

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th August, 1958

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Mr. L. ST.A. THORNE; Mr. T. W. MILLER and Mr. F. G. SMITH, B.A..

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following Papers:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1958.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1958.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 15 Order, 1958.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:
Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1958."

Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1958."

Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 15 Order, 1958".

Resolution to place the sum of \$29,333 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 14, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX:

Bill to amend the Barbados Development Act, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting, in order to consider the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Barbados Development Act, 1955, be now read a first time. With your permission, Sir, I should just like to make a few remarks in respect of a Report which appeared in last Saturday's issue of the *Barbados Advocate* to the effect that a member of the Other Place had stated that the Barbados Development Board is already assisting the Tourist Industry by helping additions to Hotels and Guest Houses and by encouraging the erection of new Hotels. I want to take this opportunity to state that the Board has not made any loans for such purposes; this Bill of which I have just given notice is for the purpose of authorising the Board to make loans.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Chairman of Committees, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. John be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

DELAY IN DELIVERY OF ORDER PAPERS

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the business of the day, I should like to say that I have not received any Order Paper for today's meeting and I was wondering what we are going to do today. I have often heard hon. members complain about this matter, and now I have not got any Order Paper at all. I wonder what had happened.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I too, should like to join with the hon. junior member for Christ Church in saying that I have not received any Order Paper for this

meeting. I will not say anything more now. I think that complaints have already been made in this Hon. House about the non-delivery of the Order Paper. There is no use "stupsing" on the Government side. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Nobody is referring to you) I will not say anything more; it is the first time that this has happened to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: On checking with the Clerk, I am informed that the Order Papers were sent out on Saturday. I think it is a question of the usual delay which occurs on the occasion of a Bank Holiday. It may be a question of the mailing of these Order Papers.

Mr. HOLDER: I received my Order Paper last Saturday afternoon, and I am wondering if the others have gone astray or what.
3.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58 NO. 13.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I must first of all call your attention to the difference between the sums stated on the Order Paper and the actual amount in the Resolution. On the Order Paper the amount is \$24,484, but the Resolution has \$20,484, which I believe is correct. I must also take this opportunity to say that I have been instructed that this mistake was not made by the Printery.

This is a Supplementary Estimate and as is the custom I should like to take the items Head by Head.

Head V - Harbour and Shipping - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This is a revote for the sum of \$6,000 which was provided in the 1957-58 Estimates for the purpose of fitting oil-filled metal fenders to the "Lord Combermere". Owing to unavoidable delays in the docking of the vessel, work on the replacement of the fenders had to be cancelled, and therefore this provision lapsed at the end of the last financial year.

I beg to move that Head V - Harbour and Shipping stand part.

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

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

Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Head XXVIII, as explained in the note is to assist the Barbados Association of the Blind, Deaf and Dumb. It is in two parts.

The first is an increase of \$1,250 in the annual subvention to offset the annual deficiency in revenue which the Association has for some time been sustaining.

The second part which is new is for the sum of \$1,100 to enable the Association to employ an Instructor in auditory training of deaf children for the remainder of the financial year.

I think this is a laudable effort on the part of Government to help in the training of deaf children in order that they may still be useful.

I beg to move that Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants, stand part.

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

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

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This is a new item under Miscellaneous Services for the removal of wreck from Carlisle Bay. The note states that the removal of the wreck of the schooner "Marion Belle Wolfe" which foundered at her moorings in Carlisle Bay late in 1956 is necessary for the safe navigation of small craft operating in the harbour. Government is in receipt of an offer to remove this wreck into deep water at a cost of \$250, and this Resolution seeks provision of the necessary funds.

I need not remind the House that it is not too long ago when a similar wreck was removed very successfully; so we have every reason to believe that on this occasion this will be as successfully done.

I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has reminded us that some time ago a similar wreck was successfully removed. I wonder, Sir, if he would supply us with the information as to whether the person who has made the offer to remove this wreck is the same person who successfully removed the other wreck. As you know, there may well be more than one person interested in removing wrecks; it is money-making by the person who removes these wrecks, and it is debatable whether Government should not advertise for tenders for the removal of these wrecks.

I admit that in this case the amount is comparatively small, but we are still entitled before we vote to seek information as to whom this money will be voted for, who made the offer, whether more than one offer was received, and what caused Government to accept this particular offer. Was it the last offer or one from the successful remover on a previous occasion? I would be very grateful for the information.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the previous speaker that we would like to know how far this removal is to take place. It is now in shallow water and it is a danger to small craft, but we have no information as to how far it is to be taken out to sea where it would not be a danger to shipping at all.

I should also like Government to say something about the removal of these wrecks or stones at the entrance of the Careenage. A contract was given out recently and from the newspaper we saw where the attempt to remove these stones have failed. What provision will be made for the removal and even for the clearing of that part? We are having a new Deep Water Harbour, but I do see that for a long time the Inner Basin will be used, and this is an admirable opportunity for Government to get the assistance of the existing contractors for the deepening and clearance of the bar at the entrance of the Careenage. It is a hazard. If that bar could be sunk two feet, it would be surprising to find the size of ships that could come in. We all know that there are two or three stones that came off the pier soon after the hurricane, and that is what they are asking us to remove; but further than that, I think a survey could be made and a deepening of that bar made at this time.
3.35 p.m.

I am not saying to give it to Messrs. Costain Ltd., but they are on the spot and they have the equipment; and just as they can dig up all the coral heads down by Pelican, I think a dredge can come in there and in a matter of hours dig up that bed. This is an opportunity which the Government has to have a survey made of that hazard which is facing us. It is for years to come that the Inner Basin will be used

and can be used by bigger craft. I do hope I will hear the Hon. Minister in charge of Transport enlighten us or tell us that he has already taken steps with a view to remedying this hazard.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, so far as the removal of wreck from Carlisle Bay is concerned, I do not know if hon. members will remember that sometime ago we did advertise and asked for tenders for purchasing and demolishing this wreck. Only one tender was submitted and the tenderer was paid \$250. He was not successful in his efforts to demolish that wreck and he proposed after his attempts were not successful that this wreck be turned over to the Government and we were advised to relieve him of his obligation. The Harbour Master then could only find one person who could undertake the removal of this wreck. As I have said, it was advertised and tenders were called for and only one tenderer applied.

Although the other head - Head V has been passed, I will take the liberty of replying to the hon. junior member for Christ Church and I will tell him that we have that matter under examination. We have consulted our engineers and they are going into the matter. I think the hon. member will appreciate that if anything is to be done, we will have to wait for sometime. However, we are consulting our engineers on the matter and we are considering that way of going about the matter.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister gave the information of who made the offer as regards the removal of the wreck, it was inaudible on this side of the Committee. I trust he does not regard it as a state secret. I do not suppose he has any reason to hide the name.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I said who the person was. It was Mr. Barrow.

The question that Head XXIX stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE

Annexed Estimates - Post Office was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As regards the Item, Inland Mails, under this Head, according to the note, the five year contract for the carriage of inland mails expired on the 31st March, 1958 and a new contract of five years was executed with effect from 1st April, 1958. The new contract is for the sum of \$11,304 per annum as against the sum of \$9,420 per annum of the old contract. Supplementary provision of \$1,884 is therefore required.

As regards the next Item, Postage Stamps, there has been a heavy increase in the sale of stamps with a consequential depletion of reserve stocks which must therefore be replenished. It is also proposed to reintroduce the sale of air letter forms for the convenience of the public. Supplementary provision of \$10,000 is therefore required for these services. The amount is recoverable. I beg to move that Annexed Estimates, - Post Office, stand part of these Estimates.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, looking at these two items, there are some questions which will have to be answered. When you look at the note with respect to Inland Mails, it says: "the five year contract for the carriage of inland mails expired on the 31st March 1958 and a new contract for five years was executed with effect from 1st April, 1958." Now, when you look at the Annual Estimates for 1958-59, the note as regards this same item says: "conveyance of mails between the General Post Office and the District Post Offices." No mention was made in the Annual Estimates when we were passing them that we were coming to the end of the contract for delivery of inland mails. What we want to know now is this. What obligation this House has now as regards the Government coming down now for a new contract when it was not stated to the House that the

contract was about to end at the end of the financial year? Nothing was stated in these Estimates. This is money for which we were making provision at the time we were dealing with the Estimates. This money was needed from the time these Estimates began to operate. Why was it that we were not told then that we were having a new contract for inland mails? Sir, we are quite in order today to refuse to vote for this money on the basis on which it was passed in the Estimates. Nothing was stated in the Annual Estimates that we were coming to the end of the contract. I will leave this point until later on in this debate.

I have some other criticisms to make. It was all right in the old days, when you had the type of transport services which Barbados and the whole world enjoyed, to continue the conveyance of mails on the basis of a contract; but today when everything is moving on so swiftly, what is the point of having a contract for inland mails when you can devise ways and means, if not for the purpose of saving money, for the purpose of better productivity? Barbados is 166 square miles and you have your District Post Offices strung all over the island. What is the difficulty now that your mail service is increasing in volume that you cannot integrate this carriage of inland mail as part of your postal services? Why cannot you integrate it in a scientific manner so that the mail vans which you have can be so constructed as I have seen them constructed in bigger countries, that they can carry bigger packages? In these Estimates you will see there are other amounts for freight charges. The reason why I say that is this. There should be no point in your saying that if you leave this primitive method of transporting your mails and you go to the modern method people would be put out of employment. I am thinking in terms of greater efficiency within the postal service.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I do not see why the Barbados Government could not have a fleet of vans, not necessarily the same number which are being used now. I do not believe that it is beyond the capacity of the Postmaster General to evolve a scheme in which you could have a network, because the network of roads which we have in Barbados is the best you can have in any country of this size. It would be a matter of the best utilisation of the services, and in many instances, you could give the people in this Island a quicker service than you are giving them now. I understand that these vans come in at 9.30 and 10 o'clock and they go back to the various districts around one o'clock; they arrive there between one and half past one. However, it would not take any vehicle more than one hour and a half to get to its destination. The furthest point from the General Post Office, I believe, would be in St. Lucy; I do not think that the St. Philip Branch Office is further away than St. Lucy or even the St. Andrew district. I am thinking of revamping the services so as to meet modern needs; I think the time is opportune now that we should have a change.

There is an additional point as to the people who drive these vans. These workers are regarded as Postal Workers in the United States of America and in the United Kingdom. It is not a question of spending \$9,000 or \$1,000; it is a question of bringing your postal services up to date. It is easy for any Postmaster General to evolve a system by which you can stop this contract basis. The Estimates have been taken away from me, but if you see the total amount spent on the Post Office annually, you will see that a service like this is just chicken feed in cost, but it is something which you can take account of. You want a system of labour intensification in the Service so that the maximum productivity can be obtained, and not the lowest; otherwise, you will get an inflation which will cost the country quite a lot to run and you will not be getting the service. Your standard of living is lowered when there is no productivity, and it will mean that the taxpayers of this Island are paying more for their services when they should be paying less for them.

I think that some attention should be given to the question of revamping this system. I am taking the oppor-

tunity to say that this House should refuse to renew this contract for the carrying of these mails at this stage and on the basis on which it is being done. There was no information whatever given to us during the consideration of the Estimates that it was proposed to enter into a new contract of the conveyance of these mails. I hope the debate in connection with the Natural Gas Corporation does not hold good for the Government now. If you must continue to carry on this contract, we would like to know if you advertised for tenders or if you just went ahead with this contract. I want this question answered, because it was not told us during the consideration of the Estimates if they would renew that contract. I think that that question should be answered quite clearly and unequivocally, and there should be no hedging. I do feel that when it comes to the awarding of public contracts, we have to be more than above-board; we have to satisfy the public at every stage. Everybody who is interested in that contract should have the opportunity of sending in his tender. What I have said, does not mean that I am deviating from the original stand which I am taking, that is to say, that I feel that the question of the contract in relation to the postal services has reached the stage where it should be stopped so that we can have a better service. The whole population has grown; the mail services have grown, and therefore, it is not necessary for us to contract on the same basis. You find that these drivers have to work for these private people without the sort of security which other people in the postal services are enjoying and my idea is that you should make a greater use of better productivity. Let us provide work for these people lasting eight hours. One of the dangers in this Island, is that too many.....

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member not to stray too far from the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not straying; I am dealing with the point that there are men who drive these mail vans, and I am saying that these persons who are doing this work are not supposed to be Government employees, because you give out this work on contract. My point is that you have these people as part of your postal services, and they should become Government servants, so that you will be utilising the full labour force. It is not making full use of a man where he can give eight hours' work and he is only giving you four hours' work. I say; let these people find something else to do until the time is up for them to go; if there is not active productivity, then people will get lazy. Barbados is too small for us to be able to waste manpower in the manner in which it is being done. You will not do a man any good by getting half-way productivity; it is better to give him full wages and receive full productivity. On the job analysis of the postal service, you will find that you can use these people who drive these vans for better efficiency. It may be that the mails will reach their destination more quickly and everything will go on with greater efficiency. These people will enjoy the benefits which they should enjoy, because they are working for the public indirectly, but they do not get any of the facilities which a normal public employee would receive. I feel that you should be willing to examine this matter in the light of what I have said. These are new trends and the Government should be in a position to think of a new way where you can have these new trends for the benefit of the community as a whole.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, as soon as I read the Note to this Resolution, it struck me that with this increased price in this contract, we would be called upon over a period of five years, for the duration of the contract, to supply the sum of \$56,520. I wonder whether the Government had given careful consideration, before giving any thought to the renewal of this contract, to the purchase of some vans themselves and allowing them to be run as a part of the Postal Service of this Island. I wonder whether they had thought of doing this work departmentally and whether it would not be in the interest of the taxpayers, because the private contractors must be getting a profit, otherwise they would not be doing it - whether the Government had given any thought to the purchase of vans and of running them themselves in the interest of the public and also in the interest of the people who operate the vans.

3.55 p.m.

You will agree that as far as we in this Chamber are concerned, we must ensure that the contract makes adequate provision and safeguard for the persons who operate these vans. I am wondering, Sir, if Government could not give consideration to the purchasing of a fleet of vans for themselves instead of giving this out to private contractors who make money out of Government. As you see, he has increased the new contract by \$1,884 a year, and it is a five year contract; so though he has five years for which to plan he has decided to burden the taxpayers with an additional amount of \$1,884. I am inquiring whether Government did give thought when the time was almost ripe for the expiration of the previous contract to the purchasing of vans and running them themselves, and if so, what was their reason for not deciding to have their own vans and to operate them themselves. Having got that information, I should like to know, as this is a new contract, whether tenders were called for before the new contract was entered into. In other words, I should like to know whether we had competitive prices or whether we were slavishly bound to the previous contractor who has agreed to carry on if you give him \$1,884 for the five years; and in respect of the new contract, I should like to know what provision was made for the people who drive the vans as to their security of tenure, pension rights and similar things for them, or whether the contract is silent on such points, or being a contract sponsored by Government, whether Government has seen to it that certain clauses are included to ensure the drivers of these vans, whom we are paying as we are paying for the use of the vans, are properly and adequately protected as to security of tenure, pension rights and things of that sort.

Another reason why I feel that Government should own these vans is this: I suggested on more than one occasion in this Chamber that motor transport should be provided for all postmen carrying out mails in hilly districts such as Boscobelle in St. Peter and so on. If Government owned vans, they could, as soon as the vans carried the mails in the afternoon to the Post Office let the vans carry the postmen to these hilly districts where now they have to walk or push their bicycles or use donkey carts. A van could take the postmen to Boscobelle or to the top of the hill and let him walk down and do his house to house visits with the mail. The same would apply to Graveyard and districts in St. Andrew. The accommodation of a van could be helpful to the unfortunate and not too well paid postmen in these districts, because you know that postmen are the Cinderellas of the Public Service in this island. Sometimes apart from the hilly districts, if we had vans they could take the postmen on rainy afternoons around and drop them in districts where they have to move from house to house. That is why I am trying to advocate that Government should give consideration or reconsideration although the contract is entered into and has five years to run, so that they can devolve a plan whereby they can run their own fleet of motor vans to convey the mails all over this island, instead of making the private contractor richer and richer all the time. We want to get rid of this idea of private contractors; we got rid of them in the case of the printery; why not get rid of the private contractors in the case of the Post Office?

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is an excellent one, and if Government up to now has not considered it, it is certainly high time that they gave some thought to this idea, because I know for a fact that some of the employees with this private firm who have been doing this sort of job for some twenty odd years are themselves perturbed about their future. I know of one man who has been driving the mail van in my constituency for nearly twenty years; he has almost reached the retiring age and is in the position where he has got to hold on because he does not know where he stands.

After taking into consideration that all kinds of people today are made Government Servants and that the Civil Service Establishment of this country is increasing daily by the creation of posts, to suggest that the men who drive these vans should not be made public servants too and de-

rive the benefit which other public servants derive when they do such an important service would be stupid. Despite the fact that the suggestion comes from the hon. senior member for St. Peter, although Government may be loath to accept any suggestion coming from him, I think on this occasion that his suggestion is worthy of consideration, because if you consider that there may be seven or eight vans - because I know for a fact that several parishes have not got a van - taking the initial cost and the length of life of them, you will see in the long run that it may very well be cheaper or cost very little more than it cost us at present. If the contract is worked out, it could give us three vans for a start, and if Government investigate this matter, I am sure they may very well find that the suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter is an excellent one.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister in charge of the Post Office the unsatisfactory state of affairs going on at the stamp counter. One has to lose time by having to wait and sometimes you have to go back to the job and return later to get the stamps. I do not know what is responsible for it; I do not know whether you want more clerks or whether they are a little on the lazy side, but I would be very glad if the Minister could see to it that the buying public are released as soon as possible when they go there.

The same thing applies to the Parcel Post. I myself have had to wait ever so long, and I do not know whether the Minister ever had any complaints or if any recommendations have been made to him for increasing the staff. I have been told by a certain Head of Department that he might just as well keep quiet as to try to make recommendations for more staff.

As to the selling of stamps, Sir, I feel that Government should encourage more stamp vendors in the country districts, because it is definitely true that the buyers of these stamps cannot get them when they want them. 4.05 p.m.

I know of the case of an old lady who sent her grandson to town to buy 38 cents in stamps and she had to give him his bus fare which was 28 cents. After having to wait so long at the stamp counter in Bridgetown, the bus left him and the old lady was so much perturbed owing to the fact that nobody could tell her what had become of her grandson that she then took a bus and came to town. I feel that shopkeepers in the country should be encouraged to sell these stamps but they are not going to sell them because the commission is too small. As a matter of fact there is no commission because they only get five percent to sell stamps and that is no profit at all. (A VOICE: It is only 2 1/2%.) I was thinking that it was five percent, but another hon. member has said that it is only 2 1/2%.

Now this is the position, Mr. Chairman. If you go and buy a million dollars in stamps from the Post Office to sell on commission, the stamp clerk is not going to wrap them for you; but when a person in the country buys one stamp from a vendor, he wants his stamps wrapped. Two and a half percent is no money whatsoever for commission. That commission cannot even pay for the paper to wrap the stamps, and I think if the Government would consider an increase in the commission on the sale of stamps it would be easier for buyers to get them; but the Government is not going to get shopkeepers to sell stamps when the commission is nothing at all. Take for instance, Cane Garden in St. Thomas. The people there have to walk to the St. Joseph Post Office to post their mails. It is easier for them so long as they can find the bus fare to take a bus and go to town for the same purpose. I can remember when we were going to build a Post Office in St. Joseph that I raised the point that the particular site was not the correct site for it as it should be more central in the parish, and my colleague at that time promised that he would see to it to put another Post Office at the other end of the parish so as to relieve the upper part. I am sure if something of that sort was done, not in St. Joseph alone because I know there is hardship in other parishes too in getting stamps, it would help a great deal. I know of people who have to ask the conductor of the

buses to buy stamps for them. Sometimes they give the letter and the money to buy a stamp to put on the letter and post it, and they never get a reply from that letter.

I do not think in this year of grace that you should look forward to this sort of thing. The Hon. Minister should take it upon himself to go into this matter and try to relieve these people from suffering from such great hardships. The Post Office has been moved from Hillaby all the way down in St. Andrew, and I do not think that the constituents of the Hon. Minister of Works should have to walk all the way down in St. Andrew to buy a stamp. I am therefore sure that he would take the matter up and do all he possibly can so as to relieve these people from such hardship. It can only be done by increasing the commission on the selling of stamps.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, I support the suggestion of increasing the commission. I do not know if we have a stamp vendor in this room but I take it that the information which was made *sotto voce* is correct; therefore, if the commission is only 2 1/2% I think a very reasonable figure should be at least five percent.

I think the suggestion of the Hon. Deputy Speaker is a very sound one, and I will go as far as to say that Government should invite the shopkeepers throughout the length and breadth of this island to become stamp vendors and say that it is offering five percent so as to attract them. I know of a first-aid shopkeeper who used to sell stamps and he stopped because it was not paying him. The reason for that was that some people who buy stamps insist that the vendor put them in an envelope for them. This same shopkeeper had a burglary on one occasion; so he thought it better not to buy any more stamps because there would be more chances of the stamps being burgled than sold.

There is one other suggestion which I want to make. There are, as I understand it, two kinds of air letter forms. There are those which do not have a stamp on them and there are those on which you have affixed a stamp. I take it if the Post Office is selling air letter forms that they will sell the type which has a stamp affixed already; therefore when you go there to buy one, you will buy the one which has the stamp affixed to suit you. I take it that those are the air letter forms which the General Post Office will be selling as distinct from the air letter forms which are sold in shops in this island in which you have to affix a stamp after purchasing the form.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the last point first, I agree with hon. members that it is a desirable service by stamp vendors especially in the rural areas but, of course, the hon. members who raised this point ought to remember that we have to be sure that the demands in the area are such as would justify it. Obviously, there cannot be two rates of commission for the selling of stamps. You cannot have a different one for certain areas. I can say that we have noticed no slackening of would-be stamp vendors in the most populated areas. It may be that the demand is so great for stamps in populated areas that they can make a reasonable profit; whereas the demand is so small in the rural areas that it would not be worthwhile to sell stamps at the present commission. I do not know, even if we increased the commission to a more reasonable percentage, whether the rural areas would benefit by having more stamp vendors. However, it is a matter which I can go into and I promise the hon. member that I will take it up with the Postmaster.

I may tell the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that I believe that the congestion which he complains of at the counter of the Post Office would be relieved by the double shift system. Of course, we all know that a new Post Office is necessary. The present building is very cramped; but due to the fact that under the present Five Year Plan we are fully committed, I think the building of a new Post Office is a matter which would have to fall into the next Five Year Plan. There is no denying that the present quarters are very cramped. The staff is very uncomfortable but the building of a new Post Office is a hope for the future.

4.15 p.m.

As regards the points made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I should like to point out to him that the contract for the carrying of mails was due to end on the 31st March, so that when the Estimates came down we could not have said in the Note what would happen. We had called for tenders for carrying out this contract, and up to the time that the Estimates were framed and were before the House, only one tender had been received. I think that the Committee will agree with me that it would hardly have been politic for us to give the information to the House that we had received one tender, and then the matter would have gone before the Tenders Committee, before it came to us and we are not supposed to open tenders until the appropriate date, which is the 1st April. What we did was a perfectly wise thing; it was the only logical thing which we could do, that is, to put in the amount we paid in the year before, and if we renewed the contract, and it cost us more money, then we would come down with a Supplementary Estimate. If it cost us less money, then the remainder of the money would remain in the Treasury.

The contract did not expire until the 31st March, by which time the Estimates were before the House. There is no legal point in that; that is commonsense. Tenders were invited and I might say that on that point the hon. member is not correct in his information; the old tenderer was Messrs. Robert Thom Limited. We went thoroughly into the matter of the Government running the service ourselves. There are only four vans and two more are provided during the Christmas rush or around the Easter season; but ordinarily, there are four vans used every day. We went carefully into all the figures, the matter of depreciation, of wages and that is another reason why the matter was delayed; I said that I was not satisfied with what the van drivers were receiving. It was pointed out to me that on some days the van drivers brought the mails and they did not do any further work, but that was a matter for the contractor. I said that these employees should be paid at Government rates. We went carefully into the matter, as I have already said. The contractors must have a garage, so that if anything happens to the vans, they can repair them. If the Government were doing this work, we do not know what we would be charged. Actually, the contractors made out to us that in the last year, they were tied down to these figures, and they were actually operating at a loss. Those are the risks which we had to take on our own; therefore, we could not risk to tell the House that we could operate this service for less than what it is costing us now. There is no other Government in the Caribbean area which is more opposed than we are to giving private people work to do if we can do it ourselves. We have laid down that policy that our own Government Departments must do this work; even in the case of secondary schools, very often the Governing Bodies of these schools would give out contracts and we would question that. Why can't the Public Works Department undertake such work and save money in the pockets of the taxpayers? All of that we have done. We have gone into these figures very carefully and we came to the conclusion that no saving would accrue and we therefore decided to renew this work on a contractual basis.

Some of these vans might be old, but this is a point which the Committee must remember. These contractors have their own garage and they can repair these vans and charge what they like. Where we can do these things, we do them. The Public Works Department has given out contracts for conveying sand, and I have told the Department that they should do this work themselves. Wherever we can save money by making a change we will do it, but if we go into the figures and find that there is no saving there is no use in making any change.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member says that the Government is opposed to the idea of giving contracts to any private people, but I am opposed to the ignorance displayed by the hon. members over there. This exhibition of ignorance which we get from the Ministers must be stopped. Somebody must say something about this pontifical ignorance which we get in here from week to week. What did I say? I said that in examining this question, you would have to examine it within the ambit of your postal service, not within the ambit of sending out your vans to the dis-

trict Post Offices. If I want to go into figures, on my feet, I can challenge anybody to say that this situation is not profitable, not on the basis of profit vis-a-vis how much money the contractors make as compared with what you are making. What I am arguing is, that instead of having four vans out on contract, you should examine the situation in order to see if you can get greater productivity. If the hon. member does not understand what I mean, I mean that the Barbados Government cannot afford to give work to a man for only four hours when you can provide a service where he can work for eight hours. I say that you should revamp your postal services so that when a man comes from St. Andrew or St. Lucy, you want his service for a maximum period of time, so that you can get from each man from the point of view of labour productivity eight multiplied by four, which would be thirty-two hours per day within your postal services, and you will find that you would not come to us for overtime work when you can do much better. There is the question of the life of a normal van of this size. What is the normal life of a van of this size if you can take these vans over? What is the amount of mobility they will do from day to day?

4.25 p.m.

If these are only doing something like forty miles per day and you go the longest distance, and if you multiply that by six - from Monday to Saturday - you will have 240 miles per week; if you multiply that by the months you will get how many miles per year that are covered, and you will then understand. If you take the argument of the Minister, you would give out all the money to Highways and Transport by contract. Does he realise that if it comes to that that I know more about Post Office dealings than he does? I have made this a study in my Trade Union business. There are some Post Offices in the world which are not run by Government; but are we going to follow them? The same thing goes for Postal Service as for any other job, but he has expressed this ignorance that this scheme is a better scheme. I challenge him that he has not gone into the points I have mentioned. He cannot tell me the average miles which these vans do per year. The hon. member talks about garaging, and that these people give in garaging; the Water Works have vans; who garages them?

I am a man who is not wedded to any particular idea of doing a job. You do the job in the best interest of the community or anything you are serving. If he says that what he is doing is in the best interest of Barbados, I have examined it and I can prove that it is not so from the point of view of labour productivity. From what the hon. member has shown, he is saying that as long as we are going to get this job done, it does not matter how the workers are served.

The hon. member is talking about illogical. What contract can you make to provide workmen with security of tenure? What can you provide to give regular employment? What contract can you make to give the workers gratuity and pension like other people in the Postal Service? What I am trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, is this mediaeval practice of paying a man with a cart to haul mail. That may appeal to the mind of Barbadians who rise above others, and who unfortunately believe that by some divine dispensation some people must pull these things. I do not belong to that school of thought, and in the running of a service it is not the amount of money that I want; it is the amount of service which I can give. What I am pointing out is that this type of job can be done by better mobile facilities. There is no point in this age in workers believing that the jack-ass cart can take part in these things; those days are gradually dying, and it is a matter of how fast they die. You are building a Deep Water Harbour, but you are not going to have the same push-cart methods. Similarly with your Postal Services when you realise that your internal volume has increased. The fact that they are asking you to increase the contract shows that not only the wages but the cost of operating must have increased. We are asking whether there is need to go on with this and the main point - and this is where I say there was an exhibition of ignorance - is that the contract expired on the 31st March and the Minister could not tell us that. We could not know that this contract was going to expire because not one word was said about it in the Estimates. The Minister said he would not know. Does

he really mean that? Does he think that we carry contracts in our hip pockets? It is his duty to know and the Finance Department should have stated in the Estimates that the contract was going to expire on the 31st March. They have come back for supplementary provision now that the contract has expired and they have renewed it. They have committed us to a new contract without discussion on the new contract being formed. What they have done is as if there was no contract at all and they have entered a contract before coming to the Legislature with this matter. The contract which they made for the Post Office is not a contract which they have the authority to make without coming to the Legislature for an expression of views. When a contract is about to expire, the legislature must know so that we can express our views as to whether we want to continue the contract in the same manner in which it was done. That is our privilege and not the privilege of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; but there is this idea that the Cabinet can enter these contracts without coming to the Legislature.

Now the Minister has told us that he has entered a contract for five years whether we like it or not, and this is what it costs us. Who has told him that he could enter a contract before the Legislature knows anything about it? Do you think I want the Attorney General to tell me what this House ought to know? You have entered a new contract for five years and the first time this House is going to know about it is when you come for supplementary provision to increase the cost. If we do not stand up for these fundamental rights, Mr. Chairman, the gradual diminution of our authority in a democracy means that we will have to give up democracy itself, and that is an unfortunate failing in this community. It is not too much money, but the whole idea is that they have entered a contract and it should be done in the same manner as when they first had the contract. The Legislature should know prior to entering the contract that it was going to expire, and I make no bones about that. I feel these are fundamental rights and members of this Legislature always stand for them. They cannot enter a new contract and come for supplementary provision like that.

The note here states that "the five year contract or the carriage of inland mails expired on the 31st March, 1958." This should have been stated in the Estimates, because the new contract started from the 1st April and you were telling us to provide you with money for a new contract which you never stated then. You made the House believe that you were continuing with the old five year contract; so no member could make any comment on it. What you have done here is a lie; it is improper, and it is political impropriety to ask for the same sum of money in the Estimates when the contract was in operation, but in truth and in fact, there was going to be a new contract from the date on which you asked for the money, which means that this Chamber would not have known that the Government proposed to enter a new contract if they did not want more money, and so the Legislature has never had any opportunity of criticising the new contract. No member knows when a contract is going to expire, and in this case when you entered the new contract we could not raise any debate on it.

4.35 p.m.

Now, he raises the point that he would not know what the tender is for because the letters were not opened. You would not know how much they are going to contract for but you will know that the contract is going to expire on the 31st March, 1958. Why did you not tell the House that the contract was going to expire then? We do not want to know who the tenderers are. The Hon. Minister said that only one tenderer applied. The rules of Government are that you do not have to accept the lowest tender. Men with dishonest and suspicious minds are interested in these things. I have nothing to tender for nor to ask for; therefore I have to make no compromise. They who make compromises have to look for something, but I do not have to look for anything. That is as clear as daylight. You have this superficial chat that they have examined the scheme. What really happened is this. They were taken by surprise today. They did not expect this type of debate to stem from this vote. The Hon. Minister did not expect this point and

now the point is raised he says that it is a saving. Mr. Chairman, he knows nothing of the Department which he is running. He is saying that this is a better scheme than having your postal services so organised that you make use of everybody to transport mails at your disposal. What these contractors are paid for is transporting mails at a certain time. They would not think that as regards the delivery of Her Majesty's mails, if you had some big lockers attached to some of those big buses which you have, you could deliver mails. You are paying for the delivery of mails from point to point. There are international regulations which state how mails should be sent. All that is laid down. What we are contending is that you have to revamp your whole ideas as regards the sending out of mails. It is costing a lot of money but we are not dealing with the cost; we are dealing with efficiency. Surely the Government of Barbados can make greater use of the productivity in the Post Office. Look at the overtime vote! Why is it that a man driving a van cannot be asked to deliver these mails? Why is it that a man coming from Christ Church with mails in a van cannot go down to the Wharf and bring up mails from there? When you are paying out for a contract, you should also see that the service can give you greater efficiency. Do you think in bigger countries you have postal services running on this stupid idea as we have? Do you think in big countries they have a person drawing in mail and after they have done that, they sit down for the balance of the day and blow a comb? You say that you have examined this. You have examined the contract in that you have not reached the stage where you are thinking that you should take it over. I am not talking of your taking it over as a question of nationalisation because the Post Office is already run by the Government. The Waterworks Department is run by the Government; yet they have vans there. I am asking that you make use of the service which you have at your disposal. The contractors for the carrying out of this mail are pledged to provide the Government with the service at all times. My colleague on my right has hinted something to me. I am saying that you should reexamine this thing which you have examined, because I am sure that on reexamination you will agree with our suggestion. I hope the time will come for you to reexamine it on the basis of seeing whether the carrying of your mails from point to point is a mode for which we have long passed the stage and because of that you will have to pay attention to the needs of this country.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I do know that it is a hopeless thing to convince some children. I am not doing this for that sake, but may be I am convinced. Let us look back at the previous Estimates. I am doing this because the Government is accused of doing something undemocratic and improper. If you look at the previous Estimates you will see it specifically stated that this thing is done on contract. In every Annual Estimates you will see as regards this item that it is done on contract for five years with effect from 1st April, 1953. That means that the contract will expire on the 31st March, 1958.

These are new Estimates. Now, we had to advertise for tenders for the contract which began on the 1st April, 1958, after the Estimates were before this House. We did not even know when we were dealing with the Estimates if you had one tender or more. How can you put any reference to a contract in the Estimates when you did not even know that you had a tenderer. The House already knew that this contract was going to expire at the end of March. What was it to prevent any hon. member from getting up at the time when we were giving consideration to the Estimates and asking: are you going to renew the contract? This House has a democratic right and opportunity to examine every item before it during the consideration of the Annual Estimates. Some hon. member questioned my saying that I examined it. Let the hon. member ask my Permanent Secretary if I discussed it. We called in the Postmaster and discussed it and questioned certain matters about it as regards depreciation and everything. I will not enlighten the hon. member any more.

Mr. WALCOTT: Enlighten whom? Whom can you enlighten?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: (*Speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter*) Please make all references to me.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, when I make a statement before this House, I make a responsible statement as a person in a responsible position and it can be questioned at any time. Any hon. member who disbelieves what I am saying can question any Permanent Secretary and the Postmaster General. We could not put this thing in the Estimates because we could not say anything about the matter. We could not say anything of the matter at that time. No tenders were received during the consideration of the Estimates. As I have said already, in every previous Annual Estimates, we stated for the benefit of the House that this thing was done on contract and that the contract was for five years from the 1st April, 1953.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would not need any enlightenment from the Hon. member to see what he is saying even if my job was different from what I am doing. In the 1958-59 Estimates, the Note in connection with this Item "Inland Mails" reads as follows:- "Conveyance of mails between the General Post Office and the District Post Offices."

I said that those were the Estimates which we passed and this is a Supplementary Resolution to those Estimates. We are supplementing those Estimates; we are not supplementing the Estimates which we passed in 1950-51; we are supplementing the Estimates which we passed in 1958-59, and I am saying that nothing was said about the contract expiring or that it was due to expire. The hon. member says that he did not know anything about the contract; we did not ask for the tenders.....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. I know what I have said, and I am capable of saying what I know. I did not say anything about knowing about the contract; I said that the contract cannot be renewed until the 1st April; who could put this information in a note? You do not know if people are going to tender.

Mr. WALCOTT: The fact that you do not know if people have tendered is nothing to do with the contract expiring. What his examination would be, is to see that if you buy these new vans whether there would be a net saving. Instead of voting another \$10,000, it may be \$12,000; that is the sort of examination he gave, but that would not be the sort of examination I would give; he did not consider the question of labour intensification. If you have to use a man within the postal service, that is the sort of examination for which we have asked; that is what they have not done. The hon. member has not given the Postmaster General any direction as to what he requires; these men could be used by the Post Office in ways other than in driving the vans in the way in which they drive them for the private contractor; they drive them here, they drive them to Messrs. Robert Thom's garage, and they see that the various things are done to them. In so far as the Government of Barbados is concerned, these employees are not required to do anything more than to convey the mails. If the hon. member cannot see that what I have said needs examination, then he cannot see anything. We say that we want to deal with the thing in a different way so as to save some of the overtime. If we have to change methods in this House, well, we do it; if we have to change methods in any Department, then we do it.

As the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has said, it is easy for the Government to make a Statement; they will say that the matter does not need any examination, because they have not given any examination to it; but I say that in the Department, you will have to consider the matter of improved productivity for the money you spend; you would have to do it, so that the taxpayers can get the maximum service. To have the maximum labour productivity is the only way in which you can have a proper standard of living. I can say that, not on the basis of begging for a vote, but on the question of greater productivity. The nitwits who run the Government cannot read a speech because it is not punctuated and so they cannot go into something which will mean more in the way of productivity for the country.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is one aspect of this matter to which I want to draw the attention of the Committee. We are dealing with additional Estimates for the Post Office and the Resolution calls for \$1,800 per year more on the contract for the carriage of inland mails. Presumably, the Government would justify the increase to the contractors on the ground of the increased cost of transporting the mails. In this connection, I want to draw to the attention of the Committee that the contractors for the carriage of inland mails are not the only people who distribute inland mails. I want to refer to that very hard-working batch of men known as Postmen. The contractors carry the mail from the Main Post Office to the rural sub-Post Offices and then these Postmen are responsible for the distribution of the mail to individual homes, and what not. The Government is considering giving an extra \$150 a month to cope with the increased transport cost to the contractor for the carriage of these mails.

Well, Sir, the Postmen have sent a Petition to this Government over a year ago, asking for an increase in their measly travelling allowance of \$10 per month. They get a measly travelling allowance of \$10 a month for the maintenance of their bicycles or motor-cycles to assist them in travelling the wide distances of the country in doing their work. We have to assume that the Ministers have found that their own cost of travelling has increased, because you will recall, Sir, that they increased their travelling allowance from \$50 to \$90 a month. They do not get any bigger, and if you do not look sharp, they look smaller. Because they have the power to do it, they came in here in March and in making a complete raid on the Treasury they gave themselves this additional \$40 a month for travelling allowance. Now, four months after, they are giving an additional \$150 a month for the transport of inland mails, and the Postmen have been waiting for sixteen months after sending in their Petition and they are still getting this \$10 a month for travelling allowance.
4.55 p.m.

I do not think, Sir, that a Government constituted as they are and elected in a manner that they are to be elected, can be justified in this absolute indifference to the plight of postmen. One would assume that when this proposal came before them in the Cabinet for granting the increase to the contractors, automatically their mental reflexes would have thought in terms of the increase in travelling rates which the postmen asked for over a year ago; but it is a matter of complete disregard to them whether the postmen ride bicycles or donkeys or even crawl on all-fours; it does not matter to them. They must give more travelling to the big firms while the exploited postmen must go on at the same rates. I want to suggest to Government that it is high time that postmen be given additional allowances. By what stretch of the imagination can \$10 be regarded as enough or too much? If it were enough when it was first sent in some years ago, in the same way as we increase the maintenance of inland mail to contractors, and as the travelling of the Minister has increased, so too have the day to day expenses of the postmen. Government, Sir, will be guilty of even more criminal indifference and neglect if immediately they did not take steps to improve the situation for postmen in this respect. What any less tolerant group of public workers would have done by now is to have gone on strike, because when you are dealing with people like the Ministers, you have to adopt harsh methods, and the public which would no doubt be severely inconvenienced by a strike of postmen, would nevertheless be in complete sympathy with them if they were forced to adopt such a measure in order to achieve the treatment to which they are entitled.

It is now about three months since this matter has been brought to my attention, and Tuesday after Tuesday I come here waiting patiently to hear them do something about it; but it is too much for me to sit down and say nothing in view of the fact that they can think in terms of giving a big firm in Bridgetown, which is more able to cope with any increased cost, attention and still continue to neglect postmen. I do not know, Sir, what are the facts underlying the demand for an increase in the contract. Generally speaking, we all know that the cost of everything is increasing; the cost of tyres, the cost of repairs, the

cost of wages and all that kind of thing, and if a case be made out for an increase of contract rates, we are all willing to pay it; but if a case can be made out for them, an even better case can be made out for the postmen; and nothing we could say could be too harsh in condemnation of the refusal by Government to pay attention long before this to the demands by postmen for a little increase in their travelling allowance.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not really think that this Committee is very much disturbed about the increase in the price of this contract, because as my colleague who has just sat down has pointed out, it is inevitable that every five years there must be a scaling upwards in the price which you pay for any service. I do not think the Minister ought to hide behind the argument which he has put up, because that is just getting away from the main point at issue. Everybody knows or should know that the persons who are responsible for carrying this mail for Government are Messrs. Robert Thom and Co. Ltd., - and I mean no reflection on them - and if they have told Government that they cannot carry on at the old price, the question is whether Government advertised for somebody else to do it either at the old price or indeed at any other.

What I am concerned about is this: that that Minister stood up here before this Committee and merely said that the contract expired. It has been renewed presumably with the same people, but he was not in a position to say whether they advertised or..... (A VOICE: Oh-h-h-h-h!) It is no use saying "Oh," because you might as well say "no"! He has not told us that since we have been in Committee; he may have done it before.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He said it before.

Mr. TUDOR: The second point is that we are not asking him - at least I am not - to revise at this moment the contract with the private firm, because he has already committed Government. When the contract was about to expire, this Committee or the House did not know of it; and there is nothing which we can do about it now; but a certain amount of responsibility still rests on the Government. If you employ less than a dozen men driving mail-vans carrying mails from Bridgetown to the rural districts, no matter who has the contract for doing it, the work these men are doing is work for the Government and you cannot argue that doing responsible work like that is somewhat different or should be differently treated from work done in any other part of the Civil Establishment. Even if you argue that the people who now own the vans and are responsible for paying the men are doing it to the best of their ability, Government ought not to be satisfied with that. There are other aspects of the matter which are equally important, one of which is this: the men who drive these vans are men who for the most part have been doing it for years, and in any other field of employment for Government would become pensionable. Have we been told or do we know that all these men who have put in all these years of service will reap some benefit from it or from Messrs. Robert Thom & Co. Ltd. when they are no longer useful? They are carrying Her Majesty's mail and in fact, they are postmen as well as any other.

5.05 p.m.

What is perhaps the most serious part of the matter is their conditions of work. People employed by Government can at any rate look forward every five years, whenever an election is drawing near, to some increase in their salaries, if only because the time is ripe for such an increase. We all exercise some influence in this House and in Committee over the conditions of work and the wages which the lowest paid local Government employees receive from time to time. We cannot do as much as we would like for them, but we can exercise some influence. That is not the case with the men employed by this private contractor. If you pay a private contractor \$11,000 a year, he will tell you that part of the increased cost goes to labour, but you cannot prove it because you have no means of exacting on them a level of wages which they must pay. Obviously, you cannot do that because you are giving out a contract and they must work that part of it in as profitable a manner as they can.

I do not know if it is true, but I have heard it said, that all of these men would welcome the taking over of this Service by Government as soon as tomorrow, and for various reasons: but I think the chief reason is that they feel they will have a better time arguing for better conditions with the Government than they would with the private employer, and they know for certain that if they were a part of the Civil Establishment of this colony, when they retire after whatever length of service they put in, there would be pensions for them to get. They would also like to know that certain other conditions, and certain other privileges which are enjoyed by Government servants now in the Civil Establishment would also be theirs. All of these things are lacking to them now. If we therefore say now to the Hon. Minister that you have no right to have this contract renewed before allowing the House to examine it thoroughly and you had no right renewing it before you discovered if you could make these men more comfortable, that is our main point.

The question as to whether mails could be more cheaply run by Government is an important question but it does not affect this issue. Investigation will have to prove that, but there is no argument against your taking over the service if it will cost more. If that were the argument against taking it over, the bitter experience you had with the transport service would warn us of that. Sir, a careful investigation ought to be made into the whole matter: and if it had been discovered that for the cost of \$4,000 or \$5,000 more the whole thing could be run by Government in the interest of the men and would provide a better service to the community, I think that is a decision which would be well worth taking.

The point which my colleague mentioned about the plight of the postmen is one of which this Government should be made aware. In addition to the slant which he gave on the matter, there is another aspect to it which this Committee should bear in mind. You cannot withhold from people decent conditions on the one hand and at the same time on the other hand do not give them the emoluments or the salary or the allowances which should be theirs. If your bicycle allowance is small and no amount of entreaty and pleading can make you raise it, then you should find ways and means of making the work of postmen less arduous in that respect. One of these days the postmen will not take all of this as they are taking it now, because when they call attention to their grievances in no uncertain manner and can repeat their case and prove that they have a good case and nothing is done about them, you cannot force them, if they get so angry that they refuse to carry your mails. The mail van system, if properly used, can be a valuable adjunct to the whole postal carrying system. There are districts in this island represented not only by hon. members on this side but by hon. members opposite. Some of them are hilly and some are very inaccessible and postmen even when they have bicycles cannot get to them. Therefore, it would be a good thing if the mail van could be used, whenever convenient, in a proper system for delivery in those places where it is arduous for postmen to climb. I understand from the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that there is a place in his constituency called Rose Hill where only goats can go and when you have business there you have to crawl on your hands and knees. I will say in passing that I hope that hon. member was well rewarded from the votes he got in that district because he did a lot of climbing there. It must be arduous on postmen going to places like that to deliver mails. Of course it is not likely that they will have to do it every day: but whenever they have to do it, it is very hard; and if a system can be worked out where a mail van can get as near as possible to those points, the postmen might not have to spend so much on the wear and tear of their boots. But that is a palliative. They are willing to do the work if a proper allowance is paid them and we feel that \$10 is not good enough.

With respect to the sale of stamps, I wonder when the Government will realise that the selling and buying of stamps is a business which people resort to for their convenience, and you cannot have, in days like this when almost everybody is a letter writer of some sort or the other, privileged persons selling stamps; therefore, any

person whose business is the selling of commodities is a fit and proper person to sell stamps. Of course, you do not want forty persons within a yard of one another selling stamps; but any drug store, any shop in a thickly populated village or district should be issued a licence for the sale of stamps. I do not know if any hon. members of this Committee are familiar with the business of selling stamps. (A VOICE: The hon. junior member for St. James.) If that is so, I wonder whether he would add his voice to mine in making a plea. He knows from his own successful experience that the sale of stamps is a boon in a thickly populated village.

5.15 p.m.

I also thought that the Government might well change their policy with respect to the commission which is given on the sale of the stamps. As far as I remember, it is 2 1/2%. If everything is going up and everybody is getting a little more for what he is engaged in, then it is only fair that some better inducement should be offered to the sellers of stamps. This is a service which is performed for the community by individual people by means of which their correspondence is done with as little difficulty as possible, because somebody is near to them from whom they can purchase these stamps. If the commission were increased, many more people would request licences to sell these stamps, and in that way, the community will be better served. I throw that out as a suggestion to the Government.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: There is one point which I think I should answer. It is just to say that the Postmaster General has informed me very recently that he had forwarded a Petition of the nature of which the hon. senior member for St. Philip has spoken to the Chief Secretary. It has not yet reached this Cabinet; so that the matter is not before us. The Petition relative to assistance in buying bicycles and so on, and also in relation to increased travelling allowance, has not yet reached me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My information was - and this came from a Postman himself - that the Postmen made this plea in April last year. Whether it was sent to the Postmaster General or to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I do not know; but I am sure that if the hon. member makes a proper enquiry he will find that my statement is quite correct; and then a lot depends upon his interpretation of "recently". I say that, because I was told this thing about three months ago. I was told three months ago.....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Perhaps, if the hon. member would give way to me, I might be able to save further discussion. I raise this point, because a letter from the Porters referring to the same matter, was referred to the Anomalies Committee, but we have not yet seen it. It was then that the Postmaster General informed me that the matter was sent to the Establishment, but it has not reached me.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will go a little further. I asked the Postmen to put the matter in writing and I have a document from them since March this year stating that the Petition has not yet been seen. It must be flying somewhere between Heaven and Hell, if it has not reached them. (A MEMBER: It has not reached us officially). Well, they must enquire into it, because there is no reason why a matter like this should not be put before the proper source. If the Head of a Department is requested for increased remuneration or anything like that, it is his duty to refer the matter to the Minister concerned immediately, since it is not his right to deal with policy. All he has to do is to minute the Minister and leave it to the Government concerned, but the matter must have been held up somewhere.

The question that the Head - Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that a Resolution for \$20,484 do now pass.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Acting Chairman, when we were dealing with the Item "Barbados Association in aid of the Blind, Deaf and Dumb" under the Head "Subsidies

and Grants", the question was put rather hurriedly, but I think that this Hon. House should go on record as paying tribute to the late Captain A. M. Jones who did so much for the Barbados Association in aid of the Blind, Deaf and Dumb. When the Item itself was being dealt with, I did not have the opportunity to say this, but I think that the community is appreciative of the services which Captain Jones has rendered. One of those services was in respect of this Association and it led Her Majesty the Queen to confer on him the honour of M.B.E., shortly before his death. I think that this is the only opportunity which I would have of saying how much the community appreciates the services which he has rendered to this Organisation and the time he gave and the sacrifice he made in assisting people who, through no fault of their own were afflicted with such incapacity. I think that we, as members who represent people who are unfortunate, should pay tribute to a man who gave of his time and energy in the interest of his poor unfortunate brothers.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am very happy to support the remarks which the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has made in paying tribute to the late Captain Jones. I doubt whether we would be able to find his equal in a lifetime. I am very happy to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member. The Late Captain Jones was indeed a great soul.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am glad that this matter has been raised at this stage. I, myself, would have spoken about the good work which Captain Jones has rendered to this Association, if the question had not been so hurriedly put when we were dealing with the particular Item. This Association is doing very good work, if we are to judge from the number of persons whom I see passing along the streets to the Headquarters everyday. At the funeral of Captain Jones, tribute was paid to him both by the Reverend Gentlemen in charge of the ceremony and also by the representation which was there - a number of blind persons who appreciated his work which he had got off to a very good start. I do hope that in whose hands the Secretaryship of this Association should fall, he will do as good a job as Captain Jones has done in taking a very personal interest on behalf of these unfortunate people. In the background, the late Captain Jones tried to organise things so as to raise funds for the improvement of these people and of their lot.

5.25 p.m.

I am glad of this opportunity of paying tribute to Captain Jones on behalf of the Blind, Deaf and Dumb.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, we are appreciative of the fact that you are allowing at this stage a certain amount of latitude for these tributes to be paid to the late Captain Arthur Jones. We on this side are highly appreciative of the work which Captain Jones did and are grateful to him for having done it. Not only in the Barbados Association in aid of the Blind, Deaf and Dumb, but in the Barbados Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and other Organisations Capt. Jones played a most active, energetic and indispensable part. He lived a very full life - to the fullest. We on this side differ from him only in respect of his political affiliation. With those, of course, we are uncompromisingly opposed and could never see eye to eye with him, but all of us have our short-comings and our weak spots; that was his only weak spot. Apart from that he was an invaluable member of the community in this island, and this island would do well with more men of his calibre. He never spared himself in serving Organisations, in founding Organisations and in accepting posts which others vacated and which no one else but he could be found to accept, because as you know, one job in which you have to put in a hard day's work is an honorary job. There are offices in which you are expected to go all day and do everything for everybody. As I happen to be Honorary Standing Counsel for the Barbados S.P.C.A., I often came in contact with Capt. Arthur Jones, and I know how much energy and enthusiasm he put into his work in respect of that Organisation. I have no doubt that he put equal energy and enthusiasm into his work with the numerous Organisations with which he was connected.

I was surprised, Mr. Chairman, when at last his

work was recognised that the recognition was at the minimum with the bare Membership of the Order of the British Empire. One could not help but feeling that so long as it was decided to recognise his work, the recognition would have been greater than it was. Anyhow it was perhaps fitting that he lived to receive the recognition, and as you know, a very few days after, he succumbed to the illness from which he had been suffering so long and in spite of which he never spared himself in the interest of these Organisations for which he was labouring.

The question that the sum of \$20,484 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

5.35 p.m.

On re-assembling

LETTER Re MR. A. B. WAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the House resumes its business, I have the honour to inform hon. members that I have received from Mr. A. B. Way of the firm of Fitzpatrick, Graham & Co., chartered accountants, a letter which reads as follows:-

Sir,

SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

I wish to offer myself for re-appointment as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year commencing 1st July, 1958, under Section 4(7) (i) of the Act - 1943 - 15, at a remuneration of £125.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,
A. B. WAY.

Checking with the Act, the salary in that is £75 per annum. So I think I have to recognise this letter as a document of the House and no action can necessarily proceed therefrom as seen under these conditions as offered here.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay two documents which should have been laid earlier today.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1958.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 15 Order, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 14 Order, 1958".

Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 15 Order, 1958".

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 10 ORDER, 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1958.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is to approve a Resolution entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1958.

The Addendum sets out this Order quite fully. First of all the Order provides for -

- (a) the abolition of 11 posts of Long Grade Clerk, Post Office, which have become redundant on the re-organisation of the Post Office establishment - vide the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1957 and Resolution No. 51/1957 which gave approval thereto, and
- (b) the creation of three additional posts of Long Grade Clerk for the Statistical Department.

It also sets out that during the years 1956 and 1957, the Statistical Department was engaged in the preparation of the first Annual Abstract and the collection of data to maintain the statistical series for the second Annual Abstract, as well as the collection of data for the monthly and quarterly publications. In addition, from January, 1957, the Department undertook the tabulation of imports and exports of the Island, migration, Income Tax statistics, etc.

The need for more than one Long Grade Clerk did not arise during the early period of building up series and arranging machine tabulations but additional staff of this calibre is now required to check the machine tabulations daily and prepare tables regularly, particularly for the trade and migration statistics, as well as for the other clerical duties in the Department.

In other words, in the early stage of this Department, they dealt with only a restricted amount of work. Quite recently the amount of work has been extended. They are doing more work and getting more statistics; consequently, they are asking for more staff.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me today that I should do what I expect the Government ought to have done on the introduction of this Resolution. Let us say at once that I am not opposed to this Resolution but I wish to pay tribute to a hard-working servant of the Government in the person of the late Mr. George Ashford Ashby. He has unfortunately died recently and I think that I am in order in dealing with this on this Resolution.

This community has lost a hard-working Civil Servant who was a young man in his prime, a man who undertook at short notice a very important Government Department and who up to the time of his death had given complete satisfaction. I think on an occasion such as this we should pay tribute to Civil Servants of his calibre who despite their failing health have given all they could and in some cases more than can be expected of them.

As you know, Sir, this Department has been comparatively new and Mr. George Ashby at the time of his death had recently returned from a Conference in Trinidad on behalf of the Government in connection with this branch of the Service. I think we should go on record in acknowledging the great service which he rendered in his comparatively short life, and in doing this we intimate to Civil Servants that we as representatives of the people do appreciate the service which they render and which in some cases undermines their health and causes their death. It is but fitting in a Legislature of this nature in which we all at some time criticise our servants, even although the occasion for paying tribute is a regrettable and sad one and even though they themselves do not know, yet the community would know that their services have not passed un-noticed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think in this connection I should like very much to say that I regard the late Mr. George Ashby as an excellent example of the decision to West Indianise the West Indian Civil Service. We have seen that a native West Indian could be responsible for a newly created Department and I had the satisfaction of hearing a very important Department Head say only a few days ago that he regarded Mr. Ashby as one of the finest officers of his kind whom he had ever met. He spoke very highly and commendably of the manner in which Mr. Ashby ran his Department and of the assistance which it was to all the other Government Departments. It was a fact that any Department Head could ring him and within the shortest possible time he was prepared to supply any information which was required. Similarly, anybody in private enterprise could ring him and he would freely throw the services of his office at their disposal.

Unfortunately, Sir, he was not spared long enough to see the Department expand to the point to which he would hope, but it is sincerely to be desired that his successors would endeavour to maintain the high standard which he set and to make this new department no less useful to the people of the island and the area as a whole.

I should like to say that Mr. Ashby's case constituted the irrefutable answer to those who claim that West Indians are not adequately capable of filling the highest posts in the West Indian Civil Service. With the minimum of training Mr. Ashby was able to assume responsibility for the discharge of the functions in a department which more than many others requires specialised training.

6.15 p.m.

It is fitting, Sir, that we should pay tribute to the commendable way in which he did his job. I think that we should regard him as an example for more Departmental Heads to follow and an example for young public officials to judge from his case and to see that there is no position in the Service for which the proper qualifications held by people will not justify their appointment. All we need say is that we sincerely hope that other Civil Servants in this position and in junior positions will go and do likewise.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Hon members on this side of the House wish to support all that has been said as regards the late Mr. Ashby. Undoubtedly, he was a man who did not spare himself; he gave the best satisfaction and won the esteem not only of the members of the staff but of the Government.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT)
No. 11 ORDER, 1958**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- "Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1958".

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a similar Resolution to the one we have just passed dealing with the appointment of staff. This Resolution deals with the appointment of Crown Counsel in the grade \$4,560 - \$6,240 for the Attorney General's Department. The legal members of this House will be quite pleased to hear that the Government is taking steps to appoint Crown Counsel. Recent events have shown the need for this Officer; within recent years, the Government has had to employ a member of the legal profession to prosecute cases at the Assizes.

The Addendum to this Resolution sets out that at least two members of the staff of the Attorney General's Department are required to spend a considerable amount of their time in the Courts with the result that drafting of Legislation is being hampered. In order to allow the officers to devote more time to drafting and advisory work, it is proposed to provide a Crown Counsel. It is also set out in the Addendum that this Officer's main duties will be to

appear in Court in both civil and criminal matters, but he will also assist in Chambers when he is not appearing in Court.

Therefore, we know that there will be quite enough work for this officer to do. In the Addendum to this Resolution, hon. members will see that mention is made of the fact that during the year 1957-58, over \$3,800 had to be paid to private counsel for prosecuting cases at the Assizes. From the foregoing remarks, it is quite obvious that such an officer is needed.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Crown Counsel in Barbados is necessary. With this Resolution I have no quarrel, because the duty of Crown Counsel, as I understand it, will not only be to prosecute at the Assizes, but his main duty will be to assist the Police with the prosecution, in serious offences, of cases in the Police Magistrate's Court; therefore, this appointment will put an end to the payment of fees to private practitioners as obtains at the present time, and the Crown Counsel will no doubt be the man on whom the Police will rely in times of difficulty. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, from my own experience, that as honest and as hardworking as the Police are, yet very often they find it very difficult to cope with the lawyers who are on the other side. Therefore, I welcome this appointment; I think it is long overdue, and I am not completely satisfied that the appointment should not be made of two Crown Counsel instead of only one. Nevertheless, one is at least a start.

In all progressive countries you have Crown Counsel, as you must have. We, in Barbados, are still at the stage where the Attorney General is still a member of the Upper Chamber. I want to say this: I see no reason why the Attorney General in this colony could not prosecute in cases of murder on behalf of the Crown. (Hear! Hear!) In England, the Attorney General is also a politician; he is invariably in the House of Commons which meets more often than the Legislative Council in Barbados, and yet he can find time to go into Her Majesty's Courts and prosecute cases of murder. However, in Barbados we have been encouraging - and it happens not only here but in Trinidad as well - the habit of the Attorney General sitting down in his office and people who are charged with the most serious offences known to the criminal law of the country, being prosecuted by private practitioners hired by the Government, or by junior Crown Counsel. I want to say that no work could be so difficult for the Attorney General that he cannot prosecute cases of murder at the Assizes; and he should be told so. It is a good practice that that should be so, because the number of murder cases in Barbados are few as compared with those taking place in other territories. Thank Heavens it is so, and I think that the Attorney General should at least undertake the prosecution of these serious offences. I should have imagined by now that it would have been brought to the attention of the Government that very often, through no fault of the Crown Law Officer, the number of Convictions at the Assizes has been dwindling and dwindling. It is not due to the dishonest verdict of Juries either. (A MEMBER: Oh, no.) Therefore, if the Government is serious in getting somebody who is worth his salt to prosecute as Crown Counsel at the Assizes - no person who is worth his salt will take this job for \$520 a month. Nobody who can earn his living at the Bar and who values his independence to go to his office when he likes and sit down in Court when he does not feel like talking - I say that that is worth quite a lot.

You cannot ask a man who has been at the Bar for five, six or seven years and who has been making a success of it - of course, he must have been making a success at the Bar to remain there for so long. In Barbados, people get this salary without a day's practice at the Bar; we are paying Magistrates this salary scale, people who have not had a day's practice at the Bar of this country.

6.25 p.m.

Are you then prepared to entice men who have been practising in the Courts six, seven, eight, nine or even ten years who may be interested in assisting Government in this important part of criminal prosecution and in the administration of justice, to start off at the same scale as a Magistrate who has never done one day's practice at the Bar? Are you not creating a necessary job for a man who has not practised at all? You will find yourself in the position where inexperience will prosper and you will not get the proper person for this very important job. If he is going to prosecute, the Solicitor General will assist him, but prosecuting is an art just as defending successfully is an art, and I am saying that this salary scale cannot attract a Barrister who has been practising in the Courts for five or six years. He would have to be down and out to enter the Government Service at a salary scale which Assistant Secretaries in this country are getting, and those are people who have never gone anywhere to study and have never spent one cent on education. You are telling a Barrister that he need not have gone away at all. You do not want a green horn in a job like this; you want an experienced man, but you are asking him to come into the service after eight or nine years and get the same salary as an Assistant Secretary who has never left Barbados and has never spent any money on education.

Of course, *a propos* to this, the Magistrates of this country are hopelessly under-paid, and when the new Judiciary comes into force this month, if they want experienced men they have got to raise the Magistrates' salaries. You want a Crown Counsel; but if you want an experienced man, even if you put him at the maximum of this scale, you cannot get him for obvious reasons. You want to give a professional man the same salary which you are giving to an Assistant Secretary who may only have gone to Harrison College. There are some Assistant Secretaries now at 32 years who are getting the same as a student whose parents have sacrificed and sent him abroad for three years and who has walked the streets of London without a cent in his pocket. I will say 'good luck' to the person who is appointed, but I will issue a warning to Government that a man who accepts this salary after six years at the Bar would either have had substantial private means, or you would not be getting the material which you really want.

I suppose Government may be in the position that this was put up to them or it may be that Government realises that if they get an experienced Barrister to do this job and they place him at a salary over and above what the Magistrates are getting, then the Magistrates will agitate for more; they will agitate for more anyhow. If the Magistrates here had any courage, they would not work for the money which Government is giving them now, and any Barrister who has spent any money on his education should bluntly refuse to work for what people in the Service are getting without going one day abroad and spending one cent to further their education. You will be lucky to get Barristers to do the job of Magistrates and put them on the same salary as people who have not been abroad.

I shall watch the appointment, Mr. Speaker, with great interest, because naturally he will be a man against whom I shall have to defend in time to come, and of course the more inexperienced the man who is appointed, the better for Defence Counsel, as my learned friend, the Leader of the Opposition, will know. He, too, has benefited from the inexperience of prosecuting Counsel longer than I have; therefore I am saying to Government that you want experience in this job; you want a man who has roughed it in the Courts and a man who through practical knowledge learned some of the Law, a man who understands human psychology and a man who can put up the case for the Crown in its right perspective. If you can get a good man at this price, you will be very fortunate. As far as my experience teaches me you will not get a man to come for this price. In Jamaica a Crown Counsel of this stamp is getting £1,900 a year, more than the Solicitor General of Barbados; he is getting that salary, plus travel and in addition Government lends him money to buy a car; so you cannot get a Jamaican who is worth his salt to come to Barbados to work for \$520 a month. In Trinidad a Crown Counsel of a similar stamp is getting £1,800 a year; so

you will have to do as they are doing in the Ministries in Barbados, that is, rely on laymen to do it.

I have always heard that the Bar in Barbados is so crowded that Lawyers are all-a-penny, but still in Barbados you have three retired men acting and one Civil Servant acting as Police Magistrates, and the Bar is so overcrowded that one Magistrate is a Solicitor and another Solicitor is on the Bench. The Bar could not be as crowded as people say or Barristers are very independent. When you consider this salary scale with those in Trinidad or Jamaica, you are not going to get a Trinidadian or Jamaican who is worth his salt coming here; you may get one of the small islanders coming, but if you get a man at this price I say Government is lucky. I think that the figure for Crown Counsel in this new post is ridiculously low and is not likely to attract a man of experience, and it is a man with experience whom you need in the Courts. This is not a job for any green horn who has had only two or three years' experience at the Bar; if he is going to deputise for the Attorney General, experience in the Courts is what you need, and you cannot get a man of any quality for that salary.

I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will have some views to express, and I would be very surprised if he did not share the views which I hold on this matter. The post is necessary and is now overdue, and it will save you from paying private practitioners; but the figure is too low, and as I said, in due course with this new administration of justice and the new set-up, the Magistrates, too, will have to receive more money. You see, Mr. Speaker, the Courts in Barbados and justice in this country have been running on too cheap a scale. Justice in Barbados is the cheapest in the world, - and you get good justice too - but the Legal Department and the Judiciary in Barbados has always been the neglected Department of the Government. That is true because at one time, as you know, Mr. Speaker, in this country we had an Acting Attorney General, an acting Solicitor General, an Acting Assistant to the Solicitor General, an Acting Registrar and an Acting Judge of the Assistant Court of Appeal, and that went on for years and years. So I am saying good luck to you if you can get a man at this salary; if you can do it you are magicians. 6.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I feel fairly sure that the hon. member himself would be the first to admit that there are barristers and barristers, and that there are barristers whom we have seen in Barbados who were very lucky to get appointed as Police Magistrates to start off at a salary of \$4,000 a year. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew is a barrister with some experience and ability; and as a barrister with some ability, he would be the first to concede that there are a number of barristers in Barbados and in the West Indies for whose ability he has no respect at all.

Mr. FG. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I respect all members of the profession to which I belong.

Mr. MOTTLEY: (*sotto voce*) That is not true.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will put it this way. There are a number of Barristers in the West Indies whose legal opinion we regard with more relish than some others. I have seen in my time - and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has seen in his time - barristers in this country in their offices week after week, month after month, hardly earning a single penny, and to them a magistracy with three or four hundred dollars per month was a paradise.

The hon. member must realise this. This salary of this Crown Counsel is being put on the same basis as that of the Assistant Legal Draughtsman and on the same basis as that of a Police Magistrate. The moment you increase his rates of pay, you interfere with the entire financial emoluments of people in the Judiciary. If you pay him more, a Police Magistrate would want more, an Assistant Legal Draughtsman would want more and all the way up the line - the Assistant to the Attorney General, the Solicitor

General and the Attorney General himself would want more money, to say nothing of the Chief Justice.

The hon. member made the point that barristers after one day's practice have been appointed magistrates in Barbados. They are lucky. In Jamaica, my assumption is that you must be a barrister of at least five years' standing before you can be appointed a Police Magistrate; so if you can come here as a raw, inexperienced barrister and get pitchforked on to the magisterial bench at a beginning salary of \$4,560 a year, that is not bad. If you compare the position with that of an Assistant Secretary, you will see that an Assistant Secretary may have taken ten or twelve years to reach the point of salary. (Mr. F. G. SMITH: I spent over £2,000 to get my education.)

The hon. member said that he spent over £2,000 to get his education but I think he will agree with me that some barristers spend £14,000 to get their education. We in this country have had to extend the Barbados Scholarship to allow a particular individual who was studying for the Bar to continue his studies, and up to now he still has not passed. There is a very important Queen's Counsel in Trinidad and others of whom we know who have had children in England who cost them a lot more than £2,000 while pursuing their study in the law and they have not qualified yet.

However, Sir, that is not the important point. The important point is the intellect and qualifications of the person. If you want someone to read law, the only educational qualification you need is something approximating to a fairly good Higher School Certificate. The qualification for an Assistant Secretary is almost on the same level. You are not going to pick any nitwit and make him an Assistant Secretary nor are you going to make him that the moment he comes into the Service. Being called to the Bar does not mean that you have more ability; it only means a good memory. Being called to the Bar and being a good barrister are two different things. Any semi-educated person with a good memory can be called to the Bar. If you have a fairly good memory that is all you need. What I mean is this. A man who becomes an Assistant Secretary after ten or twelve years in the Government Service must of necessity have the same basic intellectual and educational qualifications as a member of the Bar, though he may not have the additional training superimposed on him.

Another thing you must bear in mind. Do not forget this. An Assistant Secretary may go on to a salary of \$4,000 per annum but where a Barrister who enters the Government Service is going to reap his reward is when he starts being promoted to a Solicitor General at \$6,000 and an Attorney General at \$8,000, while the Assistant Secretary would have met the unreward of not having specialised training by dying at \$4,560 per annum. So, Sir, we have got to look at this Crown Counsel in terms of the economy of the Island. While I agree with the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that we do not require a recruit - we want a man with experience - you cannot eat your cake and have it too. The Crown Counsel has to come in with experience and be satisfied to start at a moderate salary - moderate in comparison with what the private practitioners like the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and the junior member for St. Andrew are earning - but when he is getting that, he has security of service and in time to come all his specialised training and what not would have to be rewarded.

I feel, Sir, that on the face of it, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew appears to be justified in that a Crown Counsel will be responsible for serious Government prosecutions but, Sir, all these factors must be considered in the light of the revenue of this colony and of the salaries paid right down the line through the different grades of Government employment; and in a country which is paying teachers, policemen and postmen the current salary which they are being paid, and paying members of the Unestablished Staff \$13 a week and saying that they cannot pay them more than that, then I say that it would be absurd for us to say that we are going to pay more than \$4,560 a year to a Crown Counsel. I can never stand here and agree that

the Cantonier is only worth \$16 a month and a Police Magistrate more than \$380 a month. I appreciate all the fundamental differences which exist between the two, but both have to live and exist and both must eat and wear clothes and feed their families.

6.45 p.m.

In my opinion, only if the salaries of those in the lower brackets were more than enough to meet the everyday cost of living and what not, would I agree with the suggestion that we can afford to pay more for this post. If we paid over \$3,800 last year for private Counsel to prosecute at the Assizes, it does not necessarily mean that we will have to pay that amount again this year or next year; the position may be improved from the point of view of our paying less money. We must remember that when we make this appointment, we are saddling the Treasury *in perpetuum* with what this post carries with it - pension rights, leave passages and what not. There must be a beginning somewhere. If you start tampering with this post, you must accept the fact that you must simultaneously tamper with all the other posts in the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANCKER: I was told that the reason why the salary of the Crown Counsel was fixed at this modest figure, was because it was expected that a very junior Barrister would be given the preference for this Post, since a very comparatively junior Barrister had been appointed to the important Office of Solicitor General of this colony. This is a post to which a Barrister of less than five years' experience should not be appointed. If the case for the Crown is intended to be put before the Court by a Barrister of reasonable competence, that can only be obtained as a result of one who has practical experience at the Bar; that cannot be obtained by any mere academic training, however profound. I cannot see any Barrister of competency in his profession who has had at least five years' experience at the Bar, being interested in such a Post as this.

We are told in the Addendum to this Resolution that during the year 1957-58 over \$3,800 had to be paid to private counsel for prosecuting at the Assizes. This salary was paid to a Queen's Counsel, a gentleman of some great experience, a former Solicitor General of this colony and a practitioner of over ten years' experience. They have spent over \$3,800 and the work then was not more than six weeks for three different occasions - March, July and November Assizes; therefore, for eighteen weeks last year, the Government paid over \$3,800 for prosecuting cases at the Assizes, whereas, it is proposed to pay \$760 a year more for the services of a person who will be prosecuting cases for 52 weeks in the year. It is really hard to understand how that figure has been arrived at; it is clear that the Government is not concerned with getting a Barrister of sufficient experience or competence adequately to represent the Crown. We have had a former Attorney General, and a former Solicitor General, another Barrister of considerable experience, and you have just thrown a very inexperienced Lawyer into the arena to put the case for the Crown properly and impartially before the Court. He just lacks experience to do it with the efficiency and competency of the very experienced Counsel who is almost certain to be on the other side. If the Government feels that it is good enough to have the Crown represented by a third-rate lawyer, well, let them pay the salary which would attract a third-rate man. They happen to be in power at the moment and they can have the Crown represented how they want it represented.

I support the hon. junior member for St. Andrew with regard to his remarks about the Attorney General. In England, the Attorney General prosecutes in every important murder case. It was only in the case of the murder in Carlisle Bay after I had prodded Her Majesty's senior Crown Law Officer, that he found himself in the Court to prosecute the case. I reminded him from my seat that it is the convention in England for an Attorney General to prosecute in cases of murder, treason and in other very important cases. It is not good enough for officials to come out here and not do a full day's work for a full day's pay. After all, you will remember that it is not very long ago when Mr. Keith Walcott was Attorney General of this colony. He did not only the murder cases, but other cases

at the Assizes; he really over-did it, because one could not help feeling that it was not necessary for Her Majesty's Attorney General to appear in every case at the Assizes. Nobody did cases more thoroughly than Mr. Walcott; as a matter of fact, practitioners for the defence felt that he did his cases too thoroughly, and nobody said that he neglected his work in the House or in his Chambers.

I do not suggest that Mr. Walcott was a superman, but if he could prosecute every case at the Assizes and do his work in his Chambers, and do the work inside this Chamber which is entirely different from the Other Chamber, in that calm rarified atmosphere which is nothing like leading a turbulent Chamber like this with people who have to satisfy their constituents - if he could do all that, one does not see any justification for the Attorney General or the Solicitor General not finding himself in the Courts and prosecuting cases, thereby relieving the Treasury of this burden of paying in respect of the year 1957-58, over \$3,800 just for six weeks' work.

Now, they have come along and asked for an additional \$760 a year as a starting salary for the Post of Crown Counsel. Now, Sir, a comparison has been made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip as to the salary paid to a practitioner in an office like that with the salary paid to a Permanent Secretary.
6.55 p.m.

It is true that the academic qualification for admission to the Inns of Court requires a G.C.E. pass in Latin and English. We know of one case in which Latin was dispensed with, but I will not go into the particulars of that very well known case or how that particular person managed to survive the Roman Law failure. Having got the Matriculation, Mr. Speaker, he has to look for £200 to go into the Court, two years' residence at no less than £900, then his return passage could not be less than £200, and then he should certainly be in the Chambers of a London Barrister for at least six months but preferably a year, which would cost 100 guineas; then of course, he has to pass examinations for the call to the Bar and his books would cost him no less than £100. So a person has to look for an amount in the vicinity of £1,600 besides having to pass examinations in order to be called to the Bar of England, and that does not apply to the case of those gentlemen who are appointed to be Permanent Secretaries.

In fixing the salary one has to consider the cost of the profession without which one would not be eligible for the particular post; so if we start off with that and then bear in mind that we should have not merely someone who has been called to the Bar, but someone with a reasonable amount of experience, competence and efficiency which can be derived only from experience, then we want somebody with at least five years' experience at the Bar. I believe that is the stipulation with respect to Jamaica. Of course, there is a higher cost of living in Jamaica than in Barbados, but in Barbados, Sir, the salary of Crown Counsel should be higher than that of a Police Magistrate, because a Police Magistrate appears obviously in no higher Court than that of a Police Magistrate, while Crown Counsel appears in the highest Court in the land. The Crown may assign any High Court matter to him, and he has to appear in that High Court and is expected to do his work not only conscientiously but satisfactorily. It is a matter for Government but we are throwing out the warning here about this money. I have no doubt that certainly a lot of Barristers from outside this colony will apply - and I would not be surprised if two or three from within did - but we say that no person with less than five years' actual practice at the Bar is competent to perform with reasonable efficiency the duties of Crown Counsel.

The post is necessary, even without my argument that with the more important cases the Attorney General should appear in Court and in the less important ones the Solicitor General; but even so he will have to be appearing in the highest Court in the land - higher Courts than the Police Magistrate - and he should be paid in a salary scale above that of a Police Magistrate, so that a Police Magistrate might look forward to being appointed as Crown Counsel. If the present trend continues that you do not appoint a person from the Magisterial Bench to the High Court

Bench, then this is an obvious channel whereby Police Magistrates may look forward eventually to promotion to the High Court by being appointed to the post of Crown Counsel, and thereby getting into these Chambers by going from Crown Counsel to Solicitor General to Attorney General, or from Solicitor General to the High Court Bench, because the present trend is not to appoint persons to the High Court Bench who have not practised in the High Courts, or in the same Court over which they are going to preside, because they are hopelessly, monumentally and abysmally ignorant when they sit on the High Court Bench and have never practised in the Court over which they are presiding. They do not know about the Rules and sometimes do not know that there are Rules as any Solicitor will tell you; they have to send to the Solicitor's office to borrow Rule Books of the particular Court over which the Judge is presiding and who has never had any High Court practice or whose practice was so non-controversial that it could be regarded as *any* practice at all.

I have thrown out the warning to Government, and if they are satisfied with an inexperienced Barrister, let them persist in this matter because they will get plenty of applications. If they realise the necessity for an experienced man - and there are Mr. W. W. Reece, Q.C., and Mr. Jack Dear, the former having over ten years' experience - they are not going to get an experienced man to prosecute for the salary which they are now offering. The Addendum says that this Officer's main duties will be to appear in Court in both Civil and Criminal matters, but he will also assist in Chambers when not appearing in Court. In other words, he will be advising as Counsel and assisting in the Chambers in looking up Laws; so you see the necessity for a man with over five years' experience for assisting in the Chambers when not appearing in Court. If Government think otherwise they will persist with this salary.

You know, Sir, that the tendency nowadays in filling these appointments is to have men with less experience and more War Service. While I am not crying down that, it should be otherwise. You saw what happened recently, Sir; a Barrister of over thirty years' experience was completely passed over in the office of Solicitor General despite the fact that he is in the service of Her Majesty in Barbados on the Bench; but it looks fishy. I am not saying anything against the person who has been appointed, but greater stress should be paid to legal background. You will get appointed here someone who is popular in certain social circles or who has a War record and is glad to be able to collect the emoluments of this kind. Anyhow, Sir, I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more, because that is my point of view from the experience I have had in the legal profession.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this matter was introduced by the Premier but we can say that this Resolution has been completely ignored by the Government in that the Introducer paid no more attention to the debate. I would say that in the gradual diminution of our rights there is evidence of the conduct in these things. There are hon. members here in the legal profession and I do not intend to cross swords with them, but I do not subscribe to the popular Barbadian feeling that when lawyers express themselves on these matters, laymen should keep their mouths shut.
7.05 p.m.

I have to assist in the passing of laws in this country and as long as I am supported by the people who sent me here I will continue to express my views. I am a believer in the view that when you are making changes you should examine them in the light of what is good. I have been in this House long enough to see that the whole legal structure of the colony has changed, and gradually you are adding more Crown Law Officers.

Now, the Attorney General of Barbados is no policy maker but he is a member of the Other Place. There was a time when the Attorney General of Barbados was a member of this Place, and recently he was withdrawn from this Place. I cannot understand why is it that you are saying that the work of the Attorney General's office is in-

creasing and now that you have, by your Ministerial structure you still allow your top legal man to waste his time in the Other Place instead of remaining in the Legal Department and doing the work which he is primarily appointed to do. You do not want an Attorney General to be a member of the Other Place; you have changed your structure so that you have now a Minister without portfolio there. It is the duty of the Attorney General to advise the Government; therefore, he does not have to be in the Other Place to do that with your present set up. If the Honourable Premier comes down here with any matter, he is supposed to express the legal point of view based on the information given him by the Attorney General. The Attorney General is not a member of this Place; he is not in here though this is the main Chamber of this Island; but his view will be expressed in here by Ministers and the Ministers need not to be lawyers. If that is the situation in this Lower Chamber which is the elected Chamber, Mr. Speaker, tell me why it cannot work in the Other Place? Is the Other Place more important than this Place? If that is not so, then the Attorney General should still be in here.

In addition to all of that, what is the present situation? The Solicitor General was a part time officer and he did what we are now appointing a Crown Counsel to do. The Solicitor General appeared in the Courts, but he was a part time officer. The Government said that it did not like the arrangement in which the Solicitor General was a part time officer and the members said that they will make the Solicitor General a whole time officer to do some of the work in the courts and to assist the Attorney General in the office. Now with that structure, Mr. Speaker, what are the reasons given now in this Addendum? It is stated in the Addendum that at least two members of the Attorney General's Department are required to spend a considerable amount of their time in the Courts with the result that drafting of legislation is being hampered. What did we do? We appointed the Solicitor General as a whole time officer and when we did that you said that as the Solicitor General is a whole time officer now you would have his additional service at the disposal of the Attorney General. What I consider to be a wrong arrangement is that you still have the Attorney General paying attention to political matters in the Upper House and the reason why I say that is this. The Attorney General is a highly paid officer and I agree with some hon. members who said that he should pay more attention to some matters in the High Courts. I agree with that because when Sir Henry Shawcross was Attorney General of Great Britain he went to Nuremburg to prosecute war criminals; so, there is no question of the Attorney General not appearing in High Courts; there is precedent for it.

Here in Barbados what is taking place is that Crown Law Officers are getting soft. You talk of other people not doing enough work and you are not getting sufficient productivity. I am going to say this. The sooner we get down to it that socialists must begin to tell people in the top brackets that we are paying them salaries for doing jobs, therefore we expect the maximum productivity from them and that we expect it not only from cantoniers but those people in the upper grades of the Service, then it will be the better for us. We can see no inflection on the officers in the Legal Department if you revamp your whole idea and ask them to do their work. You have just made an addition to the Other Place in the person of the Hon. C. W. W. Greenidge who reached the stage that he was Chief Justice of British Honduras. There are plenty of people of experience who have retired and who can give you service. The Hon. C. W. W. Greenidge has long years of experience and he can be of great assistance to you in the Other Place; and if the Hon. Minister without portfolio whom I regard as another luxury in our whole structure has been placed in the Other Place to deal with Government Business, I cannot see the reason why you still require the Attorney General to be there to advise him on the spot because that advice can be given to the Minister in his office. If you want these people in their office to do more work, allow them to be there.

What the barristers of this House are saying is that they are not objecting to the salary as salary but are saying: can this salary attract the right person. What I am

saying is that it is a matter of structure. My view, and it is the view of a layman, is that it was stated in the past that the Solicitor General was primarily the man who was required to appear in the courts, and yet the Attorney General also used to appear in the Assize Courts. Now, the Attorney General appears very seldom in the Assize Court and the Solicitor General does not appear in the law courts too frequently. What is wrong with these officers doing some of this work in the courts? It is true that your Ministerial structure although it has not increased the number of Departments, yet they say that it has accelerated the pace of work in that you have five points leading at the Attorney General's office now by having five Ministers. When you get the sixth Minister, the Crown Law Officers can come back to you and tell you that you have six Ministers: therefore they will have six points leading at them.

What is going to be the situation? The hon. junior member for St. Andrew and the Leader of the Opposition are not in their places at the moment but I must take up both of them on this point. This Order provides for the creation of this post at a salary of \$4,560 to \$6,240. While I would not commend the Government for doing it, this post has a salary structure and the Government can appoint somebody at the top point of the salary. I think that somebody must check these barristers and professional men in Barbados so that they will come to their senses and do not believe that in Barbados lawyers, doctors and the like must of necessity get all that the community can offer in the sense of salary. If what those two hon. members have been saying is correct that the cost of a man's education is to be regarded as a criterion for salary, then a dunce who takes longer to learn than a bright boy deserves more money to be paid to him because you spend more money on a dunce; if you work on those lines, a dunce will have to get more money than a bright boy.

7.15 p.m.

Moreover, there is a certain type of professional who has endless expenses. The very nature of the profession is expensive and on that basis people will not be able to employ them at the beginning. I will have to come to the defence of the Assistant Secretaries. There is an idea that where there is a job which is a non-professional job, nobody can do it well; I do not subscribe to that idea. An Assistant Secretary is supposed to be generally possessed of the basic qualification that any lawyer would have, and in many instances these people leave school with higher qualifications than those of the lawyers. Therefore, when you have a boy who leaves Harrison College or Lodge School and enters the Public Service and gives twelve years' service there, do you think that he is not deserving of a reward in an administrative scale which compares with what is the beginning scale of a person in the legal profession? You have two boys leaving school, one having the Higher Certificate or one who barely misses a Barbados Scholarship, and you have another one leaving school in a lower bracket and spending twelve years in the Government Service; the other man within three years' time becomes a professional Barrister and covers his profession in a short time, but the experience of the other man must mean something to the community and it must mean something to him.

What I would like to draw to the attention of this House is this: there is a fallacy that when you begin to work on the basis of not evaluating the services, you regard them in the light in which you are thinking of what a person is giving to the community. The Crown certainly provides a service to the community, but do not tell me that a man in the administrative service dealing with walls and strays, an excellent officer like that, cannot be the equivalent of any man with a Law Degree, having regard to the service which he has given to the community. When any of us reaches the stage to evaluate the worth of the community in money only, we will never appreciate the service. As soon as you cannot appreciate a person's service in terms of money - well there are services which you cannot appreciate in these terms. In that way, I have to draw swords with those two hon. members who have spoken.

We are going to have a difficult problem owing to the

difficult structure which the Government has created. Unfortunately, we have this tight-laced system where you want a better man than the salary can provide. As soon as you are dealing with the salary structure of \$4,560 - \$6,240, up comes the matter again and all of them will require more money as soon as you begin to touch any of them. I am not at all satisfied, until the whole judicial system is put before me, that the need of a Crown Counsel in the structure which you are providing is going to serve the purpose which it is intended to serve. You are only appointing an Assistant to the Attorney General with another name. The fact of the matter seems to me - I do not know much about the qualifications of the people at the Bar but from what I have been told and from what I have seen, it seems to me that the stage has been reached where you want to prosecute people to get them so afraid that everybody thinks he will go to jail, but the legal profession is becoming a laughing-stock from the point of view that the Barristers who practise at the Bar seem to be, by and large, more able to land more in their profession than what the Crown has been able to attract. If that is the situation, it means that although the Crown is paying a lot of money, the Crown is not getting the desired quality and there is the necessity for a review in your structure.

The Addendum to this Resolution says this: "During the year 1957-58 over \$3,800 had to be paid to private counsel for prosecuting at Assizes." I have some peculiar views on this matter; there is nothing wrong in that. If you deal with the administration of justice, it may be better for this country to afford to appoint people when the cases require such persons, than to have an establishment with people whom they say cannot measure up to what is taking place. In the United Kingdom, I understand that the Crown has the right to employ whom they like to employ to do certain cases. We have had the situation where we had to employ people from Trinidad to deal with a matter which should be normally within the practice of any Attorney General in the case of arbitration. I say that we are spending money in many instances without giving serious consideration to the matter.

My last point is this: it seems to be very fashionable nowadays that we make adjustments in the administration in the hierarchy, but when there is any discussion about people in the lower segments of life, there is the question of whence the money is to come. We cannot go on in this fashion. I end on this serious note. It is said that no country which runs a top-heavy administration can expect the people at the bottom to be attended to. There is too much the idea that some people can draw \$600 a month being University men, whereas, others should go and pray on \$6 a week. I have been in this House long enough to say that when they make an analysis on the basis of increased salaries for some people they do not consider other people in the same way.

7.25 p.m.

You are spending more money on the Solicitor General by making his post a whole-time one and making it pensionable. If you consider the net cost of the Solicitor General of Barbados now as compared with what it was before, you will find that it is nearly 100% more. You have increased his salary and therefore his pension goes up, and it is known that these legal people get an additional amount after a certain number of years. With all this going on, don't you realise that you are going to breed discontent, because it looks as though there is anxiety to examine all these things while no attention is paid to the people at the bottom, as the hon. member for St. Philip has said. Hon. members of the Government do not listen to debate, and for a man drawing \$13 as a cantonier they feel that they are doing all they can for that man, while they can make all these other additions. The reason for that is because too many people in Barbados are like dogs who have tasted blood. Some of them work for more than this; so it does not matter. Since the Ministerial status has come about, I find that money does not mean much; but there must be a limit.

This is an addition to the legal profession, but I feel that the Attorney General should be taken out of the Other

Place and asked to do some more work; you should ask the Solicitor General to go into the Courts a little more often. When you add up these amounts after making these additions, you can take any twenty-five people at the top and see how many people they represent at the bottom. By that I do not want any fool.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Any fool outside of the House, I presume!

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes! I do not want any fool outside of the House to ask whether we expect a cantonier to be paid the same amount of money as the Attorney General, because it can so easily be twisted. I am saying that by the same method we should get down to reality and call on some of these people in the hierarchy to do some more for the money which we are paying.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the last speaker about the top-heavy administration, I was really wondering if that was the thought running through the minds of all members of the House. I have heard a lot of speeches on this matter, but I am going to be somewhat different from the other speakers, although the hon. member who has just sat down has stolen my thunder about the Hon. and Learned Attorney General in the Other Place.

It is logical and it follows that with your present Cabinet system Government must have good legal advisers, and they must be able to study and give advice after great consideration, and that is why I said that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has stolen my thunder when he made the point about removing the Attorney General from the Other Place. How far will we go and how long will this continue? It has been rightly said that the legal opinion of the Attorney General or some Crown Law Officer is usually reflected here when the policy of a Minister is put forward. That must be so because they must have legal advisers, and it is not for them to take the advice of the Barristers or even the laymen of this House.

You have a Cabinet system and in it there is a Minister without portfolio whom you are paying and who is responsible for introducing and explaining measures passed by this House. It is no longer the duty of the Colonial Secretary or the Attorney General to introduce such measures. It is true that we have read day after day, after measures go to the Other Place and come back, that the Attorney General himself admits that when laymen find fault with them that they have not been back to his Department. I should like to know therefore, what useful purpose the Attorney General is serving in the Other Place. I am sure the hon. Minister in charge who has left will be able to give us that answer.

The Attorney General, as the hon. member said, does not prosecute any longer at Sessions. If it is *infra dig* for the Attorney General to prosecute at Sessions, then beside him you have a whole-time Solicitor General, an Assistant to the Attorney General, a Legal Draughtsman, and an Assistant Legal Draughtsman. Call them what you like, I have been told by legal luminaries that you have not had legal draughtsmen since Mr. Clyde Archer, Mr. Inniss and Mr. Fergusson. I have been told that since these men, you have had very clever copyists, people who can take some Act from Trinidad or St. Lucia and transpose it and bring it here. The difference between Messrs Archer, Inniss and Fergusson is that you had first-class original draughtsmen, while now you only have copyists. I am not voting for this because I am not guided by anybody in this matter. The Attorney General of this country should not be in the Other Place now; he is wasting time there. You have Mr. Morris to whom you pay a salary and his duty is to answer and explain questions and apprise the Council on all the circumstances concerned in any Bill, Resolution or anything of the sort which goes before them. Maybe the Attorney General is overworked because I notice quite recently that one of the Puisne Judges in delivering judgment—and I think it is my right to comment—said that he did not think the school boy who had been charged for murder and kept in prison without bail, because you cannot give a person bail who is charged for murder, should have been

charged for murder at all. The Attorney General was so over-worked that he could not give the correct opinion, and even the Police and the Judge said that you should not put the school boy up there because you never had a case of murder. I wonder what was operating in his mind! Were his duties in the Council so much that he could not attend to that?

7.35 p.m.

You see, I happen not to be a lawyer, therefore, I am saying what I have to say and if the Attorney General thinks that I am another upstart, he may only feel like other Attorney Generals. I am here to speak as my conscience directs me. If he was overworked and did not have the time to go into that case and therefore allowed it to go before the Judge for the Judge to criticise it and say that that boy should not be charged for murder at all, and on the back of it when that boy was taken out of school and put in prison, may be for two months just because the Attorney General was overworked, that is too bad. You have the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, the Assistant to the Attorney General and the Assistant Legal Draughtsman—all of them are lawyers. If I made a speech dealing with doctors at the Hospital like that which the hon. junior member for St. Andrew made in defence of the salary of a member of his profession, it would be suggested that I am an upstart.

Mr. Speaker, I do not really see the necessity for another legal man to be attached to the Attorney General's Department. What does the Addendum say? It says that at least two members of this staff are required to spend a considerable amount of their time in the courts with the result that drafting of legislation is being hampered. In order to allow the officers to devote more time to drafting and advisory work it is proposed to provide a Crown Counsel. I notice quite recently that subsidiary Boards of the Government have been appointing their own private solicitor. Those Boards come directly under the control of Ministers. I take it that these private solicitors do some of the advising for the existing authorities, but according to this Addendum it is stated that in order to allow the officers to devote more time to drafting and advisory work, it is proposed to provide a Crown Counsel, and this officer's main duties will be to appear in Court in both civil and criminal matters, but he will also assist in Chambers when not appearing in court. What you are really saying is that you want another assistant in the Attorney General's Office and that the Attorney General must not go into the law courts but must remain in the Upper Place where there is absolutely nothing for him to do. He must advise the Cabinet but not on policy. The Cabinet has already put in the Other Place a Minister without portfolio whom the Attorney General must advise. Must he sit there and look at him? There is no point in keeping him there to waste his time.

There is also this talk by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that this salary of \$520 a month is not sufficient for the Crown Counsel. A man is entitled to get what he can in his profession. If you want to stay in private business and put in 16 or 18 hours a day and possibly make more money than this, that is a matter for you. It is a question of what the Government can pay. I want to make one or two comparisons and I am sorry that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is out of the Chamber. You have what I consider is professional snobbery. Which is of the greatest importance? Can you compare a salary of \$520 a month which you are paying a man for doing a profession in one of your departments with that of a salary of \$280 which you are paying to a teacher at Combermere or the Foundation School? If you got in here and made a noise about that, it would be alright. It is of much greater importance in my considered opinion to pay a good salary to the man in the teaching profession. You have been hearing from all sides of the Government benches that in relation to the economy of the Island you have to take education, and therefore you cannot afford a Sixth Form at the St. Michael's Girls' School because you cannot afford to pay a mistress for teaching the Sixth Form; yet on the other hand you are saying that you can afford another Crown Counsel. You have seen doing the work in the Courts for Government, Mr. Keith Walcott, Mr. Wylie, Mr. Whyatt, to whom although I had various altercations with him, I

must take off my hat because he was an able man. We have seen all of those former Attorney Generals doing work in the courts. Is the Government suggesting now that it must have the Attorney General to advise, the Solicitor General to advise, the Assistant to the Attorney General and the other assistants to draft? I hope hon. members of the Government do not think that the drafting of this Resolution is something which takes a legal mind to do. It is something to draft if you come in here with an amendment to an Act or some Bill; but I hope members of the Government are not suggesting that the drafting of a Resolution is something like that. You say in this Addendum that drafting of legislation is being hampered. What is being hampered? How is it hampered? If the Government says that they want a Resolution drafted to come down here and the Secretary tells you the reasons, do not say that that is drafting. What have you to do to take four men all this time to do in the Attorney General's Department? The advice of the Attorney General or either of the Crown Law Officers to the Cabinet is absolutely necessary, but I can say today owing to the standard of the Police Force that the best ability is usually picked for prosecuting cases for the Crown. It was not like many years ago when you had the Attorney General and the Solicitor General only doing such things. You have sent out policemen to be trained and they are very good. They do a tremendous amount of the prosecution in the Lower Courts; therefore you want your lawyers only in the High Courts. With all that, you still say that four of these gentlemen are not enough to advise the Government and to do the drafting. Let us say that the Attorney General does the advising. Do you mean to say that the other three cannot do the drafting and the other work? You want a man now to do the work in the Courts.

I am really sorry that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has left the House because I want to touch on the point made by him about people spending so much money to qualify as barristers. Let me tell him that people are also spending a lot of money to become qualified teachers, and those people are more important to us because they have to train the minds of the youths of this country. You look at them and tell them they cannot get any more money; but when there is a job for a barrister, you will get the strongest arguments put up on the floor of this House telling you why you should pay him.

7.45 p.m.

You have arguments, Mr. Speaker, that it costs so much to be a Barrister. I am not belittling any Barrister or suggesting anything derogatory about any Barrister; but I do not want it to be thought that members of this House will place Barristers on any pedestal or consider that other people in the general service cannot reach them. The comparison is made about two boys going to school and one might be a little brighter than the other; one becoming a Lawyer and the other acquiring experience in life in the general service, and possibly taking a course; but there is the idea that because you are giving an Assistant Secretary \$520 a month, you must give a Barrister more than \$520 a month. I do not agree with that. I see it stated in the Press that it is necessary to have a senior man for prosecuting in the Courts, but I think it is necessary to have a senior man for giving advice. If the Government feels that there is the necessity for a more senior man next to the Solicitor General, why do they not say so?

What is the position? The Solicitor General is now on leave; and because you have this difficulty at the present time, it does not necessarily mean that you will have this difficulty all the time. I really cannot find myself voting for this Resolution. I suppose that hon. members feel that they can vote for it, but I do not feel so. If you compare a young Barrister with a Teacher - you compare the salaries and you have to take into account the five strenuous days which a Teacher must face. I am saying that you are overburdening the country with a top-heavy administration. Whither are we going and when will we stop? Did we believe that we would have lived to see that Barbados would be asking for five legally-trained men to be placed in the Attorney General's Office? Many of us will remember the time when Mr. Clyde Dear was brought in as a clerk. I do not say that the work has not

been increased since then, but it certainly has not increased to warrant the creation of these five posts. I have noticed recently that a number of Boards are now appointing their own private Solicitor; besides that fact, there are several matters in which the Queen's Solicitor is called upon to advise the Government. On the question of real estate and agreements and what not, the Queen's Solicitor advises the Government on such matters, but where it is a question of bonds, of people getting loans and so on, these matters come under the Attorney General's notice. Where it is a question of mortgaging property and lending money for building houses, those things are done by Solicitors and the Boards are appointing their own Solicitors. When all of that is taken into account, why do we want another officer like this? I feel that before the Government came down with this Bill, they should have seen whether the Solicitor General's time could not be used in giving more advice to the Cabinet and if it is a question of going into the Court and prosecuting cases, they could use some of the juniors in the Office and there would not be any necessity for having the Attorney General as a legislator in the colony.

Mr. TALMA: Unlike my colleagues, I speak as one who has had experience in the Ministerial system of Government, and speaking for myself, I say that the whole system of Government has been changed. There was a time when all of the work, all of the Government business, was done through the Colonial Secretary. At present, we have a Ministerial system of Government and a greater volume of work is done by the Government than was the case in the days to which the hon. senior member for the City has referred - the days of Mr. Dear and Mr. Archer. We now have a Premier and four Ministers and there is one Minister Without Portfolio. It may be 300% more work done now than what was done formerly and in order to expedite legislation and Government Business, you will need a man of proper calibre, a man of proper experience, a proper legally-trained man and not just a Barrister who has come out fresh from his books and who has had little or no experience. It is for that reason that I welcome the appointment of Crown Counsel, in the same way as I pressed for the appointment of a full-time Solicitor General.

We have a full-time Solicitor General at the present time and I am hoping that we will have a man of proper calibre and experience as Crown Counsel. Bearing in mind that private counsel may be engaged in some family litigation, bearing in mind that he may be appearing against one of the same parties to that litigation in a criminal prosecution on behalf of the Crown, you can very well realise that justice will not be meted out. I am diametrically opposed to the appointment of private counsel and the vast amount of money which is spent in engaging such private counsel to prosecute in the Courts. I feel that that is a bad policy and it should be stopped. I believe that a lot of harm is done and the ends of justice are not met by the appointment of private counsel to prosecute cases at the Assizes.

The Government is trying to bring Barbados into line with what obtains in other colonies. We now have a full-time Solicitor General and not the hybrid situation which we had for years. I really feel that the Crown Counsel should be a man of no less than ten years' experience at the Bar.

7.55 p.m.

He should be a practitioner of no less than ten years' experience and he must be a lawyer who has had sufficient experience and who knows his law, because he will be able not only to appear in Assize and Civil Courts but also to advise Government on all intricate points of law. After all, you are drafting legislation, and you need the services of a Legal Draughtsman, whether to advise on a legal point or to draft legislation, from day to day. It is no point for the Opposition to cry out about bad draughtsmanship and things of that sort, and when the Government comes down with a Resolution for appointing legal men of the right calibre to assist in expediting the drafting of legislation they say you do not need any more people in that office.

The hon. senior member for the City made reference to the point that the Attorney General should not have

occasion to appear in the Other Place, but I say that the Attorney General as an integral member of the Cabinet should be there to advise, and it is only fitting and proper that he should be in the Council to assist in legal points the Minister without portfolio who might find himself guessing on certain points. I cannot subscribe to the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for the City. If you want proper legal advice you cannot get it from lawyers fresh from their books; you want lawyers of at least ten years' experience and if you want to attract a lawyer with the necessary experience, ability and calibre, you have to pay him a proper salary in these days. To put a Crown Counsel on the same salary scale as an Assistant Secretary is wrong; I think, too, that it is wrong to put him on the same salary scale as a Magistrate, and therefore I think the scale should be revised. I do not think you should put him on an incremental basis; you should give him a fixed salary of \$6,240, because it is an insult to appoint a man as Crown Counsel and pay him on an incremental basis.

Speaking for myself, I am in thorough agreement with the principles set out in this Resolution, and I feel that if we are to expedite Government business, we need a proper man as Crown Counsel. We have had the Courts revised recently, and we have the Supreme Court and two Assize Courts sitting at the same time; so it is quite justifiable to get a Crown Counsel to prosecute at the same time. I, Sir, am in favour of this, and I think Government is taking a wise step in discontinuing the practice of appointing and engaging private counsel to prosecute at the Assizes.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it sometimes happens that even members of the same political Party disagree quite profoundly with one another on issues which do not in any way depreciate their underlying and more fundamental union. This is one such time, because you will have noticed quite surprisingly that all the members of the Opposition, at least in this corner, who have spoken so far, have given slightly different reasons for their support or non-support of this measure. I think also, that broadly speaking, all of my colleagues wish to support this measure, although one or two of us feel very strongly that it is not the sort of measure that we could welcome wholeheartedly. I myself take the view which was expressed in part by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, although I will go a little further than he did in the strengthening of his views.

This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that people obviously can feel strongly about. It depends upon your point of view and what you regard as being important in the administration of the country. There will be, I think, complete agreement on all sides of the House that the Legal Department of Government ought to be properly staffed; nobody will disagree with that. Some of us can be forgiven for asking whether the Legal Department is now worse staffed than it was twenty years ago. I think that two hon. members on this side have made mention of the fact that we now have an Attorney General, an Assistant to the Attorney General, a Legal Draughtsman and an Assistant Legal Draughtsman, and now it is proposed to add Crown Counsel.

Now there was a time when, Mr. Speaker, the work substantially speaking which is now done by all these people used to be done by the Attorney General, a part-time Solicitor General and, I think, a Legal Draughtsman. You can argue that the volume of work has increased three or four or possibly ten times; that is possibly true, but at the same time more people share the increase of work. Twenty years ago the Attorney General would have been sitting in this Chamber and piloting every single Bill and Resolution which came before this House or its Committee, and it would have been at a time when as now the Assize Sessions were going on, and tomorrow morning he would have been in the Courts as usual prosecuting. Now that is not the case any more for the political work which was done twenty years ago in this Assembly; we now have five Ministers sharing the work between them. Of course, I can imagine some of them saying that it was never the Attorney General himself doing the work on behalf of the Executive Committee, because there were always four members of the Executive Committee in the House, and

he could delegate part of the work to them. That is true in theory, but it is a fact that the Attorney General in those days, even if he did not speak on every occasion, certainly piloted every major Bill and Resolution on which there was bound to be controversy. There was more to it than that. 8.05 p.m.

In those days the House was not composed as it is now and there were a lot of people who though they were planters or merchants, as the case may be, were themselves trained lawyers. There was a time when in the same House of Assembly you would find that not only Mr. Keith Walcott himself but Mr. Pile, Mr. Evelyn and about three or four others who were trained lawyers and who could be relied upon to pull to pieces anything brought before them which they thought was not properly done; and so the Attorney General had to be on his toes on every occasion. Although there was no formal Opposition, they were trained men like himself who understood good draughtsmanship and who would see to it that he did his work properly. You therefore had him doing the normal work in the courts; you had him doing the political work and doing the administrative work and drafting the legislation which he himself would have to render before the House. Today, almost all the political work has been taken away. It is not suggested that the time he spends in the Other Place excludes any work on this behalf. His political work is shared between all the Ministers. Even before the Minister without portfolio was appointed to the Other Place, the person who introduced Government Business and who was responsible for piloting it was not necessarily the Attorney General but the Chief Secretary who is still up to now a member of the Other Place, and even then the burden of the Attorney General was lightened considerably under the Ministerial set-up.

It is argued with some strength that the administration of justice from the point of view of the courts is being already put to quite seriously because there is not individual in the Attorney General's Department to do the prosecution. They are the only people who will be able to pronounce judgment on that matter, but there are matters in which lay people do not have to wait for the guidance of lawyers. From observation, even if it were not viewed from the technicians' point of view, I am not convinced that the burden of prosecution is too great for the Attorney General's Department and I think that, even when it was argued that you had to pay \$3,840 last year to private people to prosecute, I think it was a racket which was being run. I am not imputing any bad motive to the people who did the prosecutions because they could not do it without being asked; but I think it was reason for the back log of work. We are not satisfied that the Attorney General has too much to do for himself. We see no reason why he himself cannot prosecute and even then, as happened recently, if he does not feel like prosecuting, there are prosecutions which have been put in motion which have profoundly shocked our reason and one must therefore ask whether the Attorney General is doing all he should do. We have seen quite recently the case of a 17-year-old boy being put in the dock when in the prosecution for the crime of murder the trial judge spoke with great strength on the conduct of the Attorney General for allowing that prosecution ever to be started. The fact is that a young person was taken out of school at a time when the General Certificate Examination was going on, to have the alternative experience of sitting in the dock on a capital charge. For the officer in charge, no matter who he is, to have allowed a young person like that to stand trial when even the trial judge had to make comment in the manner as he did, shows that the Attorney General was not doing his duty as he ought; therefore, to argue that the Attorney General is too busy to attend to prosecutions just falls down because the one thing he could have attended to was that, unless it is that the Attorney General felt that justice would not have been done if that youngster was not prosecuted. Sir, we cannot accept all of his arguments about overwork. You do not have to be over careful, but you just have to exercise a sufficient degree of care to see where a miscarriage of justice nearly took place.

It has been argued by all my colleagues and some other hon. members on this side that you have got to pay the Crown Counsel a higher salary in order to attract the best people. Well, I do not wish to embarrass the person

to whom I am now going to refer, but Mr. Speaker, just a few feet in front of me sits the Clerk of this House. Who would argue that his work is less valuable to us for the responsibility it entails and the technicality that it calls for than the work of a magistrate or the work of any of these people in the Crown Law Department? You cannot argue that because it is somebody for the Attorney General's Department that is necessary, and that he is more valuable than a person doing valuable work in another sphere. How can you argue that somebody else who may not even have the legal training or the magisterial experience of any senior magistrates is necessarily a better person to attract?

There is also this aspect. There are other Departments of this Establishment in this Island where the same argument can be used. The senior member for the City mentioned the Teaching Establishment. If you can pay any well-qualified teacher coming from a University \$500 a month, all your troubles about Sixth Forms and advanced education in this Island would vanish because a lot of people who are now employed in industry and commerce and other spheres of employment but whose natural bent is teaching would prefer to do teaching because although they would be getting less than what they got in private enterprise, they would still feel that this is occupation worthwhile to accept. We have not yet reached the stage of paying any graduate \$500 a month; we still regard that as the level for a Headmaster. But it is argued that in the Legal Department that is not sufficient. I cannot see it. I see no reason why Government should worry about that at all assuming that you do need the post or that you should pay the person that rate.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, quite a lot of people argue that because you have these prosecutions to do - particularly at Assize time - because it is necessary in the interest of justice that prosecutions should take place regularly and methodically, you must have these people.

The other thought which has not been taken into calculation is this. For the last 50 years, the Government of Barbados has been paying barristers who take short briefs something like £10 - I speak under correction. (A VOICE: It is 10 guineas.) - It is 10 guineas for defending people on capital charges. That is roughly speaking \$50. Even now in these days that is thought sufficient for a man to receive defending somebody who is likely to lose his life on the scaffold. 8.15 p.m.

Only last week, we had a wonderful example of it. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that even now that we have reached the stage of defending a man even if he has not got any money for his defence, it is just as important as if he could hire his own legal adviser and that therefore, if the Government wishes to have poor persons to defend themselves on capital charges, that they should be assisted with the same amount of money for a private Barrister as if the person could afford one? Having regard to those hon. members who have spoken on this matter, I would say this; I see nothing wrong with it in principle. There is nothing wrong with a person being paid by the Government, whether part-time or otherwise, or having to assist poor people with their defence. If you argue that way, I have no reason to suppose that it would be wrong to pay on a higher scale than what we pay now. If poor persons who cannot afford to pay their own fees can only look forward to that \$50 which is paid for them - this is not pertinent to the matter which is under discussion, but it is something which should be taken into account and something which needs revising as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, we come back to this point. We are in danger of creating an administrative class and it is a real problem. You cannot now discuss any Civil Establishment matter unless the argument is put forward that because you have work of a certain kind to be done, you must put a calabash into the Treasury and scoop deep down in it; otherwise, you cannot get anything done. That may be so in the case of agricultural experts, but in no other branch of employment should we be led away by this argument. If you have job ranges from \$380 to \$520 a month, tell your

Magistrates that they can apply for them if they wish to do so. If the Clerk of this House is so inclined, he can apply, because he comes within the salary range and within the qualifications required, and you can leave it at that. If they feel that they can contribute something in the job, well, let them do it; but you do not feel that you must raise the salary every time you want somebody for a post.

We are now reaching the stage where people think that because there are certain ranges of salaries in the upper divisions of the Civil Service, special privileges and special recognition should be given to them. You always hear better arguments in favour of them than you hear in favour of the people who are lower down. I do not know if many hon. members know that there was a move on foot in the Public Works Department to reduce the rates paid to painters, because it was felt that painters are not skilled workers in the sense that carpenters and masons are such workers. I think that the matter has been put right now. (Hon. M. E. COX: Who could have done that?) This is not his Department, but I would like his colleagues to find out and come back here next Tuesday and tell us about it. I do not think that the matter came to anything, but it was seriously considered. When you consider doing a thing like that, it is clear that you do not rate a good painter, a man who is skilled in his own technique, as you rate a good doctor or a good lawyer; but, in their respective spheres, they are heads and tops of their profession. However, no one would dream of saying that the Legal Draftsman is not going to work for the money which they are paying him. It sometimes happens with regard to the people in the lower levels of the Civil Service, that attempts are made to down-grade their salaries. We have to guard against the creation of an administrative class with special rights and privileges; if it is work to be done in the Civil Establishment of this Island, let us decide what sort of people are going to do it and what sort of people are not going to do it. It sometimes happens that after ten years has been spent in a Government Department, or after one has spent time in educating oneself, he is more often than not the equivalent of, or even better than, one who is holding a University Degree; it all depends upon a man's experience, integrity and aptitude. There is no question of arguing that it is a bad thing to give a Barrister the same thing as you give an Assistant Secretary; the matter should not be argued on that basis at all.

I am in favour of the Resolution because it is for the Government to say that it wants additional staff; and if it says so, then that is an end of the matter. However, on other grounds, I would be inclined to oppose the Resolution on the ground that the cost of administering the colony is going up by leaps and bounds and we have to draw the line somewhere. I think that these hon. members who have spoken in favour of this Resolution have made out some case for it and as it is not a matter for political division, I shall not oppose it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking for permission to speak again.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking for permission to speak again. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. *(After a pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister to speak again. 8.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I will not be long because no doubt whenever Government comes to the House to establish posts or to amend and increase salaries or anything like that, there will always be a talk and members will always say that you can do without it and form their own conclusions, and odious comparisons. I think we are satisfied as a Government that this is absolutely necessary, and I think that some members of the Opposition have more or less spoken for the Government. We are satisfied that it is necessary to have a post such as this established, and after long discussion with the Chief Justice and the Attorney General and so on, we have come to the conclusion that we should accept their advice, because we feel they are experts in this field.

The talk about removing the Attorney General from the Other Place does not amount to a row of pins because the

two hours which he spends in the Council amounts to little or nothing.

I just rose to refute one of the points made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy when he said that there was an attempt to reduce the wages of the people in the Public Works Department.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. There is nothing wrong with the Minister attempting to refute what I said, but he will remember that I said that it would be better to investigate and then attempt to prove me wrong.

Hon. M. E. COX: My point is that the wages of rates which are paid are fixed by Law. We said that a man in this category must get "X" cents per hour; so we cannot pay less or reduce it. That is in the Estimates; so do not let us feel that there is a move to reduce it. I am sorry that the hon. member always makes the mistake of making statements which no doubt when they are examined are groundless.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member is quite right in saying that I make statements which when examined are groundless because he has not examined them. He has just called for the Estimates and quoted the rates at which these people are paid, but he does not know what is happening in the particular Department, and that is why I warned him to find out what it is all about and then prove me wrong.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The hon. member said that it is not the Department of the Minister who spoke. It is my Department. Why doesn't he come forthright in these things? He is always getting up and bringing out rumours or something that has been said. The Hon. Minister quoted the rates laid down from the Estimates; they cannot be changed. Who can make attempts to change them? (Mr. WALCOTT: You.) You will say that sitting down, but you should get up and say so. Let the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, who is now sitting down, get up and say so, because he knows it is a deliberate untruth to say "you". It suits him to say that. He knows that when the rates are passed, nobody can change them; so the hon. member has spoken about things he does not know about.

Mr. SPEAKER: The asides are too loud.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I simply wanted to say that some people are tampering with Trade Union affairs but know nothing about this.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a small item and I am asking leave to take charge of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour is asking leave to take Order No. 4 and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 12 ORDER, 1958

Hon. M. E. COX: I think the House has already agreed to the principle of establishing a Ministry of Education, and as hon. members will see from the Addendum, it is proposed to have some economy between the Premier's office and the Ministry of Education. The Addendum is as follows:-

The Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1958", has been laid in the Legislature.

As the Legislature was informed at the opening of the present Legislative Session it is proposed to appoint a Minister of Education.

The Order accordingly provides for the creation of one post of Permanent Secretary and one post of Long Grade Clerk for the Ministry of Education. It also provides for the upgrading of a post of Stenographer now attached to the Ministry of the Premier (General Purposes) to the grade of Secretary for the new Ministry.

Having regard to the need for economy it is proposed to transfer the post of Assistant Secretary in the Ministry of the Premier (General Purposes) to the new Ministry and to make arrangements whereby the Assistant Secretary and Senior Clerk in the Establishment Section of the Ministry of the Premier (Finance) will perform duties in the Ministry of the Premier (General Purposes) in addition to their present duties. The Registry of the Ministry of Social Services, and the Stenographer in that Ministry, together with the addition of the Long Grade Clerk mentioned above, will also serve the Ministry of Education.

This is an attempt to effect some economy with this arrangement. (Mr. WALCOTT: Where is the economy?) It is customary as the hon. member knows to have an Assistant Secretary in these offices and you also have somebody to take charge of the Registry and all that. If he reads it and cares to study it, I believe he will understand.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is really nice when a Minister is rude and makes these remarks. It is good when you do not fall into the trap of using certain phrases glibly.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. I object to those remarks. The hon. member talks about being rude. How dare him to talk about any member of this House as being rude? It is most unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: No member may refer to another member as being rude. You might do that in other places, but not in Parliament.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if you object to the word "rude" in my remarks, I will say it is "improper". These improper remarks used relative to some person who should read and understand are expected from him, and I will proceed to show why these remarks are improper. It is true that he has asked for leave to deal with this matter, but he has not read it. I have read it.
9.35 p.m.

He speaks about economies. We are spending more money, not less money. What economies are you talking about? We are spending more money by this Resolution. You are creating another Permanent Secretary. The Hon. Premier already has three Permanent Secretaries to himself. He has a Permanent Secretary in the person of the Financial Secretary because the Premier deals with finance and that person deals with the Premier. You also have an Assistant Financial Secretary. The Hon. Premier also has a Permanent Secretary in the person of Mr. Burton who is acting. The Hon. Minister does not understand the structure of the Civil Service. You are creating another post of Permanent Secretary to deal with the subject which the Premier used to deal with; therefore, you are not effecting an economy. The person who used to act as Assistant Secretary for Education in the Premier's office is going to be transferred to the office of the Minister of Education. You are therefore reallocating the duties of the person. You are not effecting any economy because you are still going to allow the Assistant Secretary to the Premier to remain although you have transferred the portfolio of education to the Minister of Education. You cannot say that you are effecting economies when you are spending more money. You are effecting economies when you do something to save money.

Sir, what I say is that they have re-allocated the duties. I do not wish to go over what I said last week, but they should now see, if they are responsible for the administration, that the mere fact that they are now streamlining the administration only goes to prove the worth of my argument that they should have streamlined it at the top.

What I rose to say is this. All these statutory powers now want changing. As it stands now, the Director of Education, the Director of Agriculture and all the other Directors according to the law still have statutory powers and the reason why I say that is because I want to pelt out of office a Minister when anything under his portfolio goes wrong. If anything goes wrong, I want to be in the position to come in here with a vote of no confidence and I do not want the Minister to hide behind any Civil Servant. The time has come when these Ministers should see to it as a constitutional measure, that the Director of Education should not have the statutory powers as those which he now possesses. Those powers should belong to the Minister. Let me be in a position to get at the Minister's blood when I want to deal with him. Too many of them do wrong things and then say that the Director is responsible. Let the Director of Education take the advice of the Minister; let the Minister of Education be responsible and have the statutory powers which are vested in the Director of Education. Whether you are in this House or outside, I do not think that would take a Solomon to understand. These statutory powers should be vested in the Ministers instead of the Directors. Of course, Sir, I do not mean that the Minister of Education should be the Director of Education. I mean in so far as the conventions lay it down that if there has been anything wrong and the Minister wants to say: "these are not my powers, these are the powers of the Director", that he should not be allowed to get away with it. That is why I say that the structure should be changed. When you reach the stage that you still regard it that if the Chief Justice or the Attorney General says something, not on legal matters but on structure, they are the experts on it and therefore what the experts say, you must carry out, then I say, God help us.

The Addendum says that having regard to the need for economy, it is proposed to transfer the post of Assistant Secretary in the Ministry of the Premier (General Purposes) to the new Ministry and to make arrangements whereby the Assistant Secretary and the Senior Clerk in the Establishment Section of the Ministry of the Premier (Finance) will perform duties in the Ministry of the Premier (General Purposes) in addition to their duties.

Sir, "general purposes" mean anything under the sun; "general purposes" mean general interference of all the Ministers. You are doing that because the Premier's office has more Permanent Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries than in the other Ministries; therefore, if you have changed up the portfolios of the Premier, you must reallocate your officers, or else you would have people in that office butting down one another. However, Sir, if they did not see the necessity for taking my first suggestion, if they do this, all I would say is that it is necessary.

To say that you are effecting economy is not economy in the sense that you are leaving somebody out; you are only shifting some people about. You have a pool of Assistant Secretaries in existence and you are making use of them. You cannot seriously say that you are effecting economy.

You go on to say in the Addendum that the Registry of the Ministry of Social Services, and the Stenographer in that Ministry, together with the addition of the Long Grade Clerk mentioned above will also serve the Ministry of Education.

This just depends on how some Civil Services are worked. Sometimes, you have a registry for each Minister; sometimes you have a general registry for the whole Service; it just depends on how big your Ministries are. I do not think that your Ministries are so big that you should have five separate registries; but it is for you to say if the volume of work coming into the five Ministries independently requires an independent registry for each. Within your ministerial section, you must have got Civil Servants to give some study to this matter and to say what is the type of registry you should have with the type of Departments which you have.

Somebody says: "Look at the Registry". Well, the Minister of Social Services should know more of the Registry than I do; but with the size of Barbados, I do not think

that anybody would seriously suggest that we need or should have six Registries. On the other basis, you will take a Registry for the whole island; you will have a Registry for every single legal Department. My serious concern about this matter is not so much the matter of these changes; because as long as you have a separate Ministry you must have a separate Permanent Secretary; but my idea of this matter was to raise the point that as soon as you begin to change these things, then I feel that the Statutory powers of the particular Department should be modified in keeping with any proper Ministerial system.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

8.50 p.m.

ORDER POSTPONED

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Governor's Act, 1890.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 5, and to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.

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

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the consideration of amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there are a few simple amendments to the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921, which was passed by this House quite recently. The Bill was sent to the Other Place and the Other Place made one or two amendments which I hope hon. members have before them.

In the first place, the words "Court of Common Pleas" are deleted, and the words "Supreme Court" substituted therefor; and in Clause 13 (a) the word "inscribed" is deleted, because that word is already in the original Act, and it was not necessary to insert it in the Section.

I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE APPRENTICESHIP, BURSARIES ACT, 1928

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to take Order No. 11 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: As hon. members will see on page 2, Clause 2, Sub-clause 2 of the Bill, the word "Chairman" has been inserted after the word "Deputy"; and in Sub-clause 9 the word "its" is used instead of the word "their". These mistakes are made even by the best educated people at times. Then in Sub-clause 11, the word "their" is deleted and the word "its" is substituted therefor. Finally, in Sub-clause 12, the word "its" is substituted for the word "their". Those are the amendments; they are all minor ones.

I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE RATE OF INTEREST BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Rate of Interest Act, 1754.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: There are two amendments to this Bill. The first one is the insertion in Section 2 of the Bill under (b) (ii) the word "registered" after the word "firm" and in the same line the word "incorporated" is used instead of the word "registered". Those are the two amendments which have been made by the Other Place.

I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for the day. (A MEMBER: Fix the Order Paper).

The Order Paper having been fixed.

9.05 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Deputy Premier has anything to add to what the Premier said last week in connection with the question of a summer recess for Parliament. We merely want information on this side, because if it is proposed to have a recess, we will make certain arrangements for ourselves. If it is not proposed to have a recess, then we will not make any arrangements, but we merely want some information.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is Government's intention to have a recess, but there are a few important Bill which we would like to get through before the recess. For instance, there is a Bill dealing with the Gulf Oil Company which we consider very important and would like

to deal with. There is also a Bill to amend the Development Board Act and there may be another introduced on Tuesday which I would like to get passed before the recess. We may have to sit more than one day to get through them.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th August, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is a matter which I should like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works which is causing a considerable amount of dissatisfaction among the Highways and Transport workers in my constituency. Due to some administrative adjustment - I would refrain from saying "muddle" - workers have been transferred from St. Andrew to St. Joseph to do the same sort of work they were doing in St. Andrew. Similarly, people have been transferred from St. Joseph - and I hope the two members for St. Joseph can bear me out - to work at Morgan Lewis, and they are doing the same sort of work which they were doing in their own constituency.

I have endeavoured by investigation to find out from the Personnel Officer as well as from the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Communications and Works the reason for this change-over, and I have raised it today because I am not satisfied in my own mind that the need for the transfer of these people has really arisen. Of course, you will appreciate that it is extremely difficult to ask a man from, say, Lakes in St. Andrew to find himself at 7.30 a.m. in Bathsheba or a man from Hillaby to find himself at Cambridge. They are weeding gutters, and I should assume that it is the purpose of Government to make the employment of these workers as easy as possible. Of course, you will appreciate that they have got to get to work at an early hour and the districts in which they work are hilly. For a man to push a bicycle, if he has one - and he does not get a travelling allowance - from Bathsheba to Morgan Lewis to get there at 7.30 p.m. is no easy task, and then to get back home is also no easy task. It not only militates against his efficiency but creates in the worker a sense of dissatisfaction which we should all try to avoid. I have not drawn it officially to the attention of the Minister of Communications and Works because I was working through the Civil Service angle by getting in touch with his Permanent Secretary. I should be rather surprised if the hon. members for St. Joseph do not take this opportunity of voicing the complaints which were brought to them as they have been brought to me.

Only about two Saturdays ago my Chambers were filled with cantonniers complaining about this. I did not mind at all because I have some very generous cantonniers and when they interview me they give me a bottle of beer. I would not mind if they interviewed me every Saturday, but as I said, they are dissatisfied and have a genuine grouse. I talked to Mr. Barrow, the Personnel Officer, and I do not think his answer was satisfactory. He assured me that they were making a list of the names and addresses of the persons involved in order to adjust it, but in the meantime I know there is a great deal of dissatisfaction, so much so that some of them have threatened to resign because it is so difficult. It is quite easy for a cantonnier to drive from Haggatt Hall to Black Rock, but to get from Bathsheba to Morgan Lewis or even from Morgan Lewis to Hillaby or even to Boscobelle, from Belleplaine to Hillaby, from Belleplaine to Boscobelle or from Cambridge to the top of Coggins Hill is a very difficult task, and I am asking the Minister who perhaps can give an explanation tonight to investigate this matter and, if necessary, make a Statement in this House to allay, if not to explain, the fears and the grievances of the workers in that particular department. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, have been in this Department for eighteen or twenty years and have given years of satisfaction. Though some of them have been treated very badly by the Department and have threatened to resign, they are at loose ends to know what to do because they have to feed their families and cannot resign, and are forced to stick as they must. One worker who complained to me said that in one day he had to go to Hillaby from Belleplaine three

times: once for orders, once to fetch tools and once because the Supervisor said he must go. If I am correct, I hope the members for St. Joseph will say so; but I know it is a genuine grievance, and I take this opportunity at this late hour to voice what I consider legitimate grievances. Of course, if it is not remedied, I shall take opportunity to raise it again. It is not a question of playing politics; it is a question of making conditions for the workers as good and as nice as they possibly can be.

While I am on my feet, I should like to take this opportunity of enquiring for the Nth time, where "N" is an indefinite number, Government's position with regard to the Courts at Belleplaine. During the time when the ex-Premier was a member of this House, he promised to reply. As you will remember, I have asked that question countless times in this House. You have had the building there for nearly two years, and not a thing has been done to show that the money is not lying there idle, and of course, the litigants who are seeking justice have still got to go to Bisseks. I should like to know in the new set-up which is coming into force on the 15th of this month, what part the Court at Belleplaine is playing.

I do not know if they have taken the opportunity to put some rat poison in it to help kill the rats, because for the time the building has been there, if the rats in St. Andrew were clever they should use it as a dancing floor or a nice place to cohabit and have their fun.

9.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, a building erected out of the taxpayers' money has been in existence for over two years and is not used; it is just deteriorating. I do not know what is the Government's attitude and I should like the Minister in charge of that Head to tell me what is the Government's attitude towards this Court. It is high time that something should be done because, as far as I am concerned, it would prevent a great inconvenience which people in St. Andrew are now suffering.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the remarks of the last hon. member who spoke relative to the highway workers in St. Joseph. As you would know, we had any amount of trouble getting the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph to turn over the roads of the parish to the Highways Department. When we got that done, we assured the workers - my former colleague and myself - that no harm or inconvenience would be caused by the take over. I have lived long enough to see it in the reverse. All harm and inconvenience have followed the workers by the take over. Imagine, Sir, an authority of the Highways and Transport Department passed orders to transfer workers from St. Joseph to St. Andrew only to weed the side of the road and to put on stones. This is not a job which you must send an expert to do. Imagine, Sir, that some of those workers are from Bawdens, which borders St. John and they have to travel from there to as far as Boscobelle bordering St. Peter or as far as Hillaby bordering St. Thomas. That means that they have to walk up and down hill. When they have done all that walk, there is very little energy left in them to do the work which they are called upon to do.

If the Director, or whoever it is that is responsible, cared anything of the taxpayers' money, he would not think of sending people so far to do this work. All hon. members know that I am a poor struggling undertaker. In the course of my business, I have met one of these workers going from Gregg Farm to Foster Hall and the only difference between him and the corpse which I was going to commit was that his eyes were open. (Laughter) He could scarcely struggle his way onwards. This unsatisfactory state of affairs should not be allowed to exist. This is a modern age. We claim to be Labourites and to represent Labour: therefore it is our duty to see that these people are not taken advantage of. Daily they are coming to my office about this dissatisfaction. I have written letters for all of them to the Personnel Officer asking him to check up the time they have put in the Service because they wish to resign. They are not old people but they say that they cannot stick it any longer. I have seen the Personnel Officer myself but he is not the boss; he has to go by what the boss says. As far as I can see, the boss up there is very tough with my people. There

are people like this boss who come from all parts bringing with them their hard rules and they do not think they are dealing with human beings. I cannot see for the life of me why this thing should go on. I have asked the Personnel Officer but he cannot satisfy me. He only says that they are making changes. I asked him what is the reason for these transfers and why they are doing them. He said that they are going by what the overseers tell them. They feel that the overseers are angels who cannot tell lies and cannot do anything dishonest. They listen to the overseers and not to the workers. They have a particular overseer in St. Joseph who should be everything but an overseer because when you see an overseer going in a rumshop and drinking rum with the same people put under his charge, how can you get work from the people? I see those same people filling his motor-car with breadfruits and all that sort of thing. The authorities are sitting in their office and listening to the bloody overseers who are trying to kill my people in a smart way. Something will have to be done. I hope the Minister is listening to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member means bloodless overseer, not bloody overseer.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Sir, as you know, when one is vexed, words will fly out of your mouth. I will say bloodless overseer. Sir, we, as representatives of the people, should always keep our ears to the ground and listen to the complaints of the people and give them a hearing. We should always do all that lies in our power to help these people and do not rely on them only at election time. The same spirit which we have for them at election time we should have for them throughout the time that we are representing them. Those are the people who caused me to be here. As long as they keep me here, I will do all in my power to see that justice is done to them. This is really an injustice which is being done to these workers in St. Joseph and St. Andrew. Why should you ask people to go from one end of the parish to the other to work? The Personnel Officer says that they can get there very easily on bicycle. Sir, instead of riding from Boscobelle to Bathsheba, I would prefer to go to goal. I cannot see for one moment that there is a true and just administration up there. I cannot find out what it is at all. Sir, we are not looked upon by some of these Heads of Departments as anybody. They do not care anything about the politicians.

9.25 p.m.

I would not blame the Ministers for that, because if I were a Minister and I heard that, the Head would have to go where the foot is. *(Laughter)* I would make them realise that this is our country and the people must be respected.

While I am on my feet, I think I should draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister the matter of the qualification of the general workers to obtain loans from the Housing Authority. I am told that you can only be helped if you are going to repair your house or if you are going to build a permanent structure, in other words, if you are going to build a wall house. What kind of qualification can that be? What help can that be? You are telling people that you are going to help them get a home, but how many of these people have a home to be repaired? I thought that the object of the Government would be to help those people who have not got any house. Whence are these people going to get the land on which to build their house? You cannot get any land on which to build anything. I do not know who is responsible for this policy, but he just does not want to help the people; he could just as well say, "I do not want to help you". There are many young people in homes where there are six and eight people in a house and they would like to give room to others in the home; but they cannot leave that house since they cannot get any help. The ones who have houses to be repaired are better off than those who have no house.

I do not know who is responsible for this policy, because it is a bad one; where are you going to get the land on which to build the houses? In the case of a man who has to apply for help to build a house - if he has his own land, he does not have to apply for help to build a house because he can mortgage his land and build the house. But how many of the agricultural workers have houses? Whence are the

masons, carpenters and people of that sort going to get land on which to build their houses? I am suggesting that it is cheaper to help a man in building a house than getting the land and building a house, because when would he be ever able to pay for that? I feel that this is a question which should be taken up with the Housing Authority and let them be asked how he could arrive at such a policy that even the Minister does not know about that policy. If the Minister knows about it then he can reply to me now and let me know the reasons for making such a hard and fast policy.

I know a man called Norville who lives near Eagle Hall; he has about ten to twelve children; he wanted to add on another house, because he has not got any kitchen or shedroof and he has his children there. He wanted to build another house and he was told that he could not be helped. The man would like to add on a bedroom at least, and he was told: "No". I do not think that the Minister could know anything about this; I would have to blame the Authority for it.

There is another man whom I know; he has a wife and three children and in what he was trying to do, I told him: "No, do not do that, you may bring yourself in trouble". What he was trying to do is this: he was trying to forge his mother's name so as to get a bit of land. When he was told that he would have to build a permanent structure, he went to get the old lady to agree that the land was his. That man had "to come off the gas", and he is still drawing up with his wife and three children.

Another policy is that of the money from the Rehabilitation Fund. Do you know, Sir, that there are people who are going to the Parochial Treasurers and paying taxes for a donkey, which they have never owned so as to get that money?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I should like to inform the hon. member that all of that business has been gone through and very soon new Regulations will be placed before the House.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: I thank the Hon. Minister for that. I was hearing about these things going through before I was born, and they have not been got through yet. *(Laughter)* I will still continue to say that the qualification to get these few cents is that you must buy an animal or a tractor or something for tilling the land. It is only a matter of eight cents per ton. These people used to carry receipts; they would get receipts written like this: "Received from John Brown, so much for a donkey". They came to find out at the Department that these receipts were forgeries and the Director gave instructions that they must bring the Parochial Treasurer's receipt. These people were going too fast and they were paying for donkeys which they never had! I think it was 10/- for the donkey in one case, and when the poor old lady went to the Park, she was paid 84 cents. *(Laughter)* Those are the policies which a Labour Government is trying to dish out to people; are they good policies, bad policies or what? The Hon. Minister says that these things are being attended to, and what the Minister has to see is that as soon as people carry their receipts showing that they have spent money, then they should get this Rehabilitation money. Suppose they have bought a fork or a big knife or a sickle! All of these things go into the tilling of the land - even if it is a bag, because you have to head canes by means of a bag. I know you have to arrive at some method so as to show the qualification for getting the money, that people have expended money in some things.

9.35 p.m.

There are lots of peasants who have a cow but not a donkey. If the qualification was a cow they would qualify to get the little money, but even if they have 100 cows and no donkey they cannot get it. They should be able to get the loan if they had a fifteen cents knife or a sickle or anything of the sort. I have come to find out that it is a waste of time asking questions here; you ask questions and you do not get any replies. I feel that it is time that something should be done, and so long as I am in here, I am going to protect those people who are keeping me here. I am leaving it now to the Minister who is in charge of this particular Department to put the wrongs right. I am in here now and as long as I keep honest, I do not have to fear. Years ago I said that

an honest servant does not have to be in fear of his master, but if he is dishonest he has to be afraid; I do not see anything to make me afraid, and I am going to see that things are done for the people whom we promised.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to strike a rather different note, although in the same general theme. It has to do with the hardship which persons now employed in Government Departments experience in getting loans through the administration of the Public Officers Housing Loans Scheme. This is a very burning question both with the Public Works people, Highways and Transport people and people who work in other Departments. The position, as I understand it, appears to be that Government intends to raise the rate of interest at which these loans can be made in future, and that necessitates a change in the law. Because of that there has been a hold-up in the administration of the loans, and persons whose loans have been approved, so to speak, have not actually got the money and have been waiting for quite some time now. This, I think, has been the experience of almost every member of this House with his constituents.

Now, Mr. Spencer who administers the loans has been at pains to tell me that it is not his fault, but that the hold-up comes from higher up. I have spoken on this matter about three or four months ago and I have not been given any answer. That is why it is necessary to have legislation to amend the law sent before the House, but meanwhile the delay continues and a lot of hardship is being experienced. When the loans first started, a lot of Civil Servants got loans ranging from \$10,000 to \$12,000 rather quickly; these loans were approved and a lot of the big fishes have completed the building of their own homes. The trouble now is at the lower end where hundreds of persons who want loans approximating from \$500 to \$1,000 and \$1,500 are held back on the ground that the interest rate has to be raised and the matter has to be brought before the House. This is a matter we want to draw to the attention of the Minister because it is an island-wide problem and one which has to be attended to almost immediately.

The danger in the delay lies in the fact that Mr. Spencer might not be able to explain to everybody what the trouble is, and consequently there will be some of these Civil Servants in the lower brackets who will go away feeling that the whole thing is a racket, especially when they know that persons in grades above them have got, and they will feel that some injustice has been done to them. It is very important that this matter should be handled as quickly as possible.

One other aspect of it is this: I understand that the Government intends to turn over the administration of the Public Officers Housing Loans to the Housing Authority generally. I think that would be a mistake. The experience which people had with the Housing Authority and the slowness with which loans are approved and handed over will not go down well with the Civil Service generally. Let the Department which is now administering it continue to do it, bring the amendment before the House if that is what is holding you up, and let it come as quickly as possible so that the loans can be approved. One typical case which can be put up is one of a person made to me and my colleagues who got a loan from a Bank on the strength of the approval of the loan from the Civil Servants Housing Scheme, and at the time the Bank advanced the money, both he and the Bank Manager believed that it would be a matter of weeks before the money was handed over. Several months have passed and he has had to alter the basis of the loan which he borrowed at the time; he has got to pay more interest on it and the Bank Manager quite understandingly is pressing and asking him almost every month when he expects to get the money from the Government. I do not think it can be helped but the situation should not continue, and I draw it to Government's attention once again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks of the last speaker, people sometimes ask me from time to time why the voices of the Opposition are not heard more often on certain matters, and my reply invariably is that one gets weary after a while trying to impress upon people who either do not understand or do not want to

understand what are the important grievances of the country.

Now the matter to which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has drawn attention is a matter which I endeavoured to draw to the attention of this Chamber over a year ago; but the same grievance which he complains of now will be in existence three years from now, so long as the present Ministers remain in the position they are in, because they have neither the intention nor the desire to do anything about it.

The position with regard to the Public Servants Housing Loans is that since about April or May last year, \$400,000 made available to the Housing Authority was allocated. The entire application for loans totalled about \$2 1/2 million, and when I last checked some time in April or May last year, there were about 1,100 applicants for money. 9.45 p.m.

By the same date, only 165 had been attended to and the money allocated represents \$400,000. The remaining 800 odd were awaiting action on the part of the Government to make money available to Civil Servants for housing.

At the time, I suggested that the Government should take steps to utilise some of the funds that were lying idle and make them available to the Board or that alternatively steps should be undertaken to get capital from sources such as Barclay's Bank, D.C.O., or such colonial investors in order that the programme for Government servants may be implemented. This talk about new interest rate dominated the scene. I never heard it before but of course, as soon as there was the splash about the interest rate going up, we could expect that everybody will be paying a high interest rate.

At the time I drew the attention of the Government to the position, we had a sizeable portion of surplus cash lying idle. I imagine we have used eight million dollars of this surplus balance in connection with the Deep Water Harbour and from what I gather, by the end of the current financial year we may advance as much as twelve or thirteen million dollars out of our own balance in order to construct the Deep Water Harbour, pending of course the expectancy of the raising of this loan in London. However, the fact that we have been utilising such a considerable portion of our cash balances and the general financial position of the country may make it much more difficult to raise money for Civil Servants' Housing than it was a year ago.

The Government appears to expect that the increase of interest rate will have investors tumbling over with money for investment purposes. We will wait and see. In my opinion, we are not going to get one cent more for investments for housing by our tampering with the interest rate. In the meantime, whatever be the financial position and whatever be the financial prospects, generally speaking - I do not know what the figure is now, but - there were up to last June over 800 Civil Servants trying to get a loan. The figure may well be over the thousand mark now. Nobody knows what are the Government's plans as to how it is likely to raise money, whether like the Labour Welfare Fund this Public Officers (Housing Loan Fund) is going to operate as a sort of revolving fund. I join issue with the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to say that he is able to demonstrate why this fund should not be put under the Housing Authority to operate because of the slowness in which it operates. The hon. member is not casting any adverse effect on the officials of the Housing Authority but I think the position should be made clear. The Housing Authority can only act on the instructions of the Minister and what the hon. member classifies as slowness in operation is really due to the fact that slowness on the amount of loans advances is placed from time to time by the Government. At a time when we had four million dollars, the Labour Welfare Fund was lying idle and they issued instructions to stop advancing any more loans, waiting until such time as the loans they had outstanding were repaid. It is not really a question of slowness in operation on the part of the Housing Authority but it is definitely the reactionary policy on the part of the Government.

The hon. member is fully aware that the next thing we heard was that some of this idle Labour Welfare Fund would be earmarked for the construction of the new Hospital.

Let me say that the officials of the Housing Authority—the majority of them—are well meaning and they try their best; but they cannot do anything out of the scope which the Government has laid down unless they want to get fired. In any case, whether it is beyond the interest of the Housing Authority or whether the separate Housing Loan Board as at present constituted and which administers this loan fund should administer this fund, the important thing is for the money to be made available to the constituted authority so that the people will get their loans; and as the hon. member suggested, it is high time that the large number of Civil Servants now awaiting loans should be attended to. It is high time that the Government make some statement saying where the capital is to come from and whether or not it intends to make more money available or whether it intends that the applicants, as told them, should wait over until some money is paid back before money can be advanced to them.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, before you adjourn, I wish to make a statement here as a result of what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said. Sometime ago, as the hon. member knows, he and I discussed this matter of the people having to show what stock or real estate they had in order to pay this rehabilitation money and I was at pains to explain to the hon. member that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has something to do with this matter. It is a very tedious matter and it had to be taken up with the Colonial Office. We had a lot of despatches exchanged and quite recently I have assured him that the matter is now in the stage where it would be soon brought to this House. If the hon. member will take the trouble to go to the Department of Agriculture, he will see that there is a separate card made out with every peasant's name. It is only a matter of days when the people will be asked to come in for their money irrespective of what claim they may have or what animal they would be asked to buy. This cuts across the policy which was agreed to years ago. It was contended that it was rehabilitating and I had to fight the Secretary of State for the Colonies for it.

9.55 p.m.

Nevertheless, I re-assure the hon. member that we are working on it; it took a long time because despatches and telegrams had to be exchanged from Barbados to London and so on in order to get the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I can assure the Hon. House that that policy to which the hon. member has referred does not exist any longer and we have everything ready for the disposal of the money which, I think, amounts to almost \$200,000 which is lying idly there. I would like to get the record clear in the Newspapers; although it is hard for the Government to get their side put, yet I would like to get the record clear. It is not because the Opposition has said something about this matter tonight that we are saying something about it; this matter has been going on for months, because it is something which touches on the Sugar Agreement; it is something which has to be paid by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. From the time I entered the Ministry I have been negotiating for the removal of the qualification; these people who have money owed as far back as 1947 when the Rehabilitation Fund came into being, will now go and get their money.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, so many points have been raised one after the other, points of importance, that it is not fair to a Minister not to give him notice in advance of some of the important issues which are going to be raised so that he might be able to have the files in order to give the necessary information. I think that some notice should be given in advance so that I can do justice to myself and to the House, although I cannot hope to saddle the House with the figures which I would have liked to put forward. To deal with the last point which is most fresh in my mind—that is the question of loans to Public Officers—I think that hon. members will remember that it was mentioned in the last Budget Speech by the ex-Premier that we

had to raise a loan in order to supplement the amount voted in respect of Public Officers Housing Loans; but we would have to change the Act in order to give the necessary authority to do so. In fact, we are transferring the authority which is responsible for the loans to the Housing Department and we will give it power to raise money under the Act guaranteed by the Government.

We are hoping to raise a loan of over \$1 1/2 million because the sum which is available at present is very inadequate. I took up the matter and one of the Banks was approached about the matter. Of course, with the money market as it was at the time, we had to pay the full amount of interest under the Act at 6%. We are bearing the same subsidy; this matter will have to come down to the House, and I suppose it will be debated over and over again. We are bearing the same subsidy under the same conditions as we are bearing at present. We have raised loans in the past at 5% and interest on the Sinking Fund at 1 1/2% which makes a total of 6 1/2% and we will be lending money to Civil Servants at, I think, 3 1/2%. We will have to raise the interest on the new loans because instead of 5% we are going to raise them at 6%, and also because the amount of capital being raised is much more than what is being loaned at present, therefore the total amount under subsidy which the Government will be bearing will be far in excess of what we are bearing today.

However much we may want to go to the full extent of subsidising this and doing this, that and the other, we will have to remember that this Government is not yet floating in oil and we have to depend upon our limited revenue. Even if we tax the people more, these revenues are still limited and therefore, we can only subsidise to a certain extent. I hope I am not misinterpreting what certain hon. members have said, but it is not true to state that the people in the lower brackets are being discriminated against in the matter of loans. I raised the point and went into the figures when I took up this Ministry and I can say that the percentage in all the brackets has been very well maintained; but it is true that there are far more people in the lower brackets, people like policemen, cantoniers, and casual workers than in the higher brackets, and it is also true that you have a far greater number of people in that category to satisfy—people who have made applications—than those in the top category. It was suggested that when we come to the end of the present amount which is available, we should stop making loans altogether in view of the fact that more money will be raised and all the money cannot go around to everybody at present. I have made it a policy that those people in the lower brackets, because they were more in number, should be satisfied. I think we should continue lending these people, because they were applying for smaller amounts than those in the higher brackets, and when we have borrowed this money, nobody will have to complain, because everybody will be satisfied. Anyhow, that particular Bill will soon be placed before the House, and I hope that this difficulty will be got over very soon.

There were one or two other points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. I do not remember if the hon. member has told me about the Highways and Transport personnel having to remove from St. Joseph to St. Andrew and go back. This is the first time that I have heard it from the hon. member and I have not had the time to investigate it. I remember that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has told me that some cantoniers from St. Andrew had to go into St. Joseph and I was told that the matter was only a temporary one and it would soon be changed. I am surprised to know that it has not yet been altered, but I will look into the matter.

However, the hon. member has not mentioned it to me, and therefore, I have not been able to look into it. As a matter of fact, I have been taken by surprise tonight.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: On a point of explanation. I really took the matter up with the Personnel Officer, but knowing that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is more closely towards a Ministry than I am, because I am outside looking in, I thought that he had drawn the matter to the Hon. Minister's attention. (Laughter)

Hon. R. G. MAPP: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, now that I have heard about this matter, I will have it investigated. I was assured by the Director that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has told him about her case of people going over from St. Andrew to St. Joseph and I was told that it was only a temporary matter and that very soon the position would return to normal. It was not intended to be permanent. I do not think that any reasonable person would expect that that would go on forever, unless these people were paid travelling allowance. Nobody would expect that that would be done to human beings nowadays; you could not expect people to go over from Bathsheba to Boscobelle and get back within a reasonable time. That would be brutal.

10.05 p.m.

As far as St Andrew is concerned, I investigated the complaint and was told that it was only a temporary arrangement.

As regards the loans for housing, I explained to the hon. member that the matter had been raised publicly before. We have had to do that because there was no extra money apart from what was available to the Housing Authority to pump into this new Fund, and we had to draw from the money available for permanent housing. This House authorised the Housing Authority and voted money in the Estimates to build permanent houses. We said there should be between 300 and 400 houses built every year, we have had to take out money to the extent that we had to provide 100 houses less. If we could draw from somewhere else, of course, we could attend to everybody who applied for loans. All the money was committed in the Estimates, and in order not to deplete the number of permanent houses, we had to limit the people instead of attending to everybody, because the amount would have been far too great. Very

soon I will lay a Resolution before the House in which we will extend it somewhat to repairs and extensions to chattel houses. I do hope the hon. member will be satisfied with that explanation, and will convince all those who come to him, as I have had to do in certain cases, that as soon as we get more money in the Labour Welfare Fund, we will attend to them. We have had trouble through political interference, and over \$1 million are outstanding because people have been going around and telling people not to pay back the money because it is theirs. It is a wrong policy and is hurtful to the workers themselves. We expect that payments will not come back in as quickly as last year, but even last year we had to make an extraordinary effort to collect the money, because people every year, especially with the bye-elections around the corner, are told that the money is theirs and they do not have to pay it back. The same thing happened in Jamaica. The people themselves suffer because obviously the money does not revolve.

I hope the hon. member will do his duty, especially if we get a good year during the crop season, and see to it that his constituents assist in paying back the money, and not mislead them as some people have been doing for political reasons. Too much money is outstanding and it affects the schemes into which we could be pumping money if it was paid back. In difficult years we will give every opportunity possible, but people have got to realise that in the interest of their brothers and sisters they should make some effort to repay the money so that it will revolve. I hope I have clarified the position.

ADJOURNMENT

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th August, 1958 at 3 o'clock p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

10.15 p.m.