

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 8th March 1956

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

Present

His Honour 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 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*); 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, and Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN.

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.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS the Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax, was read a first time.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Michael be

appointed Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be re-appointed Chairman of Committees of this House. I have not had anything to do with what took place last night, but from what I have heard, I come today to ask the hon. member to continue his office in the House and to continue to preside over Committees.

The hon. member has a fund of commonsense which has been a source of good influence on the Committees of this House. He has had the strain of two days continuous sitting in Committee and listening to the usual repetition and wanderings of hon. members. No doubt it has had something to do with his sense of humour and patience and I am asking him to allow my motion to stand and to be disposed to resume his office in this House as from today.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second that motion. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph as Chairman of Committees and I have had some clashes but I doubt very much that hon. members of this House have reached the stage when we will not have any clashes. When that day comes we could as well make recommendations for the spot of earth which we are sure to reach some day to open to us; and as that is so, we have to admire and reflect with pride on these incidents which happen in this Chamber and say that they show we are alive.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has an extraordinary amount of humour. Sometimes I wonder what causes him to run off that high sense of humour on some occasions. I do feel on this occasion that he had a strain through sitting in the Chair for long periods. No doubt, he has an abundance of patience—something which I would like to have a bit of—and I am sure I would like to be able to endure what he has to endure; and that sentiment I express, Sir, is not from one side of this House. Mr. Speaker. You know that it is difficult even for you to rule in this House.

I hope the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will resume his office as Chairman of Committees and when he does so, I am sure he will still have cause to rap the gavel again at me. I second this motion with a full sense of my responsibility and sincerity.

Mr. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, allow me to say just a few words to endorse what the hon.

junior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. Peter said in respect of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. It is true to say that civilisation will be at an end were it not possible for us to grumble and then come back together in agreement. With these few remarks I endorse all that has been said by the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I took my seat next to the hon. junior member for the City because it would appear as if I asked him to do what he has done.

Mr. LEWIS: If the hon. member would allow me to explain, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it has exactly nothing to do with it. I am very sorry that it has so happened because from the way I did it, it could give hon. members that impression but the contrary is true.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will not altogether say that I will not assume the Chair, but I must have time to consider it. I did not come here today with that in mind. I only thought it my business to come today because I felt without my early presence there might have been an abortive meeting. As a matter of fact, I have no intention of returning later today. I cannot say at this moment that I would accept what the hon. junior member for the City has asked me to do because it is only last night that I have resigned the Chair and it is not yet 16 hours for me to come back and accept the Chair, I think would look very childish, although I was made to look as a child last night. I am therefore sorry that I cannot see my way to accept the offer today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. member who has just spoken that the motion is the property of the House.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I will ask you kindly under the circumstances with the leave of the House to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection leave was granted honourable member.

The question that the honourable junior member for St. Michael be appointed Chairman for the day's meeting, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ESTIMATES—Cont'd.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to postpone Order No. 1, and to take Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day.

Leave was granted the honourable member.

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

Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services

Head XXIX — Miscellaneous Services — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, in moving Head XXIX, there is a new Item to be added: Compensation under Advertisements Regulation Act, 1956. Provision of \$1,500 (To be voted) to meet claims for compensation in accordance with Regulations to be made under the provisions of this Act, dealing with the Regulations of advertisements in the countryside.

I beg to move that the sum of \$641,990 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, I notice that under Item 29 Fees to Queen's Solicitor, to be voted is the sum of \$1,000, which is \$300 decrease on last year's Estimate. I am wondering, Sir, if the Government cannot see, despite the small decrease, the necessity for initiating an amendment to the Act in order to make this office a whole time one. As you will realise, Sir, the present occupant is a very busy solicitor, has a tremendous private practice and the fact is that you may well have him in an embarrassing position either to himself or to his firm being concerned, with one aspect of a matter and the Government's interest being involved in the other aspect. Just as in the case of the Solicitor General which was part time and which is now whole time, I think the Government should give this matter their really serious consideration. Only last year I remember reading, I was not actually in the Court, a paper in which the Queen's Solicitor in that capacity appeared on one side and a member of the same firm appeared according to the newspaper report, for the other side in the same case. I would not say professional gentlemen under the circumstances would fail to do the best for their clients although they were on opposite sides and both members were of the same firm. But that is what would happen when we have a Queen's Solicitor as a part time official with Barbados being a small community as it is; and there is no justification since we have discarded the part time Solicitor General. I have already said I am not in any way referring adversely to the particular individual who is holding the office or the manner in which he is performing his duties at that office. Now, Sir, that is as regards Item 29.

Now, Sir, as regards Item 36 — Government binding and printing, \$114,000. I am eagerly looking forward to hear a statement from the Government benches as to what is proposed in connection with the Government binding and printing. As you know, Sir, we are required to vote this \$114,000, and we have reason to believe that this private contractor who is responsible for Government binding and printing is not satisfying its employees with adequate remuneration, and they have done what is done in all modern and civilised communities. They have gone on strike pending reasonable settlement of what I have no reason to doubt are their extremely modest and just demands. The percentage will always sound high if the amount with which you are dealing is low, and I would like to know if the Government has told this private contractor that as far as our work is concerned this House and the Legislature expect them to get on and produce our work, the binding and printing which they have contracted to do. So far as they are concerned in respect of this particular work, they had better hurry up and pay the people properly who do that department of their business and ensure that our work is kept up to date. In the past they could not keep up-to-date because the Reporters were slow and inefficient and were too few. I believe they are kept up-to-date since we have added to our reportorial staff.

Now, it is a question of our printers. We realise our work must be kept up-to-date and Government must give them a hint to settle it as soon as possible and ensure our work is done. They were not the only people who applied for the contract, and they were lucky to get it and I must say they are expected to do this work for which we awarded them the contract. It would be well for them to understand that the

Government and the Legislature take a very serious view of this matter and insist that our work be kept up-to-date.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I am wondering whether Government would consider putting in a little more money for the Hurricane Organisation. I am sure the lack of organisation in September last year would justify that. Is this amount of \$1,000 really sufficient for this Organisation? I am only putting forward a psychological fact, but I would have liked to see a little more money put down here.

I have not taken much note of this Item 59, "Financial and General Orders," in the past. The note says that it a "revote to meet expenses in connection with the compilation of Financial and General orders for the Public Service." I should like to know if that Item deals with the Consolidated Orders in relation to the Civil Establishment. However, I really feel that more money should have been given to the Hurricane Organisation.

This is the Head in the Estimates under which the salary revision is done, and I am sure that the Government servants would have been given some hope of reward if a token amount had been put in relative to the revision of salaries. The Government itself has revised salaries by putting Items in the Estimates. We know that salary revision has taken place all around us, and our own Civil Servants are looking for some action to be taken in this matter, whether it is fruitful or not. I think that an amount should have been put in here so as to give the feeling that something is being done in the matter.

In connection with Item 62, "Registration of Voters" I raised the question just a few weeks ago but I am wondering if the Hon. Minister would let us know if he has had the time to investigate the criticism which I levelled on that occasion. At that time, I claimed that a section of the Recorders were being underpaid. I do not wish to repeat the matter all over again; I am only asking him if he has had the opportunity of discussing the matter with the Chief Registering Officer Mr. Chase, and to see if he is satisfied that this category of worker in respect of the registration of voters is not being underpaid. I would also like to state now that this registration of voters is being done in a different way from how the first one was done, and lots of persons seem to think that they are being left out of this registration. Although we have not got any great publicity about it, those Registering Officers with whom I spoke, told me that they expected to have something like 95 % or 98%. On the first occasion, I think the Registering Officer had to interview each individual of the household. I am wondering whether additions or deletions can give the names of the other people in the household. On this occasion one person can give the names of the other people in the household. I am wondering whether additions or deletions can be made before the final registration is done.

Mr. GODDARD: The honourable senior member or St. Lucy has mentioned something about Government printing. A dispute has arisen, and this is an unfortunate period at which to make any comments either in one way or in the other in the matter. However, as a member of the Debates Committee, I think I should say that when the Contract was awarded, it was stated in the Contract that in the case of a lock-out or trade dispute, the Contractor is not penalised or cannot be forced to produce the goods. In any Contract with the Government over a period of years, that Clause must be put in, and I do think that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy should know that that provision was put in the Contract. It is unfortunate

that any comment one way or the other should be made in connection with this matter today. I rose to say that very little publicity should be given to this matter because of what is taking place, and we do hope for as speedy a settlement as possible.

Mr. HAYNES: I would like a little information on Item 9, "Expenses of Water Board." The amount asked for is \$4,890. I am wondering if that is in connection with this experimental irrigation work. I am very sorry that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in his place today, and it might be a lot of trouble to other Ministers to supply this information. But, sometime ago, we had some estimates made and \$½ million was allocated with the idea of improving irrigation in this island. I wonder if this Water Board has anything to do with that allocation. The matter is rather confusing, because I see that the sum of \$4,890 is to be voted now, and the expenditure for 1954—55 was \$1,401; so that they did not even spend ⅓ of that money. I am wondering what progress is being made in this matter; it is a matter which concerns three of the dry parishes in this Island, and we should be guaranteeing the sugar economy of this Island. I do appreciate the fact that the appropriate Minister is not in his place, but it would be interesting, and I think the public would welcome it, if a little information could be given, about this matter.

3.45 p.m.

Perhaps it could be given when the Minister returns to his office. I see that he has just issued a statement on agriculture which is very interesting for the Department concerned. It is very difficult to say whether this is for your Water Board or for irrigation but I take it to mean that.

The other Item which is giving me a bit of worry is Item 37, Government Advertisements. I take it that this \$15,000 is for advertisements in the newspapers. I have been noticing that some of them are two and three columns wide. Surely, there is no need for them to occupy all that space. There should be a circular sent to the Government Departments concerned asking them to draw in their advertising space and it will not make much difference because the people will still be able to read them.

This sum of \$15,000 is a lot of money to pay out for a few advertisements about vacancies and other items of that sort. To my mind, if their size was split in half, they would still be seen and read. Everybody ought to know that advertisements are charged for according to the space they occupy and the rules of arithmetic should be applied to them by splitting them in half. I believe the money saved from this expense will be useful for some more needy purpose. I am asking for a little information on these matters if I can get it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Item 52, Hurricane Organisation. I am sincerely hoping that the Government is thinking hard about the organisation of Hurricane Committees in the various parishes. We all know that "Janet" came on us just as the wolf which came when the little boy used to cry "wolf, wolf." That is, when the boy cried for "wolf, wolf," the people of the village turned out but the wolf never came. When he cried "wolf, wolf" and the wolf came, the people never turned out to help him.

Sir, as a Vestryman for the parish of St. Joseph, I well remember that the Vestry bought something like 50 lanterns years ago for hurricane use and they were kept somewhere lying about for that purpose but when "Janet" came and they went for the lanterns, they had rusted out. Now, Sir, not only were the lanterns rusted, but the organisation had also

rusted out. It is because we knew nothing of a storm, but that one has come and given us some knowledge. I am warning the Government to be alert and form committees and various organisations in case another storm visits this island. We will then be prepared to meet it.

I would have never raised this point if the Local Government Bill the Maude Bill — would have been coming into operation soon but it appears to me that another storm may come before the Maude Bill comes into operation. If this Bill had been put into operation when I had expected it would have been. I am sure the organisations to which I made reference would have been formed in each parish and they would be able to make the necessary provision for a storm. As I have said, another "Janet" might come before "Maude." I am only throwing out a warning to Government now that they should set up Committees in the various parishes and do not rely on any Churchwarden or local authorities to do so: because these local authorities went about preaching nothing else but politics when "Janet" came and they never mentioned anything of the people's sufferings; nor did they try to relieve them. This is what the Churchwarden of the Parish of St. Joseph went around telling the poor suffering people before getting a little food for them. He told them: "You see that I am the only person now to come to your aid." He carried nothing else to them but his mouth: yet he told them that he had come to their aid. I do not want anything like that to happen again. I do not want it to be put in the hands of these local authorities to make it more burdensome and hard for the poor suffering people. It is the Government's duty to set about it and Government should do it right away the setting up of organisations and Committees and things of that sort; so that in case another storm visits us everybody would know what is his duty and would go about it in the right way.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to draw to the attention of the Government that at the Crane Hotel the flag pole broke down in the storm. I do not know who is responsible for putting it back but people in the district would know from what is hoisted on it that a storm is in the wake. On the evening preceding the storm I went to bed early so I did not hear any news of it; but on the morning when I looked up at the hotel flag pole I saw the warning flag. That flag pole was there from the time I was a boy and on account of it, not only myself, but all the people around that district know when anything unusual is going to take place in the island. The people always look for a sign from that flag pole. I therefore hope the Government will cause that flag pole to be re-erected because if another storm comes in my life time there would be something to inform me. 3.55 p.m.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, there is another Item I would like to raise before the Hon. Minister replies—Item 15: Insurance of Government Buildings etc. increased by \$10,235. I am wondering if that incorporates a comprehensive insurance and so on, on the thousands of houses that are now under Government hands: those replaced by the Housing Board and also those by the Public Works Department under the Hurricane Relief Committee. As some honourable members know, I am rather emphatic on this matter. It was never taken seriously. An Address was taken to the Head of the Administration on this matter three or four years ago by myself as the Mover of the Address and nothing has been done about it. This is a very serious matter because I believe most Barbadians thought that the

island was immune from hurricanes. Well, last year opened their eyes a bit and they now see the difficulty arising out of this serious matter. Not only will it be a great expense again, but from the words of the Premier as regards the British Treasury, needs are needs. That is to say they are only going to help those in need. And another thing: although we have received a certain amount of voluntary subscriptions, owing to the careless way in which that money has been spent in some cases, we are not going to get that help on another occasion—or if so, on a very much more limited scale. People are not satisfied that they know where the subscriptions have gone. I personally foresaw it, and any little bit I saw I could give. I gave houses and had then repaired in my district. I knew where my money went. However, if something is not done with this, I foresee with another catastrophe this Government will find itself with a big debt to pay again. It cost them so far a quarter million pounds plus other moneys. I will mention to them that in the United States where they are vulnerable to floods and hurricanes, they are finding it extremely difficult to raise funds to rehabilitate their victims, and most of these vulnerable States of the Mississippi and Ohio are running insurances on houses for those who cannot run it for themselves because they are finding out that year after year floods come on them and the Federal Government are asked to come in and help. They have got the money and they are running insurances; so I would like to hear from the Hon. Premier something about that; that is, if they have been considering this matter and not waiting until another hurricane comes to consider it again, because I am afraid they might be in a worse state than the first. I brought this matter up, Sir, because I am very sympathetic about it. I know what I am speaking about and I know how important it is, and I have heard that honourable members of the Government have regretted that when the hurricane arrived some action had not been taken, and I hope they would not wait until too late before the next step is taken. I would like an expression of opinion on this matter.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few more things concerning Hurricane Relief. We have been fortunate enough for many years past to escape the calamity of a hurricane until just last year, but such is nature. We would be left out for 100 years and then we may get two consecutive years of hurricane. So it would be well for the Government to be prepared in the event of another hurricane in 1956; that is nothing impossible or improbable, it generally happens like that. You are missed for several years and then you get two claps.

Now, Sir, I am strongly opposed to appointing any planters to these local Hurricane Relief Committees, the honourable ex-planter who has just sat down not withstanding. They are not all indifferent to the care of poor people, but unfortunately most of them were in this crisis. I think an admirable body of men to appoint in each parish would be all the Ministers of religion as part of the Hurricane Relief Committee. There are several ecclesiastical districts in each parish of this island and all the Ministers in charge should be appointed to the Local Hurricane Relief Committees. I am aware that several people who have recently suffered the loss of household effects when their homes crashed have not received any type of compensation, or any sign of being compensated, because nobody investigated their case up to now; and I would bring to the notice of the Minister in charge, the Minister of Social Services, that he may warn the Central Hurricane Relief Committee that several people have not heard any-

thing relative to the applications which they sent in and which they were invited to send in. I myself have met representatives at the office of the Government Housing Board and I was told that investigating bodies or officers are going into such cases; but I am also aware that many cases have not seen anything of the Investigating Committee, and after all, it is a matter of six months or more; and it would be expected that some sign of recompense for the household requisites lost should be paid by now; so I will draw the Minister of Social Services' attention to that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word on Head XXIX, Item 15, to which the honourable junior member for St. Andrew referred in view of the proposed increase of \$10,000, in that amount for insurance. I would like Government to explain what is the principle by which they decide on this award of insurance. Do they invite various reputable companies to tender for the work and certainly up to a year ago there was one company which from time immemorial has been getting all Government business? There is a difference in rates with certain companies; but some are rather less and certainly up to a year ago there was one company whose rates per premium were less than other companies. It would be interesting to find out if that is still the case, and in any event what is the principle adopted by the Government when they are increasing the amount of insurance. Do they deal with other companies or do they put all the business in the same company which has been in the past receiving their business?

I would refer to Item 34, "Entertainment of visiting Service personnel." It was only a few weeks ago in this House that I referred to the complaints which were made in connection with the entertainment of visiting Service personnel, not of commissioned rank. We are asked to provide for an increase of \$200, and the increase is due to the increase in the number of visiting warships. The honourable senior member for St. Michael was good enough to say that he would ascertain the method adopted in issuing these entertainments, because complaints were widespread among the middle-class coloured girls in this respect. Dozens of these girls have told me that the persons who issue the invitations to the entertainment have been issuing them to a very restricted circle.

We are asked to spend \$800 of the taxpayers' money for this entertainment, and there is no reason why there should be any segregation practised in the issuing of these invitations. As a matter of fact, I have discussed the matter with some persons who have been visiting here on these ships, and they say that they cannot understand why, when there is a dance or a picnic, or a drive around the Island, they do not see more than one coloured person to about ten white people. They say that they like to meet the natives of this country and not merely their cousins. I hope the honourable senior member for St. Michael will give us an assurance that at these dances and picnics, we will see coloured people in the same proportion as they are in the Island's population.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: To deal with that last point first, if the honourable member has a good case, and he wants his grievance redressed, certainly the proper thing to do would be to go with a specific instance to the appropriate Minister, tell him what the grievance is and see to it that he deals with the matter with a view to having it redressed. I find it very difficult, when I listen to the honourable member, to know whether he, as a Parliamentarian, is making an after-dinner speech, or whether he is

really serious in what he says. However, what the honourable member has said is a very serious thing, and I suggest to him that he should do what I suggested to him to do with regard to the Police Officers. Perhaps the honourable member did not care to mention the name of the Police Officer publicly, but he could tell it to me privately. In the past, when a warship visited this Island, all the girls of the Girls' Industrial Union were seen at these dances. I do not know if the mixing which went on in those days still goes on; but, if it does not go on, the honourable member should tell the appropriate Minister and have the matter redressed. If the Minister has not got a specific instance, he cannot deal with the matter adequately.

As regards the point made by those honourable junior members for the respective parishes about the Hurricane Organisation, I am sure that the Government, or the Governor, has appointed a new Organisation in the sense that some members of the previous Organisation have had to bring up to date the methods in the hand-book proclamations which will be the methods to be put in operation in the case of another hurricane. The lessons which we have learnt include some of the points raised, as to whether a Churchwarden *ex officio* should be in the Organisation, and so on, because of the instance which we have had with a Churchwarden. Mr. Barton, the Commissioner of Police and three, or four or five other persons have been asked to make recommendations for strengthening and making more effective, the working of hurricane relief in case there is another hurricane.

As regards the question of Insurance, the honourable member is quite wrong to think that the Government has neglected his warning. Not only was his Address carefully considered, but Insurance Companies, including Lloyds, have been approached. I, personally, made very extensive preparations for a hurricane in 1954 and again last year. I went to the extent of getting special shutters built, buying hurricane lamps and so on. I was not the only member of the Government who felt that a hurricane might come then; it was only 200 miles off in 1953.

Relative to the Insurance of houses, resulting from the stand made by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, we have inquired into the matter, and the Insurance Companies will not insure houses is just at large, so to speak. You have to set out that so many chattel houses would value so much, you have almost to detail them for the Insurance Companies to insure them. I myself raised the matter in Executive Committee in August as to whether there was any chance of getting these houses insured, and again, we were told the same thing. This same matter was raised in the House of Commons as to whether there could not be a comprehensive Government Insurance Scheme, which would provide the money for rehabilitating houses, established by the different Governments in the West Indies.

4.15 p.m.

I do not tell you that I go along completely with the answer which Mr. Lennox-Boyd gave but it is not considered to be right policy for the British Government to go in for that sort of spending with the expectation of the possibility of having to rehabilitate every colony. That is not to say that the question of the possibility of recurrent hurricanes in the West Indies and what should be done about them was not present in the minds of representatives of Unit Governments and Colonial Office.

I myself believe that we might approach Insurance Companies and make a survey of the

Houses we have in order to see if we can get, say 20,000 or 30,000 of them covered by insurance under a comprehensive policy. One hon. member asked about the Housing Scheme in St. Lucy. We did get a number of companies to tender for it. It was not a question of selecting one company—nothing of the sort. For the insurance of houses at the Bay Estate, the Pine, Deacons Road or Belfield, we got quotations from many companies so that we could see from them which was the best for us to take. There is no question of our not endeavouring to get the lowest premium we can get.

Perhaps, I may as well now deal with other points made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. He said that the dispute between the Advocate Company and its workers showed the necessity for a Government Printery. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the dispute between the Advocate Company and its workers, surely hon. members should have the responsibility not to make comments on it, let alone a lawyer who knows that he should hear both sides of a matter before arriving at a verdict. Of course, he may not want to hear the other side if his sympathy is for the Advocate Company.

Although I deprecate those remarks, I welcome the suggestion of the need for a Government Printery. Members of the Government agree that there should be a Government Printery. We have accepted the principle that there is need for a Government Printery in the past, but it is purely a question of priority. This dispute has brought the need for it closer to our minds. There may be, from time to time, the possibility of the work of Government being held up and that would push it higher up in priority than it otherwise might have been. That is the answer to the hon. member's question. Apart from what I consider may be high charges, it is a good thing to have your own printery and your own officers sworn to secrecy, other than to have your printing done by an outsider, over whose employees you have no control and through whose employees Government secrets have leaked out in the past, not only in this but other communities.

I agree with what the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said about advertisements. It may be as the hon. member suggested, that some of these advertisements take up too much space and therefore they can be cut down. I will take notice of that and insist that there should be the greatest economy.

The hon. junior member for St. Andrew also drew attention to the expenses of the Water Board. I do not think the Water Board has anything to do with irrigation. The functions of the Water Board are to see that water is not wasted and persons are not allowed promiscuously to sink wells, but the question of irrigation is a question for the Waterworks Department as such; and at sometimes the Department of Agriculture sees after the distribution of the water which is available.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy referred to the Queen's Solicitor. The Government was advised some years ago, after the then Queen's Solicitor went, that consideration should be made to making this post a whole time post or to attach the post to another post such as Public Trustee in the Government Service. Really and truly you cannot get a worthwhile Solicitor to take this post as a wholetime job. It is very seldom that you get them to take the post of Clerk or Deputy Clerk of this Chamber. The fees are not at all extravagant. It is only \$1,000. This part-time arrangement is indeed the real answer to that. On the other hand, as I see that it would be better to add this office

to the staff of the Public Trustee (I am not saying that this will be done) but that seems to be the most sensible course.

Before I had finished dealing with the Item Hurricane, I should have made reference to the point made about a sum of money. The \$1,000 is for minor expenditure of the Hurricane Relief Committee. It is not money to put by for emergency expenditure; that comes under Item 58, Emergency Relief Expenditure and that sum is put down so that in case there be a hurricane you will have something to get started with your lorry loads of food and so on as soon as the storm is over.

I may also say that Mr. Chase is very careful in making suggestions to the Government, but in view of what the hon. junior member for Christ Church said possibly reconsideration of payments should be made as regards remuneration for compiling the Register of Voters, I will say that Government is still getting further advice from Mr. Chase. I think I have covered all the points which were made. If by chance anything has been left out I shall be glad to hear.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier made reference on the question of entertainment of Visiting Service Personnel. He was probably out of the Island when this matter was discussed a couple of months ago. I gather from the exceptional silence of hon. senior member for St. Michael who has been in his seat all the time that he may not have had the opportunity of going into that matter of entertainment which he promised this Committee he would do after I made comments of alleged discrimination in the issuing of invitations to people of all classes in the community.

As to the other matter about Government Printing and Binding, I would say this: I have read one side of the parties who are in dispute fully; I have heard the other side fully, and I have arrived at a just conclusion.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inform the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that I have not forgotten my remarks when the supplementary Resolution to which he made reference was under consideration. I repeat that I do not know of any discrimination but I would like to assure him that the matter will be taken up.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have to get up again, but I see under Item 60—Advice on Local Government, there is an increase. I would like some explanation on that (and I am taking the opportunity under this Head to ask the Government if it would consider bringing in a Resolution to the House about a special hurricane fund). But as regards Item 60, I would just like to know what the Government has in mind about Mr. Lightburn. Rumour has it that he is leaving the island some time this year, around July, and returning. Is it necessary for Mr. Lightburn to return? He has remained longer than we initially expected and I would like to get some information. I know people usually come out here, people like Mr. Calvert, Mr. Foster and so on, and they end up by accepting employment out here because they are so good in the advice they give, and I am wondering what the Government is doing about this gentleman's services. Has he not advised sufficiently already? We know he was here to advise on Local Government Elections, but I would like to know why he is being kept on and what provision is made for him. I will take this opportunity to ask the Government if it will have a calamitous visitation fund; in times of need they could sell the securities or whatever investments they have. Would Government consid-

er bringing in a Resolution to the House to take the money from the Loan Fund or Revenue Balance and consenting to leave that fund for calamitous visitation? I think they should do that because they are not going to liquidate it; so let us have it as what it is if it remains. You have the fund there already, you must have it invested and leave it as such and bring in a Resolution and let the House sanction it. It was said to me that you were not calling in the money because it was unfair to call it in now, and therefore you are leaving it over. I would like to hear something on Advice on Local Government, because I notice the amount was \$17,000 and has now been increased to \$22,000.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I may say from the outset that Mr. Lightburn is not asked to hold on to any job. We were lucky to get him. As I already told the House he was earning £4,000 a year plus fees and has come here for the equivalent of half that. It is not a question of his asking for money. The term under which his contract was extended is due to our Local Government Bill being still outstanding and the Government was convinced that with the alternative he put up, the best thing was to let him go for the particular period when there would have been no harm done to the introduction of the Local Government Elections and the functioning of the new set-up and come back, and the increase is due to that. We are going to have the use of his services. He will go on what would be the equivalent of vacation now, and will be re-employed for a period which would coincide with the period of election and sometime after. We have considered it is essential for proper functioning of Local Government for that to take place. I need hardly remind the Committee of what they themselves thought. I do not think it is overdoing it to state that amidst the different bits of luck this island has had in the past few years in getting outstanding people like Mr. Garrod, Captain Tomlin and Captain Barron, Mr. Lightburn is perhaps as great a find or a greater find even than those I have mentioned. Even an old lawyer like myself accustomed to the drafting of Bills and the Attorney General, had things pointed out to us by Mr. Lightburn simply by mere experience,—incidentally he was a Solicitor—or at least he was trained as a Solicitor. By sheer experience, little points that a draftsman does not see, he has shown us because he is a man who has had it happening to him over and over again; he has helped considerably. Hence that great series of amendments we have had to come to the House with, as soon as it was found cheaper to have one voting list for the House and Local Government. I would not say for a moment the Attorney General would not have seen the necessity for the amendments, but obviously, somebody who has not been doing it for 30 or 40 years would have to look up the books; so I assure the House that the Government is convinced that what we have decided with Mr. Lightburn continuing his contract until the period of election is the best thing that could happen, if we want to get Local Government set up and working as quickly as possible, starting off smoothly and efficiently. Before I sit, there was one thing I did not reply to originally and that was the one posed by the hon. junior member for the City. There is no proper method down here as is done in some colonies and in Great Britain of having general orders for the Civil Service by which they are directed as to what you must do as a Civil Servant. In Great Britain the training begins with politeness, that is, when somebody walks into your office; how you must draft a Minute for your Minister, and so on. It is with

this view to getting an up-to-date and efficient system of General Amendment Orders that this \$10,000 is voted but has not been spent.

The question that the sum of \$641,990 be voted under Head XXIX—Miscellaneous Services—was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXX—Income Tax and Death Duties

Head XXX—Income Tax and Death Duties—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, the amount of \$219,485 is to be added to the Assessment that is fixed by law. I move that without at all abandoning the position that the Items fixed by law are for the sake of letting the members see everything in one volume, strictly speaking, to be set out and added according to the Executive Committee Act to what you are voting. I am not departing from my contention unlike the hon. junior member for the City, whom I think with great respect did it to score a point at the time, but on sober reflection you can see nothing put here at all and no debate can be allowed on the columns fixed by law.

Mr. LEWIS: Read the Executive Committee Act.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have read it; and I have read it after the hon. member for the City.

Item 6—Clerks to be increased by \$1,800.

Item 8—to be increased by \$816—that is an Order that has already passed the Legislature. Item 10—to be increased by \$580; Item 17—Office Equipment and furniture to be increased by \$375, making a total with what has already been printed of \$219,485.

I beg to move that the sum of \$219,485 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. HAYNES: In connection with Item 13, "Travelling Expenses," I would like to raise a very important point. I take it that this vote is for the Inspectors of Income Tax. I hear now that this Income Tax Department has been increased in size and in Officers too, and I presume that they will have more Inspectors. I am raising this question because, as the Attorney of property here [VOICES: Hear, hear.] I have to send in by the 31st January in each year, a long sheet of employees who are paid over \$40 a month. Sometimes there are three or four sheets. Out of curiosity I will ask: "Mr. Smith, did you have any notification about Income Tax from the Income Tax Department?" The reply is, "No, I have not had anything like that." I think that Taxation should fall on the shoulders of those who are in a position to pay it. I do not know if this has been the experience of other employers, but it is my experience that no attention is paid to this sort of thing, or if it is, most of these employees have children and they are not eligible for the payment of Income Tax.

I take it that this amount for Travelling Expenses will enquire into this matter, because, as I have already said, the idea of Taxation is that those who are eligible to pay should be made to pay; otherwise it is not at all fair that some people escape payment and the others are incriminated. I am raising this question so that the Hon. Premier will enquire into the matter. I know he is a very busy man, but this matter is not at all an unimportant matter. If it is only 10/- which a person has to pay by way of Income Tax, he should pay it. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier has had any idea of looking into this

matter; if he has not done so, I think he should get these Inspectors to inspect some of the Returns which are being made. After all you cannot make a Return for £100 if a man has not earned that amount; however, I think the Inspectors should have some relevant data on which to work.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have had some talk with Mr. Marriott and the Financial Secretary in connection with this matter. One result of that has been the activity in bringing in some people who had not been making Returns, and there have been instances discovered where people have been evading Taxation. Mr. Marriott has been bringing in people; he has discovered Tax evasion, as I have said; and he has felt that the penalty under the Act has not been big enough. He has also pointed out that it was impossible for the Income Tax Department to work as speedily as it should work.

I can assure the honourable junior member for St. Andrew that a man who is less liable to be swayed by people than Mr. Marriott, is difficult to find. No friendship or relationship would stop Mr. Marriott from investigating anything which savours of an avoidance of paying Income Tax. The instance mentioned by the honourable member would be purely due to or not having sufficient staff to make the investigation or to make the assessments and get out the forms in time. I think it is more a question of sending out to persons who may come within the Income Tax bracket, and leaving it for them to prove that they do not come within the Act, than assuming in the Income Tax Department that "So and So" does not work for enough to be taxed. Before Mr. Marriott came here, I know that sometimes the Income Tax Department would be asked: "What about Mr. So and So?" Sometimes letters are sent to the Department, and sometimes politics have something to do with the matter. I have been asked: "Why don't you collect Income Tax from the waterfront workers?"

4.45 p.m.

I will not accuse the honourable junior member for Christ Church for that, but some people with his political views think that would be a fine thing to do and employers of waterfront workers were asked to send in names of all their employers together with the sum of money they work for within the last 12 months. The difficulty about that is that one—"Tom Jones" may be engaged by a particular firm and work for 156 days and "Tom Jones" may work in another firm's employ for 60 days, but in the end it may turn out that "Tom Jones" may not be the same man in each case. Everything that looks like slackness has been checked upon. It is a burning desire on the part of that Department to bring in more money and to make everybody to be aware that they have to obey the law as regards income tax. That is why the Bill for medical expenses was brought into the House at the time it was brought.

Mr. LEWIS: I believe there is another aspect to the matter. I could not hear the honourable junior member for St. Andrew very well from my seat but the figures the Income Tax Commissioners asked for is not necessary taxable figures. For instance, an unmarried individual is only taxable on something over £150 a year but the Income Tax Commissioner asks you to give him the figures of those persons who work for £100 a year; therefore, you must put in a number of the people who are not taxable. He also asks you to give him the names of those people who are working whether it be for a shilling or a penny in any part-time job. He asks for that in order to see if somebody's part-time employee is the same person doing another job somewhere else, and if so, he can add the figures together. It cannot be assumed that any of the people on that sheet is taxable even if they work for more than £150 a year because you still

have to make deductions for children. In case the person is married it is \$1,300 which he will be allowed. Because of that it is possible for you to have people on that sheet who are not taxable at all, but that information is necessary to the Income Tax Commissioner in case, say, he wants to get in more money: he can see from that sheet what the people are working for. That really is what it is, so the honourable member will understand that these returns do not necessarily follow an individual returns. I know as a result of these returns, letters have gone to people saying that they have failed to put in a return.

The question that the sum of \$219,485 voted under Head XXX was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXI—Labour

Head XXXI — Labour — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of additions to be made under this Head. They are as follows:—

Item 3 — Labour Officers — \$8,598.

Increased by \$5,304 (Fixed by Law) to \$13,902 to provide for the salaries of 2 additional Labour Officers under the authority of C.E. (G.) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Item 4 (a) (New) — Manager — \$2,280

Provision of \$2,280 (Fixed by Law) for the salary of a Manager of the Employment Exchange

Item 3 — Labour Officer — \$8,598.
C.E. (G.) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Item 6 — Clerks — \$4,450.

Increased by \$1,200 (Fixed by Law) to \$5,650 to provide for the salaries of 2 additional Labour under the authority of C.E. (G.) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Item 7 (a) (New) — Female Clerk — \$624

Provision of \$624 (Fixed by Law) for the salary of a Female Clerk for the Employment Exchange on scale \$624 x 48 — 1,008 x 72 — 1,440 under the authority of C.E. (G.) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Item 8 — Stenographers and Typists — \$1,856

Increased by \$1,248 (Fixed by Law) to \$3,104 to provide for the salaries of 2 additional Stenographers and Typists under the authority of C.E. (G.) (Amendment) Order, 1956.

Item 10 — C.O.L. Allowance — \$2,200

Increased by \$1,025 (to be voted) to \$3,225 to provide allowances for additional staff.

Item 14 — Travelling — \$4,000

Increased by \$2,000 (To be voted) to \$6,000 to cover expenses of additional Travelling Officers and for increased travelling due to intensification of inspection activities consequent upon increase in staff

Item 18 — Employment Exchange — \$10,880.

Reduced by \$9,306 (To be voted) to \$1,574 in view of provision under Personal Emoluments for Permanent Staff.

Item 21—Furniture and Office Equipment—\$600.

Increased by \$700 (To be voted) to \$1,300 to purchase three desks, three chairs, a typewriter and cushions for the additional staff.

I beg to move that the sum of \$558,520 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to me to see that an attempt has been made to make provision for Labour Officers for this Department because it was a bit surprising to me that a Labour Government should have delayed to take steps to furnish the Labour Department with adequate staff. There are certain criticisms which I should make in order that the public can be aware of certain things which are happening and I am glad

deal with that aspect in another quarter. I would only say that there should be no interference between Trade Unionists and employers by any members of the Government either directly or indirectly.

It is true on the last occasion the Hon. Premier said that he agreed that the amount of \$240 was too low for the Item, Trade Disputes. I would ask him now if he believes that \$1,000 can really provide adequately for that service if he intends to get the most experience, and best person to do it. Where are you going to get people from to deal with Trade disputes? I will make the bold statement that you do not have them in Barbados to act in this capacity, because you do not have a reserve of people who are not employed by the Government to undertake this task. If you go through your retired people, you will see that you do not have any; therefore you have to rely on existing people in the Service. If I may give you an example, Mr. Chairman, a dispute which occurred between the Barbados Telephone Company and the Barbados Workers' Union has been going on for over 18 months. A commission of enquiry was set up in September last year and up to this time the Commission has not reported. The Government could not find any person other than the Acting Puisne Judge who made it clear to the Government that the only day which he could perform the task was half day on Saturdays. Now, that is not fair to the Trade Union movement. Here it is, you have an industrial dispute with an organisation and you can only appoint someone who can carry out his function one half day a week. Can that be fair to a Trade Union which has no other choice than to accept it?

4.55 p.m.

Now, could that be fair? The Chairman, who is an important person on the Board, was also acting as Puisne Judge working five days a week and had to work half day on Saturdays to complete the work. You can see from the evidence the time it would take. These things must create bad industrial relations. Of course, a Trade Union would not have confidence in any administration that sets about appointing people who cannot conduct its work. I do not have to remind this House of what is taking place at present, and this matter has been sent to many places. A dispute at the Barbados Light and Power Company would not be like the one going on now. You cannot strike at the Electric Company, it is against the law. What is going to happen if a man has to go to arbitration? You see when you put \$1,000 here you have to send outside and get someone. Well, Trinidad was forced in recent times to send to the Colonial Office for Professor Jack, another gentleman from Cambridge who sat on the same Committee as the Premier at Conventions, to go into the question of oil. But in all these cases it is a peculiar thing that these people have even made a Report. I believe the Printing Industry in Trinidad had a Report that was submitted after the Telephone Company Report and published in Trinidad. I do not say anything against the person appointed because the person has no choice but I do say when you are limited to this small amount of money and you do not appropriate more, you have to come to the House again, and one of the worst things today is to be forced to come to the House for money for a Board of Enquiry. But if you have it in your Estimates and there should be any dispute you would not reveal it in Parliament before it is dealt with. I hope that the Premier will see that this is going to be inadequate unless you are asking people to serve freely. There is no point under these present circumstances to expect you are going to get people from neighbouring territories to come and serve without payment, because you will not get the person you need. Professor Shepherd should be in our minds with the Report he made on

the Sugar Industry and we should bear that in mind. I am sure the Premier is aware of it because he gave evidence on the Royal Commission, but what are we reminded of in the Royal Commission about the Labour Department?

"The duties of the Labour Department should include all questions relating to the regulation of wages, conciliation, arbitration, the establishment and working of wages boards and trade boards, the inspection of wage lists, the obtaining and collation of such data as statistics of unemployment, hours and wages and cost-of-living, the inspection of conditions of work in factories, workshops and agriculture, and measures for the protection and safety of the workers."

And then in the next Paragraph it says:—

"One of the most important of these duties is the work of conciliation and the adjustment of disputes between employers and workpeople."

Now, I would like to say this and while I have read that I would read another portion, that would fit in with what I said. Subject to the description of the Labour Officer and Labour Commissioner the Commission Report says,

"From this description of the duties of Labour Officers it follows that their calibre should be high and that they should be men of character, experience, capacity and integrity."

Now I should like to draw to this Committee's attention that the Government has seen the wisdom of sending the most senior man in their Department to the United Kingdom for a long period. I believe or from what can be seen, Mr. Pickwood has done and is doing a good job in the United Kingdom, but it should be borne in mind that the majority of people who have migrated to the United Kingdom have done so on a voluntary basis. In fact, it started out that way. It was not a scheme that was initiated by the Government. The people set out going to the United Kingdom voluntarily both from Jamaica and Barbados. Now, the importance of your own Labour Department is such that you should not deplete it of its senior staff and its most senior officer to perform a task in the United Kingdom that has been performed, say in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America, not by the Labour Commissioners, but by Liaison Officers selected by the Governments, whom they find suitable to perform such tasks; and I only have to mention that it could not be more difficult for us now to recruit a Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom than it was during the war years when, maybe, Mr. Herbert McDonald did the job for Jamaica and Barbados. The Jamaican Government did not see the wisdom of sending Mr. Scott, their Labour Commissioner, to do that job. Now I feel that the Industrial development and relationship in Barbados in many matters for conciliation require the best officers you have, and your senior officers should not be away performing tasks that do not require the quality of a Labour Commissioner. The Labour Commissioner's post has to be regarded as a technical job and you cannot make any man, no matter how qualified he may be, a good Labour Commissioner. There are certain qualities he should possess and I do not want in any way to reflect on the present acting appointment to the post by saying that the acting Labour Commissioner is not competent; but I do want to say that in that Department—and now that you are appointing additional staff—you cannot bring in any man from any Department and put him in the Labour Department and make him an excellent Labour Officer in a month or two. From economic and social conditions in Barbados, unless a man is possessed of the experience and grind, in putting him in a Chair to preside over industrial disputes, he is either afraid when they disagree or sometimes

in looking at the employers he is more likely to please them: because the employers are more likely to offer him employment when he retires than the Trade Union. I say that without casting reflection at anyone. But years of experience in the Trade Union show that you cannot kink along with small boys when you are dealing with employers who are hard men. You must be of strong fibre to deal with these people when a dispute arises or even before a dispute arises. The Labour Commissioner was in the United Kingdom; one of your senior Labour Officers was in the United States; and the Labour Department was left with one senior man in there and that was Mr Parris. You sent a senior Labour Officer in Mr Moseley there, and if the Premier was a member of the Labour Union and he went there and looked at the Staff he would say, "I am not going to go in there and sit down under these boys presiding over any serious meeting!"

5.05 p.m.

You cannot have a Labour Department staffed with inexperienced men and retain the confidence of the community or the Trade Unions and the employers with whom you have to deal. I want to say how, on the basis of staffing, that it would be surprising to know that on one occasion, it took 30 days before we could know from the Labour Department about something of a matter relating to a Trade Dispute. If a strike had resulted from the delay on that occasion, that strike could only have been attributed to that delay. The Royal Commission, in their Report, said that delays must inevitably bring about greater difficulty in matters, because when these delays are too long it is difficult for the contracting or the conflicting parties to come together. I know that the delays which have been taking place were due, not to any indifference on the part of the people there, but they were on the basis that the staff was inadequate, and it was all geared up to deal with this problem of emigration. I am glad to see that a Manager of Emigration is going to be appointed and the Labour Commissioner will be available to perform more of the important functions of the Labour Department.

I say that, because this Island is spending money on this Department; I would like to emphasise that without in any way appearing to be partisan. The purpose of instituting a Labour Department was that that Department should see after labour matters. Sometimes, since the Trade Union has grown strong, there is a belief that the Labour Department was attempting to see after employers' matters; but that Department was set up to see after workers' matters. It should be borne in mind that this particular section, to which I am referring of the Report of the Royal Commission, and which was agreed to by all the members of that Commission, was written by one of the leading Trade Unionists in the world. This is what is stated in this Report:—

"It should be part of their duty to advise work people about their legal rights, and to make public information on that subject whenever, as may occur from time to time, it appears that sections of the workers are unaware of their rights. Officers of the Department should also be available to address gatherings of workers on such matters either through trade unions or direct."

There has been a general belief that if the Labour Commissioner were to go to a Trade Union and address a big meeting of workers, that he is taking sides with the workers; but Sir Walter Citrine, now Lord Citrine, was one of the authors of this Document, and I do not think that anybody

could claim that Sir Walter Citrine or Mr. Morgan Jones did not know what he was doing.

I am speaking with a full sense of my responsibility and truthfulness. If it had not been for the fact that an industrial dispute is going on in this Island, I would say more about the interference which has been existing along certain lines. However, I prefer, and if I am spared, I will have the opportunity of doing so, to say something more in this regard on another occasion. I prefer to say nothing on this occasion which is likely to give the impression that my seat in this Branch of the Legislature is being used to advance the interest of the Organisation which I serve as Secretary. I say these things because it becomes difficult in this present situation, when you are aware of certain things which have been done, to know if justice is being done, and if, when Labour Legislation is passed, you will get justice or if any aspect of spite is going to be used.

If I were to make certain observations in this Chamber now, in respect of this Head, it would startle people. However, in view of this industrial dispute which is being waged, I shall not make these observations. The position is becoming serious because when matters have to be settled finally, you often wonder how you are going to start to do so, if before matters reach that stage, you are aware of what has been done in certain quarters to thwart the efforts of the workers in their cause. I am glad to see that an increase in the staff of this Department has been made. What is more, what I would like to see in this Department is more accommodation, so that when one side leaves a meeting, there is accommodation in the Labour Department so that your members can discuss matters with you outside. Sometimes we have a break at meetings, and we do not want to be public. If you want to be private, you have to use the Labour Commissioner's private room, but I am suggesting that there should be some other private room in which each contesting side could go and discuss their matters.

I would like to see the Labour Commissioner recalled to Barbados immediately so as to carry out the functions under the Act which the Labour Commissioner was appointed to carry out, and let the Government seek the means of finding somebody who is suitable to be appointed in Mr. Pickwood's place in the United Kingdom, to do the work which he is now doing.

5.15 p.m.

As I have said earlier, I give Mr. Pickwood credit for all that he has done and is doing; but you must remember that he was appointed to the Office of Labour Commissioner of Barbados: and if it were felt that you could have done without him, then the Acting Labour Commissioner, Mr. Jack, who was acting before Mr. Pickwood was appointed, could have been appointed to the post and allow the office to be run that way. It was felt that it was necessary to have Mr. Pickwood as Labour Commissioner. What he is doing in the United Kingdom will go on for some time; therefore, you should have somebody there who is suitable. I am not suggesting that you put somebody up there who is unsuitable so as to get Mr. Pickwood back here. It is true to say that you have appointed an Assistant Liaison Officer but he is a young man who is not versed in Labour matters, which are technical matters to deal with, but he is quite competent to be an Assistant Liaison Officer because he has lived in the United Kingdom for sometime and is young and flexible enough to become a good officer. Do you feel he can undertake the task of Mr. Pick-

wood? I doubt he will be able to undertake the task I do say if you feel that Mr. Pickwood cannot be relieved of his post in the United Kingdom, make some arrangement to have him appointed to that post and some means to have your Labour Department Staffed with Senior Officers. I draw that to your attention because as your Labour Department now stands, you have the Assistant Labour Commissioner acting as Labour Commissioner and only one other senior officer in the person of Mr. R. P. Parris. Those are the only two senior Officers which you have in the Labour Department today. I say that without any reflection on the other staff. Bear in mind you cannot be a Labour Commissioner or Labour Officer in six months or six weeks. It takes some years to become efficient in those posts. I do hope that steps will be taken to have your Labour Commissioner back in his Office as soon as possible or that you make some arrangements for regrading the staff.

There is another side to this matter. Mr. Chairman, you have in the Secretariat now, Mr. Springer who was sent to the United Kingdom and trained as a Labour Officer. He is away from the Labour Department now. Fortunately, Barbados can always produce men who are versatile. Do you know that one of your Labour Officers is now filling the post of Labour Commissioner in Antigua? That is as onerous a task as Labour Commissioner of Barbados because Antigua makes issues out of everything. You must have heard that they made an issue about their being selected as the site of the Federal Capital; they wanted it too. They have now a big row in Antigua and have Mr. Bird charged in the Supreme Court. It is Mr. Odle who is Labour Commissioner of Antigua today. When the Hon. Premier spoke on the question of the Barbados Scholarships and tying a man down, you can see very well that you cannot tie people like Mr. Odle, Mr. Parris or Mr. Springer down. How can you tie people like them down when you give men like them a \$160 a month and somebody will offer them \$400 a month? That is one of the difficulties you have to face in the Labour Office. That is why I say that you should proceed with the training of your officers but as soon as you train them, say as Labour Officers, do not allow them to go out of the Labour Department. What is wrong with this island is that as soon as an officer is holding an administrative post which they are capable of holding, they are appointed to another post which they do not know anything about. This island, although it spends money on training its staff, cannot hold its trained staff in the Departments for which they are trained because they do not get rapid promotion. The Labour Department is an example of that. Mr. Springer was the first Labour Inspector who was appointed in Barbados. I am sorry that officers like him are no longer available to that Department to perform the important task which are in that Department. I do hope that the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Trade will say as regards the \$1,000 provided for Trade Disputes (although it is \$760 more than last year) whether they feel that that will do for the purpose. Bear in mind if you have to get anybody from outside of Barbados to preside over such matters you will have to pay passages and hotel bills out of that. Suppose you have to bring a man like Professor Sheppard, you will have to come back to this House and ask for more money.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there is just one point which I would like to ask. Surely, in making Estimates, your estimate must relate to what is likely to be spent taking into account what you

spent recently. Last year we put in \$240 for trade disputes. Nobody envisages that we will have to send abroad for somebody to investigate disputes. If we need more than the \$1,000 we put in this year, or in case we have to send abroad to get somebody, surely, the hon. junior member for St. Peter knows that no single member of this Chamber would worry to talk about it if there was a trade dispute going on. I am sure that the Resolution will pass through this House in five minutes. I do not see why the hon. member feels that \$1,000 is not enough; we may not spend half of it.

The hon. member pointed to the difficulty of getting local people to investigate trade disputes and the necessity of getting someone from outside and I am sure every hon. member will agree with that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of explanation: I do not think the Hon. Premier understood what I said. I did not say that this House will not pass the money to bring someone here to investigate a trade dispute, but I pointed out that the difficulty is that you are likely to get a debate on the dispute. Already today the Hon. Premier had to make an appeal. The reason why I say the \$1,000 was not enough for trade disputes is because you may have to get someone from away and it is not good to have a debate on an issue which is pending. As regards what the Hon. Premier said today about hot air and industrial disputes, I would say whether it is hot air or cool air, what should be told to him and others like him is that if they think that telling workers that they are talking hot air will make them abide with conditions of employment which are unfair to them, they can wait and see.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member knows I did not mean the workers.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

On re-assembling.

ESTIMATES—Cont'd.

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

Labour Dept.—Cont'd.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, Under Head XXXI, Item 19—Emigration—we have a large sum which we are all very glad for because we realise it is being put to a good purpose. What I wish to enquire from the Minister of Trade is whether, when the two recent officials from the London Transport system came here to select workers for their transport system—I know the Government is financing that scheme, or at least assisting the workers to go up—they are assisting these workers with the entire sum

or a portion. I understood in a thing like that where they were assured of real and steady work they would have been given full assistance because many of those that were selected were probably unable to find ten or fifteen dollars. I was approached recently for a small sum because I was told they had to put up a part of the passage personally. I do not think it is necessary in this case. Government through the Transport Department could easily recover that passage money and I do not think it was necessary in this particular case to advance only a portion. If the worker is prepared to put up some, all well and good, then lend him the balance. I would suggest to Government that the entire passage be met from this fund and recovered in the usual way.

When the Minister gets up I would like to be assured that this is the case with these workers going up in a few weeks' time. We hope that with the beginning of this scheme the workers selected will do such a good job that we will find these officials returning to Barbados in the near future to select more. As a matter of fact, I think they have left instructions with the Labour Department so that it will not be necessary for them to return to recruit, but we could recruit on their behalf should they require more this year. The Minister of Labour could also enlighten us if that is a fact or not, because with this expansion of emigration to England I think it is our duty to encourage it as much as possible, give every facility to employers in England and if necessary set up our own recruiting system here. It is an expense to the employers on the other side, but in a case where they want to get a couple of hundreds, it would be wise that they come and select; but in the absence of that this Department could be extended both to the workers in Barbados and the employers in England. I hope this will be a large source of revenue in the coming year.

Another question I would like to ask is this: Unemployment Survey—I know the Report is in and I wonder if Government has considered it and whether it is possible that that Report be given to the House. It is an important part of our functioning and we in this year of election should at least know the economic set-up with respect to unemployment in Barbados from the finding of this survey, because it would be of great assistance to us and the Government as to what are the views for the future. We have our own picture of what the true position in Barbados might be, but it could be either worse or as bad. I have my own estimate; I think it is larger than most people's, but in getting around, you take those people who would go out and get a job if they thought it possible and you will see it runs into many more thousands than they have in here. I would like to know how it was done; how many families and the ages! It would be interesting and I am asking Government whether we can have it in the House. I would like to see it. With these two questions, the others have been covered fairly fully by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I would like to hear the replies from the Minister of Labour.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to continue discussion under Item 19; but I would like to know whether the Hon. Minister has reconsidered the present policy of the Government and provide any necessary amount of aid which is required. You know time and time again I have stressed in this Chamber in case of persons going abroad, there is no reason in the world why the Government should not assist with the full amount instead of putting them in a position to go around begging and borrowing and by some means accumulat-

ing the difference between £75 and £100 to buy warm clothing, ticket, and have money left with which to go to the United Kingdom and be able to carry on until they secure employment. I am sure that the majority of the members of this House are entirely in favour of giving maximum aid, and would support it: and there is no reason why the Minister should continue to hold back this aid. There is no reason why this policy should continue, and so long as a case can be proved as wanting the maximum amount of assistance, there is no reason why it should not be given.

6.15 p.m.

Under this Head, I would urge the Hon. Minister to have a word with the Police Department in connection with these emigrants and the issuing of their passports. They still continue to give the maximum of trouble and, in their way, they try to discourage or make it very difficult for people to get out of this Island; handicaps are put in the way of people in the issuing of application forms when they are seeking to get passports. I have seen it in writing from the Commissioner of Police that unless you can give evidence that you have paid your full passage money, no application form for a passport is given. That has been the policy of the Department, as if it is not the right of every person who has a clean record to have a passport. It should be automatic for such a person to have an application form for a passport. Why should a Police Official decide that he is not going to let a person go out of this Island, unless he wants him to stow away? But these Officials who are dressed in brief authority, like to say to the politicians that they cannot make them issue passports if they are not disposed to do so. I would invite the attention of the appropriate Minister to that matter because it deserves some attention to be paid to it.

There is one other matter about which I have a word to say, and that is in connection with stationery. Only last year I happened to have the opportunity of perusing certain correspondence from this Department with regard to a dispute between a worker and an employer, and I was thoroughly annoyed to see in the correspondence that the worker was referred to as "John Smith," and the employer was referred to as "Mr. John Brown." A word to the wise should be enough; let the Hon. Minister take a hint that we do not want to have any more of that. Everybody who is working in the Department is "Mr. So and So" or "Mr. John Brown."

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to hear about the progress which is being made relative to the Regional Organisation in the United Kingdom for workers. If the Hon. Minister has any figures as regards the emigration which has taken place already, I would like to hear him put them before this Committee in order that hon. members might be able to get an idea of what the position is.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: In so far as the Regional Organisation is concerned, at the last R.E.C. Conference in Antigua, we agreed to participate in the Scheme, but the figures which were presented to us at the Conference were not complete. This whole idea originated with the Jamaica Government; we have discussed with Jamaica the question of widening the scope of the Welfare Office in London. The Jamaica Government promised to go into the figures as to what it would cost to set up this Regional Organisation in the United Kingdom, and this is a matter which will be discussed at a later date. We have agreed to participate in the Scheme and that our present Organisation would be provided for. Our present arrangement is exceptional; it is not done by any other Territory in the West Indies. This

arrangement is actually finding work for people in the United Kingdom and placing people in jobs before they leave Barbados; we will bring our service under the general regional service.

I promise the Committee that I will lay a statement on the whole position as regards loans and statistics in connection with this service in the future; however, in reply to the question asked by the hon. junior member for the City, so far, we have issued from the 1st April, 1954, to the end of last year, a total of \$150,333. The amount repaid up to the end of last year was \$10,705.08, and the balance outstanding \$1,084. That shows that the workers are repaying these loans very well indeed. The number of workers which we have sent out so far is 453 to the United Kingdom and Canada, and 401 to the U.S.A. Those who found employment on their own and who were assisted by loans from Government numbered 153. Of the 453 workers which we have placed, 356 were assisted by loans.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church asked about Mr. Cumper's Report in connection with unemployment. What Mr. Cumper did was to issue an Interim Report which was intended only for the Government; but he has returned to Jamaica to write the Final Report which has not yet come to hand. That Report would be published as soon as it comes to hand; it is not our intention to keep that Report hidden. This Government is very active in finding work for people and in devising schemes by which the unemployed might be able to get work. We will publish this Report whether there is an Election taking place or not.

The hon. member also asked about the expansion of the Department. If he looks at the Estimates, he will see that the Department has already been expanded. With our avowed policy of participating in the Scheme, I do not think that there could be any question on that score. The hon. member has said that these Officials from the London Transport Service laid the basis on which the selection should be made, but I should like to say that there is no necessity for those Officials or any other Officials to return here to make any selection. We can work on the formula which has been left; Officials of the Department have seen the style of examining the applicants, and that will be used for further selection in the future.

6.25 p.m.

It is expected that the Railways may send out some officials to a similar job as was done by the delegation of the London Transport. They will also provide us with some formula on which they select persons.

So far as loans are concerned, technically we do not lend a person the whole amount of his passage. But if a person wants an increase in the loan, surely, we give him. After all, it is natural that if you are going to a strange country, like England, you will want warm clothing. I can tell the hon. member that I recommended that the repayment of the loan should be made easier for emigrants and instead of calling on them to repay the loan in two years, they will be given a longer time so that they will be able to pay less per month. We have done that because we are aware that when an emigrant goes there he has to provide himself with warm clothing as well as he has to adjust himself to a new circumstance of life. Therefore, we know it would be difficult for him to make a large repayment on the small income he is getting. His income may sound a handsome one here but when he gets through paying for what he has to pay, he will find that what is left is not as big as he would have expected. It is because of that we have made conditions easier for them. What

we lend them now covers passage money at the lowest rate. Hon. members must bear in mind that the Public Treasury is not bottomless and there must be a limit to what we can do. I do not think we can do more than lend the passage at the lowest rate and give all the assistance we give at the present. At the present moment we are loaning out money at the rate of \$150,000 annually. That is not a small amount. You may say that it is money which is revolving but it will take years to come back in. Out of this \$150,000 which we are loaning out in one year the amount repaid is about \$10,000, so you can see that it will take some years before we recover the whole amount. I am sure a really unbiassed mind will be bound to say that this Government is doing all it can do in lending emigrants the passage money and giving facilities to them.

The hon. junior member for the City made the point about recovering this money through employers but this is not such an easy matter. The emigrants who go to England are quite unlike those who go to the United States because those who go to the United States are hired on contract. Those who go to England are not morally obligated to their employer although we hope they will live up to conditions. The emigrants are not legally bound to stay with any employer for the period they declared. Some workers leave one industry and go to another because they find that they can get better wages. Of course, we try to bring home to them moral obligation and what effect it will have on the scheme if they will not stay for some time. However, I can tell this Committee that the workers in the various schemes will receive an increase this year and we are also now working out a scheme with the employers whereby better conditions will be provided for workers.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter referred to staffing at the Labour Department. He is correct in saying that the staff of this Department should be well trained and capable of carrying out their duties. It is true to say that one of the difficulties which the Labour Department has encountered is that Mr. Springer and others like him are at present serving in other Government Departments or are seconded abroad. One of the troubles is that it is not a closed Department, but that Department is not singular in that respect. Bearing in mind the necessity for good officers in other branches of the service; bearing in mind also the added advantages of increased income which come in the way of an officer who might be trained in a specialised field yet he might be quite suitable for other type of work; it would be unfair to keep him in a closed department unless you can provide for having specialists in his department and that is not an easy matter.

6.35 p.m.

It is not an easy matter at all for the administration. With the introduction of Ministerial Status we found that there was a pressing necessity for certain officers, because of their capabilities as officers in the past attached to the Ministries; and it would probably have meant a very inefficient running of the Ministries if you left those officers in a kind of closed department and did not make use of their services in the Ministries against the necessity of having a specialist officer specially trained in one department and another pressing necessity of the island as a whole especially with introduction of new Ministerial system. I as Minister of Labour could say he was trained in labour matters and I did not agree to the transfer, but had to balance things out and I saw it might interfere with the officer's chances of promotion; and taking all these circumstances into consideration, it was touch and go at the moment.

Although we would have liked to see this Department keeping Specialists Officers we could not go too far and adhere too strictly to this principle and keep these officers in the Department. I may tell the Committee that so far as increased staff for this Department is concerned it was certainly difficult to operate without bringing it up to standard — the standard necessary for efficiency. We were pressing for staff earlier than April last year and it is due to one matter or another—at one time two secretaries were on leave and this and that interfered the same year we were pressing for it that we did not get it until last year when we brought an Order for increased staff at this Department and at the Exchange. But the hon. member—and I do not blame him for it—is looking at it from one point of view and I say again we have never lost sight of the fact that from that point of view it is very important to have an office like that devoted entirely or mainly to industrial relationship, but on the other hand the hon. member must admit that so far as the economy of the Island and the welfare of the workers are concerned, it helps all workers when you promote the Emigration Scheme and have emigration proceeding smoothly. The Emigration Scheme came down with such rapidity on the Department that certain of the top officers had to perform certain duties. The Labour Commissioner has not been seconded in the first place for duty in England as the hon. member seemed to indicate in his remarks. For the major part of last year he was on leave; he did not take up duties in England while he was on leave. It is true he was doing certain work which was necessary; he offered to do it and the Government accepted, but the point is he did not take up his present duties until November and I told this House, but the House asked if it would be temporary. I said he was only seconded and not transferred (and it was good to think we could not find a more suitable person at the time to fall back on), and that it was the intention that when someone was found and sufficiently trained, and had acquired some experience he would take over and carry on. By then the original service in the origin of this thing would have to fall into its proper perspective and new arrangements would have to be made. We have been corresponding with the Labour Commissioner and we are taking steps as is apparent under this Head to see that the Department is properly staffed and able to cope with all the duties of industrial relationship and anything else that the hon. member mentioned that I have not touched upon. If there is any, I would be pleased to answer it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, there is just this I would like to say to the closing remarks of the Hon. Minister. Now, this is going to be a matter of opinion. He has his, I have mine. So far as the statement he has made about the Labour Commissioner is concerned, I believe I have more dealings with the Labour Department than any other member of this Chamber, and there is no doubt about it. The present staffing of the Labour Department from the point of view of the senior staff cannot cope with this work. I did not want to call names but there is only Mr. Jack, Mr. Springer, Mr. Parris and two senior people in that office. That office is supposed to have three people from the point of view of top people. Let there be no doubt about it that it is difficult to make this statement. I would ask, is it not the responsibility of the present Minister of Labour? Is it not the responsibility of the Government? Mr. Jack was Assistant Labour Commissioner when Mr. Burrowes was Labour Commissioner. Nobody made any recommendations that he should be a Labour Commissioner. I want to say this: I do not want to be hard on any officer because some people felt he was not strong enough to be made Labour

Commissioner; he was acting for nearly a year and it seems to me it might be no fault of the officer, maybe it is how God made him. I find him to be a gentleman, but I do say you cannot go on with a Department where the Administration itself had the opportunity of making him Head of the Department, but did not and side-stepped him for someone else, and the one we brought here we are not making use of. The Minister must admit this. The scheme was one of those voluntary exoduses that you get at some period of your history. In the economic position of Barbados, workers started out on this trek to the United Kingdom to seek better employment; and the Minister will remember that when it was brought here to the House about the jobs in the United Kingdom, it caused a bit of hilarity because at that time it was regarded as a big joke that 400,000 vacancies existed in the United Kingdom. At that time the Government did not see there was a chance of starting a scheme and that there should send and find out how things were, but from the pressure of the Opposition who made an issue of it the Government investigated and found there was opportunity in the United Kingdom for employment.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. Pickwoad was on leave in the United Kingdom, and during that time the Hon. Minister of Labour was also in the United Kingdom. The Hon. Minister agreed that Mr. Pickwoad should remain in the United Kingdom to go into these possibilities of helping the workers there. I have said that Mr. Pickwoad has done a good job, but I say also that whereas you have a Liaison Officer in the United Kingdom to help people when jobs are available, you have a difficulty in your local Department in which you have appointed a Labour Commissioner. Why do you not make the best use of your Department? I do not like this idea of leaving the Department without its complement of senior staff; you have made use of the jurors in the Department, but one would know how he feels when matters have to be delayed, and the Labour Commissioner is performing duties other than those connected with Labour.

The Acting Labour Commissioner has been called upon by the Government to do so many things, that there is a terrific amount of work thrown on this man. I understand that he is due for leave, but he cannot go on leave when the Labour Commissioner is out; he has to wait until the Labour Commissioner returns here! The position is hard on him. The Hon. Premier is head of the Government and he knows that he has objected to the idea of some people—not with regard to the present incumbent in the Labour Department, but he has expressed his views with regard to some other people in the past. You waste your time in going to a meeting; [Hon. M. E. COX: The Labour Department is not a Debating Society.] The Chairman of a Conciliation Meeting is a person who helps both sides in reaching agreement: he is not a person who is just sitting down and hearing both sides. I am saying that apart from Mr. Jack and Mr. Parris in that office, it is not fair to call upon the others to perform the duties of the office; therefore, the position is that the Island is left with two persons in that office to hold any serious meeting. If there are any serious meetings to take place in this Department, they are routed in such a way that the Labour Commissioner must deal with them. There were 21 matters to be dealt with, including matters relative to the Barbados Light and Power Company.

I do not believe that the public is aware of the tolerance, the patience and the restraint which one has to use in getting certain matters dealt with, all of which cannot be published and most of which is censored. [ASIDES]. I have written to you a letter

about the Labour Department in connection with what I said, and that letter was not published. I am not dealing with the *Advocate* newspaper; I am referring to the *Beacon* newspaper. I am not saying anything about the impertinent replies which have been sent to us saying that the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union ought to be disciplined. It is no wonder that the employers feel that they should be rude and impertinent enough to tell us what we should do. However, they will be put in their places in due course.

Relative to this Department, there is no point in allowing the Labour Commissioner to remain in the United Kingdom. I do agree that we should go into this question of emigration, and I would like to say to the Hon. Minister that he was not so enthusiastic about this matter when it was first mentioned. He was laughing at the idea that these jobs were available in the United Kingdom.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The debates have been going on smoothly so far, but when the hon. member goes on in this way, I must ask him to stick to the facts and not go out into the realm of the imaginary.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is not a debating point. I say that the Hon. Minister was not enthusiastic when the matter was first mentioned; he laughed at the idea that there were these jobs available in the United Kingdom. [Hon. R. G. MAPP: I laughed at the idea of there being some 700,000 jobs available in the United Kingdom. Before the hon. senior member for St. Philip raised the question, it was raised by the hon. senior member for the City and I am saying that the Hon. Minister, at that time because the information was not available to him, laughed at the idea. If the information had reached his Ministry, he would have said that the jobs were available. I do not blame him for that; I am just pointing out that when the emigration scheme started, members of the Opposition felt that here was a good opportunity for Barbadians, they saw that Jamaicans were going to England in large numbers, and they pressed this Government into doing something about this matter. I am glad to see that the pressure of the Opposition has caused the Government to do something which has proved to be profitable. I give the Government credit for doing something profitable but it did not stem from them; it stemmed from those who saw the need of this trek, I should like to say that there are some members of this House today who would like to die and leave their money in the Bank, but they would like the idea of paying people a shilling a day for their labour. Some would like legislation passed against workers.]

6.55p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has been given a lot of latitude. He must try a wee bit to speak on emigration.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not intend to stray, Mr. Chairman, I was only drawing an analogy to show that when you raise certain issues, there is likely to be objection purely based on mental approach to the issue. The whole idea of emigration also proves this question because people would not emigrate if enough work for them to do was in this country.

Sir, the more industrial disputes you have, the more it is going to reflect on the organisation which you have to settle trade disputes. It is needless for me to tell you that I feel your going to the Labour Department with a trade dispute is a waste of time. Your set up in the Labour Department has begun to lose the confidence of both the employers and workers sections and if you want to know what I am saying is true, any member of the Government can go and read the Minutes of the Council of the

Barbados Workers' Union or ask any member of the Union what he feels about it. I only have expressed that for the Hon. Minister of Trade to understand what is taking place in the Labour Department and am counselling him not to treat industrial conciliation as something of no importance. I am very glad that I can say that there is nothing in the Barbados Workers' Union which can be regarded as political as it could be regarded when the Hon. Premier was President.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you still speaking on emigration? Certainly this topic of the B.W.U. has nothing to do with it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you really cannot discuss the Labour Department unless you discuss *vis a vis* organisations which have something to do with the Labour Department. I was pointing out to the Hon. Minister of Trade the necessity of having the Labour Commissioner back in his Office. The analogy I was making was based on that. I was pointing out that in a small community like this, issues of an industrial character were being roped into things political (I am not saying that it is political). It was false to say so even when the Hon. Premier was President of the B.W.U. but because he was whom he was, the newspapers of this colony would make a noise and talk about what is constitutional. Even though it is not so now, you still have matters of an industrial nature regarded as something political. There is not such an association in these issues because nothing which has been drawn to the attention of the Labour Commissioner has any political significance; it is purely industrial. I do repeat that if something is not done to staff the Labour Department with senior officers, this Island will always find itself confronted with serious difficulties because when you lose the confidence of the people it means that you cannot settle things easily.

The question that the sum of \$558,520 be voted under Head XXXI was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXII.—Highways And Transport

Head XXXII — Highways and Transport was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are a few Items to be added under this Head. They are as follows:—

Item 17 (a) (New) — Senior Clerk — \$2,280. Provision of \$2,280 (to be voted) for the salary of a Senior Clerk on scale \$2,280 x 120 — 3,000.

Item 18 — Clerks — \$8,396.

Increased by \$600 (To be voted) to \$8,996 to provide for the salary of an additional Clerk.

Item 26 — C.O.L. Allowance — \$54,000.

Increased by \$261 (To be voted) to \$54,261 to provide allowances for additional staff.

I now beg to move that the sum of \$1,017,267 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying in dealing with this Head to know that I do not have to make part of the comments as regards mismanagement of the Department which one found unavoidably to make in that deplorable "Skinner" era. However, there is a matter which is a question of policy which was also raised by way of questions and which was also mentioned when discussing this Head annually. It comes under the aegis of the Minister of Social Services rather than the Minister under whose portfolio the Department falls and I would like the Minister to agree with me when I say

that the time is ripe for a decision to be taken in connection with the Unestablished Staff. I am speaking on Item 25 if you insist on my naming the Item. People of the Unestablished Staff are paid at the end of a week in respect of the number of days which they have worked; therefore, as you know in those weeks in which there is one holiday or two holidays (on which days they do not work), their pay packet is reduced by the number of days. Particularly is it heart-rending when one thinks of the week that Christmas takes place. It is hard when there is only one Bank-holiday but hon. members will remember that on the last occasion there were two Bank-holidays: so you can see that members of the Unestablished Staff were only remunerated for three and a half days instead of five or five and a half days. I think it is time to have this matter settled so that people who work all the working days in a week in which there is a Bank-holiday or two should be paid for that day or days as well. No doubt, that is a matter on which the local Tories will take violent and uncompromising action but they are unfortunately in the minority. The matter should be viewed with favour by this Socialist Government; it should find favour with them without any prodding. We are coming to the Easter Season and in the week preceding Easter there is Good Friday, a day on which these people will not be able to work as well as the following Easter Monday. Everybody who are working by the week in these weeks in which Good Friday and Easter Monday falls should be paid a full week's pay.

7.05 p.m.

That is one thing which the taxpayers of this island would be glad to share as a financial burden, and I am sure you regret at this moment being in the position you are and that you cannot lend vocal support to what I am saying. But the matter calls for much needed assistance. We have been crying out against this wrong for too long for the matter to continue as it is, and again, Sir, you will remember I raised the matter time and again about giving our employees time for such an event. Even certain of our business houses are giving time off without any reduction to their money. There was an effort made when the Australians were here. Some employees were given time off; it was not done in a wholesale manner but it was a trial scheme. In no more than a few days an English Cricket Team will be here. I do not know if the stores are giving time off. [A VOICE: Yes, they are giving some time off!] The hon. member says time will be given. Well, Mr. Acting Chairman, if a Socialist Government allowed big business to set them an example in giving a square deal to its employees, that would be a shocking thing. Let it be clearly understood and, let my colleagues understand, that if the employees of commercial enterprises will get time off without a reduction from wages to watch cricket, (and cricket is almost infinitely the religion of this country) surely the Minister of Labour should be able to persuade his Cabinet colleagues to issue instructions that similar time be given to Government employees. The Cabinet must set the Capitalists the example as to how to run a welfare state. You can imagine the quality of their work and the time wasted when an important cricket match is on. They are going to pause 30 seconds by the nearest Redifussion to get the latest score. The amount of work done, there, is hardly going to be worth while, if you ignore the fact that there is a cricket match on: and we know more than anything else they want to be present and enjoy the game. And continuing on this subject of unestablished staff, I think there should be an effort made to provide transport for their workers to and from their work, not those who have cars

and travelling allowance, but just as the Telephone Company and the Barbados Light and Power Company do in transporting their workers by vehicles to the place at which they will be working. These things have been overlooked too long and are expected to be remedied in a Socialist Welfare State. These are matters that should be attended to without further delay. So, Sir, I am looking forward to seeing an entire cessation of work by casual labourers on the same days when the stores are closed down and there must of course be no reduction in their day's pay, no adverse effect on their pay packet. Let the Hon. Minister for Labour realise that in a move like that he would get the whole-hearted support of the Chamber. He needs not to be afraid of the Stores, because they are doing it. They find good results the next day. I counsel Government to do it and I am sure they will receive the applause of the public and they stand to lose nothing by such an exhibition of kindness towards our public employees.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Speaking under the same Head, I must say that according to the similarity of the vote there has not been much imagination displayed in the Estimates where this Department is concerned. Highways and Transport has always been a source of seasonal unemployment and because of the density of the Barbados population and the multiplication of tenancies almost annually, there should be some higher estimate where road construction is concerned. The amount of estimated staff, I think, should have been substantially increased this year, but of course the Minister may give the very acceptable excuse that the expense of a much greater volume of work this year would be too much in view of the Deep Water Harbour Scheme. If that is the general excuse, it will have to be accepted. But there is too much complaint right now in country areas from road workers because the vote has been exhausted. This is a very prevalent complaint annually and it shows a lack of correlating the two things: seasonal employment and the provision of highway reconstruction. There are still tenantry roads in this colony in a deplorable state and they are inevitable with the increase of population and the multiplication of tenancies; so that in future I would advise Government that when it comes to Estimates on transport, never to think of it separately from its relation to the seasonal employment in this country which is traditional, and always to remember that with the increase in population from decade to decade a super expanse of road construction is an absolute necessity. It is not merely finding work for work's sake. It is a necessity and at the same time fills a dire need in the social conditions of the colony.

7.15 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that in the major scheme of works, they have at least considered that from the Garrison up needs re-surfacing because I see in the appendix to which it applies, Item 66: the Garrison, Haunching and Re-surfacing approximately two miles length \$17,400.

This is one of the most travelled roads in this Island, and although it is in quite good order, the surface is bumpy. If you put a little extra pressure in your tyres you have to slow right down. I am glad to see that they have considered that road, and in the very near future, the whole thing will be extended. They have re-surfaced the corners frequently so to prevent skidding. If a road has been used constantly over a period of years, the surface becomes smooth, and I have seen the buses skid along there. It is only recently that I brought down someone who said that he would rather walk to town than get into one of these buses, because they skid along there.

Under the Item, "Plant, tools, spares and equipment," I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister

that some trailer should be bought for the purpose of transporting the tractor along the highways. I have seen that tractor go up River Road, turn across Martindales Road and go down by Queen's Park and cut up all the road. About two weeks after that, they mended the tracks and in the next week, the same thing was done. Only this week this tractor was travelling down Broad Street, and it was cutting up all the road. I repeat that they should get a trailer for the purpose of transporting this tractor; they will probably find that they will be able to use it more often, and the tractor will get on the spot more quickly. I would like that matter to be taken up with the Director of Highways and Transport, in case the Hon. Minister has not thought of it.

As regards the question of road improvement, I see that there are quite a number of dangerous bends throughout the Island, and they are being tackled gradually. I also know that there are some others which are not noticed. There is a dangerous bend near "Lyrias" along Sargeant's Village, a road which is very much used. The Bank Manager who lives at "Lyrias," has said that he has had to telephone the Police Department in connection with accidents having taken place around that bend.

As regards the question of out-flows to the sea, that is another innovation which was started a year or two ago. Those which have already been completed seem to be working very well, but they still need some attention to be paid to them. They have put one in the Rockley District last year, and I think that it is working well: I say, that there is the need for one at "Caerabank" Hotel and one at the "Windsor" Hotel. There, the sea has receded, the water flows from the main highway and gathers at the back of the premises and stinks. I commend the Hon. Minister for the action which he has taken, and I ask him to take note of the things I have said, carry them back to the Department and see that these suggestions are worked on.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There are one or two things which I would like to know in respect of this Head. Item No. 55, "Transport," is one of the Items which I will pick out to draw to their attention, but I shall always remind any Chairman of Committees that when I am speaking on a Head of the Estimates, I am speaking on all of the Items which are not fixed by law. Therefore if I stray from one Item to the other, you, Mr. Chairman, will remember that, I am trying to avoid any unpleasantness; I am speaking on the Items from No. 55 to 68. I do not want it to be said that I have taken advantage of the Chair, and therefore I have selected from Item No. 55 to Item No. 68 on which to speak.

The note to Item No. 55 says this: "This Item has been increased to represent the true cost of operating the present establishment of vehicles." I cannot find any other part of the Estimates on which I can properly ask the question, but I would like to know and I am asking the Hon. Minister to tell us, something about the buses.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I take it that that note means the cost of operating the vehicles in use at the Department of Highways and Transport. I do not think the buses are included in these vehicles, the buses are the concern of the Barbados Transport Board.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Will the hon. member show me any part of the Estimates where that has been mentioned?

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member desires to speak on this Head, but I do not think it is for me to search for any Item for him.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I quite agree with that; that is why I have picked out these Items. I could

easily argue that the Director of Highways and Transport has been taken from his substantive duties and put in charge of Transport. I am therefore suggesting that before I proceed to offer criticism, I should ask the Hon. Minister of Communications to give me some information on this matter because we have a new Department, there is no Head in the Estimates about it, and the public is interested in the matter. I am taking this opportunity to ask the Hon. Minister for some information, and if you do not see any objection to that, I am doing so.

7.25 p.m.

Sir, I am sure you will take no objection to that because I am speaking under the Head. I would like the Hon. Minister of Communications to be able to tell this Committee for the benefit of the public what is the true position as regards the Transport System of which the Director of Highways and Transport is in charge. I will reserve any comment on that matter until he says something. I am sure I am singing no solo when I ask this question because it is a matter on which the entire Committee would like to know something.

On the question of Item 63, repairing and resurfacing parish roads, parish of St. Michael, and the subsequent Items for the parishes of St. Andrew, St. Lucy and St. Joseph, I would like to say at the outset that the Director of Highways and Transport is doing a very fine job (and I do not praise you today and not tomorrow) and has been giving of his best: and his best is the best. He has been doing a very fine job and is a reasonable man to get on with also. On the question of the repairs and resurfacing of these parish roads I would like the Minister in charge to tell us something about the remainder of the tenantry roads that should be constructed in St. Michael. I will offer no criticism on this point until he has explained.

Hon. M. E. COX: Leave that until you come to Capital Expenditure.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If you give the explanation now you will not have to give it under Capital Expenditure.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, so far as the buses are concerned that is not before us today, but I would like to assure hon. members that it is the intention of the Government to put the true position of the running of them before the House as soon as circumstances permit. I know hon. members will agree that this matter of taking over the buses has been referred to arbitration; it is a matter of secrecy; therefore, we should have no debate on it which would tend to prejudice feelings one way or the other.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the hon. member means by not having any debate on it. That insinuation may be all well for Government members but not for hon. members on this side of the Table. Here it is, we are in the position that months ago the buses were taken over by the Government and since then there has been a breakdown in negotiations. Must the public accept that up to now with your Board of Arbitration having been set up long ago, nothing is done and nothing is arrived at? Something is wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I enquire of the hon. member under what Item is he speaking? I see nothing concerning buses.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have already told you the Item on which I am speaking. I have already told the Chair that I am speaking on all the Items to be voted and while it is difficult to find one Item to pertain to this matter, I am not going to speak at any unnecessary length on it.

I know the Hon. Minister is aware that the matter is causing the owners of these buses much uneasiness and the public is very much concerned as to what they are taking over and what benefits are to be derived from the service. We appreciate the Minister's reply that in due course and as circumstances permit, (if I may use his honoured phrase) the matter will be brought to the House, but I must tell him that this House is generally concerned with the matter because it has been delayed too long.

We observe in the Press a notice calling for officers to run the Transport System; then, on the other hand, we have been hearing rumours that the Government is not going to run them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that the hon. senior member for the City is dealing with a matter which does not appear under this Head or before us concerning buses. The Minister has spoken of arbitration which is rather wide also.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, that is a matter for you and not for me. I am going to speak on Transport.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member continues to speak on buses, I will have no alternative but to rule him out of order.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have asked two questions and the Minister has answered one. Let me put it this way: is it or is it not a fact that the Director of Highways and Transport is carrying out the duties of Officer in charge of the Transport Board? If it is a fact, why must hon. members of this Committee shut their mouths up and say nothing at all about it? I am going to speak on Item 55, Transport. This is not an Item that is fixed by law, therefore I can speak on it; you cannot stop me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you telling me what to do. 7.35 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am discussing the Director of Highways and Transport, the activities of the Officer attached to the Highways and Transport Department other than those laid down here in the laws of this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Tell me what Item.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All the Items not fixed by law [A VOICE: Name the Item.] Travelling allowances then! You had better change position and put the Premier in the Chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of order, I hope this Committee will not allow any Minister or private member to ignore the ruling of the Chair. I am speaking on the whole subject and I appeal to the members of the Committee to assist the Chair in the ruling.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I have told you what I am speaking on. If you want to be Premier and Chairman, you rule. I am speaking on the Items not fixed by law. All you have to do is to rule. The Speaker can come and rule. . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me inform the honourable senior member for the City if he strays on any Item that is not to be voted, I will rule him out of order.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: And I will bow. I am speaking on all the Items to be voted by law and I will select 27 — Travelling Expenses.

Now, let us begin by saying that the Travelling Allowance applies to the Director of Highways and Transport. Is that right or wrong? It applies to the Director of Highways and Transport, and I am submitting that the Director is using that Travelling allowance which is put in the Estimates for another purpose other than duties prescribed here and these duties are to look after the Transport system which the Government has taken over. Do you rule me out of order on that, Sir?

Now, Sir, on this whole question, therefore, of Transport, one would like to know, for instance, if all this travelling allowance which you have here under Item 27, \$27,000 covers the travelling not only of the Director but the other officers attached to the Highways and Transport Department for looking after the buses which have been taken over by the Government. This is a question which I am entitled to ask. If that is so. . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I draw to the honourable senior member for the City's attention that the note reads: "Paid in accordance with the Travelling Allowance Regulations".

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Maybe you can draw other things to my attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is nothing to do with travelling.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If it is in the knowledge of the honourable members of this Chamber that the Officer is doing something you know is not part of his duty, are you not entitled to come in here and ask something about it? What would be the members' position? If it has been drawn to my attention that he has been put in charge of the buses, may I be permitted to ask if he is remunerated for the extra services of looking after the transport service of Barbados, and if so how much? All these things we are entitled to know because eight months ago you set up a system, took over the buses of the island, the Minister said we have been unable to settle because it has gone to arbitration. It is very well for him to say he should not like to discuss it. From his point of view, I agree he cannot discuss it. The Government's discussing it would prejudice the matter.

I do not want to let the Chair feel I am taking advantage of my position as a member. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph feels the honourable Chairman is not good enough for the Chair, he can find a better member to put in the Chair. I say that quite honestly. There are some that would be like a red rag to a bull, because they would be so prejudiced that you could not keep certain members in order, so I do not want to take advantage of my position. So this travelling allowance is for doing work connected with Highways and Transport and what not, and if it is drawn to our attention that the Director of Highways and Transport and other Officers are using and getting paid out of this \$27,000 for doing work other than connected with Highways and Transport, but connected with the Transport system, which is a new system which the Government has taken over we are entitled to know. We want Government to know we are not sleeping upon this. Just as Government feels this has gone to arbitration, nothing has been done and the balance is there, we in the Opposition are watching very carefully, and I would like to know — I do not criticise the Minister's reply because I think it is one of those replies when you are in doubt and not sure of the answer which you should give—but I think this evening, even if I sing a solo on this question that they would do a measure of good if they would let us know how the position stands, how we are to view the matter of the buses they have taken over and the service, and finally, I would like to ask the Minister one last question. I do not suppose he is going to deny that the Director of Highways and Transport is in charge of that entire set-up. I would like to know if he is paid extra and from what source he is paid? To avoid rumours the only persons to settle them are the members of the Government. Therefore, if it is a fact that he uses it from here, we cannot tell if he is paid extra and from what source for taking charge of the whole system.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Acting Chairman, to answer the honourable senior member for the City

first, I think he is well aware of the fact that the Director is the Director of Highways and Transport which includes buses. That has been in the Act as he will remember since 1945. That places the responsibility on him for seeing that the island's transport is run, and run efficiently. I think he also knows that even before the Government took over we had two inspectors to go throughout the island and see the buses moved to time and that they were properly run; and so the Director of Highways and Transport is still in that position to see that the island's transport including buses is run efficiently. Therefore, in so far as his reference to travelling is concerned, it is perfectly in order. It was so before and the vote has not been increased; you will see from the Estimates that we have not increased the vote to look after the buses, in addition to the fact that he has not been given any remuneration for being Chairman of the Board. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy raised the point about casual workers in respect of bank holidays, and he also raised the point about giving time off to these workers to see cricket.

7.45 p.m.

I think it was when the Australians were here, or on the eve of their coming here, that the hon. member raised the point and he was told then that the matter would be mentioned with a view to acquiescing in the request or suggestion made by the hon. member. I am quite sure that that has been done, and I am wondering if the hon. member did not see some of his constituents at cricket during the hours when they would have been working.

As regards the point about paying casual workers for Bank Holidays, it is not so easy as it has been suggested. While on the one hand, I agree that consideration should be given to those who are called "regular casuals", on the other hand you cannot extend that consideration to real "casuals" who might only work a few days with you, and then they go off again. You must draw the line at some point. I will promise the hon. member, however, to take up the question of the payment of "regular casuals" for Bank Holidays. As the hon. member knows, these casuals get holidays, sick leave and so on, and if they work for a number of years, they qualify for gratuities. Although the Act does not specifically say that, they are given that consideration.

The hon. member also raised the point of transporting workers to and from their work. That is a question in respect of which I know the workers feel they have a grievance, and I must admit, I feel so too. Reports have been coming to me to the effect that these workers are not paid enough to enable them to meet their travelling expenses to and from their work, and I am prepared to go into that matter with a view to seeing whether we could not make arrangements whereby the lorries which go on the site, could take the workers there and remain for them until the work is over. That system was not instituted because lorry drivers are supposed to get back in a little before 4 o'clock, and if they remain cut you will have to pay them for some overtime. Perhaps it would be better to pay them that overtime, and have these workers transported, than to allow them to find their way home after doing a hard day's work. Sometimes I take up some of these workers on the road and I can say that they have a good case for consideration.

The honourable junior member for St. John raised the question about the non-increase in the Unestablished Staff. He said that that Staff should be increased, bearing in mind the development of tenancies for which roads are provided. All tenantry roads are repaired from Capital Funds, and when those roads are repaired they will not require any surfacing for another two years or so. You cannot build

up your permanent staff merely because you are constructing a few more miles of tenantry roads; but you employ your "casuals" in the construction of those roads and the "regular casuals" provide the additional maintenance which is required for those roads from time to time.

The honourable junior member for Christ Church has raised two very valuable points. One is the question of the provision of a trailer for removing tractors and so on. That matter was discussed a year or so ago, and the Director of Highways and Transport referred to it as a "prime mover". The matter was postponed on account of the cost, but I do agree that we should have in that Department a "prime mover" because that would reduce the amount of hours of transport considerably. If you had to remove a roller from the Department to St. Andrew, for instance, that roller would be removed by this "prime mover" which would get there within two hours or so. Some firms may, from time to time, require something which would carry a heavy load. I am prepared to discuss that matter in the proper quarter, and if the Minister of Finance agrees with it, at a later stage during this financial year, we can come down with a Resolution for the purpose of purchasing this "prime mover". I am convinced that it is necessary for this Department to have a convenience such as that.

As regards the bend near "Lyrias", I think it was about July last year when we agreed to include that bend in our road improvement programme for this financial year. I agree that this bend is a dangerous one, and if some of it is cut off, it would improve the visibility considerably at that point.

I do not think there is anything else to answer. If I have not answered all the questions, I am quite willing to do so if I am reminded of them.

The question that the sum of \$1,017,267 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXIII—Civil Aviation

Head XXXIII — Civil Aviation was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are certain items to be added to this Head. They are as follows:—

Item 3 — Control Officers — \$8,700.

Increased by \$1,920 (To be voted) to \$10,620 to provide for the salary of an additional Control Officer.

Item 8 — Supervisor, Fire Services — \$1,200

Provision of \$1,200 (Fixed by Law) to be deleted as the post of Supervisor, Fire Services is to be abolished.

Item 9 — Crash Firemen — \$3,898.

Provision of \$3,898 (Fixed by Law) to be deleted as the 4 posts of Crash Firemen are to be abolished.

Item 10—Auxiliary Crash Firemen—\$9,687.

Provision of \$9,687 (Fixed by Law) to be deleted as the 14 posts of Auxiliary Crash Firemen are to be abolished.

Item 11 — Unestablished Staff — \$12,625.

Increased by \$1,311 (To be voted) to \$13,936 to provide two additional labourers to carry out certain duties now performed by the Crash and Auxiliary Firemen.

Item 12 — C.O.L. Allowance — \$6,020.

Reduced by \$1,819 (To be voted) to \$4,201 as a result of the reduction in staff.

Item 20 — Upkeep of Vehicles — \$2,400.

Reduced by \$800 (To be voted) to \$1,600 as the upkeep of existing tenders will be provided for under Head X — Fire Brigade.

Item 21 — Fire Protection — \$2,400.

Provision of \$2,400 (To be voted) to be deleted as the maintenance and replacement of fire equipment will be undertaken by the Fire Brigade.

Item 27 — Uniforms — \$3,175

Reduced by \$1,300 (To be voted) to \$1,875 as X — Fire Brigade.

We have transferred these Items to Head X—Fire Brigade; therefore, we delete them from this Head. The sum to be voted is now \$93,890.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$93,890 be now voted under this Head.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, if we are removing this cost of maintaining a Fire Department at Seawell from this Head and putting it to the Head, Fire Brigade, for administrative reasons, I do not think the present system under which the Vestry of St. Michael is called upon to pay a proportionate part of the cost of the Fire Brigade is right.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. senior member for the City raised that point and I assured him that the Act will have to be amended.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that. Under Item 30—Transportation, I am going to ask the Minister in charge of this portfolio, what is the present decision on transportation of workers to and from Seawell. We voted a similar sum last year and nothing has been expended. This year the same sum has been put back in the Estimates. Is it going to be used or have you plans for the implementation of a promise you made? If I may remind you, when you took over the buses some seven months ago, I think it was the following week that workers at Seawell were issued with bus passes to permit them to get to and from their place of residence to their work at Seawell. It was discovered when they went to use them that there was some difficulty and those passes were withdrawn. You promised to investigate the matter and let me know something about it. I am asking you if you have the information now. My other remarks can easily await the time when we are dealing with Capital Expenditure; they will be more appropriate under that Head.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I merely want to draw your attention to the apparently new Item 31, expenses of A.R.P. Surveyor. I do so because I deprecate the expense to the taxpayers of this colony in having to provide for the cost of inspection for certificate of air-worthiness of a club's aircraft. The only reason why I am not tempted to move the deletion of this Item from the Head is because when this particular vehicle is in the air in the hands of obviously incompetent people it is liable to crash on some poor person's head or home which may not have been insured and as a result may not be in a position to recover the damage of the aircraft. It is a shame that a few of the idle rich have nothing better to do than to invest their money in an unairworthy aircraft and then to have someone not properly trained to manipulate it in the air. One takes up the newspaper only to see an article written under the caption "Miss Bim in cane field." One then reads that some novice piloting it over some cane field has made a forced landing in it. Why they did not do so over the sea, I do not know. It is a great hardship that taxpayers have to pay for the cost of inspection for certificate of airworthiness of the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club's aircraft.

There is the rumour that the Club hopes to get a new aircraft from a gentleman who lives in the U.S.A. Let us hope that if and when that plane

arrives (I do not know if they would be given one which was used in the Italy-Abyssinian War) that it will be able to remain for some reasonable time overhead until it goes over the sea and then let what would happen sooner or later happen then. Nobody would be the worst off to see the last of that plane or any of the novices who have nothing to do and plenty of time to become self-styled pilots of this aircraft.

8.05 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Acting Chairman, I really thought that by now the Government would have prohibited that thing from going up in the air. It will appear that the Government is encouraging it, for they are going to grant this money. I was very much afraid every time of Miss Bim landing anywhere at all. It has its own Airport anywhere and to the detriment of the people of this country, and I am hoping that Government will take it very seriously and prohibit its going back in the air, because one can never tell where it will land again. Somehow, the pilots do not go over the sea for some reason or another; that means they more want to damage the people on land than damage themselves, and as far as this vote is concerned, I think the hon. member for St. Lucy—if he would move the deletion of this amount, I am quite willing to second it, because we will not be encouraging such a thing. It is treacherous to the public. I do not know who are the fliers, and I do not know who O.K.s it, because some time ago I read that an engine came and no quicker than it was up it was down. So I want some explanation on it from the hon. Minister in charge.

Mr. BRANCKER: The only reason why I would not move the deletion is because in the opinion of the Committee this gentleman is to be paid \$250 to inspect it and if it is not worthy it will not be allowed to go in the air again.

Mr. MILLER: What the hon. members so often forget, is that pioneers have always been the amateurs. When the two Wright Brothers of the United States created a crude contraption that did fly, in spite of the criticism of the entire world, everybody was anxious to get photographs of this stupid and ugly contraption. The same thing applied when the Dutchman developed the submarine; it was madness. These two good works were put by until they were perfected by Government rising one against the other with fortunes to buy the Rights of these particular machines. Today we are all aware of the importance to civilisation if we say nothing else, of the submarine. But what have we been doing in Barbados? You have a group of enthusiastic people interested in aircrafts who are willing by denial to their pockets—to them it is a poor sport for the island rich and not of the idle—to throw pennies into the scheme. It is not regarded as a hobby, but what has been done in the R.A.F. we have been doing through this club. The vote in this Chamber is to provide the protection for the hon. member who is afraid; that is to say, the Government would have the satisfaction that there is an engineer that would issue this private Aeroplane Club with a certificate of air worthiness—the least the Government could do to expect people to live under the training flights of the craft. These are the arguments all over the world, but I repeat for the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I am sure neither of them would be willing to travel except in a plane. I thought the hon. members would have been willing to show sympathy and support the grant for the survival of the club, but to the contrary. Little things amuse little minds but in case of an emergency you would not tarry and wonder as though something from the high heaven would fall

and suddenly you would be swept into safety; and I know the hon. member in case of emergency, would be among the first to send off members of this country to the R.A.F. to support their cause.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Acting Chairman, I would like to inform hon. members that originally this Item was being paid from the vote under the Head — Director of Civil Aviation when we had one, but the British Air Transport Advisory Council recommended that each country should pay for the services if necessary. In other words the person who inspects this craft for air worthiness will have to be paid from the colony in which the inspection is made. Hitherto it was under D.C.A. who had a block vote, but we are doing no less than what other colonies are doing. As a matter of fact, in so far as this is concerned, the other colonies are making a greater contribution to these Light Aeroplane Clubs. As regards the point raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I have tried to get in touch with the Director of Civil Aviation and I will give him the information when I receive it. I apologise for not having the information at hand.

The question that the sum of \$93,890 be voted under Head XXXIII—Civil Aviation was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

The question was put and agreed to and Mr. Acting Chairman reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

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 resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned accordingly.

8.15 p.m.

On re-assembling,

ESTIMATES—Cont'd

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

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

Head XXXIV—Electrical Inspection

Head XXXIV—Electrical Inspection — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am asking leave to make an amendment to this Head. *There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Premier.*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The amendment is an increase to Item 9 as follows:

Item 9—Casual and Other Assistance—\$2,000.

Increased by \$1,000 (To be voted) to \$3,000 to provide for the employment of an Electrician to service the electrical equipment at the General Hospital. I beg to move that the sum of \$11,892 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$11,892 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXV—Housing

Head XXXV—Housing—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$150,000 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$150,000 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXVII—Peasants' Loan Bank

Head XXXVII — Peasants' Loan Bank — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$19,000 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Under this Head, I notice that the Personal Emoluments in respect of the Manager and other members of the staff are to be voted. I understand that for some time now, the Manager has retired or has resigned, and I am wondering if any steps have been taken to fill the post; I am wondering whether his post has been filled and if any member of the Board will be good enough to say who has been appointed, and if nobody has been appointed, why not?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Acting Chairman, I have the honour to be one of the members of this Board, [Cheers] and up to now, I am wondering myself why this post has not been filled. [Laughter]. I am not responsible for the convening of the meetings nor the fixing of the Agenda; I can only say that we have discussed the appointment when we were about to advertise the vacancy in the Press, and the Acting Manager had been appointed to carry on until the out-going Manager had returned from his holiday. I do not know if the Manager has returned yet, neither do I know what has happened. I feel that it would be my duty to let this Committee know that. The hon. member on my right (Mr. Holder) is also a member of the Board, and not long ago we were discussing this matter. I do not know who is responsible for the hold-up; I know that Sir Archibald Cuke was out of the island, but he has returned here long enough so that a meeting could be held and the public told what is the position as regards the Manager.

While I am on the subject of the Bank, I have asked a question [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is out of order]. I do not know if I am out of order; I was only mentioning that by the way. Anyhow, I do not need to go any further in the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like an explanation as regards this matter of this decrease; why should there be such a large decrease of \$78,492 under this Head in respect of 1955-56? There is no explanation given here as to this large decrease.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member will see from the note opposite that this amount of \$19,000 represents the Personal Emoluments and other charges. If the Hon. Minister of Labour has the file in his possession, he would be able to give the exact figures as to the state of the loans, and so on. However, the note opposite really explains the position.

Mr. LEWIS: I quite realise that the Hon. Minister is not familiar with this portfolio, but there is no explanation, I repeat, in the note as to why there is this large decrease. This is what the note says:

"The Bank is a body corporate and meets its own expenditure, but it has been the practice for

years to grant to the Peasants' Loan Bank, an amount equivalent to the cost of operating the Bank, together with a sum estimated on the basis of new loans less repayments."

I understand that, but I have none of the Supplementary Estimates being asked for this Bank; this is really the first time that I can remember that there has been given this sort of break-down of the amount. There used to be a lump sum of money asked for in connection with the Peasants' Loan Bank; they have been good enough, perhaps due to my criticism, to show how the amount is made up. I sincerely hope that any decrease in the vote does not mean the Bank will suffer; I see that they have put down here a sum of \$220,000 in respect of loans.

That is what we used to do. We used to give it a lump sum of money. The only explanation they have given us that the money will be increased is because of the increase in running expenses. They are now good enough to tell us that they have running expenses. If the sum is sufficient for that and to make the necessary loans, it is okay for me.

The question that the sum of \$19,000 be voted under Head XXXVII was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.20 p.m.

Head XXXVIII—Old Age Pensions

Head XXXVIII—Old Age Pensions was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$811,515 be voted under this Head.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head Item 7, Old Age Pensions, the hon. senior member for the City asked about figures as regards blind people from the age of 16 years upwards. I enquired but there are no firm figures. The Social Welfare Officer only knows those who are registered at the James Street Centre [A VOICE: That's a shame.] If they do not come forward to register, how will we know? However, I believe that now the age limit is lowered they will come forward and register.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the answer given me by the Hon. Minister of Social Services but surely he should deprecate such an answer coming from the Social Welfare Officer. I appreciate it from him because that is all he could get. I asked him a simple question and the answer is easy to get. Mr. Chairman, when we were dealing with the increase in the Old Age Pension, all that we said over here was to the effect that you are saying you will give it to every blind person from the age of 25 upwards. We said to you that inasmuch as you have amended your Bastardy Act and other laws to say that a parent is responsible for his children up to the age of 16 years, that children who are born blind, from 16 years upward where the parent was not responsible they should be given a pension too. There are a number of children who are blind between that age and your qualifying age of 25 years, but they could not be so many; therefore, we told you that instead of making your qualifying age from 25 years that you should make it from 16 years because from the figures it would not cost any appreciable sum.

This is not a criticism of the Hon. Minister because he made an effort to get the information for the House. It shows the incompetence of the Social Welfare Officer as well as the disinterestedness of her. Do you mean to tell me that she could not tell you the various statistics in regard to this matter? Surely she could get them from the various Poor

Law Boards. I have asked the Minister a question, a question which would tend to relieve many of those blind persons between 16 years and 25 years. There would hardly be many of them. I am sure from the view expressed on the floor of this House that the Hon. Minister seemed to be in sympathy with that view. Every year I get an application from a few of them for assistance and I think most hon. members must have got it too. As a matter of fact, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph actually sent somebody from that parish between the age of 16 years and 25 years to me. Are you really satisfied with that answer you get from your Social Welfare Officer? It is so easy to find out.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: He is saying, go to every house and find out something.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Stop talking nonsense. He talks a lot of nonsense when he wants to defend one of his friends. He seems to be getting old and stupid; he is getting absolutely stupid.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! Address your remarks to the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You have a Social Welfare Officer. What is easier to find out if you want to find it out than this information? If you wanted to get that information, all that the Social Welfare Officer would need to do is to put a single notice in the newspapers asking the various Poor Law Boards to report to you the number of people who are blind from the age of 16 years to 25 years. What Poor Relief Committee would refuse to give the Social Welfare Department that information—information which they must have? They know the number of blind persons to whom they give relief and a record is kept of their ages. The Leader of the Opposition can support me in this.

As I have said, I appreciate that the Hon. Minister of Social Services has tried to get the information but could not get it. However, I wonder if he can honestly say that he is satisfied over the matter. Here it is, you are running a Social Welfare Department and you cannot say how many people there are who are blind between the ages of 16 years and 25 years. That is the reason why there are many people who say that you do not want a Social Welfare Department. I say that the necessity for it is so much that you see it around you everyday, but what you do want is a real Social Welfare Department. To tell me that the Hon. Minister of Social Services cannot get information from the Social Welfare Department telling us the number of blind persons whom you have in Barbados between the ages of 16 years and 25 years, who would be, say, entitled to draw a pension is the biggest piece of nonsense I have ever heard in this Chamber.

9.30 p.m.

The Hon. Minister of Social Services knows this well enough: if this is the interest the Social Welfare Department will take, you had better scrap it. It should not only exist but it should do work. Each member in here will see that after two months and you ask a question like that and the Minister showed an interest, all he can tell you is that you will not be able to get the information. What effort could have been made? I counsel the Hon. Minister of Social Services that when information is required for the House it must be taken seriously. Let me ask this: when they come to amend the Regulations so that blind people who were getting aid at 40 should get it at 25, how did he get the information? Did he go to every house? Honestly, Mr. Acting Chairman, how did Government get the information to come and tell us they wanted so much money because they were giving aid to persons at 40 but were now giving from 25? Did they guess?

You got that information, but I am taking it that you got it from the Social Welfare Department who would get it from the Blind Association plus the Poor Law Boards and advertising for persons from that age. I have been mild in recent years in dealing with the matters of the Social Welfare Department, but let me ask the Minister this: Can he honestly say tonight that this is a satisfactory answer? How can it be a satisfactory answer? Does that Department exist for people to sit and smoke cigarettes and send in a bill for travelling allowance?

Mr. Acting Chairman, do you know that in an interview with the Press I have actually made an open invitation to members of the Social Welfare Department to sit on the Board of Guardians and see cases for themselves? However I might feel about the Social Welfare Officer, as soon as I occupy an official position which must come in contact with her duties, I respect her office or the office of the person. Therefore, Sir, I wonder if the Minister of Social Services will realise that a thing like this is a serious reflection on the working of that office; that they cannot tell us what are the numbers after being able to tell us the number between 40 and 25 for reducing the age at which people could draw Old Age Pension. It is a very easy matter, and if there was any person interested the facts could be obtained by the Social Welfare Department. While I appreciate the interest shown by the Minister in replying to the question asked by the Opposition, I must say it is most unsatisfactory to get an answer of that sort from the Minister if that is all he got from the Social Welfare Department. The Social Welfare Officer has to do with the Blind Association — a most regrettable feature, because it was one of the things that kept it back from getting anything. I have had blind people come to me who after they were taught to do handicraft and chairs took work on their own and they told me of the treatment meted out to them by the Social Welfare Officer. They were taught to do this and because they took work on their own, they were told they could not come back to the school because they should take the work from the Association. I am sorry the Hon. Minister had to give a reply like that which is aggravated by the stupid reference made by the Premier and the ignorance displayed by the kicked-out Chairman. We regret very much under the circumstances that we could not get this information. It might be small; it might be five or six, but if you establish a Social Welfare Department, they should be able to keep matters like this on their finger tips.

Mr. Acting Chairman, look at the vote and you will see what you are paying for the Social Welfare Department. Do you not think they should be able to tell you tomorrow the number of blind people, so to speak? They just feel the Department exists to go to the Treasury and draw salaries, get in a motor car and drive and things like that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Acting Chairman, on a casual estimation Government could easily estimate the number of blind people to be between one to two hundred. Not all of them would be needy cases. I know it would be a little difficult to find out how many blind people there are, but from casual observation it would appear that they would be between one and two hundred persons. But if Government wants to change the Regulations to assist these blind paupers they can work on the number that they know exists, and in process of time the others who want to be considered would come forward. I do not expect them to wait until they are able to know exactly how many there are in the island, because

there are some who do not come forward to seek aid from Government or the local Parochial Authorities. I do not know if the Minister of Social Services is listening to my suggestion, but I would suggest that if you are going to reduce the age limit, to start off with those that are registered at the Blind Institute; and so as soon as the age limit is reduced, those whose existence we do not know of would readily come forward and report themselves. It is very important, Sir, that greater provision should be made for them, and I should like to state here and now that while it would be good for us to make provision for greater protection for blind people, I do not hope to see included amongst them persons who can easily take care of themselves even although they might be blind.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, I rather gathered from the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas that although the Social Welfare Department could not give or guarantee accurate figures they would be able to give all the figures that Department claims to have. I wonder if I am correct in assuming that; whether they were able to give figures of cases within their knowledge between the ages of 16 and 25. Even if I am right in assuming that the Minister for Social Services would be able to let the Committee know of the number of blind people in that age group known to the Department and for which information has been passed on to him.

That might give us an indication of the minimum number, but it does not help us very much as to the maximum; perhaps the hon. senior member for St. Thomas might be able to help us in this matter.

While I am on this question I must return to my pet subject. The hon. senior member for St. John, who is fresh from his cocktails at Lodge School describes it as a hardy annual, the reduction of the age, so that more people will benefit. We have a Report from an expert who has recommended an increase in the number of people by the reduction of the age. We only fall back on what the experts say when we want to carry out our own argument. However, the age of 63 years is too high; they seem to be considering only the people who have one foot in the grave and the other outside. I submit that the age of 65 years should be the very highest age at which you should start to pay these pensions; we can find the money to do that if we look for it.

To see that Civil Servants, some of them are present here, and people like them who have secured good jobs, do not go on to work beyond the age of 60 years. Think of the people who have to work until they are 68 years of age before they can get a pittance! I do not know if the Government will fortify itself with the recommendations of the expert and stick to 68 years; I would be glad if the Hon. Minister has the figures relative to the number of persons between 60 and 65 years known to be blind in this Island.

Mr. SMITH: I am referring to Item 7, "Old Age Pensions" Since 1952 a petition was forwarded to the Government to consider an increase in the amount of these pensions. [A MEMBER: That is out of order]. As you know, these old pensioners such as Policemen —

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do not think that the hon. member is in order.

The hon. member took his seat.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that the hon. member should be given a little latitude to speak on this matter, since he was in the Chair when the increase under this Head was recently passed. I think that some sort of reply is due by the Hon. Minister of Social Services; when he intended to lower this age in respect of the blind people to 25 years, the Government asked nobody to enquire about these

people. If they did so, the people who were 24 years old this year would be 25 years old next year, and if you did not know them, how will you include them? Of course, you could come down to this House with a supplementary Resolution; you must have some statistics which would show the number of blind people in Barbados between the ages of 25 and 40. It is not necessary to go around from house to house to find that out, because certain people would not qualify under the "means test." People might be able to inform you that in this district there are so many blind people. In so far as the estimates is concerned, that is based on the law, and I thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman, for the latitude you have allowed, because this matter was all arranged under the Act which was passed.

I am surprised that they went to the Social Welfare Department at all. However, it does not seem as if the information is forthcoming and therefore let us get on with another Head of the Estimates.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I will make another effort to get the information.

The question that the sum of \$811,515 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.50 p.m.

Head XL — Waterworks

Head XL—Waterworks was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$740,934 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: I am speaking on Item 22, repairs to mains, meters etc., for which the sum of \$73,000 is to be voted. I have time and time again suggested, and will continue to suggest, that when repairs are about to be effected to mains and water in a district is about to be locked off, before doing so, the use of a siren should be resorted to in order that the people in the district would be notified that they can turn out quickly to fill their buckets and other receptacles with water before it is locked off. It takes six or twelve hours before they can send the motor lorry or get a chauffeur to drive the motor lorry to get water to the people in the district and as a result the people are seriously discommoded of this necessary item for their cooking. It is not good enough for an official to lock off a water main and the people in the district only know that it is locked off when they cannot get water from the pipe in the district or in their homes. There should be some accommodation extended to the people who get their water from that main. Give the official a siren let him give the people 15 minutes to go and collect a bucket of water; then let him shut it off. Give the people an opportunity to get some water first. That is perfectly reasonable and clear and there is no reason why it cannot be done. If the use of a siren is not favoured by the Ministry, some other means of giving them notice can be resorted to. After all, these people can send their servants in their car with a couple buckets to get them filled before you lock it off. This is a matter which can easily be done. It should not be necessary for me to raise this matter again. This should receive the necessary attention because we have the particular Head of Department who favours helping the people. Let this matter be no longer neglected.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I also would like to call the attention of the Minister to the same Item. I know whenever they extend their mains they ask the Vestries or the Commissioners of Health

what places they would give as priority for the extension, but there are so many places where we need extensions and would like to give priority that we find it difficult to make suggestions. I was amazed to find out that in a case like St. Matthias Road that there is an area of about 200 yards which is not connected by a main. The main in that district runs as far as a shop around the corner and you do not get any main until you come to Dayrells Road Corner. Now, that is a very thickly populated district. People living along there would be only too glad to put in water in their homes but they cannot because of the absence of a main. If the Hon. Minister for Communications, Works and Housing would make this note and refer it to the Head of the Department I would be very glad indeed.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, on that same Item which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke, I would like to know whether it is still opposed to adhere to the old principle in regard to the extension of the water supply; that is, that they extend it only in respect of the thickly populated areas, ignoring the question of a few houses in a remote district by their saying that there are only a few houses there, therefore, do not put a main in that district yet. In effect you are saying that those people in remote districts can walk a mile to get water. Sir, the principle on which the Hon. Minister is working is peculiarly suited to the parish of St. Michael but most unsuited to the parishes outside of the metropolitan area. What can be more inconvenient than for people to walk a mile to collect two buckets of water.

I would like to make reference on another Item: Item 34, delivery of water by lorry. I would suggest that there should always be at least one lorry absolutely ready to move off at a moment's notice as soon as there is notification that a particular pipe is not giving out any water. I have had the occasion last year in respect of my constituency of having to enquire into the non-arrival of a motor lorry with water when a pipe was not giving out water. I was given the answer: "Yes, it was reported but we had to get a motor lorry; it was not quite ready, the driver was not in or we had to send for something to make the lorry go." You should have a man on duty, ready to move off with the lorry the minute there is notification that a pipe is running out of water just as the Fire Brigade moves off when there is notification of a fire. I am sure you realise the terrible inconvenience and hardship to which people are put when they cannot get water. If you realise that, the taxpayers will not cavil at the expense of having a man and a motor lorry there 24 hours of each day so that as soon as an alarm is sounded, out that motor lorry will go to carry water to the people in the district as quickly as the Fire Brigade apparatus would leave to extinguish a fire.

10.00 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Acting Chairman, speaking under Head XL, Item 15—Unestablished Staff, a little while ago I asked questions about the relative rates of pay for work on Sundays and Bank Holidays to the Pumping Station workers at Bowmanston, St. John, and the answer I received I will read. The point was that the same type of unestablished staff at Headquarters received overtime pay when they worked on Sundays or holidays, but not the workers at the pumping station in St. John. The reply is like this.

"The position is that the unestablished and casual staff at Headquarters normally work a 48 hour week from Monday to Saturday while the Pumping Station staff work in shifts of 8 hours for a six day

week, inclusive of Sundays and Bank Holidays. The former are paid double rates on Sundays and Bank Holidays, with treble rates on Good Friday, Easter Day and Christmas Day, while the latter are paid the same rates of overtime as Headquarters staff but only qualify for overtime in respect of work done outside the shift hours."

I will never be able to appreciate this fine distinction in language applied to the two sets of workers. I cannot appreciate the reason or the justice in paying workers down hill for that work on Sundays overtime with double rates and treble rates on Good Friday, Christmas Day and Easter, but because they call the ones in St. John 'shift workers,' they work on Sundays and must be paid at the same prevailing rates. I cannot appreciate the justice in it. As far as I know with Trade Unions, overtime rates are paid for work done on Sundays and Holidays; the question of shift workers does not arise. The point is that they are working on days that other people do not normally work. That is the principle of overtime work, and I expect the Minister should know this. Regardless of the type of answer given I fail to appreciate it. A set of workers of the same status work on Sundays and get overtime, but another set when they work on Sundays do not get overtime. The principle underlying overtime is that when you work on days which are not normally working days, you are paid overtime. Fortunately the people in St. John, as far as I have interpreted the type of people there, expect these qualities in a representative—sincerity and honesty—and I am still convinced that their loyalty, although I get no satisfaction for it, is still mine. But he need not be fooled that I appreciate this situation.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am surprised to hear what the honourable member said after I have explained the situation. The honourable member must appreciate that the running of the various stations, Belle, Bowmanston and so on for supplying water is a continuous service. It is not like a burst pipe somewhere down Broad Street and you call men and they have to work until 10 at night. It is a shift service. A man goes on at four, comes off at eight, or twelve, and you tell me because he goes on at that time you must pay overtime?

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise on a point of order. That was not my argument. My argument was working on Sundays and Bank-holidays, not working on Wednesday night or Thursday night from eight to twelve, because these are not normal working days.

Hon. M. E. COX: In this case, Mr. Acting Chairman, Sundays are normal days. You must pump water all the time. You cannot shut down the pumping station and say this is Sunday and therefore I am not pumping water. You have shifts at Seawell on Sundays and no overtime is paid; but water must be pumped all the time. The people employed over there were taken on with this explanation. The Government is not doing them any injustice. Sunday is a normal day in so far as the working of these water stations is concerned, and I pointed out that to the honourable member today. You have Seawell Airport which must be opened all night and you do not pay them extra money for working on Sundays because it is a 24-hour service; and therefore, there is no question of overtime pay. You do not pay a watchman overtime and he starts something 6 o'clock in the evening and ends at 7 o'clock in the morning. You pay so much per period because it is his normal job and there is no overtime in that. A man working at Water works goes in at 7 o'clock and comes out at 4 o'clock out in circumstances when you have a burst pipe you cannot come out at 4 o'clock but may have to work until 6 o'clock or 10 o'clock; or he may be called out on Sundays to fix a burst pipe. That is something

accidental and you pay him because it is not a normal function; but at the normal stations they are run all the time every day and night in the year. They must do that in order to supply the inhabitants with water. Therefore, it is not an extraordinary function; it is a normal function where Sundays are concerned and they were told that. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy again raised the question of locking off the pipes without giving notice. I have given instructions that notice must be given to villagers who are affected by locking off pipes at times, and I have a feeling that the instructions have been carried out; but if they are not, I will check up on that. Now, the honourable member is again making the mistake of saying that water pipes have been distributed according to the population in the various villages. That was never the basis for allocating standpipes to any parish or village. I am sure even in his parish he knows there are some villages which are more heavily populated than others that have not got the water facilities as the less thickly populated; therefore, I again want to point out to him that we never calculate the distribution on any population basis, but I had figures showing that on a population basis St. Lucy was by far better off than St. Michael. 10.10 p.m.

Again I say that it was never calculated on that basis.

The honourable junior member for Christ Church raised the point about the main in the St. Matthias district. That was drawn to my attention before, and I would like to assure the honourable member that I will see that that is included in this year's programme.

Mr. ALLDER: If what the Hon. Minister says is right, what the Government should consider is the kind of occupation of these engineers at the Pumping Station; the Government should consider that these employees work around the clock every day in the year, and that their employment is different from that of the average worker in other Government Departments who can knock off at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and go home. Taking that into consideration the wages of the employees at these Pumping Stations should be more handsome than those of the average casual and key scale workers who know nothing of working day and night. What I mean to say is that you have men at the Pumping Stations who have to work on Sundays, Bank Holidays, Good Fridays and so on; you have engineers who work for 8 hours a day, and they are paid the same thing when they get their Sundays and Bank Holidays. I am not saying that these people should get all the Holidays, because they have to keep us supplied with a commodity without which we cannot do; but you can make their wages more handsome than those of other people who have better working hours.

If an engineer gets 21c. or 23c. an hour, do not give these other workmen the same thing; an hour's work in the night is more difficult for a man to do than an hour's work in the day. I think that these employees should be given a little percentage over what the average casual employee gets, and that would be more satisfactory. These employees work for long hours, from the well to the boiler and *vice versa*; the Hon. Minister knows all that because he has been approached by these men. We are not now arguing the case for the provision of uniforms, but we suggest that, in the case of another review of the salary scale for Government servants, the point which we are now raising will be taken into consideration.

There is another point which I would like to raise. In the Newcastle — Foster Hall area, due to landslides and things of that sort, half a mile of water main has been removed on account of the breakages which take place with the mains in that

area. However, in recent months, since the owners of Newcastle have been selling out the land, many peasants have been purchasing some of this land, and they have begun to remove their houses on it. They quite agree that it was necessary to remove the water main on account of the landslides which take place there, but they are asking for the installation of a 4in. main underground in that area so as to accommodate them with their regular supply of water. You need not put this main underground; it may be run along the surface. I sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister understands what I am trying to bring forward. The Parochial Authorities of the parish are very much disturbed about this matter; some of these people have expressed the desire to instal water into their homes if such a main is laid down.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will bear in mind what the honourable member has said.

The question that the sum of \$740,934 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XLI — Social Welfare

Head XLI — Social Welfare — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am asking leave, Mr. Acting Chairman, to make some amendments under this Head.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Premier.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The amendments are as follows:—

Item 5 — Stenographer and Typist — \$776.

Increased by \$624 (To be voted) to \$1,400 to provide for the salary of an additional Stenographer and Typist.

Item 7 — C.O.L. Allowance — \$1,020

Increased by \$107 (To be voted) to \$1,127 to provide an allowance for the additional Stenographer and Typist.

I beg to move that the sum of \$10,857 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I see that the matter of the After-Care of Discharged Lepers has been put into the hands of the Social Welfare Department. I do not see in whose hands that After-Care now is; I know that when these lepers leave the Institution after they have been treated, the Government gives them a pension, and rightly so; because it is common knowledge that nobody wants to employ them and they are scorned by their own relatives. While investigating the conditions of housing in Christ Church sometime ago, I came across one of them who was living in a house which had not been repaired; I believe the Housing Board worked on it, but there was no floor in it, and this person had to shelter in the home of a relative. The relative had a house next to the one in which this person was supposed to be living, and it was in a most inhuman condition.

10.20 p.m.

Now, hurricane "Janet" struck this island 7 months ago and I would like to know whose responsibility it is to look after that person and to see that he gets a pension. I think it should have been their duty to investigate cases of this sort as soon after the hurricane as possible. I can only say that no investigation took place. It should have been their duty to go to the Housing Board, or the Public Works Department whose job it was in the initial instance, and draw the matter to their attention to tell me whether it is their full responsibility.

This is only an instance of how they are doing their work.

I would like to know what is the allowance given to each person discharged from this Institution and whose duty it is to look after them, and if they have any method of keeping a proper check on the welfare of those persons other than seeing that they get a pension. I am not saying that they should go and see every person discharged from there, say every month; but after a catastrophe like a hurricane, certainly persons in that category should be investigated in order to see what is their condition. I look on it as if they are the guardians of those persons. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me whether it is their full responsibility or if they only have to see that those persons get their pensions or allowances.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to know how many discharged people are there and how much they get as an allowance. I hope the Hon. Minister will not have to send around to get the information.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As far as after-care of those persons is concerned, this amount of money is disbursed by a Committee. It is not under the supervision of the Social Welfare Officer alone. The Committee consists of the Chaplain of the Lazaretto, the Superintendent of the Lazaretto, Mrs. Redhead, (the wife of the Superintendent of the Prison), and another person whom I do not remember. That Committee looks after these unfortunate people as far as this allowance is concerned. I do not think that their duties extend as far as visiting in the homes of these people as suggested by the hon. junior member for Christ Church but I am sure that they function so far as seeing these people get their allowances.

I was looking for the file of the Lazaretto in order to see how many ex-inmates are there but unfortunately the file is not here and I cannot give the figures. Some of these people earn a living of their own within certain bounds. [A VOICE: I am sure there are not many of them.] I said: some; how many, I do not know; I contend that there are some. There is a movement on foot to amend the provisions of the Act for those persons to be employed more than they are because the avenues of employment for them at present are so to speak limited by the Act. There is a movement to remove some of those jobs which they at present can do from the Act so that they will get a broader scope of employment; for instance, they cannot be employed in bakeries or hotels, neither can they be butchers nor even a carpenter. We are now trying, and we will soon come before this House with an amendment to the Act, to remove restrictions on some of those avenues of employment for those people to earn something to assist themselves further. I am sorry I cannot tell how many persons are there discharged as cured from that Institution but I will supply the figures at the next meeting of the House for Hon. Members.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister of Social Services forgot to answer my last question. There is a fixed amount that Government decided upon to give to those persons, but the Hon. Minister may not have it there and I am not going to press him for it. I am not going to make any further criticism on this matter now but I will say in passing that I hope the Hon. Minister of Social Services will really get the figures for me because there is a feeling among some of those discharged lepers who usually apply to the various Poor Law Boards for assistance that the amount given to them is insufficient. I have various statements from them and

they are very conflicting. Some say one thing and some say another. I do not want to make any criticism unless I have it authenticated by the Hon. Minister himself. I do not want to say that they should get something more, but there seems to be some dissatisfaction about the pension which they are allowed. Some feel that some of them get more than others because of their circumstances. I feel Government should go into that matter and I hope that the Minister will be able to give the figures as early as possible.

Let us face facts. Discharged lepers are not really employed because according to the law they cannot be employed in certain places and in certain jobs. It is just because of the society in which we live. We are prone to abide by what is laid down in Holy Writ but some of us need to change our views about lepers.

10.30 p.m.

I am suggesting with all humility to the Minister of Social Services that he should give further consideration to what is said here to-day about bringing in an Act to employ them. In a small community like Barbados if people know you are a discharged leper there are certain jobs you cannot get. The Hon. Minister said that he knew that some were employed. Of course, I have seen some employed who go fishing, and even that creates a prejudice; people go in a corner, they do not wish to buy fish from people who were lepers. It seems to me that instead of amending the Act the Minister of Social Services should give them two shillings a day and Barbadians would prefer to know you did this. It is an unfortunate affliction human beings cannot ward off, and for which Medical men cannot find a remedy. Therefore, I would be satisfied to know if Medical Scientists have found anything to allay the disease. Nobody, no matter what you do, is going to employ them. Show me anyone of them you know as a domestic servant. I have had a case at the Board of Guardians in St. Michael of a girl who went to the Leprosarium, when five years old, spent fifteen years there, and came out ten years ago, and when we questioned her we found out every job she applied for and somebody passed and saw her and said she was in the Leprosarium, out of the people's work she went. I am suggesting that you get the figures from the Social Welfare Department; the figures of the lepers discharged from the Institution and give them 30c. a day. If you have to give them \$15 a month so that they can at least exist, do so; but do not amend the Act so that people will employ lepers, if that is the advice from the Social Welfare Department. The Minister is a doctor and if he had a job to do he would be satisfied from the scientific point of view, but he would have to satisfy his family like all of us. You cannot amend the Laws and expect you are going to rectify that; so I suggest inasmuch as you cannot give the figures of how many are aided, I ask for them in the near future, because I have had a number of discharged lepers applying to the Poor Law Guardians for help and the little which is given by Government has got to be augmented. I think that would be more satisfactory than amending the Act, I would suggest this is where the Social Welfare Department should do a little work. As a matter of fact, I am going to make a very strong statement to the Minister of Social Services. I see secretaries from the various Departments here to give their Ministers information—this is a very important Head; don't you think that somebody should be here with the Minister to give this information? It is not that the Minister as Chairman is disinterested, but you do not have all the various information at your

finger-tips, and this is a Department very important to this island and you are dealing with discharged lepers. We would like to know to-night because we would like to suggest an increase. So much for that. I feel the Minister will get the necessary information forthcoming very soon, but please, Mr. Acting Chairman, do not come here and say you are amending this Act. You can amend the Act and say lepers can be employed in everything; but people are not going to employ them. The Minister knows well enough there would be nothing in taking them, but the public would react. A doctor in Trinidad said there was nothing wrong in letting lepers out in Port-of-Spain. He felt strongly on it and let all the lepers out in Port-of-Spain. What happened? Medical Science says there is nothing wrong, but so long as human beings exist they will react. The reason why much attention is not paid to T.B. is because it is not mentioned in the Holy Writ. It is not contagious nor hereditary like T.B. and all that, but you will find that human beings stand shy of lepers. I hope the Hon. Minister will be able to give the necessary information in a very short time.

Now, Sir, take Item 12, \$2,000 Travelling Expenses. We are not parsimonious with it, and I cannot see the necessity for it, for the Social Welfare Department of this colony. You have money for travelling; let it be understood that this Travelling Allowance is for travelling in the interest of the Social Welfare Department and there is so much to be done. The Hon. Minister of Social Services must realise that there is a lot to be done and all is not well with this Department. I hope the time is not far, when we will soon get in truth and in fact by nature of up-bringing somebody interested in human beings, and underprivileged human beings, because I believe that a Social Welfare Officer must be a person not drawing a salary but interested in human beings, and I hope that the time is not very far when we will have a real Social Welfare Officer who will be able to do some work for the social amelioration of the people in this country.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am speaking on Item 12. I would be glad if the Hon. Minister in charge would remind us as to how many persons benefit from this \$2,000 which it is proposed to be voted, whether the Social Welfare Officer alone or how many more? Reference was just made to the absence of anyone in this Chamber to brief the Minister at a moment's notice. I remember last year we were favoured with the presence of Mr. Thompson from that office, but since he has been removed to the Probation Office, there does not seem to be anybody capable or willing to come from that office and be available to assist at any information although we are asked to vote \$2,000 for travelling. We may have been told in the past but there is nothing to remind us of the fact that there were many, and, Sir, I notice under Item 11, Transportation—the Note reads—

“To cover incidental travelling expenses of voluntary Social Workers.”

I gather that in connection with the clothing which was sent out here and which that Department received that certain voluntary workers worked at Combermere in connection with the sale of these articles. I presume this is intended to cover their incidental travelling expenses of these and other people. I would like to know if this is so. Can the Hon. Minister tell us whether there has been an inventory of the items which were sent to us and which were received, and if he has been able to satisfy himself that all of them can be satisfactorily accounted for?

10.40 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I have a regular system with regard to this travelling. Every week

they have to tell me where they are going, what they propose to do in the coming week, the various places where they go; then they have to report that they have been to those places, so many miles have been travelled here and there, and the amount is totalled at the end of the month. I think that that is a very good system [Mr. LEWIS: In theory.] with which I have found no fault. As far as the number of people are concerned, there are four of them.

Mr. LEWIS: I am glad to hear that the Hon. Minister has a system for checking on these things. I notice that there has been a reduction of \$100 in respect of this Item, and that is due to the fact that there has been a check-up, and they have found that they have been working on \$100 too much. Perhaps it is not that. [Laughter]. They have removed from the Garrison, they have opened a building in Roebuck Street, and they are confined to selling. There is a question which is often asked: who takes care of the caretaker's daughter when the caretaker is out? I should like to ask: who checks the speedometer?

The question that the sum of \$10,857 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XLII—Controls, Subsidies, Etc.

Head XLII — Controls, Subsidies, etc. — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$440,152 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I am taking up the Hon. Premier on a legal point. He has lost his reputation as a Lawyer, and I am losing mine now. In so far as the Executive Committee is concerned, this is what the Executive Committee Act says:—

“Towards the close of every year, it shall be the duty of the Executive Committee to prepare estimates in detail of the probable revenue and expenditure of the Colony for the year next ensuing”

The Estimates show what is fixed by law, and what is not fixed by law. If you turn to the front of these Estimates, you will see Part I, Current Estimates, Estimated Revenue, and Estimated Expenditure. The Estimates include what is to be voted, and what is fixed by law. When it comes to what we will do after we have passed these Heads, the side note of the Act says this:— “Sums not fixed by law to be embodied in an appropriation Act, and unexpended balances to lapse.”

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Under what Head is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. LEWIS: Under Head XLII.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Under what Item is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. LEWIS: I have to choose the Item from both columns. It seems to me that next year's Estimates will come in only with the Head “To be voted.” I am not saying that we treat the Estimates correctly, because we can take the opportunity of speaking on the Heads generally, and let the Hon. Minister reply as to what they are going to do.

I know that once you start with controls, you will hang on to them because you feel that it gives you a little power over something. These things do not wither away after you have started them. Can the Hon. Premier or the Hon. Minister of Trade really justify this large staff which is still having to do with the controls in this Colony so many years after the war has been ended? The satisfaction of the public can be obtained by competent persons who are checking prices. Whenever I talk to Barbadians about

these controls, they tell me that the people in the United Kingdom want them; well, let them send out somebody or put somebody out here to deal with this matter. I want to say that the control which is going on, is nothing to do with Barbados. The people of Trinidad have turned this control into a Government Department, called it by a different name, and here we are carrying on currency control and all these things which are totally useless, to my way of thinking.

10.50 p.m.

We never know who is allocating hard currency or soft one. It can be controlled by the Banks and you can get an inspector to go around and see that the Banks distribute the quotas in the way they should if you are still controlling it, and publish the list of the people who get it every month. These controls are really put there for a purpose. They are kept on for that purpose but the only purpose they serve is to keep people in big business in bigger business and the small people from getting along. Of course, Government probably gets more revenue that way, but probably it would give more satisfaction to have more people in business. I really feel the time has come when we should cut down the staff of the Controller of Supplies.

I am glad to hear that the people in that Department have been able to assist in other respects after the hurricane and that they have been doing something like that. I have always said that you have good people there but their talent is wasted. This Government can carry on an insurance scheme with the people at that Department running it. With a little training, the people there who have a knowledge of statistics should be able to run an insurance business. Government every now and then is creating another bit of insurance. It has insurance for Workmen's Compensation, Third Party Insurance, Fishing Boats Insurance and other bits of insurance. Let Government do it for itself. Is the Government afraid of business of that sort that it allows somebody else to take the risk? Government takes out insurance for people in its own group, in its own corporation like the Natural Gas Corporation, for the sake of giving them a pension. It is silly. Why should this Government ask somebody else to put up a scheme of insurance to it when Government can put it up itself? Do not tell me that the revenue in the Treasury cannot back that and give these people a pension at the end of their time of service. It is good working experience for you to run your own insurance.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Acting Chairman, this is a very useful Department. It is useful by keeping a staff so that Government can call on it to do other jobs. During the last emergency, this Department has supplied officers for work in the rehabilitation and rehousing of the people. It has served its purpose.

Let us face facts. The idea of this Department being created is the result of a wartime measure. What is done by this Department can be done, as the last honourable member who spoke has suggested, in a much more simplified form. The Controller of Supplies is an anachronism. Competition in Bridgetown among merchants has put an end to your need for such a Department. There are isolated cases when prices of certain articles rise, just as the other day when there was a shortage of potatoes and onions caused by the strike and the few people in Busby's Alley pushed the prices up to something like 10c. per pound for English potatoes. The merchants were accused of exploitation according to what was written in the Labour paper, the *Beacon*. [A VOICE: What about the time when flour was decontrolled?] Since flour has been decontrolled, the price has gone down. [A VOICE: It went up.] Who pushed it up? The

merchants in Barbados did not push it up. We do not control the price of flour in Barbados; the people in Canada do. Government decontrolled flour just as the price was going up in Canada and it did go up in Barbados. That does not mean that competition in Bridgetown and Roebuck Street does not control the prices of articles. Commerce is competitive in Barbados. It applies to provisions as well as dry goods. I will go as far as to say that if to-morrow there are more lawyers in Barbados, they will cut the prices which are charged for litigation. As a matter of fact, I heard in the Lobby of this House of the cut-throat prices which lawyers are at present charging.

Subsidies are the one thing which this Department now administers. When it comes to fish and pork, those items are controlled by two people and the subsidies can be easily done by the Customs Department, whenever Government would like to save money on this Department. In the event of a drought, or when you are pressed for money, this is a little reserve to which you can look for money and find it. This Department is also a reserve of manpower to which Government can utilise at any time it wants such people. When members of that Department were utilised during the emergency it was not the only time that they were taken from there and given other jobs to do. I may say that the majority of them there are so versatile that they can easily be adapted to other jobs.

Sir, I think it is time that the Hon. Minister of Commerce should get very serious and get down to this thing for the sake of getting back to normal. Conditions outside are normal whether you believe it or not. There is one thing which you have to control and that is Currency, and it is done because of the British Government.

I am taking this opportunity to ask the Hon. Minister of Commerce whether he will be able to get more hard currency for trade in general in order that we may be able to get the cost of living down. I am sure if merchants are given about one thousand dollars more, the competition which will be created with the sterling area would be of benefit to everybody. That is what will get the cost of living down. I see that other smaller West Indian Colonies have got it.

11.00 p.m.

I am not making this application for getting motor-cars, the money can be better spent; but for consumer goods and things of that sort where you can create competition, not in Barbados but outside. Let the sellers to Barbados compete with each other. The Hon. Minister can see to the earning of hard currency for Barbados. We are earning some now in molasses. That could be put to the British Government because I claim I am as loyal as anybody else in here and I wish to see the sterling strengthened. It would be in our interest: but we do not want all the others to spend a million dollars and not leave some for us and I only want them for the purpose of making a deduction for the countries that sell to us.

Mr. VAUGHAN: What I want to emphasise, is the lack of discretion in exercising control legislation. A friend was good enough to write me some months ago and ask me to send my measurements and he would send me a gift of a suit. I did so. A brand new suit was bought and sent to me, but was returned to the sender within four weeks. I only knew that after I heard from him again. I had no notice from the Post Office and even if I could pull strings I did not know in fact that something had come for me. At least, they could have said something was there and that I should come to the Post Office and explain. That is not exercising discretion. I can say nothing else but that it is per-

sonal spite, because after all I am a public figure and they should have sent to tell me something.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Is the hon. member speaking now, under control or under subsidisation of clothing?

Mr. VAUGHAN: I would not have minded paying a subsidy on it.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Acting Chairman, the hon. members who complained about staff at the Control Department, will notice that this year it is a decrease of \$5,813. The number of Clerks has been reduced from 15 to 12, the number of Inspectors from six to five and they will have seen that we have made a reduction of staff. As far as the last point raised by the hon. junior member for Christ Church is concerned about the relaxation of control and creation of competition we have removed control from a number of items. In theory and practice it does not work out. We are sticking to our policy as announced in the Five Year Plan where you can allow relaxation of control if relaxation will not keep them out.

The question that the sum of \$440,152 be voted under Head XLIII—Controls, Subsidies, Etc. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

Head XLIII—Contribution from Revenue

Head XLIII — Contribution from Revenue — was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$250,000 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Acting Chairman, this is one of the jokes we got put on us at one time when somebody wanted to be smart, \$250,000 as a contribution from the Revenue! You expect to collect \$250,000 from Capital Expenditure and \$½ million from Revenue Balance. Can that make any sense?

The question that the sum of \$250,000 be voted under Head XLIII — Contribution from Revenue, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Annexed Estimates: Post Office

Annexed Estimates: Post Office, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In moving the Annexed Estimates I wish to include Item 40 increased by \$910 to purchase an adding machine and a calculating machine for the Post Office.

I beg to move that the sum of \$301,773 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to ask what is the reason for the increase expected in the Revenue from the Post Office of \$59,300.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, in view of that, I notice that Item 35 is for the provision of a direct line at certain Post Offices, including one in St. Lucy. Of course, that telephone will naturally be very needy and useful, but I was sorry I was not here when Item 46, under Head XXV, Public Works was being discussed re re-roofing of Post Office. This telephone is proposed to be installed at the St. Lucy's Post Office which is about to be re-roofed in the present location. May I remind the Cabinet that some years ago Government had promised to give favourable consideration to the removal of that Post Office to a central site. I gather they have overlooked that view of the removal from the present site and they propose to install the telephone in the present inconvenient and unsuitably located site. It is rather a pity that it has been overlooked and I am going to have re-

course in any matter of importance to bring it up every year instead of leaving it as I did in the case of the St. Lucy's Post Office.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I would like to ask if when we pay the subsidy to B.W.I.A. that will in any way reduce the amount under Item 20.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is one of the conditions. There is a point in what the hon. junior member for the City has said. No foreign line can carry any passengers between us and Trinidad. Some British Company would have to be subsidised. To answer the hon. member, even with what Revenue they are getting from other islands for carrying mail, they need to be subsidised and with all this talk about Pan American Airlines, they are the most heavily subsidised airlines in the world; so there is no point in that. So even with all this Revenue they do not make money; they still need money.

11.10 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: What I am after is this. I remember that in 1943, we did not favour a proposal put to us by B.W.I.A. and I understand that that resulted in something like £10,000 a year being paid for the carrying of mails. I am just wondering if the other Islands are still benefiting from this arrangement since 1943; if that is so, and we have come along with them, we should certainly benefit from it too. However, I do not understand the matter sufficiently to be able to discuss it, but I raise the question so that it can be considered. I should like to know whether these Islands are still benefiting from that arrangement; that is one of the questions which I would like to be answered when we come to discuss the Agreement with these people. I understand that the sum which we had to pay because we did not enter the Agreement at the time was colossal; I want the Hon. Minister of Communications to discuss that aspect of the matter because it might help us in the future. I understand that we are waiting on some other Islands. I realise that this Company has to carry mails from here to be put on other planes to be taken elsewhere; but B.W.I.A. are the main carriers from Barbados.

Mr. GODDARD: I think that the hon. member is on the right track. Are we paying a greater rate for carrying our mail than what Trinidad is paying? There was a time when a letter from here to Trinidad cost 8c. for postage by air, and one from Trinidad to Barbados cost 6c.; that was because we were paying a higher rate than what Trinidad was paying. Are we being charged the same rate by B.W.I.A. as they are charging Trinidad? Do they belong to some Agreement with which we do not belong, and that is resulting in a greater charge being put on us? Of course, that is a matter which will be dealt with when the Agreement comes up for consideration.

If the Hon. Minister has not got the answer tonight, the matter need not be gone into tonight but it has to be gone into. If B.W.I.A. is losing money, the Company would lose much more, if it had not been for the flights to Barbados. The same thing applies to any other Airline which is coming here; I can speak with authority about T.C.A. Those planes leave Montreal and Toronto on two flights a week, and 80% of the passengers go to Trinidad. That also applies to the Viscounts. Do not let them think that we are not contributing anything to them. We are contributing something in that we have good hotels in Barbados, and this Island is a most desirable place to which one can come. Barbados out of the picture, and B.W.I.A. will fold up; if they are losing money, they will lose tons of

money more if Barbados were to drop out of the schedule.

Mr. LEWIS: I will let the hon. member into a secret. When this difference was made in the cost of sending a letter from Barbados to Trinidad and *vice versa* I see that there was some International Regulation whereby a letter between two points could not be charged for at any greater rate. I have made some enquiries and I was told that the reason for the difference is that Trinidad was further away from Barbados than Barbados was from Trinidad! [Laughter].

Hon. M. E. COX: The only concession to which we agreed was a percentage reduction in fares for the Governor and for the Government Officials. However, I will check up on the matter and see if the hon. member's information is accurate; but I was under the impression that we are paying the same rate which Trinidad is paying. It is a fact that Trinidad used to pay 6c. to send a letter here by air, and we used to pay 8c. to send a letter there. However, as I say, I will look into the matter.

On the question of the revenue in connection with this Head, detailed information is given on page 125 of the Estimates. More letters are sent by airmail, and although not as many stamps are being sold through the Crown Agents, we still anticipate an increase of \$50,000 net.

Mr. LEWIS: We do not expect to have any celebrations next year; so therefore let us start off this year with the proposed Federation Stamp, and put our Ministerial Buildings on the stamp. There must be something which we can celebrate in Barbados every year. After all, if people are willing to buy these stamps, well, change the present ones and sell these stamps to them.

11.20 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Acting Chairman, I was under the impression, rightly or wrongly, that used clothes coming from the United States of America for poor people was admitted free of duty. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister of Commerce if I am right. Was there not such a law passed recently? [A VOICE: It was repealed.]

Hon. M. E. COX: If clothing come in to an approved organisation for distribution it is admitted duty free. Some time ago, it was coming in duty free but the Act was amended between 1950 and 1951 and that privilege ceased. I think it was an international agreement.

The question that the sum of \$301,773 be voted to Annexed Estimates—Post Office—was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PART II — CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

A — Loan Funds Postponed

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am asking leave to postpone A — Loan Funds and to go to B — Available Funds. I do not remember if that Item is to be quoted in a separate Resolution or if it is proceeded with in the normal way. Apparently, I moved it in the normal way last year. In any event we can go on to B — Available Funds.

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

B — Available Funds

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, under I.—Housing, we have the necessary provision for terraced housing but we have to insert provision for prefabricated housing. This will be Item 2. Hurricane; Prefabricated housing, \$37,500, which is half of the sum that is estimated it will need for prefabri-

ated houses. As honourable members know, the other half will come from Labour Welfare Funds. This will make the total under the Head \$168,500. I beg to move that the sum of \$168,500 stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: In seconding that motion, I would like to say that the Director of the Public Works Department has found that his calculation of prefabricated houses has worked out to a little more than the first figure given. For the first 500 houses that were built it has been found that another \$50,000 was needed and as a result we have had to increase that vote by \$50,000. We agreed to build by a supplementary Resolution another 250 prefabricated houses which would cost \$75,000; but as half of that amount will be taken from the Labour Welfare Fund, and half from the Treasury, that is the reason why we are now asking for \$37,500 for that item. It is hoped that that will finish the complete construction of those houses.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, in connection with these prefabricated houses, I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister in charge can give this Committee any information about the officials who had been employed and who have given such invaluable overtime services. I am wondering whether they have been considered and adequately remunerated for such services. Of course, we know that Mr. Lashley, the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board, has been awarded the M.B.E., but I am referring now to the seconded Clerks and the Key Foremen. I am wondering if any information is forthcoming as to whether these people have received any recognition. The recognition which means more in this materialistic age is the financial one and I think everyone will agree with that. I trust that these people have not been overlooked and that the Hon. Minister who is responsible will see to it that they receive consideration and that we will be invited to do the necessary by way of a Resolution in this House to ensure that justice is done to them.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Acting Chairman, the Housing Authority, which is a recent creation of this House is the authority which is to carry through the larger programme of this Housing. Now, there are certain Public Servants who because of their attitude, temperament and outlook should be confined to a desk and should never come into contact with members of the public. I have been made aware through the recent rehabilitation of the people as a result of the hurricane that certain applicants whose houses had been smashed and who have not yet been considered or have any hope of being considered, seem to be regarded by some of the employees of the Housing Board as nuisances. They applied to the Housing Board and stated the condition of their calamity and certain Public Servants employed by that Board have looked upon them as nuisances. Those people have been actually insulted. I think the policy of the new authority in the selection of its employers and one which its members should keep uppermost in their minds, is that certain Public Servants who think that the humble citizen applying for loans for housing is becoming a nuisance. It is a fact that you have now a few who are actually doing the policy of the Government harm. The attitude of some of these Public Servants will cause this Government to lose the vote of many people. It is not the fault of the Government.

11.30 p.m.

Inasmuch as the Minister says he is nothing to do with employment, yet I am hard to believe that if a Minister tried his best to see that certain people were employed, they would not be employed. The responsibility rests with them to give satisfaction to the public.

Mr. LEWIS: I am rising on a point of Order. I was under the impression that we were doing page 130.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We are dealing with page 131 (b) Housing, and I should have asked to take that separately.

I beg to move that the sum of \$168,500 be voted under Part II Capital Expenditure (B) Housing.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Acting Chairman, I understand that the estimates that were made for the pre-fabs were inadequately compiled and as a result after we had voted money on two occasions, we then realised that we did not have as many houses as had been anticipated and for that reason they had to come back to-day. Whether they left out these concrete blocks which are for the ground sill, or whether the houses cost more I do not know; but I am asking the Minister now: is this sum of money just a correction of the Estimate or is he going to increase these pre-fabs over and above what they have already come to the House for? Because I felt on the second occasion after discussing it with the Authorities who were allocating these pre-fab houses that we could have done with another 500 houses and that we should not underestimate them because none of the houses that were condemned should have been repaired. We do not have to have another hurricane; a forty-mile wind would throw down some of the houses put back up. Well, the housing leaves a lot to be desired; and I would ask if he is considering an increase on these pre-fab houses, and I would also like him to take this opportunity of telling the Committee whether it is his intention after the Estimates are all settled, to come back to the House for more money to continue repairs to the hurricane-damaged houses. I am sure he would see to-night that he would need more money: but I told him when we made the last vote that he had no right putting it in that this would be the final request for money. He did not have proper statistics and the figures he had were wrong: because when they started to report the houses, the ones that slipped off the ground sills—and they were expending \$150 in material on these houses not including the labour and the lorry—now they have come to the most damaged houses—the rotten houses—they are expending in many cases not more than \$125 including material, labour and the expenses of the lorry. These houses should be expending over \$200 in material on them because they were the most damaged houses and the people are dissatisfied because they are holding out that they have been waiting in shelters, lodging with neighbours, their houses have rotted on the ground and now they were getting a raw deal by having less expended on their houses than those repaired first. I am asking you to give a proper figure and get the necessary money to repair those that have been half done. I am going to ask you to let the Housing Board set up a proper Investigating Committee. What the honourable junior member for St. John said is perfectly true. These people go to the Housing Board and are turned around. They are frustrated and getting really disappointed because they feel the money is running out and they are going to be left out and I am asking you to put these two things right. You have to set up a proper organisation where these complaints can be investigated. Let people go out with motor cars and find out, because some are genuine and some are not.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the Committee unduly on the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. John about persons employed by the Housing Authority who might not be favourably disposed to the Government.

He also mentioned that it would cause the Government to lose votes and that sort of thing. I know of no new people appointed to the Housing Authority. As a matter of fact, there are only a few people as far as I remember seconded from the Control Board. I do not know if he is referring to any particular person from that Department, but if he is I do not know of any appointment, but surely we cannot have people who are not prepared to pull their weight and go along with the policy of the Government; and while it is true that I do not interfere with any appointments or anything like that, yet at the same time if I knew of anybody who was operating adversely to the policy of the Government, I would draw it to the attention of the authorities and try and see that that person is removed. Every man is entitled to his political belief, but when it comes to a Government servant, he must serve the Government in power faithfully whether he likes it or not, with the hope that one of these days he would get rid of that Government, because it is not what he likes or dislikes, but what the people of the island say. So I assure the honourable member that now that he has raised that point, I will make a little enquiry. As I said, no new person as far as I know has been appointed; maybe there were one or two people seconded from other Departments, especially the Control Department to the Housing Board in this emergency.

11.40 p.m.

A point was raised by the honourable junior member for Christ Church as regards the additional amount required for the completion of these houses. He wanted to find out whether this amount is for the purpose of completing these houses, or whether we were adding to the number on which we have already decided. Originally, the number was 500, and we came back with a Resolution for 250. That is not to be added to the number, but the Director of Public Works has pointed out that he has to transport these houses to the various sites after they have been built, and the calculation is slightly out of line. I do not think we have done badly in this matter in the circumstances.

On the question of the repair of houses, the cost has been reduced, not because the same attention has not been given to these houses, but because there has been a substantial reduction in overhead expenses. I must say quite frankly that when the hurricane came down, and we decided to go around repairing these houses, we used quite a number of untrained people. I was surprised to know that certain people who knew absolutely nothing about the matter, were appointed as Supervisors and some of them only wanted to run around and draw a salary, so that we found that the cost of these houses was high.

It is also true to say that some honourable members felt that it was a good thing to get around and let their constituents see if we would decide that we would give help by way of material and even labour; and some honourable members thought it better to state the amount of stuff which should be delivered to the individual. I do not think that that was right, because a member would hardly know how much material it would take to repair "John Jones'" house; that member might sit down and say "deliver so much and so much material." We have been able to get rid of quite a number of these Supervisors, and we have been using Foremen Carpenters, people who know what they have to do.

I would like to let the honourable member know that we have on the list over 15,000 houses claimed to have been damaged by the storm; we could not lose more than one-third of our houses in the storm, but some people seized the opportunity of getting their houses repaired, and the whole thing resulted in a

repairs programme, rather than a hurricane rehabilitation programme. If I had done what the honourable member had suggested and had a Committee set up to make investigations, we might have got something like 3,000 houses on the list. Up to now, a fairly good check has been done and there are only about 300 houses to be repaired now.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have heard it said that Jamaica has been very long in dealing with their hurricane destruction, but the two places are not on all-fours. The terrain there is nothing as simple as it is in Barbados, and there is no encouragement to tell a man who has had his house damaged in Barbados, that in Jamaica the houses have not been attended to since the hurricane in 1951.

11.50 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have had complaints about the repair of these houses just as I suppose other honourable members have had. Some people have come to me and told me that their houses were not repaired properly. I know that some of these complaints have been investigated and found not justifiable but I think there are others which are justifiable. I would invite the Hon Minister to send somebody else to see whether the first inspector really made out a proper case. You will get some results from so doing.

The question that the sum of \$168,500 be voted under Head I—Housing was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head II — Medical Services

Head II,—Medical Services, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$715,000 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I would like to enquire where the Cottage Hospital will be put. Are you converting one of the almshouses into a Cottage Hospital? I ask that question because I know you have to wait until the coming into effect of the Maude Bill to start building it and that is not likely to happen until next year.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I may say that the whole thing is still unsettled. If we have to embark on the building of a new Hospital we will have to shelve the question of Cottage Hospitals because we will have to deal with the new Hospital first. It is proposed to put one of these Cottage Hospitals in the northern part of the island and one in the southern part, but as I have said, it is bound up with the question of a new Hospital.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it that the question of a new Hospital will be something which the Legislature will have to go into.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Oh yes.

The question that the sum of \$715,000 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head III — Education

Head III,—Education, was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$1,095,200 be voted under this Head. As regards where the open air school will be, I will like to say that we thought of St. Christopher and then of putting it in St. John; and a day or two ago another idea has been put up about the possibility of having to build a Westbury Girls' School because of destruction caused by the hurricane. However, I will promise the honourable members to give them the informa-

tion as soon as it is ready. I will say that this open-air school is intended to be by way of an experiment. To my mind, we all think that it should be put in the country. I think I will approve of the latest suggestion I have heard. However, before it is actually under consideration, I will invite the House to approve of where it is going to be put.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: I wonder if the Hon. Premier has seen the St. John's Boys' School. Has he ever looked at it recently to see that it is a structure which is disgraceful to the educational standard of this island?

The question that the sum of \$1,095,200 be voted was put and resolved in the affirmative.

Head IV — Agriculture

Head IV—Agriculture was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, Agriculture, an addition is to be made in respect of fish pots. The number that was lost seems to be more than asked for at first and it is proposed to ask for another \$15,000 for this purpose. That will come under Item 9, Hurricane; Rehabilitation of fishing fleet. The total under the Head will now go to \$1,166,500. I beg to move that the sum of \$1,166,500 be now voted under this Head.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I am glad to see that something is put in for the victims of the hurricane. I refer to those people who lost their windmills and it appears as if there was quite a lot of them. It is a fact that almost every windmill was damaged.

I cannot see you using the sum of \$200,000 for soil conservation nor can I see you spending all the money on the Fish Depot. As regards the loans to fishermen for fishing boats, I think your action is very commendable. I know that is only a part. However, if it is placed in a Revolving Fund according to you, it will mean that the sum of \$150,000 would be available to be loaned out. I know that the applications for loans are large and I visualise that sum will be expended by October.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am going to ask the Hon. Premier to sit down quietly one of these days and think of the criticism which I make on these Heads. Now, a loan cannot be termed as expenditure. But if you are putting money into a Revolving Fund it has no right to be put under the Appropriation Act. If this loan to fishermen is going to be put into a Revolving Fund it has no right to be put in the Appropriation Act. Let us have a Resolution for a sum for that to be advanced from the Public Treasury. You cannot vote an amount under an expenditure head and then use it as a sum to be put in a Revolving Fund which you will get back. It cannot be termed as expenditure.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: How else should it be done? Isn't it appropriate that everything that is expended under a particular Head should be shown under a particular Head? If by chance that the loan is not paid back into the Treasury, what does it matter if the explanation is given in the Note? When you loan money to people, that is expenditure until it is paid back to you. It comes back to you. But if you said it is a loan to fishermen but when it is repaid you will loan it to other fishermen, you still expend it on other people. You know for certainty that the money you have there will always be there to expend on other people. Of course, I see the hon. member's point of view that it is not complete expenditure if it is changed from money to buildings

it is still there to see. This makes no difference as far as setting out the Estimates are concerned. 12.02 a.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I know the hon. member's views. He believes if you are taking money out it is not necessary whether you take it out of one pocket and put it into another.

What I would say, Sir, is that this is money that is being advanced from the Treasury. It is what you call advance from the Treasury. That is not how the Appropriation Act reads as regards money you are going to advance from the Treasury, and repay as in a Resolution with the word "advance" in it. When you make your assets and liabilities you put down this amount that you have for the Fishermen Revolving Fund. This is a fund that you regard not as an expenditure but as an asset. However, Sir, I am merely asking him to discuss it with the Financial Secretary and see if you should have it in the Estimates. It is the same as your Revolving Fund for the factories. That cannot be regarded as an advance from the Treasury but it is an asset to the Island and some account should be kept. The repayments do not go back into the Treasury. We have a system by which the interest is paid back to the Treasury but not the repayment; and therefore, you will only come for more money if you exhausted this. For instance, the Emigration Scheme is another one. I am appealing that there may be a third phase to our dealing with the Estimates, so let us put things straight; but you come and tell me you expended so much and the people did not pay back and you are forced to spend from your own Revenue.

The question that the sum of \$1,166,500 be voted under Part II—Capital Expenditure—IV Agriculture was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head V—Communications

Head V — Communications—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$491,490 be voted under this Head.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am speaking on Item 4, Flood Prevention works, \$20,000. That is for the construction of two dams in the Constitution Valley. Well, as a matter of interest I would like to show where I think that money could be spent to a better advantage would be in St. Matthias, Bourne's Land. When the rain falls, they become flooded and they are really a lot of poor people's houses that are affected. There are dozens and dozens of houses and the water comes through Pavilion Court. It is really a tragic scene—not created by a big flood, but any two or three inches of rain opens new tracks. I admit it runs through private tenantry but that is a matter of investigation; and I hope that you will take a note of that and ask your Engineer of Works, on the very next occasion that rain falls, to go out there and see the conditions for himself. If he likes to phone me up, I do not have a rain coat but I will go; and that is where the money can be expended. It might not need an awful lot, but the water needs channelling through the flood area to save hardship to those people in the big tenantry in that area. I am asking you to put that on your notes and investigate the possibility of rectifying it as soon as possible.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I believe the people living in that district should have brought the matter to the notice of the Minister, and I have no doubt now that the hon. member has brought up the matter to the Minister. He will have an investigation as soon as possible.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Acting Chairman, on Item 8, provision for the Re-construction of Quarters of Customs Officer at Seawall Airport, I am going to appeal to the Minister for Social Services. I am of the opinion that accommodation is needed not only for the Customs Officer up there, but also for the Medical man. I look back here under Medical and do not see it. I am saying that both the Sanitary Inspector and the Customs Officer are finding it very hard at present since the hurricane.

Hon. Dr. H. G. F. CUMMINS: The Sanitary authority had quarters for years.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not saying you should give him a new one, but you should inspect it and have it put in order.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as I remember the Director proposes to sink those dams southwest of Comrie. And I . . .

Mr. LEWIS: Can anybody tell me anything about this bar in the carenage? I understand a contract was awarded and it has been left in the air, and I would like to know if you had to abandon the scheme of widening, because news has reached me that the Government and the contractor do not seem to be able to get to any finality, and nobody knows whether Government would continue this scheme. If it has been abandoned, let us know; but do not go on putting it in here and you cannot make any headway with it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I would like to inform the hon. member it is not the policy of Government to abandon the deepening of this Carenage Bar. We have had no end of trouble with the gentleman to whom the contract was awarded. Since he was awarded the contract he has put up all sorts of schemes, suggestions, obstacles and so on. He has of course, the hon. senior member for St. George as adviser and with the Attorney General and the Queen's Solicitor we have had endless negotiations and discussions with him. We are verging on finality now and the only thing holding us up is the question of insuring the Pier Head walls. You know the Pier Head was damaged during the hurricane and we are now awaiting the decision of the insurers. When we get that decision I think we will get ahead with it, but we have had no little trouble with the contractor.

Mr. LEWIS: Did I understand the hon. senior member for St. George is giving engineering advice or legal advice? I am glad to know something is being done.

Hon. M. E. COX: Legal advice, as far as I know.

The question that the sum of \$441,490 be voted under Part II—Capital Expenditure—Head V—Communications was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
12.10 a.m.

Head VI—Miscellaneous

Head VI—Miscellaneous—was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am asking leave, Mr. Acting Chairman, to make an amendment under this Head.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The amendment is the addition of a new Item as follows:

Item 9 (New)—Hurricane Reconstruction: Repairs to Sea wall—\$11,000.

Provision of \$11,000 to meet the cost of repairs to the sea wall aback of Government land at Prince Street.

I beg to move that the sum of \$232,912 be voted under this Head.

Hon. M. E. COX: In seconding that motion, I think the Committee should know that when these premises were rented to Messrs. Wilkinson & Haynes, it was in the Agreement that the Company should keep the walls in good repair and pay the sum of £175 per year. But it has been decided that the Government should undertake the repairs for obvious reasons, and charge the Company an economic rent. We have decided to do that, and that is why we have come here for this amount of \$11,000 for the purpose of carrying out the repairs to these walls.

Mr. GODDARD: I see in respect of Item 1, "Mechanization of Accounts," the note says that this amount of \$22,000 is for the purchase of two accounting machines. For which Department are these machines required?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: They are for the Treasury. The Accountant General has recommended the acquisition of these machines. It was also recommended by Mr. Foster, and the cost should be included in the Capital Estimates.

The question that the sum of \$232,912 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RE-COMMITTAL OF HEAD XIII

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am asking leave to re-commit Head XIII of the Current Estimates.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It has been drawn to our attention, and I have drawn it to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Social Services who has complained of the lack of towels in our lobby, that apparently the sum voted in respect of "Incidentals" under this Head has proved to be insufficient. I have had an opportunity of going through the Heads of Expenditure in relation to the House of Assembly, and I have come to the conclusion—I may say it is regrettable—that it has been overlooked that insufficient money has been voted. I am told that the Bill for the lighting of this Chamber has not been paid for since the month of June, and it may be necessary to come down to this House with a Supplementary Resolution to pay outstanding accounts. We have had to make provision for extra things for which we have not had to make provision before. I am therefore asking leave to change the amount of this Item from \$450 to \$545, which would be an additional amount of \$95 to the total. [A VOICE: What about these hard cushions?]

As regards the hardness of the cushions, I hardly realise that I was sitting on a cushion, it is so comfortable! [Laughter]. The total amount under Head XIII will now be \$34,208.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the sum of \$34,208 be voted under this Head.

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

The question that the sum of \$34,208 be voted under this Head was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I now beg to move, Mr. Acting Chairman, that you do now report the passing of several Resolutions in Committee of Supply totalling the sum of \$15,659,761 being the Estimates for the year 1956—57

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

The question was put and carried nem. con.

Mr. LEWIS: I am of the opinion that this is an act of supererogation because we have to go all over the Estimates again; but I feel that the Head, Loan Funds, should be passed in the normal way, even although you bring it under a Resolution.

12.20 a.m.

RESOLUTION APPROVING ISSUE OF ADVANCES FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURE IN 1956-57 ESTIMATES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$2,896,600 to be advanced from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded from Loan Funds.) It gives formal approval for the issue of advances to meet certain expenditure for which provision is made in these Estimates under Capital Expenditure. The Expenditure will in due course be covered by the authority of a Loan Act and the advances will be repaid when the loan or loans are raised.

The items covered by this Resolution are:—
(See page 130 of the Estimates).

Deep Water Harbour	\$ 1,300,000
Development Board	250,000
<i>Housing</i>	
Housing — Civil Servants	100,000
Housing Authority	350,000
<i>Water Supplies</i>	
Re-organisation	50,000
Additional Mains and Standposts	225,000
Replacement of Mains	100,000
District "F" Police Station	12,100
<i>Education</i>	
Loans for Higher Education	16,500
<i>Agriculture</i>	
Motor Tractors — Peasants	12,000
<i>Airport</i>	
Extension of Runway	276,000
Airport Buildings	205,000

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$2,896,600 be advanced from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded from Loan Funds) do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr Acting Chairman, I do not want to hold up proceedings of this Committee but if you give notice of the Resolution you have to move the House into Committee on it. The House is not in Committee on this Resolution. I would like to have everything straight. Another point is that when you gave notice of this Resolution, you did not give notice of your intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting on it, therefore you should move the suspension of Rules 88 & 89 to consider it now.

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

ESTIMATES AND RESOLUTION PASSED IN COMMITTEE

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions on the Estimates for 1956-57 in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

12.30 a.m.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker I am asking leave to deal with the Appropriation Act, as the next Order of the day.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I propose, Mr. Speaker, in moving this to ask that when the House goes into Committee as on previous occasions that instruction be given to the Committee to take the several Heads as read.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and that instructions be given to the House in Committee that instead of reading these Items Head by Head, the whole Bill be taken as read.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I beg to move that Clauses 1—6 with the accompanying Schedule stand part of the Bill.

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

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the Bill was read a third time and passed....

The Order Paper having been fixed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 13th March, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question was put and agreed to, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

12.40 a.m.