

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th March, 1956.

Pursuant to 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*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., 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. J. C. MOTTLEY; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN; Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Barbados Light and Power Company, the Statement of Accounts for the year ended the 30th June, 1955.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor Papers were laid as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Nos. 5 — 11 Orders, 1956

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Hon. M. E. COX: Statement of Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to 30th November, 1955.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: (*For Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*): Reports of departmental activities in 1955 of the Department of Science and Agriculture.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: (*For Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*): Annual Report of the Peasants' Loan Bank for 1953—54.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1956."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1956."

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939.

Mr. BARROW: Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. BARROW, the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. BARROW, seconded by Mr. LEWIS, a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943, was read a first time.

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be postponed, and that Order No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

THE ESTIMATES 1956-57

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the consideration of the Estimates for the Financial Year 1956-57.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I think the Government and the Island as a whole are very fortunate that, in the carrying out of the Five Year Plan, we have been able to maintain our sugar production at a level far in excess of our average, at any rate, of 150,000 tons. In the last three years, our sugar production has been in the vicinity of 160,000, 170,000, 175,000 tons. That is gratifying to all of us because we are conscious of the fact that we depend upon sugar for a large percentage of our national revenue. This year the Government have based their plans on an estimate of 170,000 tons of sugar. It is true that when they were negotiating or fixing their plans, the crop had not yet been estimated; but the most recent indication is that the crop would be somewhat below, though not too far below the estimate. The crop has fluctuated so much in these few years that it is anybody's guess. I think that they have not been far from the mark, but they can expect somewhat of a drop, because I am told that the canes are not weighing as heavy as they anticipated, and there are various reasons for that.

I am not an agriculturist and I cannot go into the technical terms; but it is good to know that we have had such good fortune that we can afford to fulfil our Five Year Plan and we can expand it at the same time. The Government this year is embarking on a very grand Public Works Programme. The Capital Estimates are in the vicinity of \$6 million. Personally, I do not think that they will get near that mark because in these works there are certain items at which we can look, on which the Government has not yet made up their minds completely as to what they will do. The Plan is there, but whether they will implement it as they had made it at first, or whether it will be revised and in what manner it will be revised, we are yet to see. I cannot see the Government spending \$6 million on Capital Works this year.

3.25 p.m.

And that is an indication of where they are going and what they intend to do. Of course, there is always a report. We are within a period of change. The present session will come to an end sometime this year and it is going to mean that some members who are in here now may not be in here next year. However, the Estimates give us an indication of what the Government has in mind.

Among those items, I will deal with Agriculture. Government has a large sum of over a million dollars to be spent on Agriculture: and not only that, but it also has another large sum of \$7,000 for a Cold Storage Plant. I know Government has a report as

well as plans for that, but I am told it is not settled on the final policy. Knowing what a Cold Storage Plant is like, if the orders have not yet been placed, it is most unlikely that we will see that materialised in this financial year.

As regards the Deep Water Harbour, there is \$1,300,000 set aside for that. Some of that money can be spent on the preparation of the roads. As regards the raising of the money for that scheme by loan, I do hope when the Hon. Premier gets up he will give us a clear picture of how the money market as it stands today will affect the immediate plans for going on with the Deep Water Harbour Scheme. I saw in some Report that the British Government has raised the Bank Rate from 4½% to 5½% solely for the purpose that consumer goods at home in the United Kingdom will not be increased at the expense of exports. The Report went on to say that where capital works of a certain nature were in the offing and plans had been made, the British Government will make the money available. I do not know in what way this Government can get around the money market, so I discussed it with a financier who said that the only way it could be done is if the British Government would make a temporary loan to the Barbados Government in such a way that when the money market became a little more settled and the Bank rate more favourable they will be able to take up the loan. Whether Government can take up the loan then, and whether that was told to the Hon. Premier, I do not know; but I think an indication to the House of what Government proposes to do in that respect would allay a lot of our fears: because to raise \$17½ million on loan today at such a Bank rate would be a burden on this colony for many generations to come.

More capital expenditure has been granted for the extension of the Water Programme. We all remember that in this last year of the Five Year Programme what Government planned to spend on the extension of our Water service had been overspent and it is because the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department got on so well with his programme that he found he could do a better job with more money and it was granted him willingly. There is still a lot of things to be done and I am glad to see that they are expanding it now that the material is available. We all remember that when we were anxious to do as much as we could for the Waterworks Department, we voted large sums of money but we could not get the material. Now that the getting is good, let us put our Waterworks Department on top. We have a wonderful water supply. Let us continue to carry it to every nook and corner of Barbados; let us not stop one bit in that programme.

As regards our Airport, there is a large expansion taking place there. We have quite a good terminal there but in these days of air travel, we want to be abreast of any West Indian territory; and for more than one reason, therefore, we should be prepared to spend large sums to extend the runway so as to accommodate the largest aircraft. When you do so, it is in keeping with the policy of keeping abreast with the times. Today, our Airport occupies a position that our Harbour used to occupy in the past but we have been left behind in the race with the Deep Water Harbour.

Now, we come to the question of Housing and I may say that this is where I think Government needs to review its position and realise that the Housing in Barbados is worse than any of us thought it was before "Janet". Government is embarking on the setting up of a Housing Authority to look into this whole question of Housing and is giving it large sums of money for the purpose. It is no use to hand over a

million dollars to this Authority right away. At the present moment, the plans are the essential part.

What I think the Government has not fully realised is that in their effort to get everybody back into a home, many houses have been repaired quite adequately: but there are also many which have been repaired and handed back to the people but are still uninhabitable. On the last occasion when Government came to this House for the last vote and told us that it was the final allocation for the Hurricane Housing Programme, Government was told that that sum would not be adequate. We were willing to grant more money at the time and it should have been stressed at that time that it was not the final payment because when the Hon. Premier went up to England and pleaded our cause for a larger grant for our rehousing and rehabilitation programme he was told that we had funds and it was not a case of need. He should have been armed with the full facts and he should have told them (whether he did so or not I do not know) that we have not repaired all the damage which "Janet" did. And that is a fact. There are today hundreds of houses in the southern districts which have been handed back to people where before the hurricane there were two gables and shed there is now only one gable. I have visited Christ Church recently and I can speak with authority on that matter. There are many complaints that are going to the Housing Board about the way in which the houses have been repaired. People are telling the Representatives of that parish that they are turned away without any good answers and they are just frustrated because they do not know to whom to go next and they do not know whether they will get any help in the future.

3.35 p.m.

We are telling them that the Government's policy is to rehouse and to rehabilitate every family, and it is my intention to plead their cause; because some have got, but there are many without; and they do not know if at the end of this month further sums will be granted to the Housing Board or to the continuation of this programme. There are many houses that the Public Works Department worked on. We will remember that in those early days there was a shortage of material and the Public Works Department gangs worked and suddenly had to leave people. "We have been called off, but the Housing Board will come and continue the repairs on these houses we are leaving." In most cases when these people make application to the Housing Board they are told that the Public Works Department has worked on their house, it is not on their list and they can do little for them. There are some that they have helped and there are many that are still in the position in which they were when Public Works Department gangs worked and suddenly had to leave. Some had to leave before they were called off because of shortage of certain materials: they may have had siding and not 2" x 3" and *vice versa*; and there was a great deal of dissatisfaction and hardship.

I do not wish to go into it but I am referring them to the Housing Board: and I do hope that the Housing Board—because I know they have not got it row—will set up a proper investigation Committee. They can get some qualified Civil Servants and give them travelling allowance and let them investigate the cases coming to them, because I know they have not got that yet. As I said that is a departure this year for the Housing Board and I hope it will be done, because that is a field in which an awful lot can be done.

In this new Five Year Plan which has not yet come to the Legislature, I do hope that some priority and some high priority will be given by Government to a scheme of slum clearance in Bridgetown. This

is an opportunity of getting across to them, because although they have been told about it in the past it did not come into the first Five Year Plan. I do hope some scheme will be made and some money be put aside for slum clearance of the two parts of Bridgetown that are so dilapidated, and although it is not in the first Five Year Plan I hope that will be considered; and while they are on it, I hope that consideration be given to parking areas in Bridgetown. It is congested and is becoming more congested: and what we spend today will be a saving in years to come. I do hope in the Five Year Plan to come some priority will be given to that scheme.

Now, we have increased the Old Age Pension by 50% and according to that Report in which it was placed, we were told that if our finances remain in a healthy position, in three years to come it should be doubled. I am going to ask Government also to study the possibility of taking off means tests from the Old Age Pension Scheme. I sometimes wonder whether the cost of investigation by way of the means tests would go a long way towards giving Old Age Pension to every one. There are a large number who would not apply. It is nothing new.

We find ourselves with quite a large Revenue Balance. We have had three consecutive years of large Revenue Balances and I am not one to say because we have got this that it should be expended in all quarters, but let us give where it is most needed. Last year, Government gave us an allowance on Income Tax through the Medical expenses and at that time many members of this House asked that consideration be given to married women who had to go out to work for one reason or another to supplement their husbands' salaries. As we all know, it is combined today and it is a great hardship because when a woman leaves her home and takes up a position in Bridgetown or anywhere she has to find an extra servant at home and even that allowance is not given to her. She has her bus fare to pay and extra clothing to buy, and I do feel that some consideration in the matter of an allowance should be given to married couples and particularly to those that are working. I stressed it on the last occasion and I do believe our finances are adequate enough that consideration should have been given this year. I hope Government will pay heed to that. It is a burden on an awful lot of middle-class families.

There is an interesting paragraph here, Paragraph 14, which says:

"As in the previous year the total exports in 1955 were valued at approximately \$40 million, while the value of imports was \$53 million (as compared with \$48½ million in 1954)."

An increase of over \$3 million.

"The rise in the total value of imports has therefore continued, indicating an upward trend not influenced by war or threat of war as existed in 1951 and 1952 when the value of imports rose from \$39 million to over \$50 million. Figures so far available show that the increase is attributable to the importation in 1955 of greater quantities of consumer goods. The further increase in the unfavourable visible trade balance is more than covered by remittances, tourist receipts, and other invisibles."

Now, that is a matter of \$13 million and I wonder if the Premier would be kind enough to break down that \$13 million for us and tell us how much of that is estimated to be from the Tourist Industry, how much is from remittances and how much from other invisibles. It would be interesting: because if you look back over the last three years our exports were pretty steady. In sugar it has gone up from \$27 million in 1953 to \$28 million in 1954. There is no expansion in the revenue and from sugar: so if you continue to have an increasing recurrent expenditure we would have to find that money from other

means and that is why it is important to say where the \$13 million is being made up.
3.45 p.m.

We estimate that the tourist industry is worth in the vicinity of \$5 and \$6 million. I think that the Government should let us know if we are wrong in our calculations or if our remittances are greater than what we think. I would appreciate very much if the Premier has the breakdown and if he could furnish us with the information.

As I have said before, the Government is embarking on a very large Capital Expenditure this year—money which I do not think will be spent—but the estimated General Revenue balance, when we have finished this financial year, will come from the \$3,605,884. That is quite a large amount, because they are using it for Capital Expenditure, rather than borrow the money. They are using their available funds because, at this time, it would be unwise for the Government to borrow money when they have money available, when the Bank rate is up and when it will not be easy to raise large sums of money unless you are paying 5% interest. In fact I am not quite sure if you can even get this money at that rate of interest.

Mr. Speaker, there is one last remark which I would like to make in reply to the Hon. Premier who has said that it was frustrating to the Government to have to offer to the export rum interests the concession which they did not take advantage of. I am wondering if he could find that answer somewhere else, because the Ministry of Trade could give that answer. On the last occasion of the Budget, the Premier said that they were prepared to refund to the exporters of rum the duty which they paid on their bottles and containers which were exported; but he attached strings to that, and the proviso was that you must show that you are advertising that rum, preferably in the United Kingdom.

It is a long story. To begin with, why should he attach strings to the rum industry? He does not attach them to any other industry. They permit a refund of duty to any other industry which re-exports containers and otherwise, but when it comes to the rum industry, they attach strings. These strings which are attached to the rum industry are such that we cannot sell rum to the United Kingdom, and that is for obvious reasons. The Jamaica Government expends £200,000 per annum on advertising their rum, and if we were to start an advertising campaign over there, we could not do it under £100,000. We do not export any rum to Great Britain; it is a most difficult thing to get it in because the whisky interest is so tied up, that they say that only a limited amount can come in. People are protecting their market. We have not got sufficient storage space in Barbados, even if we had a market, to provide for the exportation of rum to England. We ship rum to Canada. There are two provinces alone in which you are allowed to advertise any kind of alcohol in any form. We can sell it through the Government control, but you are not allowed to advertise everywhere. The other remaining market is Trinidad.

I think that if the Minister of Trade could take up the matter affecting the rum industry, he could give a full explanation as to why we have not been able to get a remission on packages on the re-exportation of rum. I want to make it easy for the rum industry to get ahead; probably, the Premier was unaware of the matter and now that the Minister of Trade has had interviews with the Rum Committee, I hope he will get the O.K. for sale of rum. Let him deal with the matter as he thinks fit, and let him have a free hand so that the rum ex-

porters might enjoy what is now a frustration on the part of the Government.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. HAYNES: I think that the honourable junior member for Christ Church has touched upon some very salient points in these Estimates, and I do not think it will be necessary for me to go over them again. However, there are still some other things which I would like to add to his excellent expounding of our difficulties in these Estimates. The first thing which the honourable member mentioned was the question of the Housing Authority to whom I see they have given the sum of \$350,000 to spend.

I feel, Sir, that although we sympathise with what the Government has done for the people in Christ Church and St. Michael who suffered as a result of the hurricane, there is still room for improvement in some of the other parishes as regards the position and siting of houses. I have mentioned this matter already in this House. I feel sure Government will see that it is a pity that some move is not taken to re-site the 179 houses which are situated in most precarious positions in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew. When I say precarious positions, I mean that it is most difficult to get to these houses in dry weather and it is almost impossible to get the common necessities of life.

I am hoping that a directive of some sort will be given to the Director of this Board suggesting that they take the matter up and try and acquire some land for the purpose. I do not know what the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing will say about it, but I will say that if the Government does not see its way to buy it, the people can buy it. There is plenty of land in the parishes of St. Andrew situated in suitable positions which can be had and utilised for this purpose. It will allow those people who now live in inaccessible areas to improve their standard of living.

I do not know if this Housing Authority is what is called an emancipated authority, that is, an authority that does as it likes. If it isn't, I am hoping that the Hon. Minister of Housing will issue a directive as regards the matter. I can tell him that from my many years' experience that it is a very sad state of affairs in the two parishes which I have mentioned. It is aggravated by the fact that those parishes are very hilly. Everybody knows that in those parishes it is difficult to get around even in the easy positions, that is to say, in places like Belleplaine and Hillaby, much more the out-of-the-way places. I am hoping that we hear something from the Minister on the point whether he can ask that some of the money which is voted for the Housing Authority can be diverted for this purpose, because it is a very pressing need.

The next thing of which I want to make mention is the matter with regard to roads. I see that there is an increase of \$16,000 for the carrying out of the programme. I consider that it is a small amount considering that you get (I believe) \$98,000 out of the money you collect from gasoline to be converted to the repairing of roads. We are spending \$16,000 and that includes highway taxes, so, really, the upkeep of roads is costing us nothing, because they are paid for by the people who use them.

While I am elaborating on this heading, I must refer to the old story of the East Coast Road because the problem of the construction of that road has not yet been solved. The honourable junior member for Christ Church has told us that the tourist industry has increased the revenue of this colony by \$5 million. If we provide more amenities, there is no reason why

we should not get in the future \$10 million, \$12 million, or more from this important industry. It is a fact that it is the best dollar earner in every country. Every country, even Canada, has realised that the tourist industry is one of the best ways of getting revenue, therefore, if we can do everything possible so as not to cause inconvenience to those people who want to get away from their country for a holiday, when they come here and are satisfied, they will return year after year.

Sir, that leads me to make a point about another important road. Years ago, I think it was in 1938, the main road connecting Hillaby with St. Simon's Village was absolutely destroyed. It was put back temporarily but the terrain is of such a nature that you can never get a good road to run through that district. That road is not only an important matter for the people of that district, but the Church of St. Simons and the Mixed School are in that district. Therefore, you can imagine what those people have to face to get to Church and to get their children to school. That happened fifteen odd years ago, and nothing has been done to that road.

4.05 p.m.

I happened to suggest to the Director of Highways and Transport before Ministerial Status was set up, a diversion over the ridge at Turner's Hall Woods which is entirely out of the landslide area. He was so keen on it that he even asked the person helping in the administration to inspect the whole site and they were both very favourable to it; but for some unknown reason since Ministerial Status has been accepted, that proposal has been withdrawn. This is land which to our knowledge—and for many years older people say the same thing—is not in a land-sliding area, and that I believe has been inspected—or inspection has been suggested by the Director of Highways and Transport. This is a diversion passing through a village (which should have a road) called Hoyte's Village and going through an old road in Turner's Hall Yard, all through solid strong land. I see nothing about the expenditure on this road in the Estimates. I feel, Sir, that it is very important if we are to go forward that this matter of roads should be put into operation because, as I said already, it will mean other roads for tourists; it is a district with pretty scenery, more gasoline would be used and all the concomitant conditions and expense that go with the tourist trade which start from gasoline, whiskey and so on. The majority of it finds its way in the Public Treasury in some form or other.

I am hoping, Sir, that some priority will be given to this matter of the East Coast Road in the next Five Year Plan, because it is not a very expensive item in relation to other items and it will be a dividend earning road. I am sure there is hardly a member in this House who will not agree with what I said. Even for the local tourists that is to say, for the Bank holiday traffic, Bathsheba is their favourite resort and to-day, you can hardly get into Bathsheba on Bank holidays. There are four miles of road there which can be used by local people who want to get some fresh air from their daily jobs in Bridgetown and the suburbs. Bathsheba is chuck—full sometimes like the packed contents of a sardine tin, because there is a limited portion of road where buses and other things can go. Years ago an honourable member wanted this land developed. The honourable member does not own that land now unfortunately so it would not affect him, but the same spirit I had years ago I still have in bringing this matter very urgently before the Minister concerned.

The honourable junior member for Christ Church touched on the question of loans. It is a bitter pill,

Sir, that I do not see how Government will be able to borrow money to-day in the London market for capital expenditure. They can, but the cost of repayment and interest charges are going to be terribly burdensome. Six per cent. for 16 years is double the capital. The interest will be as much as the capital in 16 years. At 5% it will take 20 years, so that in putting things in a clear picture it means we will be paying double for most of those big undertakings. I presume, Sir, that the Premier has had talks in London about this matter and he will enlighten us on it, but I am sure he does not want me to dilate on the very serious position we will be in, for over 16 years, we will double our debt. That is what it comes to although we are paying it all the time. It is very unfortunate and very serious: and although I am the last one who would like to see capital expenditure curtailed, I certainly am not in favour of capital expenditure that is going to be so very costly. I am facing realities and I am sure the Hon. Premier does the same and he will see my point.

The next thing, Sir, is with regard to Income Tax. The Hon. Premier mentioned that he did not see his way to reduce Income Tax, because as he said he does not know what is in the offing. I presume he is thinking of the future Federation where we will probably be asked for some of our Income Tax to run the expensive overhead which would be involved with this Federation; but that does not excuse him from making our allowances more in keeping with other parts of the world. You will realise, Sir, and I think everyone realises, that with nearly every school boy in the principal secondary schools here who is a Government Scholarship holder, his fees are hardly anything like even 25% of the cost of his education; that is pretty obvious and everyone who has sat on any of the Governing Bodies and examined the position, will realise that.

4.15 p.m.

My point is that if the Government could increase the allowances for the children to what they are in the neighbouring Colonies, they would be relieving themselves and the schools of a burden in respect of education; because the children would be sent to other schools in other Colonies and that would increase the allowances. I am not speaking of myself; I have no children to educate, but I look around and see a lot of young people with young children: and I realise that these children will fill our local schools. Where proper allowances are in keeping with other Colonies like Trinidad and Jamaica, we can help ourselves in the matter of education by releasing room in our own schools by giving allowances which will permit parents to send their children to schools out of the Island.

The next point I should like to make is in connection with Medical allowances. I am pleased to see that on the Order Paper, there is a Bill which has been given its first reading, and which makes provision for medical allowances. However, it has struck me that the paucity of this allowance is extremely glaring. I am wondering if, before the Bill is read a second time, the Government will consider increasing the amount for medical expenses. Sometimes a drug bill is more than \$100 far more what we pay the modern medical practitioners. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier will consider increasing the level of the medical allowances as well as that of the educational allowances.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have touched on the points which seem to me to be very glaring, and I do not think I shall keep the House listening to me any longer; but I am only hoping that we will have a clarification from the Ministers concerned of what I have drawn to their attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that I do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee to consider these Estimates.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker —

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not be interrupted when I am on my feet. I rapped the gavel three times, and no hon. member rose to speak. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order. I would like to draw to your attention that on several occasions before Your Honour put the question —

Mr. SPEAKER: I rapped the gavel three times before any hon. member cared to take notice of the Chair, and I have put the question. I am not entertaining any point of Order.

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

Head I — Governor

Head I — Governor — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of \$18,027 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary for me to say in connection with this amount of \$1,000 which we are voting here in respect of Item 19 "Miscellaneous" that the members of the present Government seem to be doing something which is not always to their credit. At one time, money from this vote was used for installing lights in this House of Assembly, because somebody thought that it would be a good thing to display or to put some trick on the members of this House. Somebody seemed to think that we would not agree to install lights for night sittings, and therefore they would use this vote for the purpose. I do not think that this is a commendable action; it is an almost reprehensible action. Recently this vote of expenditure has been used by way of a loan, with local documents drawn up attaching the conditions of repayments. That again strikes me as being peculiar in dealing with a vote of this kind. If this \$150 which was taken out of the previous amount was sufficient for the purpose, nobody knows if the House would have known that such a thing was done.

I am counselling the Government that this is a form of slackness of which they should not be guilty, and there is no necessity at all to be tricky about this vote. If this vote is used as a quick advance for the purpose of restoring the sight of some individual, let the House know that that has been done at the first possible opportunity. Nearly a year elapsed before this House knew that a Head of expenditure was used for the purpose of lending out money: I think that that is going a bit too far because it is not competent for the Head of the Administration or the Executive Committee as a whole to attach conditions to money which is coming out of the Treasury. That is the sole right of the people's representatives in General Assembly assembled. I do not think that such slackness should be allowed to go unnoticed, because that type of thing has led to the taking of \$140,000 out of the Treasury in a manner that we knew not of prior to that particular incident.

The question that the sum of \$18,027 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.25 p.m.

Head II — Secretariat

Head II Secretariat was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make a few amendments to this Head.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Item 3 — Assistant Chief Secretary is increased by \$5,760 (To be voted) to provide for the salary of an additional Assistant Chief Secretary. This will bring the number of Assistant Chief Secretaries to two.

The Civil Establishment Order for this increase in Staff has already been laid and when the Order is passed the salary for this additional Officer will be fixed by law. It is set out here to be voted pending the passing of the Order. This will bring the amount needed for this item to \$11,520.

Item 9 — Senior Clerks — \$12,960, is increased by \$4,560 (to be voted) to provide for the salaries of two additional Senior Clerks. This will bring the amount of \$17,520.

Item 10 — Clerks — \$14,802 is increased by \$3,000 (To be voted) to \$17,802 to provide for the salaries of 5 additional Clerks.

Item 12 — Stenographers and Typists — \$5,388 is increased by \$624 (To be voted) to \$6,012 to provide for the salary of an additional Stenographer and Typist.

Item 12 (a) is a new Item for a Receptionist Typist—Provision of \$624 (To be voted) is for the salary of a Receptionist-Typist on scale \$624 x 48 — 1,200.

Item 12 (b) is a new Item for a Telephone Operator. Provision of \$528 (To be voted) is for the salary of a Telephone Operator on scale \$528 x 48 — 912.

Item 13 — Messengers — \$3,728, is increased by \$480 (To be voted) to \$4,208 to provide for the salary of an additional Messenger.

Item 15 — C.O.L. Allowance — \$8,200 is increased by \$1,400 (To be voted) to \$9,600 to provide allowances for additional staff.

Sir, this additional Staff is due to the increased staff necessary now that Government Headquarters are about to be occupied. I hope honourable members have visited this building in the course of its erection. There will be a Receptionist-Typist as you go into the building and a Telephone Operator for the whole building. The addition of an Assistant Chief Secretary and two Senior Clerks is necessary for the administration. There is also the addition of five Clerks. At the present moment there is only one Registry but when we move over to the new buildings, each Ministry will have its own Registry and each Registry will have its own Registry Clerk. Each Minister's files will be kept in the Registry which forms part of his Office. It, therefore will be easier of course for the Minister to deal with his own files than is the present system. I do not think there is any other point I should make in respect of these amendments. If honourable members wish to have any more information I shall be glad to give it to them.

4.35 p.m.

I would like to say — it was mentioned, I think, by the honourable junior member for the City, under Item 21 — the honourable junior member for the City wondered whether the Statistical Department should not be a separate Department. Mr. Seers, the Statistician, himself feels that he should be near the Premier's and the Financial Secretary's Offices and he is content that although he would be the Head of his staff, if I may put it that way, it has not been thought necessary to put a separate Department. He is quite content with things as they are although it

has caused a lot of moving to and fro. In the original plan there was no provision made for any extra office, and I believe the Hon. Minister on my left has had to be shifted about a bit in his proposed new Office, but we have made a beginning and we are meeting there for a month. We will then see how it will work when the machines come down (maybe they will cause over-crowding in a particular room); but for the present we feel that we can make a satisfactory beginning in the way the offices have been allocated.

I beg to move that the sum of \$73,587 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I had brought up this matter because of putting the Statistical Adviser under the Head—Colonial Secretary—or the Secretariat, because I know there is a great deal of duplication of keeping accounts and all that. I know that is so, and probably some of this increased staff will have time taken up with an unnecessary amount of work. I have had some knowledge of how these things work and I know this must of necessity cause this Head of Department to keep his own little accounts particularly and somebody keeping them as well, because after all it is to be paid from a Head that they really and truly control. I do not think that this is a time for the Government to go and create unnecessary work and see itself increasing the Civil Establishment. Mr. Chairman, it is not a good sign when you see a Government with two things: overburdening people with taxation and overburdening them with Civil Establishment. That is a sign of decadence. It is not a sign of efficiency at all, and I warn this Government that while it is a good thing to give people employment it is not a good sign for Government to be in need of taxation and increasing taxation all the time and at the same time creating a topheavy staff and inconveniencing Civil Servants. They are two sure signs that something is wrong.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering under Item 12 Stenographers and Typists whether in view of the high cost of living, the Government is satisfied that \$52 a month is a good salary for these young girls who are expected to keep themselves properly, and in some cases coming from the country and having to pay car fare etc. I am wondering if the Government thinks this salary is adequate.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the criticisms made by both honourable members, but I will deal with the honourable junior member for the City first. We entirely agree that in a country it is an unorthodox and perhaps not sensible way of finding work for unemployed and increasing the Civil Establishment; but this Government, which is as much to blame as any other, has been too much inclined to under-staff and over-work the Civil Service. The introduction of Ministerial Status has made me wonder over and over again how the previous Government ran with everything under one Head, because with each Minister and his staff doing one-fifth of the work done by the Colonial Secretary in the old days, heaven knows what business got done there.

We have carefully studied it since the Ministerial system was introduced and we have found that there was really and truly not sufficient staff in the Civil Service. We have learnt by sad experience, and not always by sad experience, that we got faithful service from the Civil Service, but it is not quite right to work them constantly overtime without paying them for that overtime. I suggest to any honourable member to go into my office for instance at five o'clock in the afternoon, or 5.30 or 6.00 sometimes and he

will find clerks still working. The same thing is true of the Secretariat. The same thing happens in other Departments but I speak for these because I come across them more often than the others. So I do assure the honourable member for the City that it is no reckless expenditure when we ask for this additional vote. Let me remind the House in Committee that Trinidad has eight Ministers, Jamaica has eight and each of these Ministers has his own staff. The size of Barbados makes no difference; it is the volume of work in this sense. You have a number of Departments no matter what the size, and in dealing with British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica, the fact that British Guiana is so much huger in size than Barbados does not mean we should not have the necessary Departments, and when we try to put the work of eight Ministers into five, you must see especially in the lower division—and even with the Assistant Secretary and even the Permanent Secretary—that you are giving some people more work than they are able to perform. As to the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Philip, we agree that these are small salaries but the fact that the Government has announced its intention and is already working on proposals for increased salaries is an indication that we do feel that these salaries should be increased.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I presume that honourable members are allowed to speak in Committee. When the hon. member for St. Joseph said that the Ministerial Staff and the Staff of the Administration was not sufficient, I for the first time in my life find myself entirely in agreement with the honourable member. But there was an ellipsis which the honourable member failed to state, and that was this. The Staff is not only insufficient but the money that we are paying them, and I think that we can draw an analogy between the Ministerial bench and the Staff who preside over the Departments right now, because of the inadequacy in the amount of money paid. Now, I notice, Mr. Chairman, that under Head 2 Item 5 and Item 21, two different amounts are set out: \$26,738 for the Statistical Staff and a service expenditure of \$35,000 under Head 21 which is not fixed by law for the Statistical Staff. 4.45 p.m.

Now this is a fantastic amount of money to vote for the setting up of a Department. This money is now demanded for the simple reason that the other Government Officers who are in charge of finance, are so inadequate—as one can see from the way in which the annual Estimates have been regurgitated year after year in the same unimaginative form—that it would appear to me that the Statistical Officer will have to do those jobs which the Heads of Departments have failed to do in the past. To give an illustration; after a long and lengthy introduction, which was really of the nature of play-reading by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—a recital of what was written by a junior Civil Servant or a middle group Civil Servant in the Memorandum on the Estimates—absolutely no figures were presented by the Financial Secretary to show how the production of Barbados had grown during the past year and how the Government envisaged that they would increase the volume of production for the benefit of the suffering masses of the community. Therefore, we now have to import into this island under Head II some expert to tell the Government not to operate adding machines simply to furnish the different Statistics which come from the different Departments, but to do the job which should have been done for these five years under the Administration for which we have been paying salaries quite out of proportion to the ability of the Officers who are responsible for

these Departments, and to do those things which I have been advocating on the floor of this House for the past five years and, as a matter of fact, at Government House itself.

The late departed Officer who used to preside over the unfortunate people of Barbados, I refer to Sir Alfred Savage, [Mr. LEWIS: He has not yet departed] he has departed as far as this island is concerned, said to me that it was his desire to set up a Statistical Department as soon as possible. I pointed out to that particular Officer that the setting up of a Statistical Department is only part of the job, and we would still need somebody who would take a census as to the production or underproduction, and not merely how much the Government could rake in from taxpayers and dissipate in the shortest possible time.

I am willing to predict that after this Statistical Officer is firmly established, that next year for the first time, we will probably get a census of production in this colony. We will still get a resumé of the increase in production and in national income, and we will get some information as to the national income per head, and then we will see whether the Government is doing its job or not. For some peculiar reason the Ministers of Government believe that their only job in this country is to find out from each Head of the Departments how much money he could possibly get, then prune it down and then take the money which is raised in taxation and spend it on the Administrative and Social Services normally in Barbados by paying money to those who administer the services. There has never been, since the 21 years that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has been a member of this House, one year in which he has said:—"We have provided so many jobs for the people of Barbados. We have raised the productivity of this industry or that industry by so much per cent. in order to keep pace with the 1.8% growth of population per annum." We have a large number of unemployed people in this country—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the honourable member keep to Item 19.

Mr. BARROW: I am keeping to Item 21, not Item 19.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Anyhow, keep to Item 21.

Mr. BARROW: I am dealing with the purpose of a Statistical Officer and that Item is not "Fixed by Law" as they often want to tell you when they want to stifle debate. If you had proper Ministers you would never have any need, in a small benighted country like Barbados, for a Statistical Officer to do these things. It is not this Officer's job to suggest to the Prime Minister that he should tell the people what the state of the nation is. Are the people better off or worse off than they were a year ago, or is the money which they are getting buying less goods or more goods? Has the economy of Barbados been expanded? You do not need a Statistical Officer to tell you these things. What is really happening is that there are hoping to burden the Statistical Officer with the inadequacy of other people who should be looking after these things.

In Barbados the state of the economy of the people is not looked after. When the Premier made his reference to the economy of the island, he talked about Revenue and Expenditure; he did not talk about national economy. If the Head of the Statistical Office is going to do these things, I suggest that he stick within the terms of his employment, and let us get proper financial Officers and proper Ministers and not have the Statistical Officer carrying the whole country on his shoulders. For five years, both honourable members for the City and I have

been repeating that there is no indication at this time of the year as to what the state of the country is. I do hope that when the annual Estimates are presented again next year, the people of Barbados will know whether the economy of the island has been expanded or contracted, whether the people are better off or worse off, and not merely whether the Government and the planters are well off or not.

The question that the sum of \$73,587 be voted under this Head, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD III—ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head III—Accountant General—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$7,812 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$7,812 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD IV—AUDITOR GENERAL

Head IV—Auditor General—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$4,864 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$4,864 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD V—HARBOUR AND SHIPPING

Head V—Harbour and Shipping—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In connection with this Head, I am asking leave to make amendments to the following Items:—

Item 5—Clerks—\$4,344, an increase of \$600 (to be voted) to provide for the salary of an additional Clerk. The total under this Item will now be \$4,944.

Item II—Cost of Living Allowance—\$5,910. That is to be increased by \$105 (to be voted) to make provision for an allowance for an additional Clerk.

Item 20—Classes for Able Seamen—\$1,860. There is to be an increase of \$1,400 (to be voted) making the total \$3,260, so as to provide for additional equipment and printing expenses of certificates and forms.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$101,925 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can get a little information on the training scheme which was started under this Head. I am referring to Item 20. That scheme was introduced under Supplementary Estimates sometime during the last financial year and I may say that it did not have a happy introduction although I do think that the whole thing was misunderstood by the Minister who brought it in. However, I think it was for a laudable purpose. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister would give us some idea as to whether the Scheme is justifiable. I am not saying that it is not justifiable but I think I am entitled to hear something about it now because we may not get a Report on it for the next five or ten years: and since it is an innovation and would probably help more able-bodied men to get jobs on ships, I would like to know the reason why they have increased this amount because I would like to

know that I am voting the money of the people of this Island towards a worthy cause.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to inform the honourable member that training has not yet been started because it has not yet been agreed to by the Ministry for Trade and Civil Aviation in England. As I pointed out on the last occasion, this Scheme will have to be approved by the Ministry of Trade and Civil Aviation in England. Other than that, it was agreed that the trainees would use a Harrison Line boat for training but since then that has not been possible. However, the Harrison Line people have given a boat for training but it needs certain things such as riggings which will have to be fitted in order to be able to start the Scheme. It is hoped that in the near future the green light will be given and the classes will be started.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I view this matter two ways. I am not saying that it is not a good idea for somebody to recognise the certificates given but I think the training must be worth something. I would not like to train people in the hope of getting a job and then they find it impossible to get one; but I wish to say that in the past these ships have had to take on raw recruits and then train them; therefore, I think it might be of some good to get ahead with the training even if you cannot get certificates for them.

Whether the certificates to be given will gain recognition or not, I think it would be good advice to spend the \$1,800 and another \$1,400 on training those people to do something useful. The time may come when ship companies might be glad to have these trainees to work on their ships and they might say that these trainees have had a certain amount of training though they might not have a certificate. After all, I understand that the Barbadian Seamen have built up a good reputation on the Harrison Line boats; therefore, I think you should get ahead with the training of these people. It will do no harm. Of course, I would not like it to lead to frustration, but certainly it will do no harm if you start ahead with this training and await its acceptance or recognition by the Ministry for Trade and Civil Aviation.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure that the Harbour Master would have started this course in anticipation of the Ministry for Trade and Civil Aviation agreeing to issue these certificates were it not for the fact that we did not have the necessary equipment to start the course.

Mr. LEWIS: I am glad for the information and I like that attitude. When I made this comment I did not associate this thing purely with a ship. I was told that the Y.M.C.A. would be used for part of the instruction and that is why I said that you could get ahead with the training because it was my belief that you could give the trainees some lectures at the Y.M.C.A. during the time.

The question that the sum of \$101,925 be voted under Head V—Harbour & Shipping was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
5.05 p.m.

HEAD VI. CUSTOMS

Head VI—Customs was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: There are certain additions to be made to this Head:

Item 5—Increased by \$4,200 (to be voted) \$46,620 to provide for five additional clerks; item 10 Temporary Clerical Assistants \$2,400. Item 12 is to be increased by \$1,350. I beg to move that the sum of \$177,333 be voted under Head VI.

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

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, another illustration of the ineptitude of the people who are responsible for preparing the Estimates is apparent in the way in which this particular Head has been drawn up. Now under Head VI Item 11 you will see Overtime is put as an item by itself, and then if you turn to Item 15 on the next page, you will see that this is probably one of the few examples where the Legislature of this colony has actually dictated under which Head the items should be drawn up. Under section 176 of the Trade Act of 1910-4, page 508 of Volume III of the Laws, you will find this:

"Whenever, in the interest of the public, the services of any officer of Customs may be required by the Comptroller out of prescribed hours of attendance, the Comptroller is hereby authorised and empowered to remunerate such officer for the extra services required of him at a rate to be fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and to be approved by both Houses of the Legislature, such remuneration to be included in the incidental expenses of the Customs Department and to be sanctioned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Now, Sir, this is clear even to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and certainly not ambiguous even to the honourable senior member for St. Michael or the so-called Minister of Trade. Here you have the law stating which item Overtime should be charged to. We have frequently questioned the Government bench about incidental expenses, but this is one of the few occasions on which we cannot query this expense. It is patterned by section 176 of the Trade Act, and here you have two separate Heads, Overtime when it is not overtime, because in Section 175 the Government does not pay for that and that brings me to my main point. I have it on fairly reliable authority, Sir, that the Chamber of Commerce has actually offered to increase overtime rates for the Customs Officers working in Warehouses after regular hours of duty, because under Section 175 the taxpayers do not have to pay for overtime in warehouses although some members of the Government may not be aware of it. The actual producers and the owners of the bonds and warehouses have to pay the overtime.

Now, you have this state of affairs: you have men in charge of the warehouses getting about one-fifth of the overtime rate that the porter who is standing up at the door would get; not idling but I mean actually doing no physical work because he may just be checking or something like that. Well to show you what little respect we have for our Customs Clerks, I understand that one of the members of the Government—I do not want to call any names at present, but the particular Minister would know to whom I refer—informed the Chamber of Commerce that if they allowed them to pay better rates to the Customs Clerks, it would affect the people in the Waterworks; the people in the Waterworks would ask for more money. The Trade Act 1910-4 in Section 175 states that whoever requests the bond to be open after duty is responsible for paying. Now, we get capitalists whom the honourable junior member for St. Peter and other Socialists excluding the Government in this House, frequently accuse of paying low rates of pay, anxious to pay higher wages to the Customs Officers but the Ministers fear it might bring the salaries of the Civil Servants too close to their own and they would lose the disparity on which their prestige rests as Ministers, because it does not rest on their ability.

Now, Sir, this is a shocking state of affairs and the honourable member for St. Michael would

know what I am saying is actually correct and the honourable junior member for Christ Church, who is a member of the Chamber of Commerce, would be able to corroborate what I have said; and I would like all Civil Servants to know what kind of Government they are dealing with. This is not an imposition on the taxpayers. We are going to spend \$35,000 on a statistical service but we will not allow the capitalists in this island to pay proper rates for overtime to Government employees. The honourable junior member for the City obviously has not refreshed his memory on Section 175, but, Sir, I am stating that under Item 11 the Law says in Section 176, I quote the chapter and the actual page which you can refer to, that Overtime must come under Incidentals. For the benefit of the honourable junior member for the City Section 175 says that whoever demands the time of Government servants to work in bonds or warehouses would have to pay the salaries and that is the section to which I am referring.

Now, Sir, I would like an explanation from the Government bench. Is the Government really saying that Government servants must not draw too much money, that they are being paid adequate salaries already, and that the men in charge of warehouses are only entitled to one-fifth of the overtime rate that a water-front worker or porter is getting? If Government feels they are getting enough and is telling Capitalists, "You must not pay too high wages," there is not one of the members on this side of the House who would not agree. It is little wonder the honourable junior member for St. Peter, who is General Secretary of the Union, and its members, have to protest against the low wages being paid, because that is nothing less than encouraging low wages to be paid by the Capitalists in this country. But here it is that the conscience of the people including the honourable junior member for Christ Church, whom we know from personal experience to have a conscience in contra-distinction from the Minister of Trade, being moved. People like the honourable junior member for Christ Church have asked Government to allow them to pay higher rates to these people. I have it from reliable sources and I would be surprised if the honourable member for St. Thomas does not know of it as well. That is a bad state of affairs and if the Government has made that decision, I am asking them to reconsider it as soon as possible, because I do not think it is fair to keep a man out of his bed until three or four o'clock in the morning doing responsible work without giving him a pay which is commensurate to the responsibility he has undertaken.

I hope that Item 11 will be deleted, and that this \$4,800 will be inserted in and added to Item 15 which is the proper Item under which it should have been brought to this Chamber.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, since 1954, I think it was. I drew the Government's attention to the fact that there was some dissatisfaction among these Customs Officers over their rates of pay and the fees paid to them for overtime. On that occasion, I set out the facts for the consideration of the Government. The figures are based on 30 or 40 years ago Warehouse Clerks and Customs Officers received similar fees; but the Barbados Workers' Union at one time made representation on behalf of these workers, and the Warehouse Clerks received an increase as a result. The fees at that time were \$4.80 per day for Sundays and Bank Holidays, and 4/- an hour for overtime. Due to the representation by the Barbados Workers' Union, the Warehouse Clerks were increased in their fees to \$9.60 per day for Sundays

and Bank Holidays, and to \$1.32 per hour for overtime.

The Customs Clerks approached the Government by means of a letter without any results, and in 1954 I drew the matter to the Government's attention also without results. Far from an improvement, I believe that things have got worse. However, the fees for Warehouse Clerks have gone up to \$10.56 for Sundays and Bank Holidays, and to \$1.58 per hour for overtime. But the Customs Officers have remained at the same rate of \$4.80 per day for Sundays and Bank Holidays, and 4/- per hour for overtime.

I am not criticising the fees paid to the Warehouse Clerks; I am now putting up a plea for these Customs Officers. I do not know if it is correct, but I see in the note to Item 11 that these fees for overtime to the staff are not recoverable. I am told that these fees are paid by the merchants, but if the merchants are willing to increase the fees for the Customs Officers, I am at a loss to see what has held up the matter for all this time. As I said before, I am making a plea on behalf of the Customs Officers, and I sincerely hope that that plea does not fall on deaf ears as has happened in 1954.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to be enlightened as to whether we are voting any money for these particular fees which are paid, either by the merchants or which the merchants pay the Clerks directly. I take it that this question of overtime arises when the Government want people to work, and these are expenses which are not recoverable, because they are not provided for by law. I should like to know what is the right of these people under Item 11? Are they fixed by law? This matter of overtime fees for the Customs Officers with regard to the landing or shipping of cargo, should really be a matter for the Civil Service Association to take up and try and get straightened out. If they have a good case, and if the merchants are willing to pay, I think it should be an easy matter to be settled. The people who should pay ought to say that they are willing to bring the payment up to date, and the people who are to receive the payment are willing to receive it, I am sure. Can the Civil Service Association do nothing about the matter?

Another matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the Government is the position of the Customs Guards. I understand that they have no status at all and they would like to know exactly where they stand with the Government. These people are a bit uneasy about the matter. The method of employing some of them for long periods at night has been given some consideration; they would like to supplement the small income they get in this way, and they would like to know how they stand with the Government. I would like the Hon. Minister of Trade to give that matter some consideration and put the minds of these people at rest.

I am always asking about the revenue from these rum bonds. Under "Customs and Excise" duties, I cannot find anything to tell me what is the revenue earned from this source. I should like to know what revenue do we get, and is it included under the Excise Duty on the rum? I would like to know if we are getting back the rent which we pay for these numerous Warehouses; and I would like a statement to be made now, if that is at all possible, because I think the Government is committing itself on the floor of this House to the giving of private rum bottling to the merchants. Is that likely to be settled during the current year so that the rent of Warehouses can be dealt with?

I would like to know something about the revenue directly from the Warehouses and whether

it is ascertainable at all. I have been asking for this information for a long time, and I would like to have it, because it would help me to decide on the possibility of giving private bonds the right for the bottling of rum.

Mr. BRANCKER: Before the hon. member replies, I would also like to say a word as regards Item 7 "Unestablished Staff." The Appendix discloses that this Item deals with the Customs Guards; representations have been made to me about the excessive hours which these people are asked to work, and their salaries are on the scale of \$528 x 48—912 per annum for these long hours during which they have to work. I would like to know if the Hon. Minister can tell this Chamber officially what are the hours?

5.25 p.m.

I would like to know from the appropriate Minister if he can tell this Chamber officially what are the hours which in the course of a month any of these Customs Guards are required to work and whether they have any off days, and if any, how many in the course of a month.

There is no reason why because Customs Guards are new public employees that they should not be considered as regards normal working periods and reasonable rates of pay. Because they know that they are public employees, they may not be disposed of becoming members of our Workers Union and may rely on the Civil Service Association to plead their case. You will realise the tepid representation of that association when it comes to improved conditions and salaries of workers at the bottom of the scale. Sir, I would really like to hear an official pronouncement on the maximum working hours which Customs Guards are required to work.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member must know that he cannot be given an answer to such a question on the spur of the moment. I will promise to get the information for him as early as possible—possibly tomorrow. If he reads what is set out on page 173, he will find what is their salary scale and that they are classified separately and have a recognised status.

As regards the epithets made against Ministers of the Government by the honourable senior member for St. George, we are accustomed to that. You can train a parrot to abuse people; I believe most parrots abuse most of the time. No Minister has done anybody what the honourable senior member for St. George has accused us of. It is true that item as regards the working of the Customs Officers is not before us. There is no money which we are hoping to get back. The rates fixed should be paid by those people. However, I will investigate the matter. Perhaps, I do not know, whether the Civil Service Association has approached the Establishment and said that the merchants are willing to pay more. I know that nothing has come to the Executive about it. This is the first time I have heard any thing like the allegation made by the honourable senior member for St. George. Why should the Government object if the merchants want to pay more money? The only reason I can see anybody objecting is because it will cause the merchants to pay more income tax. At any rate, I will have the matter investigated. I will ask the Secretariat whether any representation has been made to the Establishment by the Customs Officers.

I know what the honourable junior member for St. Michael is referring to is something which took place a couple years ago but frankly I have not got my fingertips on the matter.

As regards the warehouses, I suppose it will not be difficult to get the names and set out the

amounts collected from each warehouse; but the system is to charge so much and no more as would cover whatever rents Government has to pay. That has been the practice for the last three years. I do not think there is anything more to which I should reply.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get straight what the Hon. Premier said for the record and I hope that the Minister of Truth who represents the constituency of St. Thomas and who edits the debates of this Chamber will not expunge it. I am going to say it slowly because it has been our experience when we go to check up statements made during the course of a debate to find that the Minister of Truth has been at work and has corrected history.

I understand the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to say: (1) that no merchant, or warehouse or bond owner, has ever offered under Section 175 of the Trade Act, 1910, Chapter IV, found on page 508 of Volume III of the Laws of Barbados, to increase the rates now paid the Customs Officers who now come under that Section; (2) if any of those people ever done so, no Minister knows anything about it; (That makes the honourable junior member for St. Michael misguided in his statement.) (3) it is pure hypothetical if any of those people made such an offer and that Government does not believe that they are sincere in their offer; and finally (4) if any of those people did make such an offer and the Government had to take them seriously, no Minister has made any statement to the effect, though it could not be entertained because the Public Works Department and the Waterworks Department employees would also want more money. If the Reporters have got that down and everybody has got it down at dictation speed, I hope next week it will not be expunged from the Official Debates.

The crowning statement made by the Hon. Premier in the course of his remarks was that despite the fact that our fears are unfounded, our suspicions are ungrounded and our information is incorrect, that he is going to investigate the matter. Now, what is he going to investigate? He also knows that none of the other Ministers made any statement.

Now, what is he going to investigate? The Minister knows he is not going to make any investigation and even if he does make an investigation, they are not going to be serious about paying more money. I only wanted to straighten out the records; I have nothing more to say.

5.35 p.m.
The question that the sum of \$177,333 be voted under Head VI was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: 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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: 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 agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

ESTIMATES C'TD.

On re-assembling.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply on the Barbados Estimates for the year 1956-57.

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

Head VII — Powder Magazine

Head VII—Powder Magazine—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$984 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I hope, Sir, that you will permit me to say this, but I would like the Hon. Premier to look back at Item 15 under the Head before. I see there is something for refilling fire-extinguishers and I have a note to say it is being put under the Fire Brigade. However, that is only by the way.

The question that Head VII be passed, was put and resolved in the affirmative, without division.

HEAD VIII—LEGAL

Head VIII—Legal—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$3,902 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, in Head VIII, under 10, "Purchase of Law Books," the Note says:—

"To meet recurrent expenditure to keep Attorney General's Library up to date."

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if in connection with keeping this Library up-to-date, there is any information as to when we are likely to have an Attorney General. For whom are we keeping the Library up-to-date. What are the prospects? Without an Attorney General and without a Registrar the prospect seems so grim; but the honourable senior member for St. Joseph made no remarks about it in his opening Budget Speech. What is the use of getting books if nobody is there to use them?

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member will go lower down he will see they are voting \$1,600 for Law Books.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is one general comment I would like to make and the whole element of it is this. It is nearly a year ago now that the Attorney General of Barbados was appointed to British Guiana, and everyone will agree that the salary that we are paying of \$8,160 a year cannot be regarded as so insignificant a salary that at this stage an Attorney General could not be appointed to Barbados. It reduces the colony's legal work of the Crown Law Officers and I must state that it is becoming very difficult indeed for a colony like Barbados to carry on without an Attorney General. Mr. Wylie has been appointed so long to British Guiana that he could take part in the Federation talks. We have provision for a Solicitor General, for an Assistant to the Attorney General and other legal persons. The bulk of the work in Barbados today is not the same as it used to be in the old days without the services of a Solicitor General, and I feel I must say publicly that the Colonial Office will regret to see that there is such a shortage of barristers available in the West Indies that they can sniff at a salary of \$8,160, and we know many practising barristers do not come anywhere near this and would be glad to give up the profession and take the \$8,160. It is a source of regret that Barbados is without the service of an Attorney General for so long.

Mr. LEWIS: I think I should use this Head to say that I do not like the idea of the Attorney

General compiling the laws of this country for us I do not see any law for it, but the Regulation says he does it now. And I am hoping that we will be able to go back and put something in the Estimates to get somebody outside the office to check up on the work that is done and compile the laws. I do not know why it is done. Previously it was done by some Judge of the Court of Appeal Mr. Chenery used to do it. I feel it would be best to have it done outside the Attorney General's office.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I wish I could see what advantage that is. Practically anybody could do it. I think the honourable member made the point before that the Attorney General should not compile the laws or anybody in that office. They do not revise them when they are compiling them, but just put them together. An officer boy can do that so I do not know there is any point in saying the Attorney General should not compile them. If there were a question of revision for the purpose of detecting mistakes, I would agree; because a man who made a mistake will go over and over and not see it. I think with some of the old Acts, apart from the consolidated Acts, Sir Herbert Greaves had enough time on his hand to put together the set of laws and edit them, but I will make enquiries. I do not know if there is any particular reason why Mr. Justice Chenery cannot continue to do it. I cannot answer the question of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy. I do not know how close we are to getting an Attorney General. One can think of lawyers whom we know, Barbadians chiefly, who would do well as an Attorney General from the point of view of ability, but they may be in positions which it would not be worth their while except from the point of view of prestige, to give up their present jobs in order to take up the post of Attorney General, and if I can get any releasable information I promise to let the House know as soon as possible.

Mr. BRANCKER: It occurred to me as I listened to the honourable member that in the neighbouring island of Trinidad there is a Barbadian holding a post, who was formerly in the Attorney General's Chamber of this island; and I am wondering if that Barbadian would not be interested in the Attorney Generalship because I think the salary of a Legal Draftsman in Trinidad is below that of the Barbados Attorney General, and none would deny the ability of a Legal Draftsman from Trinidad or Tobago. If however, I call Mr. Ferguson's name that might be a thing that would stand against him getting this appointment, so I would like "Mum" to be the word.

6.25 p.m.

I am wondering if that gentleman has been considered and if he has intimated that he is not interested in such a post. That is only the name of one individual which has occurred to me, an individual who would fill the office with first-class ability. In so far as Mr. Archer is concerned, his salary is very much in excess of the salary of the Attorney General of Barbados; he is one whom we might consider for the post of Chief Justice when we come to deal with that particular Head.

In connection with the compilation of the Laws, and the annual Proclamations, Orders and Regulations, they have been done until 1951, by the staff of the Attorney General's Office. Since then, no Proclamations, so far as I have been able to ascertain, have been published. If you want to see the Proclamations for the years from 1952 to 1955, you would have to go to the Public Library or the *Official Gazette*. I understand that they have been held up in the Attorney General's Office. Even now, if they

are released from there, with nobody to print them, one never knows what prospects there are of getting these Proclamations after the year 1951.

The question that the sum of \$3,902 be voted under this Head, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD IX—MARKETS

Head IX—Markets—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$45,250 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Item 16 "Cleaning Materials" I would like to say that I have been hearing quite a number of complaints about the condition of the stalls in the Public Market, and the cleaning of the stalls generally seems to leave a lot to be desired. The butchers complain that they go into the Market and find the stalls in an insanitary condition. Formerly, these stalls were cleaned in the afternoon, but for some reason or other, that has been stopped. I am wondering if we could not revert to the practice of cleaning these stalls in the afternoon, so that in the morning they could be used right away, instead of running the risk of meat being placed in insanitary stalls.

Relative to Item 26, "Refrigerating Plant," the question was raised when we voted an amount to supplement the Estimates a short time ago. The honourable junior member for Christ Church mentioned on that occasion that meat was thrown away, but one would expect that there would have been some improvement in the service at the Market. I understand that there is a practice of shutting off the electricity during certain hours of the day. If there is a risk involved in the refrigeration, there is also a risk involved in the meat. I am wondering if the butchers are compensated for the loss of this meat or if they have to lose it. I am also wondering if consideration should not be given to the question of installing some sort of automatic system just as obtains in refrigerators in people's homes.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I agree with the honourable member that there are lots of complaints made about this Market, and some investigation should be made as to keeping it clean. With respect to Item 31, "Central Market," the note says this: "Tentative estimate, to cover three months running of new Central Market, Fairchild St. to be constructed shortly."

If you look at the Capital Estimates, you will find that there is provision for the sum of \$75,000—\$40,000 is a re-vote, and \$35,000 is a new vote—relative to this Market; but we are not clear as to whether that \$75,000 is to be regarded as the \$75,000 for construction of this new Market. As regards this tentative estimate, that is an estimate for the running of this place for three months. I should like to know what is the meaning of this phrase "tentative estimate." Is this only a token, or is this the estimate for the running of the Market for three months? We are a little bit bewildered with this phrase "tentative estimate" because a tentative estimate does not look as if it is something which you have estimated for the running of this Market for three months. We do not want to put in the Estimates more money than we are going to spend in the year 1956—57.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know whether there are any drawings available indicating the plan of this Market.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what Item is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. MILLER: I am speaking on Markets generally, but I am speaking on Item 31, if you want to be particular. Much has been said in the past few years and criticisms have been made of the service of the Refrigerating Plant at the Public Market. Honourable members will, however, appreciate the fact that when that Market was designed, it was not designed for the storage of large quantities of meat; it was intended for the storage of meat mainly for the tables of the working-class people. To-day there is a considerable demand for this meat, but the design was not for the storage of meat for any long period. It is obvious that some of the meat has been spoilt; however, if the drawings in connection with this Market are not available at the moment, I would be happy if the Hon. Minister in charge would release them later on. We should like to inspect any such plans showing the detailed design of the new Market.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat puzzled as to the policy of the Government as regards District Markets. They agreed at one time to place one at Four Cross Roads, St. John, and another at Top Rock, Christ Church. I would like to know if these talks of schemes have been abandoned temporarily or altogether.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I am sure this Committee will allow me in the absence of the Minister in charge of this Department to make a reply on his behalf and I will do my best to answer honourable members' questions under this Head. As far as the question of the last honourable member who has spoken is concerned, I would like to say that this Head includes provision for a District Market at Eagle Hall and Markets at Top Rock, Oistins and Speightstown. As regards the Top Rock Market, that is to be erected in the near future and there will also be the new Central Market in Fairchild Street.

The name of the Head has been amended to read "Markets" and these Markets will be administered by the Superintendent whose Head Office is at present at Cheapside but will be removed in due course to the Central Market.

An honourable member asked about the wording of the Note. I can only say that the amount is not as firm and accurate an estimate as it might be and the word "tentative" was put in. From what has been given, the figure of \$5,000 has been based on an estimate for one year at an average rate of expenditure of \$20,000. I repeat it is not an accurate figure and that is the reason why the word "tentative" was used.

The honourable junior member for St. Michael asked about the refrigerating plant and said that it was spoiling meat. I do not know if the honourable member was present when I read a Reply from the Superintendent of the Market (I think it was on Tuesday last) in reply to the accusations made by the honourable junior member for Christ Church that quantities of meat had been thrown away. The Note explained that it was no large, excessive or unusual quantity; it was just a normal amount of meat which a butcher might think was a bit stale, and he should dispose of it. The Superintendent denied that it was any unusual amount of meat thrown away. I do not know if the honourable member was present when the Note was read but the Committee did not dispute it. therefore one can only come to the conclusion that they seemed satisfied with the explanation. [A VOICE: Which Committee?] I mean that of this House on Tuesday last. I read the Note to the Committee.

With regard to the other suggestion made by the hon. member as to improvements in the cleaning of the stalls, I will promise him to bring the matter to the attention of the Ministry concerned.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, actually I would not have risen, were it not for the Hon. Minister who has just sat down making the remarks that the Committee seemed satisfied. I want to say now that I was not present when the Hon. Minister read from the file or anybody made a statement. It is all very well and good for one to make replies of that sort by the Minister, but I want to inform the Government that there is not a week that goes by that I am not called to the market to see a quantity of meat spoiled. Let me put it in its true perspective by saying "stink." There is no two ways about it either. I have spoken and complained to the Superintendent about this matter on more than one occasion, drawing his attention to what is the use of his trying to save a few dollars in electricity for the Government when by so doing it is spoiling the meat of the butchers. The hon. junior member for St. Michael asked the question, why is it necessary to shut off the refrigerating plant at night at all? The only answer to be given to that is that while you may be saving some electricity and a few shillings for the Government, I do not think the Government would appreciate the saving at the expense of a few hard working butchers. I would like to let the Hon. Minister know that that statement by the Superintendent is not good enough. You have spent money to repair the refrigerator and because of your parsimonious attitude of your trying to save a few dollars, butchers are suffering as a result. Whether they are losing one pound or ten pounds of meat, it is sufficient to cause dissatisfaction.

I know that this matter does not concern the Minister of Trade's portfolio but I hope he will draw the attention of the Superintendent to our remarks that the Government shows no appreciation of his shutting the refrigerating plant off and as a result butchers' meat is spoilt. Let me repeat that that has been happening for some time and I have drawn the matter to the attention of the Superintendent of the Market and have talked the matter over with him. Apparently some people seem to be a law unto themselves and because they can write a report to satisfy a Minister's vanity, they believe they can go Scotch free feeling assured that nothing more will be said. As far as I am concerned, I will always raise a question about any matter I think deserves my questioning. I say again that it is not necessary to shut this plant off even if he had given a more justifiable reason than he gave. He knows no more about running a refrigerating plant than I know of running an aeroplane.

6.45 p.m.

It cannot harm the plant by running it all night because it would not get over cold. It is not one of those modern plants with an automatic device to shut it off and I urge the Minister to see that the butchers are protected, because every week although the Superintendent himself might for reasons known to himself pass some meat after it has been condemned by would-be purchasers—I do not say by butchers, because after a man invests his money although the meat has the appearance of being spoiled meat, surely he would still try to sell it—the superintendent would say it is not spoiled, but it is the butchers that matter. If they say it stinks, it stinks; and no Superintendent can say that meat that stinks is not stink. That has been going on for some time and I urge the Minister to see that the Market is not shut off at night in any effort to save five shillings for the Government.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman. I wonder if we have not reached the stage when Item 22 should be taken from under the supervision of the Superintendent of the market and attached to the Police Department. I believe it would be better run if that item were to be transferred to the Police Department for the simple reason that nowadays a lot of short weights are given, and the fact that the Police Department would be responsible for them would be used as a deterrent to those who have to sell goods and whom we all know give the consuming public less than a pound. I would like to see in the not too distant future that this item be transferred from the public market to the Police Department.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I just want to answer the honourable member that a Bill to amend the Weights and Measures Act has been passed by us and not yet by the Other Place, and when that Bill comes into effect it will be handled by the Police Department, but in the meantime we put it back under the old item. So far as the market is concerned, as I said before I agree with what honourable members said, and if there is anything, without attempting to say that the management is at fault, that can be done—if there is any mismanagement or anything that can be done to safeguard the people, of course I will do that.

The question that the sum of \$47,250 be voted under Head IX was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head X—Fire Brigade

Head X — Fire Brigade was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to move in the following items:— Item 4 Corporals to be increased by \$2,304, total to be voted \$10,944, to provide for the salaries of two additional Corporals. Item 5, Firemen—to be increased by \$11,520 (to be voted) \$34,636 to provide for the salaries of 16 additional Firemen. I shall ask the Minister responsible to give the explanation. Item 7—Scrubber and Cleaner will be increased by \$252, to be voted \$504 to provide for the wages of an additional Scrubber and Cleaner. Item 8—Rent allowance to be increased by \$500, to be voted \$2,900 to provide allowances for additional staff of Corporals and Firemen under Items 4 and 5. Cost of Living Allowance similarly for that staff to be increased by \$2,250, total to be voted \$7,720. Item 12 Clothing increased by \$1,350, total to be voted \$3,950 to provide Clothing for additional staff. Item 13—Equipment—increased by \$2,340, total to be voted \$6,340 to provide equipment for additional staff. Item 14—Cleaning, Water and Light—to be increased by \$350, total to be voted \$1,186 to meet expenses in connection with the new Fire Station at Seawell. Item 15—Incidentals is increased by \$100, total to be voted \$340, similarly for the new Fire Station at Seawell. Item 16—Medical Treatment—to be increased by \$30 and the total to be voted is \$90, to provide for the cost of medical treatment in respect of additional staff. Item 17—Appliances—increased by \$1,400 to be voted \$5,400 to provide for maintenance of additional appliances. Item 20—Stationery—is increased by \$30, total to be voted is \$90 to meet expenses in connection with the new Fire Station at Seawell. Item 23—Furniture—is a new Item and provision of \$840 (to be voted) to meet the cost of furniture for the new Fire Station at Seawell. Item 24—Appliances is also a new Item and provision of \$32,000 (to be voted) to purchase a crash tender (\$22,000) and a rescue tender (\$10,000).

I beg to move that the sum of \$80,333 be voted under this Head.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, in seconding this motion, I propose to let the Committee know that it has been decided to transfer the responsibility of fire fighting at Seawell Airport from the Director of Civil Aviation to the Fire Brigade Officer. That was contingent upon the recommendation which was made some time ago by the representative of M.C.A., a gentleman by the name of Mr. Abbott, from the Ministry of Civil Aviation who investigated the provision and equipment used for rescue in case there was any crash at the Airport. That is part of it, and in view of the fact that we can safely say that the Fire Brigade Officer has got his fire fighting up to scratch, judging from the demonstrations which we have seen in recent months—as a matter of fact I think they had two demonstrations which I am sure the public will agree that the men are very keen indeed—it has been decided that this service should be placed under the supervision of the Fire Brigade Officer. Those concerned including the Director of Civil Aviation have agreed to the transfer, and as a result the posts which were under the Civil Aviation Head will be transferred to the Fire Brigade and it is hoped that these men who are now serving at Seawell will be drafted into the service. So these changes were made to transfer authority and the men from the Head of Civil Aviation to the Fire Brigade.

6.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this is a rather serious matter. I take it, Sir, that the sum of \$55,000 will be added to this Estimate. [A VOICE: And the corresponding reduction from the Civil Aviation end] You mean the 16 additional firemen will be the people who are working at Seawell, and you will get an appropriate reduction from the Civil Aviation end?

Mr. Chairman, I referred earlier to the Fire Brigade Department being responsible for the fire-fighting appliances in the various Offices; I sincerely hope that that does not lead to some irresponsibility on the part of those who are actually running the fire risk. When you get this dual control of anything, it is a case where people can say: "You should have a fire extinguisher there." The reply will be that the Fire Department is in charge of that, and they did not think that it was necessary. I think the Fire Officer should go and tell people what they should have; that is what I understand obtained before. I should like to criticise the Department and not the Officer; let him say "I told you to keep a fire extinguisher on the wall there, and you have not kept it."

To my way of thinking, this is a very serious matter, and it might lead the Government into trouble. I well remember when the then Chief Medical Officer's staff was transferred to the Central Foundry Building, he said that there must be escape windows installed and it saved a lot of lives when that building was burnt down. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and people will look after their lives. The Fire Officer is of the opinion that his Department is so efficient that it can get from Bridgetown to Oistins in two seconds, but people got burnt up there. If you get a type of fire extinguisher which is of no use, you will get it in every Office in the place.

I like a little authority in these things. We have had a Fire Officer recommending that the type of fire extinguisher which you had already, was not of the right type. I feel that the Fire Officer should advise people as to what they should do. The Government should even allow him to advise private people in this matter. I really do not like this idea; I do not think it is necessary.

Under the Head "Customs" there is the Item "Incidentals" and the note to that Item says: "Includes cost of cleaning, electric current for lighting and power, purchase and refilling of fire extinguishers etc." It is said that the Customs Department was to purchase its own fire extinguisher; I see that the Item is authorised by law. I hope that this does not lead to any danger to people who are working in the Government Offices. As far as the Ministers are concerned, they are going into a concrete building. [Laughter]. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We can always jump through a window!] [Laughter]. I understand that some people have taken the opportunity to roughen the path up there so that it will not be as dangerous as in their private houses; [Laughter] so that the Ministers are getting protection all around.

I do not know if the Fire Officer took any note of the debate which took place in this House, but we felt that no particular man had any right using his office to be a salesman for some particular branch of fire extinguisher or anything else. I am quite sure that nobody would disregard the advice given by a trained Officer; but this responsibility for the fire extinguisher in every Government Building, that does not seem to be right to me. Somebody might say that the fire extinguisher fell down last week and something fell out of it.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not want to do what the Hon. Minister should be doing in connection with this matter, but after seeing the activities and interest of the present Fire Officer, I will say that the hon. junior member for the City need not have any of those fears. We have all seen his good works since he was here amongst us, and we have been very much impressed with his overhauling of the Department. Energetic as we have noticed that he is, I have a feeling that such new authority as is placed in him, would be in quite good and capable hands. It is possible that the Head of a Department or any member of the staff is liable to overlook the necessity of changing a fire extinguisher which might have been out of order. On the other hand, a Department whose duty it is exclusively to see after proper equipment, and also to handle fires would be more up-to-date in seeing that replacements are put there as often as is necessary, and also to see that the best is there.

It is only because I am interested in the improvement of that Department that I have thought of that. I have been to see some of the improvements and that is why I feel that unlike a previous Officer of that Department we can feel quite safe with the one whom we have now.

7.05 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, you should leave it to the Fire Officer to say where a fire escape or extinguisher should be placed because he is the best person to say where those things should be put. It is his duty to go in public places and to tell private people. I cannot say how far the law applies to private employers who do not come within the law which apply to these services, but speaking as an ordinary citizen it would seem extraordinary that the administration would not allow him to give advice on that matter to private citizens; I feel his services can be put at the disposal of private business with a fee attached to it. [A VOICE: No no!] The Fire Officer is not like the Government Electrical Inspector. He is paid a comparatively small salary and to be asked by, say, 100 people to visit their places of business and give advice on this and that without a fee paid does not seem right to me. Of course, it is a matter which needs investigation. I am glad that hon. members have spoken well of the

present Fire Officer. He is a good officer and he entices men to be good fire fighters. Of course, anybody coming from British Guiana ought to be a good Fire Officer.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as regards this extra \$55,000 to purchase a crash tender and a rescue tender for service at the Seawell Airport, will the Hon. Minister say whether the parish of St. Michael will have to pay two-thirds of that share? If so, I think it will be unfair. I think the Hon. Premier will recall what the actual law is in regard to the parish of St. Michael paying for running the Fire Brigade. I ask again, will the Government call on the parish of St. Michael to pay two-thirds of that estimate?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It may be that the taxpayers of Christ Church have something to do with that expenditure but all of this money has to be spent on the Seawell Airport and probably no taxpayer will be called on to pay it. Of course, obviously if there is a fire in Christ Church, or for that matter in St. Michael, and you will need all the fire engines, the appliances will have to come to the fire; but as this expenditure will be for Seawell and it is an addition, I do not see how the St. Michael taxpayer should pay any more towards it than the rest of taxpayers of the island.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I hope from what the Hon. Premier says that the Financial Secretary will be instructed accordingly; because actually what is spent on the Fire Brigade, according to the Act, the St. Michael ratepayer must contribute a two-thirds proportion of it. Unless you say that this is a special amount for the parish of Christ Church (which actually contributes no fire tax) and so you are going to waive it from the taxes of the St. Michael ratepayer so that the parish may not be called upon to contribute the proportion to it. I am sure the Hon. Minister will appreciate the point I am making. I think it will be grossly unfair to call on the St. Michael ratepayer to pay a proportion of this amount: therefore I take it for granted that what the Premier has said will be an instruction given to the Financial Secretary.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Executive will have to reconsider that portion of the Act because it must be remembered how old it may be. According to our Statute Book the Fire Brigade Act is set out in 1908 but may be this particular phase of the matter could be 100 years old. It could have come from a previous enactment. Section 33 of the Fire Brigade Act reads as follows:—

"In consideration of the protection under the provisions of this Act afforded to the inhabitants of Bridgetown and its vicinity the Superintendent of the Fire Brigade shall on or before the twenty fifth day of February in each year make a return to the Vestry of the parish of Saint Michael of the cost of the Brigade for the ensuing year: and the Vestry are hereby required, at the laying of the general rates on the twenty fifth day of March next after the receipt of such return, to raise two thirds of the amount by rate on the City and its suburbs, to the distance of half a mile, and to pay the amount to the Colonial Treasurer; provided always that the rate to be raised beyond the limits of the City shall be only half of the rate raised on the City."

I will say as a lawyer that if the primary object of this vote for this new appliance is to safeguard passengers in-coming and out-going at Seawell, it does not come under this Section. Of course, anyone can say that if there is a large fire in Bridgetown, you should try to get every fire engine in. I am almost inclined to say that every parish should be a con-

tributor to the rates for the services of the Fire Brigade. Even when cane fires take place in St. Andrew, you can see the Fire Brigade rushing down there.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Actually the Hon. Premier will remember that a former Commissioner of Police ordered the Fire Brigade from going to cane fires. He said that the Fire Brigade was only for the purpose of extinguishing fires in St. Michael. I think he can recall that I have been raising the question that that Section should be amended because of the extension of the services of the Fire Brigade. It is a fact that every year with the improved Fire Brigade service there is an increase in the amount of money to be voted under this Head and the ratepayers of St. Michael are called upon to pay the proportionate part of the money. I repeat again that this \$55,000 is for services not only in Christ Church but for services of the island, so to speak; and I do not think it will be fair that the ratepayers of St. Michael should pay two-thirds of the amount. I am hoping that the Hon. Premier will take steps to see—at least until that Section of the Act is amended,—that the actual figures for the purchase of the new appliances will be subtracted from the amount voted under this Head so that the ratepayers of St. Michael will not have to pay its two-thirds proportion on that amount.

Actually, what will happen now as soon as you pass the Estimates is, the Fire Officer is going to say, "here take this, this is your portion." I hoped what you said in here would have been a guide to me that at least what you pay will be the usual increase with the exception of \$55,000 you are paying at Seawell. But actually, in fact, when this is passed, that is the end of it; and if I am to be guided by the Act here, the Governor-in-Executive Committee should consider it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I would be inclined to say this: if the Fire Brigade Officer is strictly correct in reading the Act, there could be refund if the amount as amended could be shared more fairly between the parishes and some adjustment could be made by the House to pay that money to the Vestry.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The argument about the proportion of money comes to this: if you take the density of the houses in St. Michael it is clear they would have to pay more. This is a service where you are going to reduce the Civil Aviation by \$55,000 and add it on to this. Where is the equity in saying this is a service which the Fire Brigade would carry on? I am submitting no part of the \$55,000 should be borne by the St. Michael parish at all, because the density of the population in St. Michael would be in proportion to say Christ Church but in St. Joseph there is no such thing. So what I am saying is that in reducing the Civil Aviation by \$55,000 and putting it on to this, it is not at all fair to ask the parish of St. Michael to pay in proportion. This is not a normal Fire Brigade vote, it is something new. Therefore I submit that the Hon. Premier should see to it that this amount is not added to this vote to be taxed on the people of St. Michael at all. What I am submitting, Sir, is that a note can be made where it should not be put on at all because what you would get is not an increase of Firemen for the normal work, but it is something you are putting on to the Fire Brigade which you have taken off from Civil Aviation.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like you to permit me to say that in my remarks I had no desire to criticise the Fire Officer. I have had the opportunity of seeing him at work and at play, so to speak, and I think he is a very good man for the

job. But my point was, is it right to have him not only to advise but to be also responsible for these fire extinguishers? I said he was the most capable man to advise on them, but if he continues to recommend one particular make of fire extinguisher, he might be wrong. My point is to make him responsible for what is in the office. After all he is not the Government Fire Officer, but an Officer for the whole island and responsible for putting out fires anywhere — house fires as well as cane fires. He is not responsible for Government offices alone and I say he has time enough to go around and see what wants replacing. Next thing, Sir, is at Seawall. You have the Police and the Customs up there; I do not know what control the Director of Civil Aviation has over them. If you have somebody as Director of Civil Aviation and you have a separate person in charge of the people who are going to put a plane out if it catches fire. It seems to me a dual control, and this matter is going to lead to trouble.

The question that the sum of \$80,333 be voted under Head X was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XI—Lighthouses

Head XI — Lighthouses was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$4,245 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On the last occasion when the Estimates were discussed in here, in fact when the Estimates for last year were before this House, I made mention that under this Head I could not understand why it is that you were perpetuating that system and it does not seem that you can offer any logical reason for so doing. You have a system here where you have four lighthouses. At three of these lighthouses you employ three lighthouse keepers on the basis that each lighthouse keeper works a period of four hours at night. At Needham's Lighthouse you are only working two lighthouse keepers. Now, can there be any justification for saying that the Lighthouse at Needham's is different from the others and therefore it can work with two? The purpose of the lighthouse is to work it at night; it is of no use in the day and therefore, the parties have to work at night and from international practice it is a bad standard you are maintaining that a man would have to work everyday of the year in order to keep the lighthouse going because on a two shift basis a man would not get his regular 21 days leave. You cannot see him getting Sundays off; he has to work on a seven days a week basis, and the Government comes back again this year with two people for Needham's lighthouse. It is not fair to people working there. How can you justify having three at Ragged Point in St. Philip, three at South Point in Christ Church, three at Harrison's Point in St. Lucy and only two at Needham's Point in St. Michael to perform the work they have to do? If you are employing two at Needham's Point, have two all around; but three at other places and two there, is not fair to the workmen and those who are called upon to work on a two shift basis. It cannot bankrupt the Government to pay another man to work at this lighthouse. They have to be on duty in the day and they have to work every night on that basis, and it is not fair. Moreover, the Minister in charge of this should not have allowed this to come back here because on the last occasion he said he would go into the matter and investigate it, and I cannot understand why it has come back in the same way.

It does not call for experts; it is a matter of commonsense. It is not fair to have people working on that system. I would go further and say where you have people working at night, there should be periods in which they should only work a maximum of six nights per week; and these people should never be required to work seven nights a week. No worker should be called upon to work seven nights a week, but six nights a week. We wink our eyes at the system; but it is in this system that you can employ people without bankrupting the Government by giving good conditions of work; and if the Government is not a model employer, more employers are going to believe they can be bad employers like the Government. If this is one of the things we have not heard of, the time has come for us to change it; and I cannot see what justification there is for allowing the men at Needham's Point to continue to work on a two shift system. This is not like the Sugar Industry where a man only works for 16 weeks; this is where a man has to work in permanent employment and he should not be called upon to work for these hours as a night worker.
7.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: As the last honourable member has said, on the last occasion when this Head was being discussed, I promised him that I would look into the matter, and I did so. The report I got was that these Keepers at Needham's Point did an extra six hours duty at night. There is a Head Keeper and an Assistant Keeper. The Head Keeper is allowed leave of absence on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and on each alternate Sunday. The Assistant Keeper is allowed leave of absence on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, and each alternate Sunday. Each Keeper is therefore on duty 120 hours per week, 42 of which are spent in the lantern room.

As regards the Ragged Point, South Point and Harrison's Point Lighthouses, these are revolving lights with a Head Keeper and two Assistant Keepers each. Each Keeper is allowed 36 hours leave of absence weekly. Each Keeper is therefore on duty 132 hours per week, 30 of which are spent in the lantern room.

As regards the hours of work, you will see that in the case of the Needham's Point Lighthouse, the keepers there are in a slightly better position than those at the other Lighthouses. However, I can quite see the force of the hon. member's argument; in the case of the other keepers, they have the opportunity to be off at night, whereas in the case of Needham's Point Lighthouse, there are only two keepers, and they can never get a whole night off, but they can get at least 5½ hours. However, I will discuss the matter with the Establishment Branch.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister very much for the information, but this is where I differ from him. It is not the Establishment Branch which is going to tell him these things; there is the tendency for people to look at the Lighthouse keeper as a glorified watchman, and believe that if he watches the place every night for 365 nights, when he gets Sunday off, he is a glorified domestic servant who is being treated a little better than a watchman. The Establishment Branch will continue this system which you see in the Civil Service here. You never give a watchman a period off, and he is required to watch your building every night for 365 nights. These workers are entitled to a six-day working week; they live on the premises and they do not have any better working hours than the other people.

What happens at the other Lighthouses is that you have a four-hour shift. When a man is on duty at

Needham's Point Lighthouse, no matter that there is a fixed light there, he has to be there. He cannot fix the light at 6 o'clock and go to his bed and come back at 11 o'clock and see the light there. If the men at the Public Works Department were to go up there and find that he is not on duty, he can be reported and punished.

The lighthouse at Southpoint gives a different flash from the one at Harrison's Point. I am wondering when are we going to have better conditions of employment in Barbados, if Ministers of the Government just look smilingly on the idea that a man has to work for 120 hours a week. That is something which is not only fantastic, but for you to have a man at your command for 120 hours per week, and you look smilingly at the idea, that is tantamount to saying that a Civil Servant works for 24 hours a day. When you ask employers for a 44-hour working week, they will want to know if you are crazy. What I am really arguing is that working for 120 hours a week—

Hon. M. E. COX: He spends 42 hours on duty in the lantern room.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I can give the hon. member a report on these Lighthouses. As regards the Southpoint Lighthouse—

Hon. M. E. COX: That is different from the other Lighthouses.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: These men have duties to perform during the day as well. Do you believe that they have to sweep and clean out the Lighthouses? These people have to do that themselves. I am pointing out that in respect of a Lighthouse, you cannot have a man living away from it; in view of the nature of the job, he must live within the precincts of the Lighthouse and you therefore have to provide him with living quarters. If the Hon. Minister is satisfied that three keepers should be at the Needham's Point Lighthouse, the fact that there are not flashlights does not make any difference; whenever a man is on duty he has a spell of six hours, while the others have spells of four hours. In order to make working conditions good and agreeable to people, wherever you have people working as they have to work at these Lighthouses, you should have four keepers so as to make the shifts easy.
7.35 p.m.

In view of the fact that you are not working them for 24 hours as 24 hours are per day, but they are only at your service for 24 hours per day, we will pass over the idea of having four persons in order to provide the necessary personnel for the shifts. The Hon. Minister is setting forth a bad example to employers in Barbados on the question of night work by not providing the additional Lighthouse Keeper necessary at Needham's Point Lighthouse.

In addition to their duties at night, these Lighthouse Keepers have to work four hours in the day and added to that, they are under the control of the Government all the time. They cannot leave the lighthouse when they are not working and go wherever they please as the ordinary working man can when he is off the job. They can only leave on permission. That is why I stated that he has to work 120 hours per week. No employer can tell an employee of his who works for eight hours a day that he cannot go off after his working for the eight hours. If what I say means nothing to the Minister, it is because of the nature of him. It will not cost the Government a bagatelle to provide the money to pay this other keeper. The Hon. Minister seems to be smiling at what I say.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not smiling at what the hon. member is saying; I am smiling because he

held that portfolio from 1949 to 1952 and did not say so then.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What does the Minister mean by saying that I held that portfolio? What portfolios did I ever hold? I was a member of the Executive of which four members of this House were on it, but could I give instructions as the Minister can get up in here and boast about his giving instructions and saying "I have instructed somebody to do this and that?" In my time, everything had to be done by the direction of the Executive Committee. I do not want to bring out any Executive secrets but do you know the rows which we have had about roads? What control have I ever had? Could I say as the Minister says today that such and such a road cannot be done? It was a matter for the Premier; it was a matter of if the Leader felt it should be done. The Hon. Minister can come in here and say: "I have done Mahaico Road and Cave Hill Road." What is the idea of the Minister saying "I held that portfolio"? Even if I held that portfolio that does not mean I could do something. If I held something four years ago what is that to do with today? In those days nothing could be done by any one person: everything had to go back to the Executive Committee and if they felt it was not politic to have it done you would not get it done.

The question that the sum of \$4,245 be voted under Head XI—Lighthouses, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XII — Registration

Head XII—Registration was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$16,200 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to this Head, I notice Item 15, Furniture, for which the sum of \$850 is to be voted represents an increase of \$245 and we are informed by the note that it is for the purpose of purchasing four desks, five tables, six chairs and six filing cabinets. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the purchase of these Items is because we are going to have a Registrar. For many years this colony has been without a Registrar. Is this an intimation that we may soon have a Registrar and because of that we are buying these four desks, five tables, six chairs and six filing cabinets?

This is another case in which we have vacancies in this Island indefinitely though we have suitable people available without any appointment being made. The Acting Registrar at present, like his immediate predecessor, is acting. He is an extremely competent and efficient man. Cannot you decide whether you are going to appoint him? Let us know whether this is an indirect way to tell us that we are going to have a Registrar, therefore we are preparing the way with the vote of \$850 for additional furniture.

The question that the sum \$16,200 be voted under Head XII—Registration, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XIII — Legislature

Head XIII — Legislature, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$34,113 be voted under this Head. I did hear the hon. junior member for St. Thomas before he left this Chamber a few minutes ago make some caustic remarks about the sanitary arrangements in the House and the inability to get face towels. I do not know what is the exact position, nor can I move under this Head any provision for that though it

may be necessary, but I do promise this Hon. Committee that if we need more face towels, hair brushes or whatever it may be, to see that something brought down separately for acquiring them. I do not remember offhand when the Committee was dealing with the Estimates whether any provision was asked for anything in connection with the Lobby. I have made those remarks because the Hon. Minister of Social Services made use of caustive remarks about the sanitary arrangements in the Lobby. I beg to move that the sum of \$34,113 be voted under this Head.

7.45 p.m.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the honourable member must have forgotten to give the answer to my colleague as he did not reply in his Budget Speech to the question which he asked which is causing him some concern. I do not know whether it is right or wrong but he should enlighten the House to-day. My colleague raised the question of Item 14 under Head XIII of four extra members to the Executive Committee.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am glad the honourable member brought it to my attention. When this House passed a Resolution for paying members of the Executive Committee other than the Ministers, they made it possible for the members of the Executive Committee to be paid by warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, implying that at any time that sum may go up as long as the Governor had the right to add to the Executive Council more or less in his discretion, because the members of the Executive Council comprise the Chief Secretary, the Attorney General, the Premier and such other persons as the Governor may appoint from time to time. Obviously, to-morrow or any time the Governor may feel that the services of somebody in the community that has rendered good service are required, and automatically he becomes a member of the Executive Council and automatically he is entitled to be paid. The House agreed that every non-official of the Executive Committee other than the Ministers can get so much, so as soon as you say that, there is no limit to appointments to the Executive Council. There can be two, three four or five. You have already granted the right to the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay them.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his explanation but I feel that when we said we would pay the members of the Executive Committee including the unofficial members of the Executive Council it could have meant the ones that were there then. I will tell the honourable member this: that probably he does not remember that when we passed the first Act to pay them there was a Civil Servant, Head of a Department that was on it, and the moment that he resigned from the service, a Resolution was brought in here to pay his salary; it was not automatic. [A VOICE: Who was it?] It was Dr. Saint. I feel that on occasions when His Excellency feels it necessary to increase members by appointment, he should feel the same way when we ask, will you send down a Resolution to do so and so for the House; as when we wanted to entertain people from England and we asked him to send down a Resolution for us to entertain people from the House of Commons. If he is going to create a charge on the Treasury, he should be courteous enough to inform the House. If he wants to create a charge on the Treasury—and that is what he is doing—he should be careful about it. I am saying it is a breach because I am sure that when Dr. Saint ceased to be a non-paid member of the Executive and became a paid

member he did not go into the Treasury for his salary. A Resolution was brought in here to pay him; and so it was taken at that time that we agreed to pay the Executive and it would be wrong to increase it beyond the amount that we were told at the time and which we agreed to pay. The whole spirit of the Executive Committee that it was to be paid was entirely new.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I wish the honourable member would say the specific instance. I cannot follow it at all. This goes back to 1949. The honourable member may be speaking of something that took place in 1949. In the Laws of Barbados 1949—30 we have:

"Subject to the provisions of section three of this Act, members of the Executive Committee shall each be entitled to receive salary at the rate of one thousand two hundred dollars per annum.

All salaries payable under this Act shall be paid from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee . . ."

You thereby empowered the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay any member of the Executive Committee, and so long as the Act is in operation, you have already empowered the Governor to pay the Executive Committee. It applies to to-morrow and the rest of the century unless you repeal it or amend it. I do not know to whom the honourable member is referring, and if he would give more details I would be able to say more in the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is a matter on which lawyers disagreed, but I am telling the Minister for Finance that if he look it up he will see that from the day Dr. Saint resigned as Director of Agriculture, while he remained on the Executive Committee, a Resolution came to the House to pay his salary to the end of that financial year.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I cannot remember having seen that Resolution; I must have been out of the island. The Act says, "Subject to the provision of Section 3 of this Act, members of the Executive shall be entitled." If he ceased to be a member of the Executive then that Resolution was superfluous and I have no recollection of it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, when we passed these Estimates . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for the City must remember that the honourable junior member for the City is on his feet.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, what we pass here as fixed by law is not only an amount, it has a number next to it and what we pass we pass for three, four or twenty-five members; that is what we did. When an additional salary was wanted on the last occasion, we voted it to the end of the financial year and one was stuck in the next lot. I remember that distinctly but it was not done on this occasion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I think the honourable member is saying, you now have four additional members and the law says we have given the right to pay an amount as appropriated, but how did you pay unless money came to the House? What he is saying is that you cannot pay out money that is not in the Treasury.

Mr. LEWIS: When Sir John Saint became a member of the Executive Committee a Resolution came to this House for money to pay him, because in the Estimates for that year we did not make provision for four unofficial members and we did not have money to pay and the Auditor General did not make any advance.

7.55 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I notice the Government is trying to tell you that they do not want to spend money unnecessarily and what not. Now, I think I agree with the Premier if you pass a Bill saying that a non-official Executive member can get so much, he can get it. I am inclined to agree there. Is this the first time you have had so many unofficial members? Nobody can question the Governor except the Premier who can say what he wants.

Do not let us waste any time about that. If the Hon. Premier says that there should not be any more members on the Executive Committee, there will not be any more members on that Committee. I should like to ask whether this is the first time that you have had all these members there. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: One was only holding on.] And the other was trying to get on. [Laughter] I want it explained to me whether this is the first time that you have had so many non-official members on the Executive Committee, and whether they are necessary. There are five Socialist members in the Government whose word must be carried anyhow, and according to the system of Ministerial Government, the Ministers make decisions; but to me, it is just a wilful waste of \$160 a month to put another member on the Executive Committee. I do not care what anybody else feels; that is how I feel about it. When we had nine members on the Executive Committee, you did not have any system of Ministerial Government, and therefore the Premier had no say in the matter; nowadays, when the Premier says anything, it must be carried. You have had nine members on the Executive Committee all along, and having a new system of Government whose policy must be carried out, it is not therefore a matter of putting another member on the Executive Committee, so that your policy can be brought down here.

I should like to know what benefit would accrue to this Country by the Governor putting another member on the Executive Committee at \$160 a month. The Governor could put as many members on the Executive Committee as he likes, but the Premier would object; why does the Governor not select people like the honourable junior member for Christ Church, the honourable senior member for St. George, the honourable junior member for St. Peter, and the honourable senior member for St. Philip? I will bet you that the Premier would object to them: the top of Government House would be blown off if that were done. [Hon. M. E. COX: What about the honourable members for St. John?] Oh! He will accept people like him because they are easily handled! [Laughter..]

We have in these Estimates an increase of \$1,920 this year for membership of the Executive Committee. Can you tell me if that is necessary for the working of the present Socialist Government to be able to get its policy carried? I do not believe that, because it is not true. You have Sir John Chandler, Sir Archibald Cuke and Sir John Saint, three Knights up there, and if the Premier wishes to bring down legislation to turn a woman into a man, it must come down. Therefore, there is really no justification when we have to husband all our resources, to saddle us by putting another member on the Executive Committee. That is an absolutely unnecessary, wanton wicked waste of public money. For all these years you had only a limited number of members on the Executive Committee; if the Premier says "I had to pack the Executive Committee with members so as to be able to bring something down here," I do not believe that. I feel very strongly on this matter. 8.05 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: This debate is out of order.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Whether it is out of order or not, I have expressed my view that I do not think you should saddle this Country with \$160 a month for another member of the Executive Committee.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I do not agree with the views of the hon. member because he is not right so far as the constitution of Barbados is concerned. The hon. junior member for the City was right when he said that previously the Appropriation Bill did not carry the amount of money to pay an additional member on the Executive Committee, therefore a Supplementary Resolution had to be passed for it. Although the Item was fixed by law it had to be appropriated because we appropriate these things.

As regards the point which the hon. senior member for the City raised, I think he has forgotten the constitution of the Island where the Governor's name is only used but if the Hon. Premier feels that he should have someone to advise him on something because his Ministers are incapable of giving that advice or he cannot get that advice from any one in his Party, he can seek to get that advice. It is as clear as that. If the Hon. Dr. Cato can give him the advice which none of the Ministers of the Government can and there is nothing in the constitution to say that Ministers should advise the Government and nobody else can give the advice except somebody on the Executive — if the Hon. Premier in his own ability cannot give that advice, he can seek to get it.

The Hon. Premier has to be a member of the Executive Council. That is an automatic thing because of his office. Now the Premier's Deputy is not a member of the Executive Council. I remember telling the Hon. Premier when Ministerial System was to be started that his Deputy should be a member of the Executive Council but because of his false modesty he did not press that. The Leader of this House should be a member of the Council.

So far as the money is concerned, that is infinitesimal. As I was saying, no member of this House can be a member of the Executive Committee unless the Hon. Premier agrees. It will wreck the whole constitution if the Governor attempts to make someone a member of the Executive without the consent of the Premier.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Peter is serious when he suggests that the Hon. Premier has made the Hon. Dr. Cato a member of the Executive Committee because of the advice he can give which no Ministers or any member of the Premier's Party can give.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member allow me to say something? Where and how hon. members began a debate on this subject, I do not know. I do not see it under this Head. I am not allowing any reply to be given to it. The hon. junior member for the City began by mentioning a Resolution. I do not see anything of it under the column "To be Voted." I think the debate has gone quite far enough.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the debate is out of order but I am asking your permission since this portion of it is going to be published to allow hon. members to hear a word from me on it. I regret I have to say what might have operated in my mind in doing anything of this nature. Surely hon. members have had more than one hint from me that our present status is only a half-way house and to have full self-government with all that it implies, surely hon. members will say that Government business should be done in the Upper House not by an Official but that you must have a man favourable to the Party putting the case of the Government in the Upper House. It should not be done by the Chief Secretary or the Attorney General. Of course, the Attorney General is not in the Upper House *ex-officio*. I would

say this: if Bishop Hughes were in the Council I would have suggested that he should be made a member of the Executive Committee because he used to put the Government's case. I am sorry to make the explanation now, but surely I thought hon. members would have seen that if we want an advanced constitution, you cannot continue with the colonial system of asking the Chief Secretary to put the Government's point of view in the Upper House. I do not think any further information is needed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just allow me to ask the Hon. Premier one question. What would be the position of the Government if the Chief Secretary sat in Executive Committee and then went into the Other Place and put something different from the views of the Government? Let me say it could not happen; if it did, he could not stay in the Island. Do not try to fool people that way. After all, you are Premier, do not try to fool people with that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might have been the cause of initiating this debate but if you took the Executive Act and read it, you will be able to see whether or not this Committee can discuss the things which are fixed by law. The Act says that we are to discuss the Estimates and those Items that are not already made provision for in the law shall be put into an Act. It does not say that you cannot discuss the Items which are fixed by law. It implies that you can discuss them but those Items which are not in an Act shall be put into an Act. I have not looked up the law recently but I will not allow any member of this Committee to mislead you. When we are considering the Estimates we are considering the Establishment of this Island. 8.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, when we consider Estimates we consider the expense of the entire colony. What is not an Act is not an Act and what is not in an Act we put in an Act.

Mr. Chairman, I may tell you if you read the Act, you will see that is how it is worded. It says, after we have considered all of them, what is not in an Act is to be put in an Appropriation Act.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, if I may revert to another Item in this matter of the Legislature under Item 24 in which we are asked to vote \$17,000 for the Reporting and Printing of debates of this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, you will remember that in his speech introducing the Estimates, the Hon. Minister of Finance referred to what he described as the "oft repeated" suggestion that the Government should have its own printery and that Government still agree with the suggestion, and the only reason why it has not gone fully into implementation of it was the question of priority.

Now, Sir, as you will remember, in another part of the Estimates we are asked to vote \$114,000, but the particular vote with which we are now concerned is for \$17,000 under Head 24. Now, Sir, I trust the Government will see how this question of priority becomes really exceptionally urgent now that there is no prospect of the Debates of the Legislature being printed in the near future unless the Government Printers decide to pay the staff the amount for which they are asking and which in my opinion is a reasonable figure for which they are rightly insisting.

Now, Sir, we are faced with this fact that our Debates cannot be kept up to date, for heaven knows how long it will last, unless something happens and the Directors of this Company undergo a change of heart; because, Sir, as you know, we are the biggest customer of this concern and if they decide not to pay a reasonable increase to their employees—al-

though they can bring anybody from abroad and pay a fantastic salary—we have to be held up with the Debates of the Legislature and this ancient Chamber will be prevented from getting its Debates printed simply because the Company is refraining from paying a reasonable remuneration for the services which these men in my view rightly demand. So, Sir, I trust the Government will consider this matter at the next meeting of the Executive Committee and reconsider their attitude to the priority list, because we cannot go on without it. We are the only Caribbean colony without a Government Printery. I suppose he is going to tell us that he is unable to fulfil his contract, and a suggestion which I would draw to the Minister of Finance's attention is something more than a suggestion. He referred to this suggestion of a Government Printery as an oft repeated suggestion, but it is very much more so as far as this Chamber is concerned. You will remember an Address passed this Chamber some years ago unanimously commending a Government Printery and it was favourably considered by the Executive, so I would like the Hon. Minister for Finance to forget this idea that it is only an oft repeated suggestion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the honourable member, I have said in here more than once that the Government absolutely accepts the point of view that we ought to have a printery. It is purely a matter of priority, what with building a new Hospital and doing this and the other. It is not merely a good thing; we accept the principle.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am only going to say that in the present event they should realise the question of priority is settled. This is an absolutely urgent priority to be put amongst the first five things requiring attention.

The question that the sum of \$34,113 be voted under Head XIII was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

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

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

The question was put and agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.25 p.m.

On re-assembling,

ESTIMATES—Cont'd

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee on the Estimates for 1956-57.

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

Head XIV — Judiciary

Head XIV — Judiciary—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$62,157 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: In connection with Item 32 "Jurors and Marshals at Grand Sessions," Mr. Chairman, ever since you have had the honour of

being in the Chair, you have heard me refer to this item. I am reminded that even before we were fortunate enough to sit under your Chairmanship, I was agitating for a square deal for these Jurors and Marshals at the Assizes. It was not so long ago—it was as late as last year—when I reverted to the subject, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas without committing himself irrevocably, gave an intimation which I think was very much to the point, that I would soon be in the happy position of being able to discontinue reminding them about these Jurors and Marshals at the Assizes because there was —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member, I should like to say that actually I have before me a Draft Bill, which will be considered in Executive Committee on Thursday morning, dealing with that matter. I can assure the hon. member that a correction will be made to the present state of affairs.

Mr. BRANCKER: I appreciate the fact that if one agitates for anything long enough in this Chamber, he will be able to get his point considered. We have had the abolition of the Grand Jury and we may have to wait for two years more in respect of the coming into being of a Government Printery.

In respect of Item 33 "Jurors and Marshals at Common Pleas," I would like to remind the Premier, who is the legal member of the Cabinet, to give consideration to these people. I think we have been promised the abolition of trial by jury in civil cases, but in so far as criminal cases are concerned, there can be no doubt that there is no better trial than trial by Jury. We have no doubt that conditions are worse here in respect of Special Juries than the English Special Juries could ever be, and there is also no doubt that the abolition of Juries in civil cases would be a step in the right direction.

One or two vociferous members of this House who feel that they belong to a privileged class, would stand up for the continuation of trial by jury in civil cases. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Especially when we have dishonest lawyers]. Dishonest lawyers cannot get their living at the Bar, and they have to consider other means of livelihood. I hope that we will abolish trial by Jury in civil cases.

As regards to Item 46, "Examination under Solicitors' Act," I think it is time that the Government consider an Amendment to that Act. There is no reason why any part of a Solicitor's fee should be paid by the taxpayer of this Island. On this occasion, we are asked to vote \$1,000. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We are agreed.] The Premier says "We are agreed;" that is something else for them to consider at this week's meeting of the Executive Committee. It must be realised that those who want to be Solicitors, should pay their own fees. I see before me two of our employees who are members of the junior branch of the profession, and it is notorious that if one of us wants to get a loan, he can go to each one of these employees. People who are going in for a lucrative profession should be able to pay the expenses of it. The Solicitors work for no less than the medical practitioners, and one should consider how little the members of this profession have to pay in attaining to their profession as compared with the medical practitioners.

When we come to Item 51, "Reporter" for the use of the Chief Justice we are asked to vote \$350. The note to this Item observes that the services of a Reporter are required more frequently than formerly. The services of a Reporter are required on a whole time basis; of that there is no doubt. I remember a few years ago when there was a case before the

Court of Grand Sessions which I was defending, the Judge who was then sitting was notoriously incapable of giving a proper summing up, and I applied for the services of a Reporter, knowing that the summing up would be such that I could get conviction quashed in the event of an appeal. I was asked by the then Acting Judge: "Would your client be in a position to pay for the services of the Reporter in that particular case? I replied: "Certainly not." That occasion could not have arisen if you had a permanent Reporter to serve this Court, and in the interest of the Administration of Justice in this Island, it is not enough to have a person available occasionally, for this amount of \$350 a year would not be sufficient for any Reporter who is really worth his salt. Sometimes peoples' lives and liberty are at stake and they should have a full report taken of their case so that if the matter calls for a review by a Higher Court, the summing up of the Judge would be available to consider whether or not the jury had been properly directed.

One can even indulge in false economy with respect to the Administration of Justice. Therefore, when the Cabinet meets this week to consider the question of a square deal for the Jurors and Marshals at the Assizes, at my invitation, I am sure they will also consider the question of the establishment of the Reporter on a whole-time basis for the High Courts of this Island. The note speaks of providing a Reporter for the use of the Chief Justice, and that recalls to my mind a remark made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the Hon. Premier, in his introduction of the Budget that the Chief Justice was due to retire and that he, the Hon. Premier, had heard that it was not possible to get any Chief Justice who is worth while at the present salary. Of course, the appointment to this Office is not made by the Cabinet, but a word to the wise is considered to be sufficient.

If the Hon. Premier would give an intimation to those who are higher in the Administration of this Colony that we need not consider merely Officials or persons who are already Judges for this post,—although I cannot conceive of a man either English or West Indian who is more suitable for the post than our distinguished West Indian Mr. C. V. H. Archer. I hear sounds of dissent but they are from those who, I presume, would resent the thought of a coloured Chief Justice in this Island in this 20th century. Even if there is an Officer who has rendered services in the Judiciary being thought of, is there any reason why we cannot adopt the principle of promoting people from the Bar to this high position? [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: You are not going to leave the House.] Even apart from the Office of Chief Justice, well, there is a Federal Prime Ministership in the running, and the Hon. Premier would not be interested; but there are other members of the West Indian Bar who may be interested, and whose claims merit consideration for such a post. Who would deny persons such as Messrs. Butt, Wooding and O'Reilly to fill the Office of Chief Justice of Barbados? Of course, such persons are working for more money, but there is a chance of an early Knighthood, and they have the ease which accompanies a high appointment like that together with the Knighthood. I do think we should begin to think of the filling of this post of Chief Justice, because of the feeling which every member of the Bar has; I see our Clerk is smiling, as if to ask why we did not enquire of the legal profession in this Island in the matter when we know that the Chief Justice would be retiring. A suitable successor to the Chief Justice has to be sought, and he can be

found within the framework and inside this British Caribbean Federation.

We do not have to go outside for a man; therefore, Sir, I think when we are considering a Reporter for the use of the Chief Justice and the purchase of books, publications, and so on for the Law Library, that that will be fitting time to refer to that matter which the honourable and learned Premier referred to in his speech while introducing this Budget, so I would remind the Hon. Premier to deal with these various matters at the Executive Committee.

9.30 p.m.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Premier to Item 42, Constables fees and staves. I would like to tell the Government of the serious need for rural and island constables in the country districts. With the increase in lawlessness the need is great. Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy a few years ago [*Laughter*], there were around a dozen rural and island constables in my district, but to-day you cannot find one. I would like to know who is responsible for appointing these constables. Up to last week, there was a great disturbance in the district and there was no one to restore order. The Police Department does not patrol that district frequently and the nearest telephone is over three miles away.

I am sure that the presence of a few island constables in these districts would cause many of the lawless young men to think twice before they engage in their lawlessness; therefore, I am appealing to the Hon. Premier to give immediate consideration to the appointment of island constables throughout the country districts. The practice of appointing island constables is dying out. It is true that the Police have better means of communications for the purpose of getting around than before, but they do not patrol sufficiently enough.

I hope these few remarks which I have made on this point will give Government the impetus to appoint more rural and island constables because conditions in country districts demand it. The young men in these districts feel that they are a law unto themselves. I see regularly the extent of their lawlessness and there is nobody to go to the rescue of the people. I do hope that Government will give serious consideration to the appointment of more rural and island constables so as to help the Police in the preservation of law and order because that is one of the prerequisites of a civilised country. To-day, many are prejudiced against law and order in this island because their thoughts are in the wrong direction. I hope Government will take steps to appoint some more constables in these districts.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of this Committee that so far as this Head is concerned, if you look at the Item, Puisne Judge, you will find that an Act passed in 1951 provided for the appointment of someone to this post and up to this moment there is no substantive holder of that office. I draw it to the notice of the Committee because that is another instance which is not satisfactory for this Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw to the attention of the honourable member that Item 2, Puisne Judge, is fixed by law.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am pointing out to the Committee that for an office fixed by law, no substantive holder has been appointed since its inception. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs because the necessity for the office caused the law to be enacted. The Government at that time felt that the time had come for the appointment of a Puisne Judge and the fact that we have never had a substantive holder of

that post is something which we should look into. It is five years since the law was enacted. Do not cluster up the Statute Book with an Act unless it is a necessity.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak on all the Items not fixed by law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would you just give me one?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I will start with Item 25, but to avoid any clash I am informing you that I am going to speak on all the items not fixed by law. I am going to speak on the Items from 25 and onwards.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not puzzle me.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that I will not try to puzzle you. All I am trying to do is to abide by the decision of the Chair so as to avoid any clash.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not mind the clash.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If there is no worry about a clash, I will start off by saying that I am worried about domestic matters tried in the Courts of this island. Why I mentioned that is because a few months ago I was prompted to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that what appeared to me to be necessary was to have a Domestic Court, because it was becoming—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What Domestic Court are you talking about? Try and keep to the Item. There is no Domestic Court under that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I was saying what I suggested to the Hon. Premier about it and he said he handed it in writing to the learned Attorney General. I hope it is not pigeon-holed because I have found that cases concerned with the Bastardy Act and married women suing their husbands are heard in open court which is not in keeping with the standard of decency at all. I feel, Sir, and I suggested to the Hon. Premier, that since the Cause List was becoming so full of such cases, and owing to the fact that the parties concerned had to wait for anything between three to six months before their cases were heard—which necessitated that a mother who was suing an alleged father of her children for support of such children had to stay in need of support during all that time, or go to the Churchwarden of the parish in which she lived for aid to support them, — that it appeared to me to be necessary to have a Domestic Court.

I am wondering whether there could be an amendment to the Act of this colony to establish a Domestic Court and make necessary the appointment of a Magistrate for that Court so that women could have their cases, especially bastardy cases, tried in more privacy and not tried as they are done now in open Court.

9.40 p.m.

In all civilised countries today, there is a Domestic Court where a woman can go without being harrassed by the public and have the cases tried. Beside that, there is the question that justice delayed is as bad as justice denied: and when people must wait five or six months to have their cases tried, in many cases we find that after the cases have been lodged, especially with the people going to the United Kingdom today, the alleged father has left the island and the children are left at the mercy of the Poor Law Boards in the various parishes. I hope something will be done in the matter, because we must regard the position of these poor unfortunate women and children. Therefore, I join the honourable member for St. Peter in suggesting that something should be done about the appointment of a Puisne Judge, because if we start at the top, you will be able to release some of the magistrates and lawyers without having to go any further. As a

matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I drew it to the Premier's attention as Churchwarden of this parish that there were 144 bastardy cases waiting to be tried, but in some cases the fathers did not get their summonses and in other cases when the time came for them to be heard, the fathers had left for England and left the mothers at the mercy of the Poor Law Guardians. I hope the promise made by the Premier will not be just a promise.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member who has just sat down seems to be unaware of the settlement of the Bastardy Act of 1950. He was a member of the House when we passed it, but I did not want to embarrass him by interrupting just now. In Section 5 sub-section 2, "No person shall be present during the hearing and determination by a Police Magistrate of any application under this Act except,

- (a) members and officers of the Court;
- (b) parties to the case before the Court, their Solicitors and Counsel, and witnesses and other persons directly concerned in the case;
- (c) Solicitors and Counsel in attendance for other cases;
- (d) any other person whom the Court may permit to be present."

So Mr. Chairman, that does not arise. The honourable member should visit the Court more often as the perpetual Churchwarden of the St. Michael parish.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, to tell you the truth I said that purely because I see when these cases are being heard, people like the honourable senior member for St. Lucy are still in the Court, not as Counsel or any other thing, but the honourable member is just interested because he is the only bachelor of this House who has refused to stray from that happy band.

The question that the sum of \$62,157 be voted under Head XIV was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XV — Police

Head XV — Police — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$369,898 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, under Item 72 "Labour to assist Police Artisans" the note says "to pay wages of \$5 per week each to four persons who assist Police artisans."

Mr. Chairman, I should like to know what these people are required to do today that they deserve a wage of \$5 a week, what are the terms of their employment and their requirements. I do not want to comment on it because I do not think the wage in itself is one I need make any comment on at this stage; I shall do so when I have received the information. I would also like to know something about Item 84 "Tape Recorder." It says in the Note "For use in the recording of statements, conversations, public speeches etc."

It is a new item and I would like to know more about it. I know this year is going to be election year and I would like to know how this is going to work. Are you going to bring this recording machine to use with the loud speakers or is it for the purpose of when the Governor opens places and you want to record an admirable speech by him or is it for the purpose of silencing people? [A VOICE: It will be used to prevent strikes.] Strikes and

things like that will always be with us. I do not want to make any comment on Item 72, until the information is given, because I would like to know the justification for the permission of the wage of \$5 a week for this sort of domestic servant.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am told that there is a system developing at the Police Department which is causing great disappointment and dissatisfaction amongst the members of the Force, and it is that a few weeks ago members of the Force have been threatened with a reduction or a failure to give them their increment if they did not increase the number of cases which they have been making. The men were very disturbed about it, Sir, but they have not the authority or the courage to protest. I think the Premier who holds the portfolio for Police should use his influence and suggest to those of that Department who are carrying out such tyrannical methods to cease doing so. I feel, Sir, that the Police Department should not be there to glorify itself in the number of cases made against the public, but that the opposite should be the case; and if you get the Police willing to co-operate with the public, the public would be willing to co-operate with the Police in return. When the Police set out to terrorise the public, the public does not co-operate and crime tends to increase as a result. It is not a proper thing for a Head of that Department or Heads of that Department to suggest to N.C.O's and other members of the Force under them to increase the number of cases brought against the public. It is a fact some of them have been threatened with transfers, failure to promote and refusal to give permission for their increments to be passed on to them. That is a bad thing for us to develop in this colony, and as a result, Sir, all these policemen have attempted to show that they are willing to carry out the reign of terror which they have been instructed to carry out and many cases which should have gone with a mere caution have been carried before the Police Magistrate Courts and things of that sort.

There is another point. We notice that some very attractive buildings are being set up as District Police Stations, but when one goes inside one sees about half dozen old stoves, Beatrice Stoves. 5.50 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: With what item are you dealing?

Mr. ALLDER: I am dealing with Item 35 because it refers to furniture. These stations are removed from the areas where the Police live, and I feel that the same day you give them a new building, you should also give them new stoves, in the same manner you erect a palatial building at the Garrison, at Worthing, at Black Rock and elsewhere in this Island. What is the use of erecting such attractive and commodious buildings with the absence of a small item, which causes injury or destruction to the big structure which you have put up? What I am suggesting is that in the Hastings area you have Natural Gas, and there is no great expense to get that Natural Gas let into these District Police Stations. It would only cost a few dollars to instal a range whereby these Officers could prepare their own meals. These Officers provide their meals under a great handicap, because when a man is waiting on a small stove which should be dumped, he is called upon to investigate a case in the district. If he could use the Natural Gas flame, his food would be cooked in a much shorter time, thereby affording him the opportunity to relax and refresh himself before he is called upon to investigate that case.

Where the Natural Gas does not pass near by these Stations, there is nothing wrong in buying a stove from any of the Broad Street Stores [MEM

BERS: What about Roebuck Street? [Laughter]. You can easily acquire a "Dover" coal stove or a "Florence" stove and put it there for the convenience of these men. I regret that nobody has seen fit to introduce this service because it would bring great relief if such a thing were to be done. I hope that the Hon. Premier, who is responsible for the destiny of the Police Department, would consider the suggestions which I have made.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Now that the hon. member has mentioned the matter, I will see what can be done about it. I should just like to remind the hon. member that this is a matter which reasonably comes within my portfolio, but I am not responsible for all of the duties of the Police.

I do deprecate the matter which was mentioned about Policemen being told that they must bring in more cases; that is wrong. For years, I have been at pains to point out to policemen when I was at the Bar, that it was better to prevent crime rather than see it committed, and then hale the matter into the Courts. It is regrettable, to use the mildest adjective I can think of, if the hon. member's information is correct, for a policeman to be told that he must bring in more cases. If you do that, then some policemen would make cases. [Mr. ALLDER: They have been doing that.

As regards Item 72, "Labour to assist Police artisans," when this matter was put before me, I asked about it, and the Commissioner's reply was that these people are apprentices, and he thought that \$5.00 a week was sufficient to pay them. Hitherto, these people have been paid from the Motor Transport and the Clothing and Equipment vote. I do not think that there is any hardship, because an apprentice would hardly be paid anything more outside. I am sure I will be told that the Government should set a good example, but I do not think that there is any hardship caused to these people.

Relative to the tape recorder, it is strange that a Police Force in any part of the world should not have a tape recorder. That is a sure way of making it impossible for the policemen themselves to write statements which are alleged to have been made by a person on his being interrogated; so that it would not be possible for a policeman and a witness to contradict each other as to what is said. If a policeman has to use a tape recorder, he would be doing it for posterity.

10.00 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Hon. Premier got up and replied before I had the opportunity of making a few observations under this Head because he might be able to help this Committee on the matters. I was interested to hear his remarks about preventing crime and I wish it would be passed on to the Police that it is their duty to prevent crime. Only yesterday, there was evidence in the Assistant Court of Appeal in which a policeman said he saw a vehicle passing and "I decided to try to make a case." Then you get the Judicial Officer (I would not call his name) saying "Why should the policeman tell a lie?" I would be glad if the Hon. Premier would explain to the Head of that Department that it is their duty to try and prevent crime, not to hide and cringe with a view of making a case.

What the hon. senior member for St. John said is right. Not only are policemen told that if they do not make a certain number of cases that there would be no increment for them, but they are told that if they do not make a certain number of cases on their off days, they will be required to attend lectures on those days. As every policeman looks forward to his off day which is one in every six or

seven days, you can well imagine that he will try his best to make cases in order to get his off days and not to risk the sacrifice of another year's increment.

A year or two ago, a policeman found that an officer of the law had committed a breach of the traffic law and reported him. The breach was committed at the traffic marks where traffic has to stop before swinging right to go down Beckles Road. The policeman who was patrolling near that junction saw that a few motorists were not stopping at the studs, so he reported two people who broke the law and the third person to come along and commit the same offence was a Police Officer, and the policeman reported him also. The policeman was brought up before someone in the office and was told that he could be charged for reporting his superior officer. That policeman was stationed at Brittons Hill Sub-Police Station, and because he dared to do that, he was sent to a country district Police Station where he was stationed for over a year or two. It is a station where a policeman is sent when he is disgraced.

I will deal with Item 51, Motor Transport. Since the hon. and learned senior member for St. Joseph has ceased to undergo the unhappy experience of working for a living at the Bar, a new method has developed by the use of police motor transport for speed traps. Instead of what they used to do in the past, that is, to get two policemen to measure off a distance of 110 yards on a public highway and then one of them got at one end and the other at the other end with stop watches to clock the speed of a motor vehicle, it is now done by means of motor transport. A member of the Police Motor Transport rides a motor cycle behind a motor vehicle and goes into Court and says that he has maintained an even distance behind the motor vehicle and that the speedometer of the motor-cycle registered 40 miles and he had done that distance for 440 yards. He takes the motor-cycle to Constant Road (which is a very busy country road to be tested) and he tries out that motor-cycle speedometer with the assistance of two other policemen, each of whom has stop watches. I have evidence in which this police motor cyclist has tried out the speed of the motor cycle up to speeds of 80 miles and 90 miles per hour on Constant highway at midday and in the afternoon. Traffic is not diverted from that road at that time and you can see the tremendous danger to life and limb when those trial runs are being carried out. They are tried out with the vehicle doing 60 miles to 90 miles per hour as the Police swear in Court on oath that they did it in order to tell the accuracy of the speedometer of the motor cycle. The sum of \$14,344 is voted for motor transport and that is one of the uses to which it is put.

I am suggesting to the Hon. Premier, and if he does not agree with me perhaps his colleague will agree with me, that there is danger to life and limb when it comes to those motor cycles being tried out at those tremendous speeds. It is a technical breach of the law to have those trial runs when the road is not zoned off to preclude other traffic from using it at that particular time.

There is another Item,—Item 52, Maintenance of Prisoners in lock ups—on which I would like to say something and for which the amount of \$120 is to be voted. That amount is inadequate for that purpose. As you know, Sir, it has long been the custom if someone is arrested without anyone standing bail, that person will remain in a lock-up from the Saturday afternoon until the Monday and sometimes until the Tuesday if the Monday is a Bank Holiday. We vote \$120 to maintain prisoners in lock-ups. They are entitled by custom and tradi-

tion to only biscuits and water — the water unlimited, but only 14 biscuits per day. Therefore you can see that that amount is inadequate for the purpose. Ten dollars a month is hopelessly inadequate for that purpose. I suppose it is one of the Items under which the Government will have to come down to this House with a Supplementary Resolution.

10.10 p.m.

That is why I feel it should be dealt with in a more adequate way. They have spent all they allocated but certainly the sum of not less than \$240,000 would be a reasonable amount to invite us to vote under that Head.

Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the Workers Union representative in this Chamber, referred to this matter of Labour to assist Police Artisans. I will tell you what policemen have mentioned to me in connection with the artisans in the Force. As carpenters, masons, and painters, they are at times required to do the work which they used to do before they were in the Force instead of normal police duties. It is not for a moment that they scorn doing these duties, but when they gave up carpentry, masonry and painting they did so because they wanted to become policemen and because they earned more for it than for the duties of their trade; and many of them are compelled by the Commissioner to pick up their paint brush, saw and hammer again which they had abandoned because they preferred the duties of a police officer. There are certain of them who tell me they do not mind having to do these duties because they do not have to do night patrol, because an officer who is made to do the painting of a building and so on does not have to do night duty; but there are others who prefer to do night duty and normal police routine than the duties of their former vocation, and I suggest that the least the authorities could do was to make it optional. Then it would be a matter for you to put your name on the Board if you would like to do the work, and if you do not put your name you would never be invited to do such work. We have to consider from the unemployment problem that whilst policemen are required to do their painting or carpentry, a corresponding number of carpenters, masons and painters are unemployed who would be employed if the policemen were not called upon to do these duties; and with this vast number of unemployed artisans one has to question whether the Commissioner of Police should be able to avail himself of the services of these men. I submit, Sir, that we have too many unemployed artisans connected with the Public Works Department for it to be reasonable or for you to use policemen for this purpose; and do not forget that as soon as you take the policemen to do that type of work they are not available to do police duties, and so you are reducing the number of available policemen in the Force. Sometimes, there are as many as 30 engaged in such work and the available personnel in the Force for normal police duties is reduced. So, Sir, I think there are certain matters which should be dealt with by the Cabinet Minister in dealing with police, in order that an improvement in this state of affairs could be made.

Now, Sir, under Item 66, "To pay an allowance of \$2 per month to writ servers." I would like to ask the Hon. Premier, if he cares to tell us in this Committee, whether the Writ Department was increased by the full number of writ servers for which they asked or if it was increased by a smaller number in the usual spirit of meeting them half way; that is, whether they asked for twenty and only ten were allowed or if the Cabinet allowed the full amount which the officers requested. That is im-

portant because it seems as if, even with ten additional ones and in view of the fact that some are required to do work as Court Criers and also required to do serving of writs and summonses whilst also having to do a full day's work in the Court, they are insufficient. I would like to know whether Government has whittled down the number asked for by the Head of the Department or whether there was a recommendation for this small number of ten.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the last question I happen to know that the number of writ servers asked for was granted. If the hon. member knew it why did he not say so? My recollection is that as part of the reorganisation of the Judiciary one of the things strongly put to the Executive was the number of adjournments of cases, and one of the reasons put was that people were not always summoned: and it was necessary to have more writ servers so that so many cases would not be adjourned because witnesses did not appear. It was for that reason we said, "Certainly, have all the writ servers you want;" so I am surprised that these writ servers were not appointed. But I do know that one of the very strong things in the state of the administration of justice is that too many cases are adjourned too often; so I repeat, I am surprised to find that there are no additional writ servers.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of explanation, I hope the Hon. Minister did not misunderstand me. I was seeking to find out whether ten was the full number for which the Department asked or whether the number for which they asked was reduced by the Cabinet.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 21, "rent allowance". Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Premier to tell me what is the number of married men in the Force. This is house rent. I know it is only for married men, because only married men are to sleep in houses; single men are to sleep in trees or at their sweethearts. Anyway, it is based on the number of married men in the Force. Can the Hon. Premier tell me whether anything has been done to increase the amount of allowance given to policemen for rent? I would like him to tell me because I have been raising it several times in here and I think the amount is inadequate.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I cannot remember but certainly the amount has been increased although it might not have been recently. I remember the occasion when it came before the Executive but that may be a year ago.

As regards the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I know that the Executive has not cut down the number of writ servers. We know that one of the chief things of which people complained was the fact that people did not get justice administered and there was constant adjournment and I think that the thanks of the Committee and the community for that matter is due to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy for the public spirit which he has shown in exposing some of these evils. I am sure any Officer who prevented a man from getting his off duty deserves to be exposed to the public and I am asking the hon. member for St. Lucy to name him.

10.20 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the Hon. Minister when he answered the question meant to say that because it was \$41,000 last year and the amount is now \$42,000, that that has accounted for the increase, because you have a greater number of married men.

I am thinking of the poor man. There is an amount of \$7.20 per month for a policeman for the rent of a house. If that is so, I do not think that that is anything of which a Socialist Government

should be proud. What do you expect a policeman to get for \$7.20 a month, if it is a question of renting a house? I think that this is disgraceful; I have been raising this question here year after year. Where do you expect a policeman to live for \$7.20 a month? If that is correct, I am wondering whether the Hon. Premier can tell me if any appeal has been made in connection with this matter. Surely the Hon. Premier and his advisers must know about this matter. I see the Hon. Premier looking —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is laid down by an Act, and that Act will have to be amended. This is not just done by an estimate; the Sergeants and Lance Sergeants get £39 per year. This is not intended to cover rent; I suggest that an Amendment to the Act be brought down.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I am saying is that for years I have been raising this question. It is the duty of the Government to amend the Act. I am not criticising the Act; I am criticising the Hon. Premier for not amending the Act, which I am entitled — and in order — to do. You must not draw any red herring across the trail like that and say that this amount is just for giving assistance. I would like the Hon. Premier to think in terms of amending the Act, so that the minimum you can give a policeman for renting a house would be \$15 per month. I sincerely hope that this will be the last occasion on which I shall have to criticise this amount; this amount of \$7.20 per month is merely for the rental of a room. I am tempted to say that the people whom they were thinking of when they amended the Act were married men; but you cannot penalise a man for not getting married because he cannot get married on the small salary which he gets when he goes into the Police Force.

Mr. BRYAN: Before the Hon. Premier replies, I should like to say that I am puzzled over Item 86, "Beds for Police Lock-ups". The note to this Item says: "To provide the minimum standard of sleeping accommodation in lock-ups." I am asking the Hon. Premier to throw a little light on this matter; I cannot follow it clearly.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: These beds are not for policemen; they are for prisoners.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to two Items and to suggest that such things as traffic lights be given a Head in these Estimates. To put this Item under "Incidentals" is wrong, and you have put the bicycles by themselves. You have an amount of \$240 for the upkeep of the traffic lights; what is that for? You cannot keep a check on these things when they are put down like that.

I should like to take the opportunity of enquiring about the contribution to the Regional Training School. Should that be put under this Head? Do they ask the Police Department of Barbados to look after this Item? Do these other Islands ask the Police Department of Barbados to look after this vote? Are our expenses in Barbados dealt with by this vote?

10.30 p.m.
If the Barbadian Policemen up there want something, are you leaving it to the Police Department to look after that or are you paying everything in the \$21,000 and getting it back as a contribution? It may be so. I am only going to say that a Department which can spend as much as \$21,000 should be given the opportunity of having some entity of its own. It is the only way to keep a proper check on it. Here we are voting the large sum of \$21,000 to the Police Training School and we do not know if it is to be used for books, pots or pans, while when it comes to the running of our own Police Force

and its getting an amount of money, we want to know what has been spent on the last bicycle repaired. I do not know if details of it are put in an appendix to these Estimates; it does not say so. All that they will come and tell you about it is that the vote has expired. I repeat, members of this House should have some idea of what is spent on salaries and the other things to be done at the Training School with this money. Is this the entire amount for the running of that School? I would like to see this amount in detail so that I can keep a check on what this Department is doing from year to year. You cannot tell what they are doing, so far as salaries, wages, incidentals and non-recurrent expenditure are concerned.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: A Message was sent to this House when this Regional Training School was to be established, the Message setting out everything that was to be done. We were told that according to the number of policemen in the School, we, the Leewards and the Windwards would have to pay a proportionate part. Our part comes to \$21,000. That is not the whole sum, that is our share of the expenses. I cannot tell the honourable member anything more. Frankly, I have not got the Message here of how it was proposed to spend the money but the House is aware of how it was to be spent.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, that really does not answer the question. I would be surprised if all of what the Hon. Premier has said about the Police Training School was put in the Message. I would be surprised to see put in that Message that it would be a block vote or somebody has sent a Message giving details of something which would never be changed. I think the Hon. Premier owes it to himself to see that some details of the Expenditure at that School are kept. This is an expensive way to get Barbadians trained as policemen. We used to get it done for actually nothing before. You used to put \$5,000 in the Estimates every year to train people to be policemen. How many do you take in a year to train? This is a serious matter. I feel one of these days that this Government will come to the conclusion that you cannot take \$21,000 and give it to the Police Training School. Just before these Estimates were placed before us, this Government was talking about retrenchment as regards Leave Passages and that is a word which has been used already. Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that this money is wasted. I have no doubt that they have capable people to train people at the Police Training School to be policemen and I do know that we may have to equip that School properly. All I am saying is that if this is such a nice system of training, let us know something about it.

Last year we voted \$7,500 as part of the annual sum for this Regional Training School. Now, we find that the actual sum is \$21,000. You cannot put a part-time thing in the Estimates if it has to be for the whole year. This amount of \$21,000 is probably the entire amount which you are spending on the Regional Training School. Perhaps we might be asked to put it that way. You knew exactly what it would have cost you last year. Nothing you put in the Estimates must be for part of the year. All we can say is that the \$7,500 which was put in the Estimates of last year was our part for the 12 months. I am not criticising the amount of \$21,000 set out here for the Item; it may be most necessary, but I am saying that it is too much money to give as a block vote for one Item of a Department.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, sometimes when Messages are sent to us from the Head of the Administration for the introduction of a new scheme,

owing to the way they are passed through this Chamber, one does not get the opportunity of knowing every possible thing about the matter. I think what the honourable junior member for the City has said carries weight. It is true that I did not notice it before he had spoken, but after hearing him I think it is time that we should go more deeply into the matter.

The honourable junior member for the City drew to our attention that we used to have our policemen trained here in the past for the small sum of \$7,000 a year. It is a fact that we cannot be ashamed at all of the type of policemen which we produce. Now we are asked to spend \$21,000 as our part of training the policemen we need at the Regional Police Training School which is now set up at Seawell. I am wondering if we have not just committed ourselves to an increased expenditure just to accommodate the other islands of the West Indies. I regret that we find ourselves saddled with this additional expense of \$14,000. We can only come to the conclusion that we are only doing so just to accommodate the other islands. I do not know who made the suggestion; I do not know whether it was decided by the various West Indian Governments or whether it was a recommendation from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but certainly we find ourselves going into a scheme which will cost us unnecessary expense. We used to produce the best policemen in the West Indies. As a matter of fact, every Police Force in the West Indies contains some of our policemen and that is due to the good set-up which we have here. They appreciate it.

Now, rather than to have a cut down in the expense of training, we are asked to spend an additional \$14,000. If I were this Government which was asked to go into a scheme with other Governments to train policemen, I would make sure that in view of the fact that I am using my trained personnel to train those policemen who are sent from the other colonies, my recurrent expenditure does not exceed what it was originally.

10.40 p.m.

I am wondering, Sir, who had to pay for the cost of the nice buildings that have been put up there to accommodate them. I am wondering if we had to pay for that [A VOICE: It was paid for from C.D. & W. grant.] But even that is taking the Barbados grant from C.D. & W. to utilise it in the interest of other Governments who get theirs and spend it on themselves. It should not be so even although it might be a grant from C.D. & W. We should spend it for the use of Barbados and the Barbadians, but not in this way. We have spent it on a West Indian basis to accommodate West Indians. I regret we have committed ourselves to it already, but I would like to suggest, Sir, that having the knowledge which we do have now, that you do your utmost in the future to see how far you can have it cut down during the years to come. There is nothing to show how much the other colonies contribute to it and I feel all that should be before us. However, Sir, I regret the added increase. I know that we really were not in need of that centre being set up at Seawell as I said, and I will repeat that District "A" has produced some of the best trained policemen that can be produced in this part of the world. I can only hope that the Hon. Premier will see what best he can do in this matter, having committed ourselves to it already.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think if the honourable member would look at the Estimates for last year he will see there is a note to the effect that \$7,500 was part of our contribution. I have before me all the information and it would take me

twenty minutes to read it all out. The honourable member said we got nothing from the Leewards and Windwards. Well, I am prepared to get copies cyclo-styled to give to all honourable members who so desire them. I wonder if the honourable member thinks that in the running of this Government Department in which other colonies are concerned that you could not have a meticulous line-by-line account of the money spent! The Leewards and Windwards have theirs, too, because it is regional. I cannot say everything because I would take up the time of the Committee by reading it all, but I will give a few items. Personal Emoluments for the Director of Training for the Financial period 1st April, 1956 to 31 March, 1957; Commandant; Chief Inspector, Quarter Master Sergeant Instructors, Corporals; Clerks; Stenographer-Typists, etc. Washing allowance, duty allowance and so on, making total personal emoluments to the amount of \$30,353, plus other charges to the total of \$26,795. Summary total, therefore, \$57,148, of which Barbados contributes \$21,767, Leeward Islands \$10,999, and Windward Islands \$24,382. As I said, if honourable members want a copy of this I will circulate it; but it is idle to suggest that there can be no keeping of an account of what is happening. It is not an increase of \$14,267, but merely that \$7,500 is what the annual charge is going to be which was put in last year, of which we spent \$5,898. You might just as well make the same accusation of having Erdiston College for the Windwards and Leewards. We did that, unlike Erdiston for which you have to give a more careful account of how the money is allocated and spent.

The question that the sum of \$369,898 be voted under Head XV, Police, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XVI — Prisons

Head XVI—Prisons—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Item 25, after-care of discharged prisoners, to be increased by \$420, to be added Item 31 (a) a new Item, Prisoners Earning Scheme, \$2,650. The Hon. Minister for Social Services will explain the prisoners' earning scheme. Item 31(b) also new, Prisoners' Canteen; provision of \$250 (to be voted) to finance a canteen for prisoners to be used in conjunction with the Earning Scheme.

I beg to move that the sum of \$60,838 be voted under this Head.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In seconding that motion sir, honourable members, I am sure will be glad to hear that the old system of after-care is being revised. The Chaplain and Superintendent were the after-care officers. That is being extended to bring in people from outside: a member of the Chamber of Commerce, a representative from the Social Welfare Office, one or two parsons and other people interested in the after-care and welfare of these prisoners. As a matter of fact, I have an over-all Committee for the G.I. Schools as well as the Prisons and sub-Committees to each institution.

10.50 p.m.

There is a system whereby prisoners do not now go to Codrington Hill to cut stones, but they remain in the Prison and work in the workshops. They learn handicrafts whereby they make a living after they leave the Institution. These handicrafts when made, will be sold, and part of the proceeds will go to the credit of the Prison, so that when these prisoners leave the Prison, they will have a little cash in hand, and thereby have a means of carrying on and earning a living. [Mr. E. D.

MOTTLEY: Will the Canteen have grog? [*Laughter*] The Canteen will not have any grog; it is a Canteen whereby they purchase soap and things like that. That is the expenditure foreshadowed in this year's Estimates.

It will be interesting to know that 64 cells were lighted with electricity during the financial year, and there is an amount in this year's Estimates for lighting another 64. The cells will be lighted gradually until all of them have been lighted. The whole Prison has sanitary conveniences; there is no bucket system any longer. Prisoners are encouraged to work on the Farm. I have risen to give all this explanation in order to show that we are working along modern lines.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have risen to say that to err is human.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what Item is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Item on which the Hon. Minister has just spoken.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister made an explanation in connection with the Head.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Well I claim the privilege of making further comment on this Head. We all appreciate this After Care of discharged prisoners, of which the Hon. Minister of Social Services is so proud to tell us. I am one of those people who believe that first things must come first. In connection with this Item 25, "After Care of discharged prisoners," the note says that this amount of \$580 is to be expended on released prisoners by the After Care Committee, and the Hon. Minister of Social Services took pride in telling us about the Social Welfare Office —

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I mentioned a representative from that Department.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister told us about the After Care of prisoners with pride; I wonder if he will tell us about the After Care of people who have been suffering from Tuberculosis. They will lead us to think that all is well with all the people in this country who are afflicted with T.B. It seems to me that it would be better to commit yourself and to provide for After Care, in respect of those who have been suffering from this disease; I say that the After Care of prisoners should take second place to the After Care of Tuberculosis patients.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Are we dealing with Tuberculosis, Mr. Chairman? I am submitting that the hon. member will have an opportunity of dealing with that matter under some other Head.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am surprised that the Hon. Minister of Social Services has attempted to prevent me from expressing myself. I just want to give notice of what this House and the public expect of me in dealing with this question of the After Care of T.B. patients.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion the Hon. Premier told us about the —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what Item is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, you know I always pick out the right Item. I am speaking on Items 24 and 25. I was saying, Sir, that from the attitude of the Hon. Premier when we discussed the Estimates last year, one would have thought that by now, there would have been the institution of motorised transport for the convenience of prisoners who are going to work.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Item 24 is "Expenditure under Gratuities."

Mr. ALLDER: I am really dealing with travelling expenses. I really thought that by now,

this Institution would have some means of transporting prisoners to the General Hospital and elsewhere. It is known that every member of the Staff, from top to bottom —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but the note to that Item "Travelling Expenses," says that these expenses are for the Superintendent.

Mr. ALLDER: The note also tells me that the Superintendent is a member of the Institution inasmuch as he lives there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as that is concerned, you would only have to say whether you are giving these travelling expenses or not.

Mr. ALLDER: I am saying that this Item should be extended to the travelling done by the prisoners when they go to the General Hospital, the Garrison, the Pierhead, the Reef and Government House.

11 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The sum of \$120 cannot do all that.

Mr. ALLDER: The fact that we have seen prisoners transported by motor vehicles of the Department of Highways and Transport shows that somebody is convinced of transporting them by that method. The Hon. Premier suggested that he would give the matter favourable consideration. I would suggest to the Hon. Minister of Social Services that as Colonel Julien has given us two motor vans which are lying idle, that we can take them and use them for that purpose. Something even bad is better than none. What I have noticed is that these two vehicles are in the yard of the General Hospital exposed to the weather, and I have been told that they are not used. If you do not want to incur any expense by purchasing transport for the conveyance of those prisoners who have to go to the General Hospital on Mondays and at other times to get injections, why not use one of those vehicles for the purpose? I am told that the Head of the Department is in favour of my suggestion.

Let me say again that the present method of transporting prisoners is outmoded. I feel that I owe apologies to prisoners for having done a wrong thing to them. I am forced with the feeling that because I have initiated the suggestion of placing motor vehicular transport at the disposal of the prison authorities for the conveyance of prisoners that that is the reason why they have not got it. Why should you penalise them? Why should you hurt so many for one? All I want the Hon. Premier to do is to show that such statements are unfounded.

Sir, I am glad to hear that prisoners are not sent to Codrington to cut stone now. I am not against their cutting stone but what looks horrible to me and to persons with a modern mind is the method of conveying prisoners to that quarry. The Hon. Premier meets these people almost every day and he knows that that method of getting them there is out-moded.

However, I hope that the Hon. Premier would stick to the suggestion and intimation which he made on the last occasion when we discussed this matter. I am suggesting that one of the motor vehicles from the Police Department which cannot be sufficiently serviceable to the Police Department can be easily transferred to the Prison. I see some of those unserviceable vehicles sold to private people who are using them for conveying passengers. The fact of the matter is that sometimes Warders at the Prison take a half a day to walk a prisoner from

Glendairy to the General Hospital and back. Sometimes the Superintendent of the Prison has to convey them in his car. Motor vehicular transport is definitely a necessity for the conveyance of prisoners and I hope that supplementary provision will be brought down here for that purpose before the next Estimates.

The question that the sum of \$57,518 be voted under Head XVI—Prisons, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

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

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

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 until tomorrow, Wednesday 7th, March, 1956 at 12 o'clock (noon).

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.

11.10 p.m.