembly that they could invite this man here well knowing in advance that the House of Assembly would provide the funds. That is more serious, and it is something that this House ought to resent very bitterly. With respect secondly to the merits of the Resolution, if you had listened Mr. Chairman, as carefully to the Minister as I did—and I think perhaps you did because he was very emphatic, you would have heard him imply that it was because he himself does not know what is wrong with the Prison that he set up the Committee of Enquiry upon it, and he refused to be drawn into any discussion as to the conditions of work among the prison officers or even the treatment of the prisoners themselves. I wish to say this: that I think he was quite right in his refusal to enter into discussion on these matters. But Mr. Chairman, when he allowed that Committee to be set up, he knew before hand that there were certain things about the Prison that he did not know, and therefore he set it up to find out for himself and for the public the truth about certain things. Then again on his own admission we hear that the Committee has not yet reported and he is asking us not to anticipate its findings by discussing matters of detail whether factual or not, and while he is doing that, he himself is anticipating the Committee by superimposing on it the services of a gentleman who according to him is an expert in Prison Administration, without knowing what the Committee itself will have to say about the administration of the prison, without knowing whether the Committee will find that the administration of the prison is in itself the cause of the disturbance. Without knowing all that, he is undertaking to allow this gentleman to come into the matter without indicating whether the scope of the gentleman's enquiry is to be parallel to the enquiry already proceeding or whether it is to supplement it or indeed to cancel it out. None of these things he has said: so that even, Mr. Chairman, if Members of this House were prepared to forgive them for the insult which they have given to the House in bringing the man before the House voted the money, if we are prepared even to forgive them, and him especially for the superficial and incompetent way in which he has handled this matter so far as presentation to the House is concerned, if we are prepared to forgive all of that, you cannot overlook, Mr. Chairman the superimposition of this man, who is only an expert in Prison Administration, on the work of the Committee already set up to investigate the cause of the disturbance. If the Hon. Minister for Social Services had treated the House to his customary contempt and did not condescend to answer or to make the few explanations, I am sure he would have stood in a much better light: because all silence, Mr. Chairman, is not necessarily insolence; some of it could have been put down to ignorance; but the Minister was rash enough to undertake to give a few explanations in answer both to the hon. senior

member for St. John and the hon. senior member for the City; and it was these few interventions in this debate and the few things he said, that he read the report like anybody else in the newspaper, that he does not know what is wrong at the prison but that a Committee was set up, and this man is coming to tell you about prison administration—had he remained silent and not said these things, we would have been inclined to give him the benefit of the doubt; but he has put his foot into it by the explanations he has given, because he has made his case worse than we actually thought it was: and by his intervention he has made us to see that he has not got the faintest reason to do what he is asking us to do, but that somebody has told him to do it and that this is only a brazen attempt on their part to wring \$600 out of the Public Treasury because at the moment they cannot think of any more absurd reason for having it. I am not going to support them on it. That should not raise any heart-aches because they know my attitude to these things already; but I am concerned that whenever they on their own initiative undertake to find out what is wrong with a Department under their control, they should not give the impression that they are not only ignorant but also indifferent; and by the presentation of this Resolution, by their admission that the man is here before they knew how they were going to pay him, and by the affront they have made to the House in so doing, in my opinion they have made themselves both ignorant and indifferent.
4.55 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I just want to say a simple word. I must say that I was somewhat touched by the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. John when he referred to the conditions existing at the Prison where the Prisoners have to walk a mile or more to perform their duties. I sincerely hope that the Government would make some means of transport available to the Prison. I am not at all in agreement with all the remarks made to-day as to the expenditure of this \$600 in getting this expert here; it is time that we have a change or some reform at the Prison. Having regard to what we know of the British Prisons to-day, what obtains here can be regarded as being obsolete.

Judging from the speeches of hon. members, they have missed the concept aback of getting this expert here. We want to have the type of reform like that which obtains in other Countries. I gleaned from the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Social Services that the idea of getting this expert here is not any kind of buttress of the sitting Commission, but that the idea is to bring about the necessary Prison reform. Despite the fact that you have a Superintendent of the Prison who is a particularly good man from what we have been told, yet we can do with an expert to make a report on what is yet necessary to be done at the Prison. I hope that the Hon. Minister of Social Services in his final word will promise to bring about the amenities which should be included in the reform of the Prison.

Mr. BRANCKER: As to this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, I am not averse to having an official from the United Kingdom taking a look at our local Prison administration, because I am sure that it will be in the interest of the prisoners as well as in the interest of the Staff, if this official has a look at our Prison and will apply the same yardstick towards the proper running of the Prison in this Colony as would apply equally in Great Britain. Therefore, I do not object to this particular amount of money which is not as large as many other amounts which are brought to

this Chamber to be passed for bringing experts here. Things have got to such a bad past with these men being suspended, and with the Commission of Enquiry still sitting—and I understand that when gentlemen of the long robe had been asked to appear on behalf of the Warders, they had the utmost difficulty, until recently in securing an audience.

When a Commission is sitting, and the Warders want their side of the case presented, they seek the assistance of persons who have had some experience in such matters. I have been told that when gentlemen like Mr. J. S. B. Dear and Mr. H. A. Williams went to appear on behalf of the Warders, they were treated with scant courtesy. If the local Commission is adopting that attitude, it may be well for the Director of Prisons in the United Kingdom to advise on the local Administration.

What has struck me about the local Committee is that of the three persons, there was no Barbadian who, apparently, was found worthy of a seat on this Board. We have the Irish gentleman who is the Chairman, an English businessman, and we have our esteemed medico from St. Vincent. Although I see no objection to such things from the Imperial standpoint, yet I still wonder whether, on a Committee like this, at least one Barbadian was not found suitable enough and competent enough to make a place on this small Board.

I gather that there was an attempt either to bluff or to rush us into a hasty decision last week that it was either then or never; that if we did not pass the Resolution then, there was no hope of getting this man to make this investigation. However, in view of the fact that the Committee at present does not seem to be working as well as one would have expected it to work, and in view of the fact that Prison Administration in the United Kingdom is on a higher and better level than it is in this Colony, it is as well that we have the opinion of a person from a big country. Consequently, I am disposed to support the passing of this Resolution.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, VAUGHAN, MILLER, BRANCKER, HAYNES, E. K. WALCOTT and GODDARD—14.

Noes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, TUDOR and ALLDER.—3.

The Resolution was passed.

CURE AT ST. MICHAEL'S CATHEDRAL

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The next Resolution, which appears first on the Order Paper, is a Resolution for \$5,000. This is a simple Resolution in accordance with the provisions of the Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Act. The Cure of the Cathedral was vacant for a period of six months from the beginning of this year, and the salary has been lapsing in the Treasury. A temporary appointment has been made from the 1st July, and the object of this Resolution is to pay the sum of \$1,620 to the *locum tenens* of the Cure for the period until the end of the financial year and to have a sum of money in hand to meet similar cases which may arise.

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$5,000 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.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX; Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the CHAIR and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.10 p.m.

On re-assembling

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, there is no regular order for dealing with Private Members' Business and I do not want to be in the same position as that in which I found myself last Tuesday. There is a matter of Private Members' Business standing in my name — a Bill — and it is my intention to proceed with that Bill now; because in the past couple of weeks, the attitude of the Government is to proceed with Government Business, and immediately as it finishes its business, to move the adjournment of the House. There is nothing to say that I cannot proceed with Private Members' Business now if the House so desires and, as I have said, there is a Bill standing in my name, which is Order No. 1, and it is my intention to proceed with it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is an irregularity for a Private Member to interrupt Government Business. As I understand from Mr. Chairman, before the adjournment, the House was to resume Committee of Supply to continue with Government Business. We have not reached the stage where Government Business has been disposed of. There is no excuse at all at this particular moment for a Private Member to interrupt Government Business especially when a Committee has been sitting.

The hon. member said that there is no regular Order for dealing with Private Members' Business. That is not so. Let the hon. member give some indication that he intends to proceed with a matter which stands under his name under Private Members' Business. Things must be done in order; otherwise they will get out of hand.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter upon which you will have to rule because there is nothing in the Rules of the House which says that Private Members' Business must be proceeded with at any specific time. In view of the practice over which you have no control, and by virtue of which the Hon. Leader of this House can close Government Business and immediately afterwards move the adjournment of the whole House, and then you say that the motion for the adjournment takes precedent over anything, I am bound to ask you to rule. You do not say that such and such a time is allowed to Private Members' Business, and you hear members of the Government talking boastfully about "exercising your grey matter." I am saying that no Private Members' Business should be so subjected to Government Business that you cannot do it at all, because every item of Private Members' Business is public business.

If any Private Member puts a matter on the Order Paper and it means that he can only put it there, and it cannot be debated, then we must have some ruling to say what procedure should take place.

I have no intention of preventing Government from proceeding with its business, but what I am saying is that what is happening in this House (and I do not mean that it happened on one occasion) is that the Hon. Leader of the House after the completion of Government Business proceeds to move the adjournment of the whole House and it is done with the intention of preventing private members from proceeding with their business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot attribute any motive to what has happened on the last occasion. I must remind the hon. member of custom: and the custom has been and will be, I presume, that private members will be given opportunity to follow on with their business after Government Business, unless the House directs otherwise. There is no question of any ruling by me.

Give me some indication. Had I any indication on the last occasion, I would have let the hon. member proceed with his matter. The hon. member said that I allowed the Hon. Leader of the House to move the adjournment of the House. That is wrong; I have allowed nothing.

The hon. member has risen on two occasions. If his rising means to indicate that he intends later on to proceed with the Order standing in his name. I think the Government has ample notice of his so doing.

On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

AMPLIFYING EQUIPMENT FOR THE HOUSE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$2,000 to provide amplifying equipment for the Legislature. I think I am correct in saying that on many occasions members of the House as well as strangers, have reported that the acoustics of the House were unsatisfactory and it is difficult for persons to hear what is going on. We have had various representations made about the matter, and the Government has agreed to install amplifiers and loud speakers in both branches of the Legislature.

The breakdown of that \$2,000 is as follows:—

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

1 25-watt Amplifier	\$195	
13 Microphones @ \$35 each ..	455	
13 Microphone Stands @ \$13 ..	169	
2 Circular Loudspeakers @ \$45 each ..	90	
1 Mixer Unit, approximately ..	100	
Installation—Leads and Material ..	200	\$ 1,209

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1 25-watt Amplifier	\$195	
3 Suspension Microphones ..	180	
1 Circular Loudspeaker	45	
Installation—Leads and Materials ..	200	620
		\$ 1,829

That brings it approximately to \$2,000.

I think, Sir, all hon. members will agree that there is an absolute necessity for improving the acoustics of the House, and with these few remarks

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$2,000 do now pass.
6.00 p.m.

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

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the need for this amplifying apparatus, I do not think it is quite going to meet the situation. Probably members will remember from the discussion on the Five Year Plan and the idea of moving the Parliamentary Buildings, that I stated there in no uncertain terms that it would be a pity to leave these palatial halls, and the answer today is air-conditioning and amplifying; but Sir, when one considers the acoustics of this building, as bad as they are, they are made ten times worse as soon as the next door building, the Olympic Theatre, starts operating — plus other horns and other sounds coming from the surroundings of this place. No amplifying apparatus is going to help that situation. My idea, Sir, is to ask the Minister in charge to postpone this Resolution and investigate the cost of air-conditioning. You may not even need it; I am not standing here as an authority on these matters but am only talking from broad experience and a knowledge of how it works in other buildings. I was told a few days ago by the Manager of Barclays Bank that the air-conditioning plant there is paying dividends. The bank's work is finished at a reasonable hour, and the staff is satisfied, and is not disturbed by all the noises from all sorts of traffic and the obstructions which are prevalent in the vicinity; and mind you, I am not advocating that the Government should go in for a large concern like that because the plant at the Bank is not only to air-condition a couple of rooms, it is for the entire big building; we only want a unit for two rooms here. There are one or two other consequences; that is, sometimes the temperature is too low, but that is only a matter of adjusting. You can adjust the temperature of a room if it is air-conditioned to suit normal conditions. I am suggesting, Sir, that the Hon. Minister postpone this matter and get further investigations. Perhaps it is a very costly matter: but a large number of individuals now are putting in air-conditioning plants in their bedrooms and I am told, the cost is \$500 or \$600. This Chamber is not bigger than five or six bedrooms; so I am asking him, Sir, if he could see to that, because he would really be doing a service to the colony by having the Chambers livable, and not only livable but also comfortable to those members who are returned by the people of the island.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is a bit disappointing when in a matter like this the honourable member who has just sat down, though one gives him credit for his sincerity, misses the whole point at issue. You cannot, Mr. Chairman, measure the relative merits of air-conditioning as against that of installing loud-speaking equipment, when what is to be known in the first place is this: Who has considered that this House or that this Chamber should have loudspeaking equipment? This is a matter which concerns the House: and in the first place, because it concerns the House, it does not have any right being in charge of the Minister; it is not a Government measure. The merits of it are not in dispute at the moment but the point is this: if it seems good to the House to make alterations to this Chamber, alterations will be made; but Mr. Speaker ought to direct some honourable member, not necessarily the Minister, to take charge of the particular matter. This matter is being treated as if it were an ordinary routine expenditure, and I think I should like to know—I may be ignorant—how it is that the House has reached the decision to instal amplifying equipment. Now I know that

it can be said that almost everybody knows how difficult it is to get voices to carry in this room, and how the obstruction from the traffic outside makes it difficult for honourable members to hear each other or even themselves. All that is known. But the point is this, Mr. Chairman, if it is thought necessary so to amplify voices of honourable members when speaking, why at the same time is it necessary to make what I think is a series of unnecessary restrictions and unnecessary regulations governing the entry of persons into these precincts when this Hon. Chamber is in session?

6.10 p.m.

For the purpose of installing loud-speaking equipment is not so much that we should be able to hear each other—because we do that after a fashion—but in order that our voices can be carried above the din and roar of the traffic outside, and of course, some of the distraction which some hon. members of the Government put up from time to time. Later on, I shall have something to say on the merits of the Resolution itself, but it does appear to be a breach of the privileges of this House, that some people can take it upon themselves to decide to instal amplifying equipment, not only in here, but in the Other Place. Everybody knows that scarcely more than 9 or 10 people attend meetings of the Other Place at any time; everybody knows that there is a general rule that visitors are not encouraged in that Chamber because the number of seats available for persons who are not members of that Chamber are not more than 3 or possibly 4. Therefore, there has never been any great trouble with people in the Other Place except on such rare occasions when members of this hon. Chamber are summoned there to meet His Excellency the Governor along with the members of the Other Place.

Those occasions are very few and rare. We have never heard it said on any of those occasions, that people find it difficult to hear the proceedings or to follow the ceremonies. Therefore I fail to see how this decision could have been arrived at; this is not necessarily the best decision. At this point, I meet the hon. junior member for St. Andrew on common ground, because the Hon. Minister could have at least told us why this particular form of improvement is better than another form of improvement. It is possible to hold the opinion that if you could get this Chamber properly ventilated with all the windows closed, and instal the cooling system, hon. members might be able to hear each other better. We should have been told about the cost of this proposal in relation to other things. We have to be told how it is that, this House not having requested the loud-speaking system, the Government could take it upon themselves to advise or provide hon. members with this system. I think it is a breach of the privileges of this House, and I do not think that is a matter which is a Government matter, properly speaking.

As I said before, if the House had decided either informally or by distinct motion to make alterations in this Chamber, the House would have the means of indicating its desire to Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker would take the proper steps to have the thing done. Consequently, when the Resolution came before the House for providing the money to make the alterations, the House could be told in an official and formal way, that Mr. Speaker is directing somebody to take charge of the particular matter. These things must be properly set up; anything which has to do with this House—whether it is in the selection of its servants or in the alteration of the furniture—any such matter should be exclusively the privilege of the House, and Mr. Speaker should have the directing influence in it. I do not

like the idea of the Hon. Minister introducing this measure and treating it as a routine Government matter, which it is not. It is even a matter in connection with which the claims or ties of party should not bind hon. members, because by its very nature it cannot be that kind of privilege.

It should be said from the outset that hon. members should be free to speak their minds on the measure without regard to party affiliations or party allegiance, because it is a matter which concerns the House, and it should be dealt with in that light and on that basis. Later on, when the debate is developed, I shall say something about loud-speaking equipment itself, but at this point, I want to emphasise that something irregular is taking place. I would like hon. members to turn their attention to this matter, and see whether it is not possible that we might be doing something which might be done differently.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, from time immemorial hon. members have been questioning what improvements could be made to this Chamber in various ways. At one time we sat at the far end of this Chamber, and we thought that by moving to this end of the Chamber, the acoustics would lend themselves to better hearing. I am not any expert; I do not pretend to be one; but I think that we should be given the fullest opportunity and the fullest details, whether they are from experts in the field of acoustics, in the field of amplification or even in the field of air-conditioning, before we agree to make this step. I would have thought that this procedure would have started from Mr. Speaker, and probably the Debates Committee or some working Committee from both sides of this House, because this is not a party matter; it is purely an internal matter, and we would like to see steps taken for the improvement of this Chamber.

It is not enough to have visitors say that they come in here and they cannot hear what is going on. If they are invited here, by all means, we want them to hear what is taking place; but we also want to know that we will be providing the correct methods whereby that improvement would be made. I do not know, if we have 24 or 30 amplifiers around this table, how they would work; I think that this is a matter which could better be dealt with by a small Committee, rather than how we are dealing with it now. I would like to enquire how many speakers are there going to be; whatever the position is, I think that hon. members should be given the opportunity of being given fuller details as to what we are being committed to today. I go further; I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister who introduced this Resolution whether the members of the Other Place have accepted the proposal that amplification be used in that Chamber.

6.20 p.m.

Have they approached them? Have they told them anything about it? Or is it that they are going to them and saying: "We are going to put it in there." If that is so, it is an intrusion. I would not like to think that somebody outside has told them to do it, because it would be so embarrassing. It would be as somebody trying to impose on us something which we know nothing about. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Communications to rise at this stage and give us some firm detail on those lines before we proceed to discuss this thing further.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should have reminded the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that sometime in the 1948 to 1951 Session, a Committee sat and considered the provision of equipment for amplification of this House; and at that time it was recommended, if I remember correctly, (and honourable members will remember that the Government Electrical Inspector, Hr. Hooper, installed an electrical speaker and tried out experi-

ments at that time and made recommendations) that it would cost us something like \$2,400 for the House alone. The result was that the Government did not proceed to carry out installations then. However, Sir, recently members of the Other Place have informed the Government it is difficult for them to hear in their Chamber and they have appealed to the Government for an amplifier and microphones. Because of this, the question of amplifying the House was brought to the fore, again, and Government decided to come down for the money for the installation. That is the position.

The Government Electrical Inspector did all the inspections and the various tests and then recommended that we should install these microphones and amplifiers. It is proposed to have suspension mikes in the other Chamber inasmuch as the table there is almost square, but he has told us that he cannot work that arrangement satisfactorily in this Chamber; therefore, we would have to use microphones in the other Chamber inasmuch as the table there between every two members and one for the Speaker. That should enable the members of this House and the gallery to hear what is going on and should give satisfaction.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite satisfied with the explanation at all. I have listened carefully to the Hon. Minister and if I understand him correctly he said thirteen microphones; but he told the Leader of the Opposition thirteen speakers.

Hon. M. E. COX: No, no! There would be two speakers which, I presume, will be installed on the roof of the building and there will be thirteen microphones.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I take it that there will be one amplifier, thirteen microphones and two speakers which will be installed in this Chamber. Now, my own idea about it is if you are going to have some system of amplification, what you propose to do is nonsense.

Bear in mind that in your amplification you are going to amplify noise from outside this Chamber as well. We debate in a two-by-four room: and if you cannot make people in the room hear you, it is time for you to go home. That is my own personal feelings. But if the feeling of the Committee is that you should have some system of amplification, then I think the honourable member who is most competent for contradicting me is the honourable junior member for St. George. There is a system of concealed amplification which is the correct system for this room. In big countries where there is some system of amplification they do not have anything hanging. If you want to do it, and you want to improve the acoustics of this Chamber because of the type of people who speak, then do it the correct way. As I have said, there is a system in which you can have concealed amplification, and there is no point in having what the Hon. Minister spoke about. If you are going to have amplification, in my opinion you should have it in the right way. What the honourable member is proposing to have in here is what every honourable member who is in politics has. That is not what you want in here. What you really are proposing to have in here is a public address system. What you want is a system which is so modernised that when the honourable lady member speaks or when the honourable junior member for St. Peter speaks it can be so toned that you can hear both equally in the same manner. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would not be in here too long; so you need not think of me.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, you know there is a time and place for saying certain things, but I cannot resist the temptation for saying what I am going to

say now. Last week we received some statement by His Honour the Speaker and I do think that that statement has been really misunderstood by the general public, because the feeling among the public is that there is an attempt to prevent people from coming to the House and listening to the debates. I would say I am not one who subscribes to any bad behaviour in the House, but you will agree with me that there were times when the party to which I have the honour to belong saw strangers from the gallery expressing a cheer when members of the Government got up to speak. That is democracy. You must give people that opportunity of expressing openly their feelings although it is absolutely wrong for people to express their appreciation that way in this Chamber. It has been reported to me that at the bottom of the stairs leading to this Chamber there is a policeman preventing people from entering this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is straying from the Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am talking of the acoustics of this Chamber. With the greatest respect to Your Honour, when the Hon. Minister of Communications said that it had been represented to them and they have brought the matter here, I have not made that representation; therefore the Hon. Minister is talking of representation made by strangers in the gallery. I hope you will grant me that privilege of making reference to them.

6.30 p.m.

I do not see how we can reconcile that we are trying to put in this amplifying apparatus and still in the same breath say that persons cannot enter without getting a recommendation from the Archangel Gabriel. To me it is unnecessary and after with the Premier and the Leader of the House, while denying the Leader of the Opposition the right to discuss it with them, I personally realise that is going too far. I am prepared to back the authority of the Speaker and you, Sir, in upholding the dignity of this House, but I am not prepared to give away my right as a member of this House at any time. I am letting it be known now that as far as I am concerned, Party or no Party, I am elected here: and any Tuesday, I will fill all the seats in this House, and I don't care if the Premier likes it or the Leader of the House or the Speaker do not—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for the City. I am asking you to regard the authority of the Chair, and when I knock the gavel you must listen to what the Chair has to say.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do so, but what I wanted

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon members are getting in the habit when I knock the gavel to try and drown the noise of the gavel.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I shall never do that, Sir, but just now you knocked the gavel; when I stopped to listen you were speaking to somebody else.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is breaking the Rules.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is why I

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must listen to the Chair. The gavel is not used for foolishness.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I agree it is not always used for foolishness; when you use it, you do not use it for foolishness.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I do not always use it for foolishness, there is only one other person that uses it and that is the Speaker.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Why do you interpret that way? You are not the only person in the Chair.

As far as I am concerned in a matter of this sort, it strikes me in dealing with this amplification that eight years ago a Committee sat on this and the question was discussed, after which there was a change around of the House so that Reporters were in a better position and His Honour the Speaker would be facing and seeing everybody coming into the gallery, and so on. That was eight years ago. You, Mr. Chairman, were not a member of the party in power nor Chairman at the time, so how would you feel for this Resolution to come down here to-day saying that "it is considered that amplifying equipment should be provided in both Chambers" and so on? The answer was given by the Minister; the Other Place had asked for it, the Other Place had represented to the Government that they cannot hear each other when speaking. They are gentlemen advanced in age and many of them have not got the voices we have in here (although it is smaller, I believe), and they have represented to the Government that they cannot hear each other when speaking; but that is because of the noise from outside. We cannot amplify the noise from outside to reduce it; if you amplify it at all you are going to make it worse. There are a lot of members here who were not in here eight years ago when a Committee sat on this, and since then there has been a change-around

the House. Do you think it is fair to hon. members of this House even in dealing with something which is to do with the privilege of this House not to consult hon. members and say let us have a small Committee to see what is best? Do you know there are a lot of people who would not like to have the Chamber amplified? It tends to harness people's nerves, and the Hon. Minister of Health would know this from experience that some of these things feed back so that they jar. There is no need in a small room like this to have 13 microphones. Of course, you can have thirteen microphones but what would be the position in here? Let the engineer be any engineer at all; there is a system by which you can do it which will cost more money; but this is a waste of money. I do not think it is fair to hon. members to say eight years ago you investigated this matter and felt something should be done, and now today members, who were not here eight years ago, were not consulted or asked to give any suggestions. That is like the third paragraph in the statement the Hon. Speaker made. You consulted the Premier and the Leader of the House, but the others can take the road down to the careenage as far as you are concerned. [A VOICE: And the Commissioner of Police] Yes, and the Commissioner of Police. Do you consult the Commissioner of Police when you are trying to get a vote? Why can't they ask the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must keep to the Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am keeping to the Resolution. You are going to put up loudspeakers and install microphones and ask the people to stay in the yard and hear what is being said. As I said just now, the Police and about two dozen people had a row downstairs because they were not allowed to come up. It is true they have no right cheering in here; they must not show by any physical expression their agreement with either side, but we cannot be so drastic. I remember an instance when you had to ask J. T. C. Ramsay to leave this Chamber, and what happened? There was a tremendous row. Now you are going to perpetuate the same thing here. What

I mostly strongly object to is to see the Speaker, who must be impartial and who, we assume, is impartial, saying in the statement that he consulted the Leader of the House and the Premier of the same Party, and the Commissioner of Police; all the others can go away! How does that sound? Then you come in here to day and say it has been represented to Government. One would not be surprised if representation was made to the Government by a front bench gentleman who had reached the stage of advanced age. But by whom has it been represented? It is not fair to the Opposition of this Government. If the position had been in the reverse and this had been done, they would have consulted them in this matter. I do not know how the other members look at it, but I am not going to vote for it. I do not see the necessity for it. But I will tell you what I would like. A tape recorder! Let us have a tape recorder [A VOICE: It would not work!] It would not work. Let us have the records so that any honourable member would not be able to say "I did not say thus". A system of amplification must be approached in a proper way. You must have a Committee to meet and make a decision, and the honourable junior member for St. George could very well sit on that Committee and advise Government. He is not an engineer but he has read sufficient about the matter to give some advice. There is a system in big countries and in big cathedrals by which they are concealed, but what would you do with thirteen microphones around here? Look at the size of this place. If you put in microphones and the honourable lady member for St. Andrew was speaking, although concealed you still would be able to hear.

6.40 p.m.

What would you do with them? Would any hon. member seriously sit down and say that he would vote for placing these microphones in this room? That is nonsense. I suggest to hon. members that they should not vote for any such thing. If you want a system of amplification in here, let the Government appoint a Committee to go into the matter. It is a matter as to whether this House would like this thing to be done or not; this is just like saying that the Government has decided to remove these chairs, and that hon. members should sit on benches. Do you mean to say that we should have absolutely no say in such a matter? Are you just saying that this matter has been represented to you? If it has been represented to you, then let us have a Committee to go into the matter and see if this is really necessary.

The people of this country are beginning to feel that while a Government with Socialist views has gone into power, they have become so drunk with power, that they want to be twin gods. In other words, people are beginning to feel that you are overthrowing everything that they believed you have done in the public good. I counsel hon. members not to vote for this Resolution; if you vote for this Resolution, the next thing you will hear is that the Government is saying that these chairs on which we are now sitting are to be removed and we have to sit on benches, and we would not have any say in the matter.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I was extremely interested in the observations which were made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and the fulmination of the hon. senior member for the City in respect of having 13 microphones in this Chamber, who have been here for very many years, for the benefit of the contributions of lackadaisical politicians who feel it necessary to have themselves encircled by these things. The debates of this Chamber, until the advent of persons of the ilk of the hon. member who has introduced this Resolution, were conducted with a fair degree of propriety and decorum. I remember

that in 1934, I was turned out of this Chamber because I wore short pants, but I was only 13 years old at that time. Perhaps children and fools were not allowed to come into this Chamber. In those days, the hon. senior member for St. Michael was conspicuously absent; he was not interested then, but it would have been noticed that hon. members spoke with clarity in those days, and were not distracted by the asides which come from Government benches, the asides and rude interruptions to which we are subjected from Tuesday to Tuesday, and which assault Your Honour's ears. I would like to inform the honourable senior member for St. Michael that the question of the acoustics of this Chamber has nothing to do with the matter of how many microphones you have.

The acoustics of a building, subject to anything that my omniscient colleague may have to say on the subject, are entirely independent of the equipment which you may install within the building. The matter of the acoustics of a building, within my limited knowledge, is something which can be improved perhaps by extensive alterations to the building itself. Any alterations to the structure of the honourable senior member for St. Michael, I presume, would end in his downfall. I am not trying to be rude to the honourable member or to hurt his feelings; I am just using what ideas come to my mind.

From 1934, I have been coming into this Chamber and I have been able to hear speeches of honourable members. If due to the increase in the volume of external traffic, the increase in the volume of the internal conversations which go on during most of a debate, and the increase in the number of people who come into this Chamber, sound is either absorbed or drowned or saturated, it is time that we begin to think of some alterations to the structure of this building along the lines suggested by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. When we come to the point of having 1 microphone or 13 microphones, it is a matter of supreme indifference to me. I can see my colleague sharpening his pencil and perhaps instructing the honourable senior member for St. Michael that it would not be necessary to have all 13 microphones switched on at one and the same time.

6.50 p.m.:

That is not the point. If you are going to put in elaborate equipment of that nature, it would stand to reason that you must have someone with that technical knowledge and experience to supervise the equipment so as to make sure that it does not blow up, or blow out; or alternatively depending on the nature of the layout of the equipment that the right voices are heard at the right time.

This Resolution is the thin edge of the wedge and I am going to oppose it on these grounds. I do not know by whom were the recommendations made but I think that it is an insult to this House that the recommendations were made by someone outside of the House when they did not hear what was said. I know it is difficult for strangers to hear what is going on in this Chamber but that is due to a multiplicity of causes some of which I have spoken of before.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to go through the Annual Estimates because I want to draw to your attention some anomalies on the question of public expenditure. Public expenditure can only be justified either on the grounds of pure necessity or on the basis of social and economic alternatives. I do know that \$15 million or £15 million does not seem a lot of money to the people on the other side of this House, but \$15 million is the revenue of this colony; therefore any Government in power, is faced with the question of deciding the priority and the scale

of social preferences and social alternatives judged by the categorical preference in the social setup.

We have an initial expenditure of \$2,000 for the installation of amplifying equipment in this Chamber. You give to the children of the Goodwill League according to this year's Estimates \$1,200. You give to the Young Men's Christian Association \$1,940. You give the Salvation Army \$720 and to the Barbados Association in aid of the Blind, Deaf and Dumb \$2,250.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying from the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I am not straying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is asking for \$2,000 for amplifying equipment.

Mr. BARROW: I am showing to you the social alternatives and the amount of money spent on those items.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with amplifying equipment at all. This Resolution is for the expenditure of \$2,000 and according to the Addendum of the Resolution it is considered that amplifying equipment should be provided in both Chambers of the Legislature. I am not going to entertain what the hon. member was speaking on at all. It looks like the Estimates from which he is quoting.

Mr. BARROW: It is a copy of the Estimates which I have in hand. I told you that I was going to quote from it. I was dealing with the way in which money was spent and I was showing the reason why I was going to vote against this Resolution. I feel strongly on this matter. I did not know that you took your directions from the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not taken my directions from any person. This Resolution is for the sum of \$2,000 for amplifying equipment.

Mr. BARROW: I must say: "this Resolution is for \$2,000. I am the senior member for St. George: Glory Hallelujah!" and then sit down! That is what I have to say on it. I must praise God; and because I see the big brothers watching me talk about Gideon or something in St. Peter. What is your standard of debate?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member goes on like that I am going to rule him out of order.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking you for guidance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot stay up and talk what you like.

Mr. BARROW: What must I do? I was showing you how the money in this year's Estimates is being spent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. BARROW: I am justified in quoting the Estimates under "Subsidies and Grants." As I have said, the Association for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb gets \$2,250 as a grant, apart from the Young Men's Christian Association which gets a grant of \$1,940. The \$2,000 which is proposed in this Resolution to be spent in amplifying equipment represents in my scale of preference two aided self-help houses and if those Conservative planters could have done without microphones in here my lungs are healthy enough to do without them. As long as they are people living in the appalling slum conditions in this colony as they are living, as long as they are people without houses, we in this House of Assembly should be the last persons to be spending money on unnecessary frivolities and on ourselves. All that we are doing is showing off. Because you probably have been to Paris and you saw some place with microphones installed for 7,000 people, must we

have it too? Because you went to some big convention hall and you saw it laid out for television and you saw something like small condensed tins, do you mean to say that you want something like that to show how important you are? The next thing that the Minister would want is a Rolls Royce motor-car. This is not one of those places. If you had put every man in St. Michael who wanted a house in a house, if the school children were getting a hot mid-day meal, if the poor babies were getting milk and all those things were done, then you could justify expenditure on the Ministerial Buildings and microphones not only in this Chamber but in the Other Place.

Mr. Chairman, have we gone out of our senses? A Resolution of this nature can only display a lack of social orientation on the part of this Government. We speak with difficulty in this Chamber, it is true, but speaking with difficulty is not as bad a thing as one going a whole day without a meal in one's stomach: and there are too many people in Barbados in that position for me to support a Resolution of this nature.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not influenced by the purely erroneous comparison of this amount for amplifying equipment and other amounts for grants to institutions because the other amounts quoted by the hon. senior member for St. George are only annual amounts: therefore the comparison is not at all valid; but I am not at all satisfied that we have had any essential reason to spend \$2,000 on something that may prove entirely unsatisfactory in this House. If the hearing in this Chamber were as difficult as alleged, this Chamber would not be so filled every Tuesday and their general complaint would be that since they cannot hear well in the House of Assembly they are not going there. I am not drawing any red herring across the trail. It seems to me that even if we have to spend more than \$2,000 on this equipment, we can still talk of starving people. I am not at all satisfied of this expenditure under the circumstances. 7.00 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the hon. member, but it is so strange that he has made a speech like that. However, it has been for years a normal democratic process, and since I have been in this Chamber, over five years ago, we have been repeatedly asked by the Press and the people who use the gallery for a means of better hearing, and that also applies to members of Parliament. The Minister in his remarks about the breakdown says there will be thirteen microphones provided. What he is thinking of is one for every two members and one for the Speaker; but there are occasions when the Clerk of the House is expected to address the Chamber. But this \$2,000 would not be the entire cost of the equipment, because certainly there should be a man in charge of the equipment to control it. You are bound to have a control panel or a board to switch the microphones from speaker to speaker; that is bound to be a result. But any remarks about the acoustics and improving the acoustics of the Chamber is not solved by amplifiers. The amplifier is for the reproduction, that is, to reproduce the voices of the various speakers, and the type you can get would determine the quality of the reproduction you expect to get. But on the question of acoustics, you either have or you are without acoustics, dependent on the particular type of building. What I would rather prefer would cost ten times as much money: that is a structural change that would bring a better repro-

duction of voices. In a theatre, it would be considered "infra dignitatem" to attempt to put microphones, but I would admit it would involve a lot of structural changes and a considerable sum to bring this about. The amplifying system as referred to in this Resolution is in itself a means of substitute in that it can never improve the acoustics in the building. You either have acoustics or you don't! This is a cheap substitute for what we should have, but we have had all reasons why we should vote against this money. I do not agree with the technical information as referred to by the Minister in that you should have two loudspeakers. Usually on occasions like that where you are using the building as an auditorium, you use several small speakers to bring the volume just above that of the natural voice and make it comfortable. If you plan to use two loudspeakers, you are going to have some difficulty because the travel of sound is slower than air and you will have the sound echoing down the Chamber. In an auditorium where you have several small speakers instead of two large ones, if you bring the speakers up and above the volume, you must impair the quality of the voice. I am sorry and I hope the Hon. Minister will talk it over with the Government Electrical Inspector, and see if arrangements can be made to use several small speakers. The Premier would be in a better position to tell you that it is customary to use headphones instead, I believe at some conferences. The idea here again is a natural democratic process where you had several applications from the Press and the Gallery that it is difficult to hear, and they went about and provided means for making the conditions better; but it does not improve the quality and all that goes with it. By using large speakers you must at least have a control man at the panel to control the switch arrangements. As to those few remarks made by the Minister I am of the opinion that he was wrong to say that amplification was to improve the acoustics of the place. That never happens.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks made by members, I am going to ask leave to postpone this for further consideration with a view to asking the House to agree to the appointment of a Select Committee to go into the matter more thoroughly, although I must assure the Committee that the Government Electrical Inspector has gone into this matter very thoroughly and he has also produced a brochure demonstrating the type of speaker that he intends using. It is not the ordinary type of speaker which we normally use, it is a completely different type. However, I am asking leave to postpone the matter for further consideration.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, my attitude of the matter is this, that in this House it is exceedingly difficult sometimes to hear hon. members and I believe.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has asked leave to postpone the matter. Are you against leave being granted?

Mr. CRAWFORD: At this stage, yes! Because I feel this way about it.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: But I am entitled to say why I object, and I am saying every member in this House at sometime or other has complained about the manner in which he cannot hear other speakers. Secondly, Sir, we are all opposed or annoyed by

the manner in which many of our speeches are reported by the Reporters and I have got to the point where I do not read the *Official Gazette* at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member seems to be losing his temper.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying, Sir, that of the Reporters who take speeches in this Chamber, some of them are capable, some of them are not, and invariably, I suppose they would offer the excuse that they cannot hear what is being said; but I cannot read the Gazette anymore. The stupidity everybody appears to be saying in here astonishes me; and if for no other reason than to get an accurate debate, we should provide some means of amplification and I would agree with it. What happens is this: Government is so stupid in its approach to almost any matter that anything anybody comes and pushes down their throats they have to swallow. What do you need thirteen table microphones in here for? We need three suspended from the ceiling; one facing this direction, one in the centre and the other one facing the other direction; or if you want table model microphones, six are quite enough. I am opposed to spending two thousand dollars, but I am not opposed to providing some sort of amplification equipment in the Chamber. It can be done at a cheaper cost than two thousand dollars, and in fairness to ourselves and to the Reporters and the public who come here—because they come for any other reason—I think it is advisable to provide some sort of amplification in order, Sir, to assist the acoustics in the building. If the Government feels like postponing the Resolution to appoint a Committee to present a more reasonable and satisfactory Resolution to the House, I will vote for it.

7.10 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Communications has asked leave to postpone the further consideration of this Resolution. [After a pause]. There being no objection, the Hon. Minister is granted leave to postpone the further consideration of this Resolution.

Public Works Dept.

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one for the sum of \$43,000. As honourable members will see, this Resolution is for the purpose of completing certain works. They will see from the Addendum to this Resolution that with regard to the new Highways and Transport Offices, Workshops, Traffic Inspectorate, Stores and Yards, and in respect of the new Offices for Registrar, Public Trustee, Writ Servers, Petty Debt Clerks, Assistant Court of Appeal Clerks, two new Courts of Appeal and one new Supreme Court, and the rehabilitation of the Town Hall, the total estimated expenditure for these works was \$530,000. The Addendum also points out that the increase in this expenditure is due to a variety of reasons as follows:—

- (a) The original layout costs of the office blocks at the Pine were based on a flat site, but the site finally selected was on sloping ground, and it therefore needed a large amount of filling for the yard, yard spaces and the construction of retaining walls. The additional cost is \$13,000

- (b) The mechanical workshop at the Pine was to be a light steel framed building, but owing to the delay in steel delivery the building was constructed of heavier reinforced concrete. In addition, there was an increase in the cost of two sets of 20ft. high by 20ft. wide sliding doors, and it was found necessary to provide three sunken working and inspection pits, an additional steel framed building for the mechanical hoist, and an extra amount of filling owing to the nature of the site. Provision for these was not included in the original estimate, and the additional cost is \$17,500
- (c) The provision of a larger yard and store room for the Public Works Department was made necessary by the arrival of various stores including hurricane relief material and the additional cost is .. \$ 5,000
- (d) At the new Courts extra expenditure was incurred in preparing the foundations of the vault building where soft ground was found at a depth of 12ft., and a large cavity had to be bridged in preparing the foundations of the Writ Servers' Office. The additional cost is .. \$ 5,000
- (e) At the Government Headquarters an outside building has to be constructed for use as a gardener's room, and to house certain files and records which could not be stored in the main building. The estimated cost is \$ 2,500

That makes a total of \$43,000. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether, with all these improvements and extensions to Government Offices, the Government would consider the possibility of removing the Old Age Pension Office from that dangerous point in White Park Road where it is now situated. Many of these old people have to go there to collect their pensions, and we know what the traffic is like in that area. For some time now, that Office has been shifted from street to street, and the improvements to the Office have been unsuitable. It is time that, with the extension of these Government Offices, the Old Age Pension Department should be removed to a safer place where the lives of these Old Age Pensioners will not remain in jeopardy as they are in now. I am hoping that the Hon. Minister of Works will make a statement as to the provision of a new and safe Office for this Old Age Pension Department.

Mr. GODDARD: I should like to say that with any estimate which runs in the vicinity of half million dollars, there is liable to be an error either in one way or in the other. The Addendum to this Resolution points out quite clearly that there has been an underestimate with regard to these works. I merely rose to say or point out to the Government that if Officers of the Department responsible for drawing up estimates come back to this House with reasonable grounds for increases we will readily grant them, but let it be clearly understood that we also expect to have honest estimates in the first instance. In the past there have been times when this House was diffident about

granting supplementary amounts for Capital Works, because the Officer or Draughtsman who prepared the estimates always presented estimates which were rather high, the reason being that he did not want to come back to the House with increases. I say: let us have correct estimates in the first instance, always having the assurance that if the Officer comes back for additional amounts on reasonable grounds, the money will be provided.

I just want to point out to the Department and the Officer concerned that if the House must treat him with respect, he must come forward with correct estimates in the first place.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What worries me, Mr. Chairman, is the extravagantly high cost of these additions. In Item (a) they have to provide some more filling for yard spaces. Originally they were building office blocks at the Pine based on a flat site; after they had selected the site, they had to fill in that space and erect a retaining wall in front. That work costs \$13,000. I do not know what is the area of the building of these office blocks at the Pine, but the amount of \$13,000 for doing this work is high in anybody's money. The reason for my saying that is that you have not got to buy the stuff for filling; you excavate foundations and you have the stuff for filling. What costs the money is the transportation of the stuff to the site to be filled in and then you build your retaining wall. If anybody in Barbados is building a house of one-half or one-quarter of that size, and he had to fill in that proportionate space and spent that proportionate amount of money in doing so, then he could not build the house. It is either that the people who make out these Addenda think that the people in this House are very guillible or they are very stupid. Let us take Item (b).

7.20 p.m.

It was intended to build the mechanical workshop at the Pine out of light steel, but because of the delay in obtaining the steel, they have used reinforced concrete. Then, it is stated that there was an increase in the cost of two sets of 20' high by 20' wide sliding doors and it was found necessary to provide three sunken working and inspection pits, an additional steel frame building for the mechanical hoist, and an extra amount of filling owing to the nature of the site. The additional cost for that is \$17,500.

I can see the reason why they wanted a larger yard and store room for the Public Works Department. The yard and storeroom were extended inside at an additional cost of \$5,000.

Then at the new Courts you incur extra expenditure in preparing the foundations of the vault building where soft ground was found and the additional cost is \$5,000. At the Government Headquarters in Bay Street you needed an outside building for use as a gardener's room. I presume that is for the purpose of storing his tools such as a fork, rake and so on. This room is estimated to cost \$2,500.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, if any of us had to erect a gardener's room of the dimensions of the one there with a small concrete wall to put records in, it would not cost \$2,500. The trouble really is that there is nobody to question these things when they are put up before the Government. Whatever figure is given to them, they accept and they do so in nine out of every ten cases. Obviously, this money must be used for other things than what is put before the House. They would over-spend a vote and say nothing. With the intelligence of the members in this House, would you expect them to believe that these amounts are wanted merely for the items which appear in the Resolution?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to reply to the last honourable member who spoke because I do not think anybody shares his views. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said in his remarks, he thinks a full explanation is given in the Addendum to the Resolution, and to my mind I think a proper account is given for the necessity of these increases of the various items.

As far as the point made by the honourable senior member for St. John is concerned, I would like to assure him that I heartily agree with him. We have been looking around for the past month for some place to house the Old Age Pension Office. I agree that the building in which the staff is housed is almost falling to pieces and there is necessity for proper quarters for them. I want to assure him that as soon as we find a suitable place or area, we would do it.

Mr. ALLDER: I would not suggest that you look around for another place with a view to renting it. I feel the time has come when Government could save money on it by constructing their own building for the purpose.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee and the postponement of one.

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

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded in each case by the Hon. M. E. COX, the three Resolutions were read a first, and second time and agreed to.

7.30 p.m.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED

Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Resolution which was postponed in Committee, it was suggested that a Select Committee be appointed to give further consideration to that Resolution.

I therefore beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Resolution for \$2,000

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following to serve on such a Committee.

The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works; the hon. junior member for Christ Church; the hon. junior member for St. Lucy; the hon. junior member for St. George.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to ask Your Honour to serve on the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not desirous of serving on such a Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: May I ask leave that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew be appointed to serve on the Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew be appointed to the Committee. Unless there be any objection leave will be granted the hon. member.

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

MAGISTRATES BILL C'TD.

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, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I regret that after postponing consideration of Section 68 for legal members of the House who were not present, they are not here. I propose now to deal with that Section which is outstanding.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy has made restrictions about it and that was the chief reason why I postponed consideration so that other members might express their points of view.

I now beg to move that Section 68 stand part. In case the hon. senior member for the City does not know what it is, it is about fingerprints.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I wonder why the Premier said in case I do not know what it is, it is about fingerprints! The only thing about it is that the Premier postponed it in order to give the legal members a chance to discuss it and I was trying to get them in; here comes one, he seems to be limping. Sir, this question deals with the Police taking fingerprints, and I think that the restrictions levelled by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy were to the effect that at least there should be some reservation and that you should not leave it merely to the discretion of the Police Force. If a youngster of around seventeen years is carried in for an offence under the Highway Act, and the Section reads: "where any person not less than fourteen years old 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." Well, I think the restrictions levelled by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy were to the effect that the question of fourteen years was not quite right, and also this should depend on the seriousness of the offence. This is what I should really like to suggest to the Premier; it is not on the legal luminaries, but on him we should depend for the up and coming generation of this country. A youngster of sixteen or seventeen can have a licence. He might commit an offence for which he is carried in; for driving a car without due caution or any driving offence under the Highway Act.

7.40 p.m.

Where you have a Policeman not below the rank of Inspector making any such application, then the fingerprints are taken. I am wondering whether the Hon. Premier with his experience in practising at the Bar, does not think we should have some reservations there and let the Section read: "Any person not below the age of 16 years." This Section was postponed so that the legal members of this House might be able to offer their strictures; if the legal members are offering their strictures on a particular Section, and they do not propose any amendment, then that is not good enough. I would like to hear from the Hon. Premier whether, from his experience the word "offence" in this Section should not be defined. I do not think that this word "offence" should be so broad. I am just making an appeal here; when you say where any person not less than 14 years old who has been taken into custody is charged with an offence" and the Magistrate may, if

he thinks fit on the application of a Police Officer not below the ranks of Inspector order the fingerprints of that person to be taken, I say, it is not good enough to take the fingerprints of a boy of the age of 14 years who has been charged with committing a highway offence.

How many of us at this age of 14 years have not been indiscreet? I suggest to the Hon. Premier that this Section should read "Where any person not below the age of 16 years." Under the Bastardy Act, a man has to support his child up to the age of 16, and that is the age which should be put in this Section. We are here to make laws, it is true, but we also want to see that the Country is properly run. We represent people who have children. A boy who has committed an offence may be rude to the Police and the Magistrate can order that his fingerprints be taken. I am not at all happy about this Section, and I feel sure that the Hon. Premier is not happy about it either.

I repeat; my idea is that this age should be extended and the Section should read "Not below the age of 16." Another thing is this: are you saying that a boy's fingerprints should be taken and kept for eternity? The provision in this Section might have been alright in the past 16 or 20 years, but not today. Under this Section, if a boy steals a piece of cane (which I suppose, many of us have done except those who are paragons of virtue), the Magistrate can order his fingerprints to be taken. I am again appealing to the Hon. Premier to let this Section read: "Not below the age of 16 years of age."

Another point is this: here there is the question of a boy being charged with an offence. I should like to point out that if he is acquitted of the offence, under this Section, you can still take his fingerprints and keep them for eternity. I do not think we should treat the people of this Colony to such indignity.

7.50 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You must give magistrates—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I cannot hear you.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You see, we need a loud-speaker. I was saying that you must give magistrates, however diffident practitioners may feel about it, credit for using their intelligence. What magistrate, if a boy were charged with some trivial offence, would, because a member of the Police Force asked permission to take his fingerprints, give the permission? However, I would not myself object to the using of the same expression "as appears to the officer to be a serious one." If that expression is repeated here, it would mean that unless the boy was charged with something really serious that the magistrate need not do it. I think that amendment would cover the hon. member's point.

I may say that some young boy may go astray. He may go out with a burglar and his fingerprints may be left. The offence being a serious one, it may especially if he thinks that the offence appears to him to be a serious one (note, I am using the same expression as appears in Clause 66) on the application of a member of the Police Force not below the rank of Inspector.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, sometimes it is better to accept small mercies than nothing at all and if the Hon. Premier is willing to put in the Section "where the offence appears to the officer to be a serious one," I think that will be alright.

Now, what about the age of 16 years and not 14 years, I suggest that the age be 16 years because for many years we have been making criticisms against asking a fourteen-year-old boy to come out of school.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the age of 16 years.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let us turn now to subsection 4. The whole Section deals with a person so charged. Sub-section 4 states that where the fingerprints of any person have been taken in pursuance of an order under this Section, then, if he is acquitted, or the examining magistrate determines not to commit him for trial, or if the information against him is dismissed, the fingerprints and all copies and records of them shall be destroyed.

Let us say that a boy is charged at the age of 16 years with an offence and before anything is proved against him you take his fingerprints. I can well imagine the Hon. Premier arguing over that if he were in my position. I do not think that is British. If it is to be before he is convicted, I would say "no"; if it is after he is convicted, I would say "yes". You say: "take the fingerprints," and then if the magistrate acquits him that you will have the fingerprints destroyed. The Hon. Premier knows well enough that in any British country under British law you are considered innocent until you are found guilty. Not only that; we should avoid suspicion of the citizen. We should not allow this sub-section to stay in this Bill. I do not think this corresponds to the traditional way of British justice. May I ask the Hon. Premier what is done in this case in England?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The same thing as in this Bill.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It does not seem right to me. However, Sir, it seems as if the lawyers have abandoned me. It seems to me as if I will have to accept the small mercies offered. It is not much sense in butting my head against a brick wall. All the gentlemen of the long robe have left me to argue this alone and, as I see it, I will continue to argue on this point but will not get any support. The Hon. Premier has graciously agreed that it should be 16 years instead of 14 years and he has introduced another amendment to say that the offence must be of a serious nature.

For your information, I would argue against the provision of the Section where it states that where a person is taken into custody and charged, his fingerprints are taken, and then if he is acquitted the fingerprints and all copies and records of them shall be destroyed. I am saying that when the person is convicted you should then take the fingerprints, not when he is first charged. According to this, the minute a person is arrested you can take the fingerprints.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Not until he is charged with the offence.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes, that is so, but the case may be one where some boy is charged for parking on the wrong side of the road. I am referring to a boy probably going to school at Combermere or Harrison College. It may be, he may be charged with riding without a light attached to his bicycle and coming up against a limb of the law he then refuses to give his name.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member did not understand me rightly. I also agreed that it should only be done if the offence is of a serious nature. It is not done as soon as the youngster is arrested. An application has to be made by a senior officer and he would have to satisfy the Magistrate that the grounds were sufficiently strong,

or the case was of a serious nature to warrant a record of the boy's fingerprints. You cannot record them unless you have a special statute for recording them but if the person is proved innocent, you say you must destroy those fingerprints and all copies and records of them.

8.00 p.m.

You record his fingerprints but if he is proved innocent they must be destroyed. I agree, in the way it must have appeared to the hon. member, that it is not British Justice to convict a man or do any thing which looks as if you believe he is guilty. It was changed in England and became the law because the Police felt later on that if a man persisted in committing crime it would help them to have the fingerprints on record. If I were a magistrate or judge, it would be of great help to have the fingerprints put on record for the future as being of help to police in keeping down crime; and while it is true that barristers must exist, it is necessary to keep down crime.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I still have the layman's point of view to which I have been accustomed, that we have always been able to shout and say with pride about the administration of justice. Anyway I think the first thing I should like to ask is that in line 2 the word "fourteen" be deleted and that "sixteen" be inserted in its place, and in line 4, after the word "think fit" insert "and if the offence appears to be of a serious nature." It seems as if the Premier has made his mind up about the other part and nothing can be done. My own idea is that fingerprints should only be taken after the court had adjudged him guilty of the particular offence if it were a serious offence. If the offence is serious and application is made by the police, then and only then should fingerprints be taken, but certainly not in the case of a boy riding home a Saturday night after being out with the boys and is charged with an offence because he may be rude to some policeman. I know an instance of just a few weeks ago of a boy who was absolutely correct when the police officer asked him where he lived and he replied "Glendairy Prison," but the police arrested him and when a check was made he was really living at Glendairy Prison, but the police thought it was a joke. If nobody had come to his rescue, it would have been considered rude and next morning he would be in Court; he might have been rude or he might have considered the Police so foolish that he may have struggled away; and as has been argued by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, as soon as you touch a policeman or resist arrest the policeman may consider it of a serious nature and take his fingerprints. That is not so nice for a youngster. I agree you should take the fingerprints of criminals and protect us from them. Anyway, I do not think I can argue any more, but I hope he will accept the amendment and give some protection to the children, who, I think, may find themselves in difficulty through this.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, Section 68 deals with the taking of fingerprints of persons now from the age of sixteen and upwards who have been charged before a magistrate with a serious offence. That is what I understand the Government has accepted; and the fingerprints may be taken on application of a police officer not below the rank of inspector. I would like to know under what authority fingerprints are taken at present because sub-clause 3 says: "The provision of this Section shall be in addition to those of any other enactment under which fingerprints may be taken." And this is only to be found in the Police Magistrates' Act. I really cannot find it in any other Acts, and not being a policeman I do not know the authority,

and I doubt the honourable member knows himself. Fingerprints do not prove anything anyhow, because the usual method of taking fingerprints is to put some powder on the paper on which the accused person has made an impression with his thumb and then a photograph is taken of that. Then, when they want to prove that the fingerprints compare with the fingerprints at the scene of the crime, all they have to do is to take another fingerprint or thumb print off the same paper on which the accused person has made an impression. It is the most flimsy evidence anyone could produce in Court. It is very simple and I defy anyone to prove when they produce these prints, when, where, and how the two photographs can be taken. Fortunately, you do not have to deal with fingerprint evidence much in the Criminal Courts of this Island, because everybody recognises it is the kind of evidence which is capable of being manufactured without any difficulty at all; but there is not one provision in Section 68—and I am sure that honourable members will forgive me if I do not expatiate on the provisions of Clause 68, Sections 1, 2 and 3, because the various points have been adequately dealt with by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for the City but when you come to sub-Clause 4 which says: "Where the fingerprints of any person have been taken in pursuance of an order under this section, then, if he is acquitted, or the examining magistrate determines not to commit him for trial, or if the information against him is dismissed, the fingerprints and all copies and records of them shall be destroyed," that is not good enough because you have demanded in sub-clause 2 that the fingerprints should be taken preferably in the presence of the Magistrate. Therefore it is my humble submission that the fingerprints ought to be destroyed then and there in the presence of the Magistrate, because they should bring the fingerprints and all copies and record into the Court. Of course, we members of the profession know that once your fingerprints are taken in Barbados they never leave the files at all. I do not agree that they should be taken; and I can challenge the Acting Commissioner of Police to come in Court and swear on oath that they do not destroy them. We all know they do not destroy them. The fingerprints when taken should be taken in the presence of the Magistrate and initialed by him and produced in Court in evidence only if they bear the signature of the Magistrate before whom they were taken. It is very, very simple: and they can always keep a copy on the files. They have an index system over there, they have photographs next to the fingerprints, and they can always get them off the file to use against the person accused of an offence. If it does not bear the signature of the Magistrate to prove those were the fingerprints taken in Court, the Magistrate will then be able to check on the number of copies which he initialed and make sure the same number of copies were destroyed in Court, so that if on a subsequent occasion they produced a photograph that was found on a windowsill or a pocket book and it does not bear the signature of the Magistrate, that would be right out of Court.

8.10 p.m.

I think that in Sub-Clause (4) of this Clause, words should be added to the effect that the fingerprints and copies and records of them shall be destroyed in the presence of the Police Magistrate who has tried the offence. What happens now is this: they take fingerprints, under what authority I am not particularly clear. I was never interested to find

out that authority because they never tried it with me.

The thing about practising in the Law Courts, is that you are not supposed to know everything, like the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seems to think, but you are to be able to look for things, and apply them intelligently when they apply. If I have never taken the trouble to find out under what authority they take fingerprints, it is because I have never been interested in the matter. They never take any fingerprints in the presence of the Police Magistrate today; there is an unwritten rule that if the fingerprints of a person have been taken, that person is entitled to go to the Criminal Investigation Department and inform the prosecuting Inspector or Superintendent that he would like his fingerprints destroyed. If we pass this Clause as it is now, the position is that all the Police Inspector or Superintendent has to do is to tell a person that his fingerprints have been destroyed, and the person who has been acquitted would not be in a position to say "yea" or "nay," because there is no provision which demands that the fingerprints shall be destroyed in the presence of the accused person or in the presence of the Magistrate who has tried the case. If the accused person is not represented by Counsel, he is just chased out of the premises with the remarks that he is lucky—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member, I quite agree with the principle which he has enunciated; but he should, through the Bar Council, bring the matter to the notice of the Judicial Advisory Council, which under Section 161 of this Bill, has the power to make rules providing, among other things, for the practice and procedure of Magistrates in exercising functions preliminary or incidental to proceedings before them. In these rules, it can be laid down that fingerprints are to be destroyed in the presence of the Magistrate, and they should be destroyed. It is better to do that than to put in that provision in the substantive part of the Section.

Mr. BARROW: This is one of the rare occasions on which the Hon. Premier has attempted to make a contribution without launching into a philippic at first. I am rather surprised that he should suggest that something should be put into one of the rules which, according to Section 161, the Judicial Council is empowered to make in respect of certain things. Under Part X of this Bill "Miscellaneous," you have Section 161 (1) which reads as follows:—

161. (1) The Judicial Advisory Council established under section forty-one of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956 may make rules for regulating and prescribing the procedure and practice to be followed in proceedings before a magistrate, and, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, such rules may make provision as to—

- (a) the practice and procedure of magistrates in exercising functions preliminary or incidental to proceedings before them;
- (b) the service and execution of process issued for the purposes of any proceeding before a magistrate;
- (c) the keeping of records of proceedings before magistrates and the manner in which things done in the course of, or as preliminary or incidental to, any such proceedings, or any proceedings on appeal from magistrates, may be proved in any legal proceedings;

- (d) the functions of clerks for the purpose of securing the attendance of persons bound over conditionally by examining magistrates to attend a trial on indictment;
- (e) the furnishing of copies of depositions, and of the information (if it is in writing) to a person committed for trial;
- (f) which magistrate shall have jurisdiction to hear any complaint;
- (g) the matters additional to those specified in section seventy-four of this Act on complaint for which a magistrate shall have power to make an order with the consent of the defendant without hearing evidence.
- (h) any matter which by this Act is stated to be prescribed.

Nowhere in this Section do you have any provision in the Judicial Advisory Council to give to the Magistrate the power of supervising the destruction of documents, which power is inherent in the Police Department. Surely then, there would be some argument as to the authority within the province of the Police Magistrate and the Commissioner of Police. I do not know if it is because of the logic of the amendment which I have suggested has appealed to the hon. member and against his better judgment or his dead body, which phases are being used all the time. When something appeals to legislators on the basis of logic, still the rash statements which they have made in the past prevent them from following the logical course.

I suggest that since we have made it clear that the fingerprints must be taken in the presence of the Police Magistrate, then, of course, the Judicial Advisory Council can say that the Police Magistrate should initial those fingerprints when they are so taken, but we also want to ensure that the provision is put in the main body of the Bill itself, that the destruction of these fingerprints takes place in the presence of the Police Magistrate himself.

The point which I was making when I was interrupted by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is this: the procedure to-day, is that when a person goes into the Criminal Investigation Department as an acquitted person, and the request is made that his fingerprints be destroyed, they either tell him: "You are lucky to get off, and get out of here," or they will tell him: "We have destroyed them," or "We will destroy them." But there is no provision whereby the Police Magistrate has power to go to the Police Department to see whether the fingerprints have been destroyed or not.

Since the hon. member agrees in principle, I not *in toto*, with the observations which I have made in respect of Sub-Clause (4) of this Clause then I see no reason for not inserting the provision right here in this Clause.

8.20 p.m.

Because when we come to Section 161, we cannot bring a "mandamus" against the Judicial Advisory Council, the power that has authority to make such a regulation. If they have power to make it, the power under Section 161 is a discretionary one and not a mandatory one. Under Section 161, the Judicial Advisory Council is "allowed".... They do not have to, and it may be something like fifty years before we get any provision inserted which we want inserted.

Sir, I will give you an illustration. Sometime in 1937 we brought into force officially the Food

and Drugs Act and in the Act itself, the Director of Agriculture or the Executive Committee was given the power to make regulations stating what should be considered as pure milk. That is some twenty years ago and it has not been done up to today. The General Board of Health has wide powers to make regulations for the carrying out of the provisions of the law but that Board has been most neglectful in the exercise of the powers which are given it. The result is growing slums. When you give a subsidiary body discretionary powers, from my experience in Barbados, it seems to sit down and do nothing. That is the position; that is the only reason and it is not with reluctance that I have acknowledged the fact that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is becoming more amenable to reason. It is because of the sad experience which we all have had in matters relating to regulations and subsidiary legislation in that the authorities whom such things are put in charge of never take the trouble at all unless some specific thing causes them to make any regulations.

My suggestion therefore, is that the fingerprints should be destroyed in the presence of the Police Magistrate and not elsewhere. You should not try to maintain the ridiculous situation which now exists of a discharged or acquitted person going to the C.I.D. and being told that they have destroyed his fingerprints. I know that if they destroy some, they do not destroy all, so the documents remain to be used against the particular person if he happens to become within the toils of the law on a future occasion.

Apart from those remarks, I do not think I have anything else useful to contribute on this matter. I have already spoken on the other clauses.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, allow me just to make a few remarks. I am unhappy about the Bill which is before the House and I will be very pleased if the Hon. Premier would give me a patient hearing and then satisfy me to some extent, whether or not I am wrong. Is this what we should expect with the type of reform in advanced countries such as ours and in some other Colonies? I refer to the type of legislation which we have in this Bill. It does not look like what we have had. I believe it is your intention to remove those ugly strictures which are likely to have an undesirable effect on our people.

As regards the Clause dealing with whipping boys between the ages of seven and 14 years, I am hoping that the Hon. Premier would explain or satisfy me that I am wrong in my view about it. That Clause has given me some concern and has left me to some extent unsatisfied about it. Long gone is the age where the Government hopes to subdue its natives by flogging and I am yet to understand the motive why it is reasonable to apply it in modern legislation. Now, let us examine if the idea of flogging youngsters is correct. With the type of reform which is now preached, can you achieve it by flogging? What effect is flogging likely to have on a boy between the ages of 7 and 17 years?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which section are you dealing with now?

Mr. MILLER: I am dealing with the Sections of the Bill which have made me a bit unhappy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which section are you dealing with now?

Mr. MILLER: I happened to be outside of the House when the major part of this Bill was dealt with. I am appealing to the Hon. Premier to satisfy me on some parts of the Bill. I am not asking for the recommitment of any particular section; I am asking for some latitude.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will have to ask for re-committal of the sections which you want to speak on. That is the only way you can get some latitude.

Mr. MILLER: I do not want to waste the time of the House. I am asking for some latitude.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of Order.

Mr. MILLER: I do not want to ask for re-committal of any section. I am asking you to exercise some discretion. All I want to say is that the Bill has not been accepted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of Order.

Mr. MILLER: I believe, Mr. Chairman, you would allow me—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow you. What Clause do you want to deal with?

Mr. MILLER: This is an awkward position. I am a bit reluctant to do so. I am only asking you to look at the Bill and hear me. I am unhappy about the taking of fingerprints of youngsters and I am particularly unhappy about the question of appeal to the Supreme Court. I am not working up any fury. I think this is a stage in our development when the Hon. Premier would be willing to hear the humble appeal of a layman who sees something awkward in the development of the country relating to this Bill. This is the type of legislation that one would expect to see in Africa. As I read the Bill I somewhat saw the shackles and heard the clank of them in the prison.

The whole attempt of this move is to suppress debate. Do you want to rob a Member of Parliament of saying what is national feeling and development in your attempt to ridicule? The flogging of a child is something that has been abolished. Is this Government really agreeing to the flogging of a child?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of Order.

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking on the question of fingerprints.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of Order.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of Order. I am not entertaining it.

Mr. MILLER: Can I deal with any section of the Bill, or am I not expected to speak on it? Would you kindly tell me what section of the Bill you want me to deal with?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Section 68.

Mr. MILLER: Can I deal with any section of the Bill? Am I allowed to speak? With your kind permission will you tell me on what section I will be allowed to speak?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you carry on I shall have to rule you out of Order.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, can I ask you to permit me some latitude on Section 68, not already passed by this Chamber?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can stay the whole night on Section 68.

Mr. MILLER: Can I speak on Section 130, part 9 on Appeals? Can I spend an hour on that, or must I take the whole night on that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is making sport.

Mr. MILLER: I am not, Sir. You are putting legislation on the Statute Book, that could throw seven-eighths of the people in prison; and that is not what should happen in a civilised country. All I am asking for is some latitude on this. The lawyers are not particularly interested in it, because it prob-

ably means some fees; but I am not happy that we should hurry it through. We have already spent three days on it and if we want to be critical on this Bill you know it can take four weeks of the Assembly's business. With this Bill there has been the usual talking and railroading. You are not likely to have much legislation of this type because it provides hunting ground for the lawyers, and I appeal to you and it is in your place to give me some latitude to speak on it. I am unhappy about the Bill and about fingerprints, and what I want to say is that it has not yet passed this Chamber but you seem to be so rash with me; I do not know if you are hungry or if you feel . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have to rule you out of Order and ask you to take your seat.

Mr. MILLER: Can I enjoy the freedom of this Chamber to get up again?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, on Section 68 in connection with fingerprints, my objection to the taking of them at all in respect of a non-convicted person is that it would be very difficult for the layman to know whether what is purported to be destroyed—that is, the copies and records of fingerprints—are really the actual fingerprints which have been taken. Nothing could be more important than for people to satisfy themselves that what the Police pretend to destroy are in truth and in fact the fingerprints and copies and records of them of the person who has not been convicted, and in any event another point arises; whether before the destruction of such copies and records you can be assured that there are no photostatic copies made of them; because if that is so, there will be very little difference if the copies and records are destroyed if they keep photostatic copies of them. I would tell you from experience in practising in the Criminal Court, even now (I do not know under what legislative authority they do so) they invite you to have your fingerprints taken when you are arrested and if you are a person of a certain intelligence, you know they have no authority and you decline to take the invitation; but when you accept the invitation and the case ends in your favour, there is to be this destruction of the copies or what purports to be the copies and records. If the case is at District "E" and the fingerprints were taken at that Station by some member of the C.I.D., when the case is over and you go back for the copies they tell you they do not have them and that you have to go to Bridgetown. Sometimes when you go to the C.I.D. in Bridgetown they usually tell you they cannot find them; and it means that some poor person has to take time off from work and has to go to town and back in order to get the copies, only eventually to be presented with something which you are told are the fingerprints taken. I understand that the honourable and learned member for St. George has suggested that the person himself or herself should be allowed to initial the copies and they would be assured that what they are getting back are the actual copies and records which were taken from them. [A VOICE: He said the Magistrate should initial them.] I am corrected that he said the Magistrate should initial them. Certainly, Sir, some sort of safeguard is needed in the case of unconvicted persons. I do not know whether this is copied from any English Legislation and it would be interesting if the Premier would let us know if that is so, because if this is, as the honourable senior member for St. George has suggested, merely a copy of some legislation which is practised in Trinidad or Kenya or anywhere else, I do not see we have any need to copy it. Sir, I do not think it would be fair to you, although you were patient and tolerant to continue this discussion any longer until you have had your repast and whatever accompanies it, and

I beg that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MILLER: 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.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House for three-quarters of an hour. 8.35 p.m.

MAGISTRATES' BILL C'TD.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee on the 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 resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was speaking.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I had completed my point; concisely as usual [*Laughter*.]

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion when we discussed this Clause 68 of this Bill, apprehension was expressed by a few members in respect of the provision for the taking of fingerprints. I shall read the clause so as to refresh the minds of hon. members. It reads as follows:—

68. (1) 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.

(2) Fingerprints taken in pursuance of an order under this section shall be taken either at the place where the magistrate is sitting or, if the person to whom the order relates is remanded in custody; at any use reasonable force as may be necessary for that purpose.

(3) The provisions of this section shall be in addition to those of any other enactment under which fingerprints may be taken.

(4) Where the fingerprints of any person have been taken in pursuance of an order under this section, then, if he is acquitted, or the examining magistrate determines not to commit him for trial, or if the information against him is dismissed, the fingerprints and all copies and records of them shall be destroyed.

While I agree that in respect of certain serious crimes which have been committed, fingerprints should be taken . . . [*Pause*]. Mr. Chairman, I am informed by the Clerk that the points which I wanted to raise have already been raised, and that the Government has accepted the suggestions which have been made.

The question that Clause 68 as amended 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. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION "THE EXPORTATION (DRAWBACK OF DUTIES ON CYLINDERS CONTAINING LOCALLY MANUFACTURED GASES) REGULATIONS"

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The exportation (Drawback of Duties on Cylinders containing locally Manufactured Gases) Regulations, 1955.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that on the last occasion in June, this year, when I attempted to deal with this Resolution, Your Honour ruled that the Regulations to which the Resolution refers, and which were laid on the table of the House during the previous Session, should again be laid on the table before I could deal with this Resolution. These Regulations were duly laid and this Resolution is to give effect to such Regulations.

The Addendum sets out the position quite clearly. As hon. members are aware, this industry was given pioneer status, and exporters in the industry were also granted a drawback on duties paid on cylinders when they were re-exported. It was represented by the industry that the duties paid on these cylinders when they came into the island amounted to more than what was charged, in the majority of cases, for filling them, and it would be an encouragement to the industry if this drawback were given. In accordance with the application, this drawback was given to the industry. These Regulations were made in order effectively to control the refund of duties paid on these cylinders, and this Resolution is to give sanction to these Regulations. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as far as I see, these Regulations are absolutely necessary if you expect a new industry to thrive. It is a well known fact that we import cylinder cases from Trinidad, and I gather that they have similar regulations in Trinidad: otherwise the industry would not thrive. These cylinders are like empty bottles: the gas is used, and the bottles are returned. You can see the schooners taking these cylinders back to Trinidad. I understand that they intend to ship oxygen to the smaller islands, and the authorities are pressing for these Regulations to be made law.

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

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION THE "CUSTOMS (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS BULK STORAGE) REGULATIONS"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to sanction

the "Customs (Petroleum Products Bulk Storage) Regulations, 1955."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In connection with this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, as is set out in the Addendum, the Petroleum Regulations, 1936, and the Petroleum (Amendment) Regulations, 1937, which are made under the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, specifically refer to the Bulk Storage installation at Spring Garden. As has happened in the case of the Esso Standard Oil Company, if any such Oil Company applies to the Government to have Bulk Storage Installations, we have to bring down Regulations afresh. We feel that the procedure should be simplified, and in order to give effect to that proposal, we have brought down these Regulations. The proposal is, that whenever a new Bulk installation constructed, instead of coming down here with fresh Regulations under a new name, we will simply list the installations in a Schedule; otherwise these Regulations do not depart from the general lines of the former Regulations.

In accordance with Section 2 of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, the Legislature must give approval of these Regulations, and it is in accordance with the Act that this Resolution sanctioning these Regulations has been brought before this House. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the consideration of Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business having been concluded, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION TO MAKE ADVANCES TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that I introduced a Resolution earlier today dealing with increased advances to the Postmaster General. I am now asking leave to deal with this Resolution, before the consideration of Private Members' Business is begun.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: In connection with this Resolution, hon members will see that in 1955, the House agreed to increase the amounts advanced to the Postmaster General from time to time to a sum not exceeding \$800,000 to enable him to pay money orders. The view was expressed at the time by some hon. members that at least these sums should have amounted to \$2,000,000. As the Addendum to this Resolution points out:—

"The Postmaster General has reported that during the period January — July, 1956, the total money order payments amounted to \$1,524,870 as compared with \$1,636,643 for the year 1955, and that during the first seven months period of this year British Postal Orders alone amounted to \$848,326. With the steady increase in money order remittances each month it is anticipated that the three million dollar mark (\$3,000,000) will be reached by the end of the current year.

The Postmaster General has recommended therefore that the amount authorised to be advanced for the payment of money orders should be increased to \$1,500,000 and this Resolution is to provide the necessary authority."

9.15 p.m.

It is hardly necessary, Mr. Speaker, to comment at length on this, but it can be seen from the remittances which are coming back here, both from the United Kingdom and the United States, that it is absolutely necessary to increase the authorised advance for the payment of these money orders when they arrive; therefore, this Resolution seeks to give the Accountant General the authority to advance to the Postmaster General a sum not exceeding \$1,500,000.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I notice the business of the Post Office has increased considerably and it seems as if Tom, Dick and Harry are sending back quite a lot of money. What I will like to tell the Government now is that it seems as if the employment gaps in England are becoming closed; but that does not mean that you cannot get a couple more thousands of our population there if you make regulations and loans more easily available.

This is what I want to throw out to the Government. Tell those members of the Select Committee who select student nurses to be less embarrassing and more co-operative to the Government in getting some more of our unemployed young women out of the colony. It is just this morning that two of them came to me and complained. The questions which they are asked are really too embarrassing, although the work which they were given to do was reasonably done. Whoever the members of that Committee are (I do not know them), I am just throwing it out to the Government to let them know that we do not want to make it too difficult for people who cannot get employment in the island to go overseas if the opportunity is there for them to go. I am saying that the stipulations put up for student nurses are greater by the local Select Committee than by the Hospital authorities in England. It is a waste of time for us to permit these handicaps to be maintained. They can only do greater harm to the colony.

Sir, I am proud to see that you have to give to the Postmaster General a sum of money like what you are asking in this Resolution, because it shows that the traffic has become considerably swollen. It is only an indication to show the Government that it does not matter where a suggestion may come from, so long as it is constructive, do not refuse to work on it.

The Government had to be threatened so as to get them to decide to give assistance to the couple of dozen persons who have been able to get to England; and it is a bad reflection on the name of a Socialist Government which realises that this community is over populated and unemployment is too great, when private individuals every other day can be telling the world how many individuals they have been instrumental in getting out of this colony. Were it not for the efforts of private individuals, many of our young girls and boys would not have been able to leave the colony. It is a fact that they have succeeded in getting out a larger number than that which the Government has helped. I have also been told that when the Government sees advertisements in the *Advocate* about girls going to Canada and England to do nursing through the help of these private individuals that the Government becomes embarrassed. I am told that members of the Government have even suggested to the Labour Department not to give that measure of co-operation to those girls who have been sent there by certain private individuals. That is something which this Government should not do.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I have given the honourable member a lot of latitude.

A VOICE: He is telling lies.

Mr. ALLDER: Let the honourable member get up and deny that. I am only warning the Government to stop that. Everybody knows and the so-called Minister of Labour knows that we on this side of the Table have had to fight a hard battle to force his hands.

A VOICE: Fight for what?

Mr. ALLDER: We had to fight the Government, and the Hon. Minister of Labour had to be sent for at Government House to discuss the matter with us. At that time the Hon. Premier said that not one Tom, Dick and Harry could get Government money to go there. Let the Hon. Premier get up and deny that and we can summon the Head of the Administration to prove that. They can sneer: but the fact remains the Ministers of the Government are so oblivious to proper suggestions that they had to be put on the cross before they decided to give any assistance.

Now I have heard them taking the praise of people having left the colony. The next time they try to take the praise—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not speaking on the subject of this Resolution.
9.25 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, before emigration started from this island to the Mother Country you did not have to ask for any additional funds to accommodate the Postal Department and it is a fact that if you did not have it, you would not be handling Resolution like this.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member fails to see he is dealing with a subject not now under discussion. Can he possibly fail to see that? Does he want to impress me that he thinks otherwise?

Mr. ALLDER: I do not know, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, the honourable member has been speaking that way for the greater part of his speech.

Mr. ALLDER: However, Sir, I would still like Government to do its utmost to see and realise that this opportunity might not pass our way again and therefore we should try to make as much of the opportunity as we can. If we miss this now, Sir, we might have to wait until another war comes before the condition is created overseas for an emigration scheme of the magnitude which now exists there.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: A Resolution of this nature.....

Mr. ALLDER: I am not finished speaking, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: A Resolution of this nature, Sir, is always very gratifying because for so long we have lived in this country, and not until just over the past three years, I would say, we have seen anything over the three-figure mark dealing with postal orders and remittances from the United Kingdom. It is therefore very gratifying to find, especially to us in the Opposition that our labours and speeches were not in vain when we pressed for a scheme to help these people migrate to the United Kingdom. What the Addendum to the Resolution says makes it more gratifying: "The Postmaster General has reported that during the period January—July, 1956, the total money order payments amounted to \$1,524,870 as compared with \$1,636,643 for the year 1955, and that during the first seven months' period of this year British Postal Orders alone amounted to \$848,828." That is indeed gratifying, for over all the period of years that Barbados, which has been under British rule, at no time in its history never got remittances of that magnitude from the United Kingdom. It might have been so with people who went to the Panama Canal or Cuba or the United States of America, but today it is England. Today whatever efforts were made by the

Government to assist these people to go to England and work are paying dividends. It is not asking too much from this indication that Government should certainly do more to assist people in going to England. The Addendum goes on to say: "it is anticipated that the three million-dollar mark will be reached by the end of the current year." Those of us who know our Barbados and Barbadians, know that few Barbadians who leave this country and work for money will not send back some to help his family or set up a home in this country for his future. That is where we are getting the dividends on the money spent on any system of emigration. While it is true what the honourable member said about the rumours that the Government has been attempting to stay in the way of persons going outside of the Government scheme to England, I am not saying whether it is true or not today. They will hear rumours and it is their duty to try and make clear the position to the public and say it is not true. I have had an occasion, and I said this before, of obstacles being put in the way of people who wanted to go, not directly by the Minister but by Government. The tendency by Government in lending money for girls who want to go to get jobs in England is to say that somebody outside must sign the bond, and I have often had to ask: "For God's sake, if the girl's father, although he may be a carpenter or mason and has land, provided he has something, can sign, why set these obstacles?" And I have absolute proof for this by saying you have got to bring somebody beside your father. To me it is stupid; because if the father can offer security, who can be a better security than the father? Quite recently, reading an Australian Journal, I saw that Canadians and Englishmen are leaving by the thousands and going to Australia; therefore, there is no difficulty for our boys and girls going there to find work. Englishmen are leaving England for Australia and New Zealand and are making room for our boys and girls: so there is no fear that it is going to come to an end. They are being assisted in Australia and New Zealand with money for the agriculture of land; and even Barbadian people are becoming jealous and seeking ways to get to Australia and New Zealand. A lot of people are leaving for these countries because they want to go in for practical farming. There is going to be no difficulty: and we should take this opportunity, especially where we see here that for the first seven months of the year the total payments amounted to \$1,524,870. I think it was for the last two years \$80,000 as against \$848,828 which means that this emigration is paying off great dividends. When Barbadians send money back home to help their families you get everything circulating. I suggested once before that what the honourable member said about there being so many obstacles is true. Although it might not be by design, obstacles have been put in the way of these people, because (a) they have to go through Government channels and (b) if Government decide to lend them a proportion of money and the father has to sign, they must bring a stranger. That is unnecessary. The father can sign as well as anybody else, and to my way of thinking it is absolute nonsense. Let the fathers or the uncles sign, but for God's sake do not ask them to get somebody outside.

The next point which has been raised and which is going to be an election issue and not just a case of words, is the dividends which are paying off here. When you come to think that in less than three years nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ million come back which go to pay off passages, one wonders whether Government could not have decided to approach the West Indian Navigation Company after consultation with the smaller Islands and see whether they could by some means, charter the boat and reduce the passages of these

people and bring it to around \$200. That would be a sound proposition to put up because we still have another 20,000 people who could go and settle in England. Our economy can carry it, and the families will benefit, as this Resolution indicates today, by the remittances which come back through the Post Office, the majority of which finds itself in the general circulation of the economy of the Island.

9.35 p.m.

I have discovered that the majority of this money which is coming back to the Island now is not finding itself in the general circulation of the economy of this Island; this money is coming back for the repayment of passages. I am wondering what is the position of the Government in this matter. These people will repay their passage money; there are not going to be any defaulters. I would say this; even if there were to be any defaulters, look at the dividends here tonight! Motor car, house, cow, every thing is sold so that these people can get out to England and work for a living. When the passages are liquidated to some extent, then this money will get into circulation. Therefore, we have very great pleasure in supporting a Resolution of this nature, especially when the Postmaster General says that these money order remittances will soon reach the three million dollar mark with the steady increase in these remittances each month.

I am suggesting that you should find a way in getting together with the smaller islands in conference, as a result of which you can obtain a reduction in the cost of the passages of these intended emigrants; because if this money is going in the repayment of passages, the bulk of it is going to the Italian people. I consider that arrangements should be made for a reduction in the cost of passages; if you think of the Regional Economic Committee, and so on, you can think of the man power which we have to offer. At this stage, I do suggest to the Government that they should consider ways and means of reducing the cost of passages to England; I also suggest that they should put down some money so that, after your Panel or Committee has made investigations, and you have discovered that people can find work and are ready to go out, you can make an advance to them. I say that this is such a strong investment, that there is absolutely nothing wrong even if you pay the cost of these passages and you do not get it back.

All the people who are going to England, are finding work; therefore let us reduce the cost of the passage by having a Conference with the other islands in connection with this matter of transport. The Government can sit by and become the fourth partner. I want to say that in this matter, the members of the Opposition will have the satisfaction that we have made the Government realise that people would go to England even if they had to sell their houses etc., in order to work for their families.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on the 21st December last year, the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Resolution, brought before us a similar Resolution; and I think he received the same reception which he is now receiving; that is, a whole-hearted expression of the pleasure of the whole House, as to the favourable result of the Emigration Scheme, particularly with respect to the United Kingdom. I remember at the time, that one or two hon. members said that while they were glad to hear that permission was being sought for the Postmaster General to have at his disposal what then looked like the very large sum of \$800,000 they felt that within a short time the Government

would have to come back here for an increase and tonight the Hon. Minister of Communications has come back and is asking us to increase this amount to \$1,500,000. Again, Mr. Speaker, the amount is going to be more than that, as we have been told here in the Addendum to this Resolution that it is anticipated that the three million dollar mark will be reached by the end of the current year.

9.45 p.m.

It is unnecessary to remind the Government as to how fruitful has been the Opposition in this House in bringing to pass this favourable situation. Whoever is entitled to have any claims to this favourable position, at least they on that side have no claim to it. There must be a spark of consciousness left with them, Your Honour, which will prevent them through modesty from claiming any great share or indeed any share at all in the migration projects which have become so fruitful.

However, I am wondering if the time has not come for the Minister and his Colleagues to revise the whole policy of granting advances to the Postmaster General and find some way in which they can so subscribe to the public funds while at the same time they can give him the flexibility which he wishes without it becoming necessary for them every few months to authorise the Accountant General to give him an increase advance: because it is a fact that the more people that go to England and the more fruitful employment they find, the more remittances will come in. I do hope something will be arrived at whereby the Postmaster General will be given authority on a wider basis so as to save the trouble and time of coming to the House every few months.

My next point is this. Your Honour will have noticed that of these large sums which are coming back to this Island in remittances that the major part of them are already earmarked for their payment of Government loans. That means, as the hon. member has drawn to our notice, the repayment of the passage money so that even if \$2 million comes back from Great Britain, a large part of that is already earmarked for the repayment of loans, not only to Government, but to private people. Welcome as it is, we cannot even say that the relatives and dependents of those people are benefiting to the fullest possible extent. I am wondering if Government realises this, if it would not like to modify its policy so as to enable people to get out with greater ease. It is a dismal thing to mention this, but I think it is important. If I may give an instance, a person has to pay \$5 or \$6 just to get a bond drawn up so as to get money from the Government. Even that, I think you can spare them. In the summer months when persons are leaving for the United Kingdom, surely it is not necessary to put them to the expense of getting winter clothing when in these months the winter is still a long way off. I understand that there is this necessary precaution against migrants arriving in winter without winter clothing. Surely in the summer months when they are going, it is not necessary to burden them with that expense because they would arrive in England within four or five months of the winter season and that will be time enough for them to get as much money as to acquire winter clothing.

I am wondering if the process could not be somewhat speeded up by the relaxation of the rule which exists that intending migrants must prove that they are first going into a job before they can qualify for a loan. While it is true that each migrant would prefer to have assurance of work before he leaves here, everybody knows that there is relatively little difficulty in finding work

up to now in England. Even with the changes taking place in British industry through the introduction of automation and the changing techniques in factories, yet the unemployment which exists in England is not unemployment due to the fact that work cannot be found but due to technological changes. It is also true that if large numbers of our people crowd themselves for psychological reasons near each other, there is bound to be in those places where they crowd themselves the resulting housing shortage; but if they spread themselves over the whole country, the housing shortage need not occur. I am principally interested in getting things speeded up so that more people would get the opportunity of going to England. If you keep in touch with these matters, you will be interested to know that from the latest statistics it appears that between 60,000 and 100,000 people in England leave Great Britain every year as emigrants to the Dominions. The figure is really 75,000. We seldom get more than 15,000 West Indians from the whole Caribbean area going there so that you will see that man for man, population for population, that at no stage we (I mean West Indians) are overcrowding Great Britain. I think that if this Government realises, as I hope it will, that more Englishmen are leaving England than West Indians are going there, it should take every opportunity to see that more of our people will go.

While I am on this point, Your Honour will be interested to know or to recall that sometime ago (I think it was last year) our Government did make arrangements for a pilot scheme of domestic servants or girls to be trained in domestic science to go to the United Kingdom under the auspices of the National Institute of Hotel Workers. I do not recall whether we have been told anything about them or how well they have done, but the Institute with which I have been in correspondence wrote to say that as a result of that experiment and I quote: "We are in correspondence with the Barbadian Government over the future of the Scheme in the light of the experiment and we are too hoping that we would be able to continue our co-operation on perhaps a slightly different basis." Surely the Government and the Hon. Minister of Labour will say whether they propose to send more of our girls and what that slightly different basis is because the getting of our women and girls there is a very important thing.

It is for these reasons that I am glad of this Resolution. The remittances indicate that there is an increasing number of our people in the United Kingdom. They indicate that there should be no talk about the anti-honesty of our Barbadian folk. When it is borne in mind that they are sending back between \$1½ or \$2 million, it shows that they have put more money into circulation in the few months that they have been there than has been done in all these years. Therefore they have strengthened to some slight extent the economy of the Island, in a way in which the Government has not yet done. I hope that the time will come when we will hear that between \$5 million and \$6 million is what the Postmaster General is using to clear postal orders. It is even more welcomed when we hear that that large amount is going into the pockets, not of the shipping people and of the Accountant General, but in the pockets of the families and friends and members of those people. That will be a welcome day.

10.05 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: There has never been an occasion when a Resolution of this kind comes before this Chamber that I have not stressed the necessity-

and I do it again now—for Government favourably and sympathetically to consider granting of the full amount which is needed, instead of the amount which is computed at three-quarters or two-thirds of the minimum amount required for persons who are about to go to the United Kingdom in search of work. Even if at an early stage Government felt it would be unwise or unbusinesslike or economically perilous to do so, now, Mr. Speaker, they should be convinced that there is no justification for causing those people who want to go from here to the United Kingdom to have to pawn or pledge or borrow or encumber what small property they have in order to raise the minimum amount. They must have to qualify for a Government loan and which is the minimum essential for them to migrate under reasonable conditions. When you have, as you do now in this Addendum before us, that this amount is required in order to provide for the payment by the Post Office of these very considerable amounts which are coming back as a result of the emigration to the United Kingdom, surely, Government can see they will be taking on unreasonable risk, (but a risk which Lloyds would take) in lending the full amount: as it is almost a certainty that they will get it back. It may be said, Sir, that the people are going, notwithstanding the fact that they have to raise some of their own, but if Government is sympathetic, it is our duty to help these people so that they would not have to go to the extreme to raise the amount to meet the minimum sum which is required. Therefore, I suggest the time has come for Government to reconsider; and in every case where it is obvious that the person cannot find the full amount, to lend them all so that they do not have to sell their last rags or their shedroof in order to raise the amount to complete the sum which is necessary for them to go to the United Kingdom in search of work. As to the bond, Sir, that is really an interesting point to which the hon. senior member for the City has referred. The belief is that that amount goes to pay the Queen's Solicitor's fee for preparing the bond. If that is so, the job to-day is certainly a lucrative one; but that is only an argument for making the post of Queen's Solicitor a whole-time post like the Solicitor General's. As I said when I raised the matter in this Chamber some time ago, there is no excuse any longer for the Queen's Solicitor not to be a whole-time post, and it does not look well in Court seeing the Queen's Solicitor appearing on one side and the Solicitor General on the other side of the case as we saw not very long ago,—but that is a slight digression for which I am grateful to Your Honour. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown who is a keen businessman—in Bridgetown, let alone in this Chamber—has given food for thought. The West Indian Governments bought the "Wingsang"—the "West Indian" as it is now called. One presumes the West Indian Governments might get together persons of like minds and who have people to go to England: and either this boat should be used, or a liner should be chartered to take people from this island to the United Kingdom. That must work out cheaper to them; and the very least the Government should do if the idea has never occurred to them until the suggestion was made in this Chamber by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, is to give it some consideration and contact certain firms who are agents for liners and find out what it would cost to charter a liner for that purpose, if it is felt that the "West Indian" is too small and uncomfortable to make it profitable and useful to send boat loads of emigrants by that boat to the United Kingdom. They should also bear in mind that if the like-

ly date of departure from the United Kingdom is widely known, likewise people from England finding difficulty in getting a boat and held up there indefinitely for steamship accommodation, would know that the "West Indian" is doing a return trip to the British West Indies for their return journey to some of the other West Indian Islands. I think, Sir, that despite the fact that the suggestion which is obvious has come for the hon. senior member for the City, it should make no difference to Government and should receive careful consideration. They should, after consultation with the proper authorities and the agents for the Company which operates the "West Indian", see whether it would not be found feasible, as in the case of companies which operate steamships which come to Barbados, to charter a boat every month or every other month in order to send off these emigrants as reasonably as possible, because I think they are going at a certain rate now; and with what it costs, we want them to spend as little as possible so that they would be able in quick time to return to this island money to be repaid not only to the Treasury, but to the people of this island which must necessarily circulate. So I hope we will hear from Government that this idea coming from a business man and sounding so feasible will receive the consideration which it deserves.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$1,500,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St Peter to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

TRADE UNION BILL C'TD.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this amendment here stands in my name. It is an amendment to the Trade Union (Amendment) Act, 1949, and to those who are not familiar with it, it is quite simple. It deals specifically with the question of peaceful picketing, and here in Barbados it took the Barbadians a long time to understand what peaceful picketing was and it was eventually passed in 1950. In order to familiarise members with it, the present section reads as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons appointed by the trade union, the firm or the individual employer directly concerned in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person works or carries on business or happens to be other than where he resides, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

10.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the words specifically have been put in this Act, "other than where he resides." The amendment which is proposed by me is to delete these words in order that it becomes permissible for peaceful picketing to take place at his work place or the place where he works. The English Act reads as follows:—

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person

resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

It should be drawn to the attention of hon. members that even in the United Kingdom, this question of peaceful picketing goes a little further than our Act, because it says: "It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union...." whereas here in Barbados, the Act says that the thing must be done by a trade union. To those hon. members who are not aware of the full significance of the Trade Union Act, I will say that the purpose of the Act was to be a restraint on Trade. There is no question about it that if a trade union has to do something which is a restraint on trade, then that is something which the Law prescribes. In Barbados, we should have the same privilege as obtains in the United Kingdom. You cannot argue that the Law can be changed in the United Kingdom, but not in Barbados because we have not yet evolved to that stage; to argue that, would be to argue that we should not have any peaceful picketing at all.

In a trade dispute, the employer is always at an advantage in that he is able to send his motor car or any of his servants to the home of the employee who is on strike and bring him out to work. A trade union cannot by any means peacefully picket that man's home as a means of telling that man that he should not come out to work. To reject or block the passing of this Act in Barbados is to say the fundamental trade union rights should not exist here as they exist in the United Kingdom, and that the average worker in Barbados is not entitled to the same right as trade unionists in the United Kingdom.

This amendment give the trade union the right to persuade a workman at his home. The idea of peaceful picketing does not mean anything other than what the Law prescribes; all it means, is that a strike has taken place and that although you are an employee, you should not now be working. The practical point of view is this: the trade union does not picket a man's home because that is not the operating place, but that right is in the United Kingdom Act although it may not be used. They had to put it in the Act, because things might become so hard that a man's home would be the important place at which to picket. Although they may not have any industrial dispute, the right is still there.

I might go further and say that there is no intention of any revolution in this matter. Some employers have been given the idea that there is a certain anti-trade union attitude prevailing among members of the Government, but the Government must be aware that in Jamaica, there is the revolutionary idea that apart from peaceful picketing, they will pass legislation to make the trade union recognised where the majority fail to do so. In Barbados, you do not get the pro-trade union attitude, because you have those who are closely connected with the Government writing anti-trade union articles. For that reason, the idea in Barbados has been to make the employers believe that the trade union must be a child of the Government, and not an independent organisation.

This amendment stands on its own feet in compliance with the English Trade Union Act; and if there is any rejection to this Act, there should be a rejection of many of the Acts which we pass, based on Acts of England. Any attempt which is made to

reject this Bill is to say that the trade union in Barbados is not entitled to the same rights as obtain in the United Kingdom. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

10.25 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should say something. My first point is as regards the statement made by the hon. member that the tendency of Barbados was to be anti-Trade Union and because he as General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Trade Union has said that, it can principally be taken that he meant it in respect of the employing class. That is not a correct statement nor can it be considered a true statement. I have heard from no less a person than the ex-General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Trade Union, Mr. Hugh Springer, the statement that he had found in his travelling from Jamaica and all through the West Indian Islands that the tendency was that the employing class in Barbados was more cooperative and more harmonious to Workers' Trade Unions than in any other West Indian colony. Therefore I am bound to protest against those remarks. That is not correct because the employing class in Barbados, generally speaking, very quickly recognised and climatised themselves to having Trade Unions and dealing with them. They recognise that it is much easier to deal with one body of men than to deal with a body of individuals. If the idea of the Introducer of the Bill when he made that reference was in respect of the employing class, then I say that he is not correct.

As regards the second reading of this Bill, I want to say that I have listened to the hon. introducer very carefully and I must confess that I have a high regard and appreciation for the hon. member's ability in dealing with Trade Unions, for indeed in a very short time he has acquainted himself with all matters relative to Trade Unions, and that not only in Barbados. He made it clear that these amendments would give the Trade Union the right to peaceful picketing at or near the residence of a person directly concerned in a Trade dispute. When this Bill came before the House on the very first occasion I said then that I agreed with peaceful picketing. It was something which Unionists should have the right to do. They should be able to peacefully picket their employers' place of business and to say what they struck for; but I never agreed that the right should be given to workers in Barbados to picket a man's home and I am going to vote against it. I never agreed to vote for any such thing that contained peaceful picketing of the home of an owner of a business after he leaves his place of business for home. I do not agree that a trade unionist should wend himself to the man's home, sacred as it is to the man, and where his wife and family are living. Other hon. members may want to say so but do not have the courage. I am saying that if provision is made for that, it might be dangerous to either of them. I can well imagine what will happen, taking into consideration conditions as they are locally. Mr. Speaker, I can never be anti-trade union; I come from too far down the ladder. Let us surmise that Mr. X, an employer, leaves his place of business for home and there is a trade dispute going on. A trade unionist with a placard, which he has the right to carry, then walks up to the man's home and pickets. A big row takes place and as a result somebody gets hurt.

The hon. Introducer of the Bill knows how I feel about this matter of peaceful picketing, but I am not supporting the amendment which says that you should go to anybody's house to peacefully picket, because you can intimidate the man's family and children there. I am not going to vote for this amendment and, as a matter of fact, I am going to oppose it and still get back into this House. If you want to picket anybody's business or mine, I say, "yes" but I will not support the picketing of the home of somebody. Let us say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who is Director of the Self Help Enterprises is engaged in a trade dispute with its employees. He leaves Tweedside Road where all the employees are picketing and goes home to Sugar Hill where there is his wife and children. There up in St. Joseph he sees some of his employees with placards picketing his home. Do you not see that you are courting trouble? I am sure the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will agree with me.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter is a very eminent and distinguished trade unionist and he has done a very good job as General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Trade Union. If his amendment is put in because from his experience he finds that when trade unionists at a firm strike he wants the legal right that unionists should be able to go to the home of a brother trade unionist so as to discuss with the man something about the strike or to bolster him up that is alright; but I do not agree if it is the law in England that it should be law of Barbados because I know my Barbados. I am not voting for it here. I know I cannot be taken to be any Capitalist by my saying that. As a matter of fact, my stock and-trade is in here.

I am throwing this out as a warning. When you picket a man's home you are going to intimidate that man's family. You may put this on the Statute Book but it could not be used. It is far different in England. Of course you picket a dress factory, store or motor car factory of an owner, but you will find that the owner lives at a hotel and you do not know which room he occupies; or you will find that the owner lives 500 miles away from his place of business, so you are not going there and picket. As a matter of fact, the Director of a Business in England may be living in France. Let us be practical. I am not going to take the case of any particular individual but let us say that there is a strike on in Bridgetown. Everybody knows where the owner lives. The owner leaves his place of business to go to his home and you go there to picket. You must intimidate his wife and children and when you do that you are courting a lot of trouble. I will support the other part of the amendment but not that.

10.35 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Like the hon. senior member for the City, I am of the same opinion. You cannot say that the employing class in Barbados is opposed to the Union, because I have heard that the co-operation with the Barbados Workers Union is much higher in Barbados than in any other West Indian Island; so we start off with that. We have passed Trade Union laws and we have passed peaceful picketing, and that applies to buildings which we accept; but I cannot accept the principle of taking picketing to a man's home whether he is a labourer or an employer. Indeed, you have taken this to a man's home where there are minors or children. The person may have children coming in from school and you are asking for trouble. I do not know what happens in England, and similarly what the law is in Jamaica I do not know; but I think there is some

difference between the Jamaican law and the one in England. I speak under correction, but I think that is so, and I can foresee a lot of trouble. Today there may be no difficulty and, conditions may be calm and we may be tempted to pass it; but when we have a strike and we go to a person's home where there are minors and people who are not accustomed to this sort of thing, you are going away from peaceful picketing probably to intimidation. I cannot agree and only on these grounds I will vote against it. I am not afraid of picketing, but it must be done where a business is established; I think it is wrong to take it to a man's home whether it is in England or in any other countries of the world. They must have special reasons for it, I must vote against it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Unlike the last two speakers, I am not discussing the principles of this Bill. I am going to vote against it for the reasons I have already given. Whether the hon. member uses this against me, it is absolutely immaterial to me; but I have assured the hon. member for St. Peter here in this House that the labour code which the I.L.O. went to such pains to produce for Barbados has arrived in this Island and the Union ought to have had copies this week. The Government is asking the Union, the Chamber of Commerce and other employers for comments, and I absolutely and completely object, where you have to go in for wholesale amendments, to be having piecemeal amendments. I have given the member my assurance and I repeat it is immaterial to me whether he can accept my word or not. Government is still prepared to discuss both with the Union and employers such comments as they may have to make in the whole code of labour legislation. Tomorrow, we are discussing with the Union a matter concerning Sugar licences and the Provident Fund — one aspect of Labour; and I again say that Government is not going to agree to piecemeal legislation. I said that I am going to vote against the second reading and I am not prepared to discuss the merits of the Bill as far as peaceful picketing is concerned, but on the grounds I gave weeks ago and I repeated two days or so ago, I shall vote against the second reading.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is also immaterial to me what the Premier says with respect to what I say about him, because it is immaterial to me what he says about me, and there is no love lost. Whatever he said he need not repeat again, because it is immaterial to me what he thinks about what I do. So far as the Bill is concerned, I can appreciate his stand. His stand is one of delay in anything brought forward by me; and he is similar to the boy who had failed, and when asked why he had failed he replied that when he was going to pass they stopped work. You will remember I left this Island about seven weeks ago and the Trade Union was to have received the labour code. Far from receiving it we have heard everything about the Trade Union Secretary not being a fit person to be the Secretary of the Union as quoted by the Premier. That has nothing to do with this Bill or about asking employers to agree to the principles of it; but may be the Premier has seen fit to hold out on this because it is his point of view. Government never said they intended to amend the Trade Union Act, with respect to peaceful picketing; therefore the labour code could not have this. Are you going to submit to the employers whom you are approaching that you are no longer dealing with it because I have something to do with it? He is telling members of the merits or demerits of it and that he is going to vote against it, and doing everything pos-

sible to prevent this from being passed. It is not anything you are doing to me; it is the workers who are backing me. This is not a matter on which he should be naive, and the workers know what it was for twelve weeks despite what the Premier said, but he would get the answer in due course from the bulk of people in this country if he by his subtlety does anything to prevent this from passing. For twelve weeks we found that no worker could go to the home of an employee and persuade him nor to go to work, but that an employer could send his vans and emissaries to the workers' homes and bring them out. The purpose of the Act is not to be naive; the Act is to preserve all stages right not only to picket at work but at a person's residence. The Trade Union Act gives the right to peaceful picketing, and to satisfy the mind of the Leader of the Opposition, I would not expect the hon. senior member for the City or the hon. junior member for Christ Church to agree to peaceful picketing that goes as far as this. I would say that any professing Conservative must of necessity vote against peaceful picketing. The whole idea in the past was that conservatives voted against Trade Union amendments because they felt it should not be a restraint on trade. They have fought for years the Taff Vale case, and after they had struck on that and caused damages, they decided that the Union should pay damages. Legislation has put it down for the furtherance of trade dispute that if the employers lose something there is no restraint and no payment of damages. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has had that experience at his store when the bakers went out on strike and he had a lot of flour to be given to the pigs, and the pigs were better off on that occasion. That is the Trade Union Act the world fought for, in the United Kingdom, the United States and in Europe.

10.45 p.m.

In order to settle the minds of hon. members as to how far peaceful picketing is to be directed, I shall just read this passage from the Trade Union, Law in England. This is what is stated:—

"Similarly, if the manner of picketing ceases to be peaceful or becomes an obstruction or a nuisance, or endangers the public peace, the picketing will cease to be lawful. Thus, if a picket commits a private nuisance, as by violently and continually banging on the door, shouting obstructing ingress or egress, or otherwise seriously interfering with the enjoyment of the house, or if he commits a public nuisance such as behaving in a manner calculated to cause a breach of the peace, or unreasonably obstructing the highway, his common law right to picket and his right to 'attend' under the section will cease and neither will protect him from civil or criminal liability for any of these acts, or for any 'watching or besetting' 'with a view to compel' which he may also have committed."

I have read that passage, so that hon. members' minds may be put at rest. Peaceful picketing can not interfere with the residents in the home; it is nothing to do with the persons who live there. You cannot do anything with the employer at all; you cannot commit an act which would be an unlawful act; you can only do something which the act permits you to do if you have the right to picket a man's home or workplace. If you are picketing at a factory you cannot go inside the gate and say that you are picketing inside the premises. I do not intend to lay down any legal dogma in so far as trespassing is concerned, but I will be at pains to point out that hon. members need not take peaceful picketing to

mean that a trade union is allowed to go at the employer's home and that anything would be said to the employer at all. Those who are picketing do not say anything to the employer.

When it comes to the question of the workers home, you will persuade the worker, but anything which is said and done to the employers would not be in accordance with the Act. There have been many cases which have occurred throughout the world where there have been breaches of the Act. I should like to say this, that if the Government vote against this Bill, let them vote against it; but to say that you are voting against it because it is not in the Labour Code, and to say that you should ask the employer's approbation as to whether there should be peaceful picketing or not, that suits the Hon. Premier and people like that; that is the type of trade union which he would run.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I object to being misquoted. I said not only the trade union's views but also the views of the employers would be placed against the Labour Code. There is the question of superannuation payment, provident fund, and so on.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Why should that be mentioned in this connection? [ASIDES] Why don't you keep quiet?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must sit when I am on my feet; he has refused to obey the Chair. I wonder if the hon. member realised it, what a position he has put himself. I have repeatedly cautioned the hon. member not to lose his temper and to contain himself; he is now addressing some hon. member on the Government bench, and is taking no notice whatever of the Chair.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am very sorry if I have offended Your Honour, but the Hon. Minister of Labour knows nothing about the things of which I am speaking, and he is making *sotto voce* remarks which Your Honour cannot hear. Why not come out in the Election campaign and say what you want to say?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not say that he is sorry and still offend.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: In so far as the illogical statement which has been made by the Hon. Premier is concerned, I ask: what is the use of talking about postponing this Bill until you have the Labour Code? That is only a means of delaying the consideration of this Bill. What do you mean? Do you mean that whenever there is anything to be passed you have to wait for the Labour Code? Mr. Matthews was waiting on the Labour Code all this time, and when you talk about the provident fund, what provident fund can you put into a Labour Code? What has that got to do with the Trade Union (Amendment) Bill? If the Government had brought down this Bill, after the Holidays with Pay Bill, and the Hon. Premier had sat down with me and seen what peaceful picketing means, he would have brought it in this House and got it done; he would have been able to see what peaceful picketing means in the matter of a trade union, but he says that I have messed up the *Advocate* strike, and we cannot pass anything which this chap has brought in.

What the Hon. Minister knows about this Act, is as much as I know why that aeroplane went down in the Mediterranean. [Laughter]. But there are wonderful articles written in the *Beacon*. However, the hon. member's days are numbered, certainly politically. In so far as this amendment is concerned, I have no compunction as to what the workers feel about it. There was the Annual Conference which the Hon. Premier has addressed, and this

same Conference has approved of this Bill. 10.55 p.m.

I am saying that the workers have confidence in me so far as this proposition is concerned, therefore, I did not leave it to the Government to make a decision. I leave it to the workers who have a greater voice than the few members of the Government possess.

Now, as regards this amendment, I will say, and the workers will say so too, that when the Government votes against it, they are not voting against it because the conservative members in this House said that they are not going to vote for it. And their reason for doing so is because they are not mentally divorced from the sacred idea that a man's home is something to glory. They do not realise that a man's home is not greater than your bread and butter.

This amendment of peacefully picketing a man's home would not have been in Trade Union legislation were it not that the workers fought hard for it. It was put in the Trade Union Act precisely for the benefit of giving workers the opportunity to be able to persuade their comrades, if their comrades wanted to work when a trade dispute was going on and there was a strike; or in case their comrade lived far from the factory and did not know what was taking place, they would be able to go to him and tell him: "Well boy, the other fellows are on strike: do not go to work."

I will not say anything more on what the Hon. Premier said that the whole idea of his speaking on behalf of the Government is because of the labour code. The reason for many of them not supporting this amendment may be some of the other reasons you have heard. However, Sir, I feel I have discharged my duty and have done so in accordance with the wishes of the workers whom I have the honour to represent.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. TUDOR and Mr. CRAWFORD—4.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. GODDARD, and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—8.

During the taking of the vote by Mr. Clerk, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT pointed out to Mr. SPEAKER that the honourable junior member for St. Michael, (Mr. BRYAN) was not entitled to vote because he was not present when the question was put.

INFANT MORTALITY

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Order No. 7 which stands in my name and which is an Address to His Excellency the Governor. It reads as follows:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House has learned with pain—"

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the next Order?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour I will ask leave to defer all the items under my name which immediately precede that of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: I take it that the other hon. members will do likewise.

The Address reads as follows:—

**"THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR**

The House has learnt with pain and dismay of the high death rate from starvation of children in the island.

2. The House is of the opinion that a free distribution of milk to the parents and guardians of all children under five years, would tend to ameliorate this condition.

3. Accordingly, the House requests Your Excellency to take all the steps necessary to make such a benefit available to the parents and guardians of young children."

Mr. Speaker, I did say Order No. 7 but the one I meant is Order No. 8.

Quite briefly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say with respect to this Address that the people in this island have long suspected from their own experience that all was not well with the great infant mortality in this island; but I must confess that it was a shock to a large number of people to hear, in a broadcast given by the Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital, of the appalling death rate of children from starvation. Your Honour will recall that Dr. Humby made it quite clear that of 267 deaths in the General Hospital of children under 5 years, fully 186 were deaths from starvation.

Now I do not think I disclosed any secret when I told you, Mr. Speaker, that it was my good fortune with one or two other hon. members to have further elucidation on this, and we were told—which was not news to us—that the distribution of milk to children under five years would meet the case.

Now Mr. Speaker, the Address is so worded that it does not in any way bind the Government as to a particular method of doing this. It is realised by members on this side of the House that Government must have a free hand as to how best it can give effect to this desire of the House, but we do feel the matter is important enough; and that in the Island the very last thing that should be said of us is that we allow all sorts of things to happen and among these things we allowed little children to starve to death. If it is only milk which will keep them alive between the years of birth and the completion of five years, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is not too much to ask of them to give effect to the desire of this House so that these children might not die from starvation which we think is very cruel and unnecessary.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second the Address which has been so ably moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I do not suppose anybody can dispute the facts which he has brought before the House because it comes from the Medical Officer at the General Hospital, and it is very regrettable in these days to hear these things. I have much pleasure in seconding the Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: I heartily agree with the principle of this Address, but I would suggest that a small amendment be made and I move that in the second paragraph line two, the word "needy" be inserted between the words "all" and "children", so that it would now read: "House is of the opinion that a free distribution of milk to the parents and guardians of all needy children under five years, would tend to ameliorate this condition." For obvious reasons the children of the well-to-do should not be getting free milk; and then as a consequential amendment in paragraph three the deletion of the

penultimate word "young" and the substitution of "all such children," that is the needy children.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member accept these amendments?

Mr. TUDOR: Yes.

The question that the Address as amended to now pass was put and resolved in the negative seven hon. members voting "No" and five hon. members voting "Aye" as follows:

Ayes: Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—5.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER and Mr. BRYAN—7.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for a fortnight.

Natural Gas And By-Products

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I want to second the motion for the adjournment and I want to use the opportunity to draw to the attention of the House a matter of some importance. I refer to the supplies of Natural Gas in this Island. Honourable members may have read in the *Trinidad Guardian* on Sunday that there is a move on foot in Trinidad to start a \$17 million plant to convert Natural Gas into a fertiliser and plastics. Now, I think the industry is being established under the initiative of Mr. Albert Gomes. I must say in this respect that Mr. Gomes has acted in advance of me because I have been working on this matter for about a year, and I had planned a trip to Britain and Germany later in the year myself in order to see at first hand the process. Our supplies of Natural Gas are the biggest in the British Caribbean whereas in Trinidad, Natural Gas is a by-product of the Oil Industry. Here we have wells of almost unlimited resources from which we get our Natural Gas. Now, the manufacture of a fertiliser is made, Sir, by the combination of Natural Gas and air, and with our unlimited supplies of Natural Gas we could easily have converted some of these resources into a fertiliser even if only for domestic consumption. Barbados uses about eight thousand tons a year and its expenditure is over \$1 million, and of course there is a West Indian market. Trinidad spends about \$3 million on fertiliser and neither in British Guiana, Jamaica or any other British West Indian colony is there any supply of Natural Gas, so that in Barbados, Sir, we have available a Natural Gas resource which could be easily and readily be supplied for the manufacture in the process of fertiliser and in the second instance later on for plastics. About a year ago Mr. Arthur Coppin, retired Government Analyst, drew this matter to my attention and we had several discussions on it; I have correspondence on the matter, and as I said earlier I had planned to go to Europe later this year to get first-hand information on the production of Natural Gas. I am therefore very sorry to think that Trinidad will be the first to establish an industry of this kind in the British Caribbean, because I know what it will mean to that colony from the point of view both from the domestic consumption and export trade; and since our supplies are what they are, and since there is no comparable source of supply in the area, I do not see why the Government of this Island should not bestir itself to endeavour to make some use of these resources in

this manner. There is no reason why both Barbados and Trinidad should not embark upon fertiliser from the respective supplies of Natural Gas. Even if we use ours alone for domestic use, we have a one million dollar domestic turn over to support the industry, and while on this matter, Sir, I should like also to add that before some other West Indian colonies start upon it and we are left in the cold, that we have one other natural resource of some importance which could be easily be converted into an industry. I refer, Sir, to the large supplies of sea-weed which abound on the coasts of Barbados at certain times of the year.

11.15 p.m.

The manufacture of seaweed into alginates is now a big industry in Scotland, and these plants which are dotted all along the Scottish coast provide work at certain lean times during the year for farmers and agricultural workers who may not be otherwise employed. The Scotland seaweed plants only supply one-quarter of the British consumption of alginates, and here in the West Indies, we could make available to the British industry an appreciable portion of the alginates which it needs.

I have mentioned the seaweed industry, because, as I said earlier, in the same manner as Hon. Albert Gomes of Trinidad has been thinking of converting natural gas into fertilizers, some other West Indian Government may be thinking in terms of processing

and getting equipment for the manufacture of alginates from seaweed. It is not an expensive process; I have been in correspondence with the British Alginate Industries Ltd. in London, and I propose to get some direct information myself; but I only mention the matter now, because I do not want the same thing which happened with the conversion of natural gas into fertilizers to happen with this industry.

It is, of course, too much to hope that this Government could be asked to take seriously the possibility of using the Island's natural gas resources along the lines which I have indicated; I say so advisedly. It is as well that the people of this Colony should know that where there are natural resources like these, with a certain amount of initiative and a desire to improve the economic condition of the Country, we should take advantage of these natural resources. If I did not mention the matter earlier, it was because I wanted to see what the manufacture was like in order to speak with authority; but I am sure it is not too late for some action along these lines to be taken.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day fortnight, Tuesday, 4th September, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.22 p.m.