
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th February, 1960.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. D. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

Messrs TUDOR, GODDARD and CORBIN entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 12th February, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a pause*). There being no objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present Message No. 3/1960 from His Excellency the Governor forwarding the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1960-61.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1960.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1960.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$6,979,191 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet expenditure to be incurred during the financial year, 1960-61 on the Capital Works included in the Estimates 1960-61, Part II - Capital.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1960".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1960".

Resolution to place the sum of \$80,825 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1959-60, No. 42, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$1 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-60, No. 43, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to place the sum of \$141,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1959-60, Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1959-60, No. 44 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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 Resolution for \$6,979,191 of which notice has just been given. In connection with the other two Resolutions of which notice has also been given, as far as I am able to gather, they have been circulated amongst hon. members with a view of having them discussed today.

12.25 p.m.

I hope that members have received their copies in time, because the Resolution which deals with emigration is very, very urgent, and I hope that members will be prepared to deal with those two Resolutions today.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

1. Will the Minister state how many Grade VI Head Teachers there are in the Public Service of this Island?

2. Will he further state how many graduates, if any, are serving in schools under Grade VI Head Teachers?

3. Will he further state whether the emoluments currently received by these Heads are greater than those of the graduate Assistants serving under them?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

1. Will the Minister state how many children are currently enrolled in the Public Elementary Schools of this island?

2. Will he further state whether the average attendance per school is declining in the country schools?

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will he state the reasons, so far as they can be known, for this declension?

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to ask on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Philip questions which stand in his name.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to ask questions on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. TUDOR: On behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Philip: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Trade Industry and Labour:-

1. Will the Minister state what moneys still remain in Fund set up in consequence of Bulk shipment of Molasses, which was earmarked for *ex-gratia* payments to displaced coopers?

2. Will the Minister state whether payments are still being made into that Fund, and also at what rate per gallon

3. Will the Minister announce the figures showing the quantity of Molasses shipped out during the years 1958 and 1959?

These are all for oral answers.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ending 31st March, 1961, be now read a first time.

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

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

ORDERS NOS. 1-6 EXEMPTED FROM STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to make a motion to the effect that Orders Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave that Orders Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 of this House and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to object.

The question that leave be granted in respect of Orders Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive being exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SEARLES and Mr. STRAUGHN - 9.

NOES: Mr. CORBIN; Mr. DOWDING; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 5.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SEARLES and Mr. STRAUGHN - 9.

NOES: Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. DOWDING; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 6.
12.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATIONS TO H.M. THE QUEEN ON THE BIRTH OF A SECOND SON

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, it is now my duty to move a Resolution of congratulations to Her Majesty the Queen in respect of the birth of a second son. This is an event for which practically the whole world has been waiting for the last couple of weeks and which came on Friday last.

According to our position and especially so because of our long and loyal tradition in connection with the Crown, I think this House should go on record and send a Message of Congratulations to Her Majesty the Queen.

The Address as follows:

"TO HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY THE QUEEN"

We, Your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Speaker and Members of the General Assembly of this ancient colony of Barbados, desire to offer our warmest and most respectful congratulations to Your Majesty and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh on the birth of your second son."

I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in seconding that Resolution, I have great pleasure in doing so for more reasons than one, but particularly so because we of this Chamber are following the precedent of the Mother of Parliaments in that the Resolution which the House of Commons passed was moved by Mr. Harold MacMillan, the Prime Minister, and duly seconded by Mr. Gaitskell, the Leader of the Opposition. I also have much pleasure in seconding this Resolution as a further indication, although we know that none is needed, of the affection which the Official Opposition has - I do not speak for the minority Party - for the Crown of Great Britain and in so doing on this occasion to congratulate with all due respect Her Majesty on the birth of this her third child who happens to be her second son.

The two eldest children of Her Majesty, as, Mr. Speaker, you are well aware, were born before she became Queen and it is interesting to recall that in 1857 Queen Victoria became the mother of Princess Beatrice and at that time the late lamented Queen Victoria was Empress of India. India had recently become a part of the British Empire, and Queen Victoria was titled as Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and Empress of India.

Now, we find, just over a century after that date, that Queen Elizabeth the Second who is the first Sovereign

after Queen Victoria to whom a child has been born since her accession to the Throne is now Sovereign of the British Commonwealth of Nations, Head of the Commonwealth of Nations which still embraces India but that country is now a republic; and while the Commonwealth of Nations still embraces the West Indies, the islands are now joined in a West Indian Federation. Therefore, it is of interest to follow the changes between 1857 and 1960 in this Commonwealth of British Nations between the birth of Princess Beatrice and the birth of this Royal Prince last week to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second.

On behalf of the Official Opposition I warmly support the passing of this Resolution, respectfully and sincerely congratulating Her Majesty and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh on the birth of this their second son. I hope that His Excellency will transmit this Resolution by telegram to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party I wish to be associated with this Resolution of Congratulations to Her Majesty the Queen. The birth of this Prince was awaited, as the Hon. Premier said, not only throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations but throughout the world. Today, we are living in an age of quick communications and what is happening at this present moment is flashed throughout the world; therefore, we have a greater number of people brought in the knowledge of what is happening from day to day. I can well imagine with the birth of this Prince that more millions were aware of it almost immediately than the birth of any previous child of a Monarch.

Sir, I have not got to speak of the loyalty of this Party to the Throne because it is well known that in Barbados we have on all occasions risen to the occasion when we have been called upon to show our loyalty. On this occasion I offer our congratulations to Her Majesty on the birth of this new Prince.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have not got up to add anything to the congratulations which have been offered to Her Majesty because that has already been done; but it does strike me that there can be a certain amount of adjustment in the form of the Address which would be more fitting for the person we have to address.

It is customary to put "To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty" and then follow that up with "May it please Your Majesty." I do not think I need make any amendment here but I think what I have suggested would be a proper thing to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will show their acceptance of this Resolution by standing.

The Resolution was formally passed, hon. members standing in their places.

HOUSE PASSES ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, consequent upon the passing of that Resolution of Congratulations to Her Majesty the Queen, there is an Address which we have to pass to His Excellency the Governor.

The Address reads as follows:-

"THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House of Assembly have the honour to request that Your Excellency take the necessary steps to telegraph to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies for transmission to Her Majesty the Queen the accompanying Address this day passed by the Honourable the House of Assembly."

I now beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second the motion for the passing of that Address.

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

Mr. HOLDER TO ACT CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the hon. junior member for St. Michael.

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

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

12.45 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction of the House while in Committee to consider the money Resolutions for \$141,500 and \$80,825 respectively, of which notice has just been given.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60 No. 39

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a Resolution for \$26,621 under four Heads of the Current Estimates, and, as usual, these Heads will be taken separately.

HEAD XVII - INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Head XVII - Industrial Schools - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with the Government Industrial Schools. I think that hon. members will remember that some years ago it was decided by the Legislature that as and when there are vacancies at these schools, such vacancies should be filled by members of the teaching staff. That is being done and because of recent additions to the staff there is the need for a supplementary amount of \$120.00 I beg to move that Head XVII stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (2) - GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head XXIII - Medical (2) - General Hospital - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members will remember that recently there has been a full-time Ophthalmic Surgeon engaged at the General Hospital. Formerly there was a part-time officer employed but now the post is a whole-time one. There are certain pieces of Ophthalmic equipment which are considered to be necessary by the new Ophthalmic Surgeon, and the amount which is being asked for is \$1. The reason for that is this: it is feared that if we should vote the full amount now, the equipment or all of it, will not arrive in the island until after the expiration of the financial Year and the full amount will have to be revoted. So, Sir, this dollar is for the pur-

pose of giving permission for this equipment to be ordered and when it arrives the full amount of money will be voted. I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (2) - General Hospital, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question that Head XXIII - Medical (2) - General Hospital stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXVI - PENSIONS

Head XXVI - Pensions - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this Head, Mr. Chairman, there is a new Item "Local Government Compensation" and it is in connection with the Local Government Establishment. It will be remembered that it was decided, and quite rightly so, that compensation should be paid to certain Local Government Officers who were called upon to resign, or rather, those who suffered direct pecuniary loss by reason of the termination, otherwise than by resignation, of their employment or the diminution of their emoluments by virtue of the provisions of the Public Assistance Act, 1954, the Public Health Act, 1954 and the Local Government Act, 1958. The Government's share of the compensation has to be made during the financial year. I beg to move that Head XXVI stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think I must draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier a matter which I consider to be one of principle. It might have slipped the authorities when they were calculating these pensions that they have excluded certain people in the way in which the Act operates. I would like a clear statement to be made on this matter. Some people have been to me, people whom I regard as Sextons, who are eligible for pension under the Vestry Act. I understand that with the passing of this new Local Government Act, the position is that people like sextons and organists are no longer being paid by the State just like the other Parochial employees, although a lumpsum of money will be paid to the Church Authorities, and the Church Authorities will have to pay these people as they deem fit.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in having something which cannot be consistent. Some years ago we passed an Act which gave Priests the right that, as long as they did not come under the new Act, they are entitled to go on with their pensions in perpetuity; and I think that that principle should apply to everybody as a matter of right. The Church being paid a lump sum of money should have nothing to do with a man's condition of employment, which was a condition of employment prior to the passing of an Act.
12.55 p.m.

A man should not lose, by the passing of an Act, his pension rights; that is to say, if a sexton today has been a sexton for 25 years but is only 45 years old, he is not eligible to resign; and as long as he is willing to work as a sexton, he should be able to draw his pension when he retires in the same way as the priests did before the 1949 Act or the Act that changed it. There should be no distinction of what he should get as a pension, and I would like the Hon. Premier to look into that because it is a matter which might have slipped him.

I feel that all pensionable people, if they are willing to go on until 1966 or 1980 when they should be eligible, should not now be left to the Church as such to determine whether they are going to continue to get their pension for the years after this has been passed. If they are willing to retire now, by all means they should get the pension, but their services after this has been passed, should be given to them. To put it shortly, I feel that if you have

taken over that liability, since the Vestries would have continued to pay them a pension, they should enjoy the same right which they had before the passing of the Act, and I am saying to the Premier that if that is not the case, an amendment should be made in order that these servants should enjoy their pension rights.

There are other quarrels, but these will be settled in another way. One of the quarrels they have is that some consideration should be given to them as is the case with the Local Government employees immediately on the passing of the Act. Their complaint is that the Local Government authorities are taxing people in a general way to provide other servants with better emoluments and they have been left out; but on the specific question of pensions, I feel that sextons, organists, and all people who were entitled to receive a pension through the Vestry should be granted their pensionable rights up to the time of retirement and should not be separated from that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the hon. senior member for St. Peter in this matter because I feel it has been an oversight on the part of the Central Government when they did that. The lesser employees of the Anglican Church have been separated, and this could easily be corrected either by paying them out now, adding them to the list of gratuities at this moment even if they are not yet of retiring age or as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, allowing them to continue as they were with the same conditions with which they accepted the post. By that, if they retire in 15 years, they will then draw their pension. You can do it either way, but what I want to ask the Premier is how many persons are involved with this Resolution. Could he tell me how many persons in the Vestries have been affected by this change? I know of one in the City, there may be more, but could he tell us how many there are in all and how many in each district, North, South and the City. I think he should have that in his file.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I have here before me a Schedule of the Officers to which this refers. Organists, sextons, bell ringers, organ blowers, organ tuners, keeper of the clock, gardeners, watchmen are included. As far as I know, I do not think that any of the people included in this Schedule are ready to retire, and as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, when the time comes I am quite sure that their years of service will be taken into consideration.

With regard to the number of Officers to whom this Resolution applies, there is Mr. Redman who was the Vestry Clerk of St. Michael, there is Mr. King who was Parochial Treasurer of St. Joseph, seven registering Officers, nine Vestry Auditors and Vestry assessors, and there is also mentioned here for liability in respect of claims for officers who may be eligible for pension \$2,000. I have an idea that this \$2,000 is probably for those people whom the hon. senior member for St. Peter mentioned - organists, bell ringers, sextons and people of that sort; so, Sir, these people have not been omitted; but as far as I can remember, I do not think that they have made any claim now, because so far as I know, they are still carrying on, and it might be that when they come to retiring age they will apply then and provision is already made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Hon. Premier though I saw that part of the Act. What was not clear to me - and I am still in doubt over it - is if they are entitled to these pensions in the same way as the priests, no matter how long they go on. There seems to be some doubt that they will be entitled up to this point of the passing of the Act. What we are saying is that if a man is an organist or a bell ringer, he was appointed as such and should be given the pension no matter how long he goes on. I do not agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church with paying out a man who is going to continue to work after he has drawn his gratuity. I do not favour that, and I feel that unless he has a reason to resign through ill health or something like that, that

should not be done. I understand that there is some doubt and I would be glad if the Hon. Premier will get from the Crown Law Officers the position so far as a man continuing to work is concerned.

If the Premier looks at the Act he will see that it only speaks about those people in the Schedule and not the people to whom you are going to pay a pension in the coming into operation of this. If you are going to give the Church a lump sum, what we want to know is if that lump sum is for the salaries they were getting or for salaries and pension. What is going to take place with their pensions after the passing of this Act is not clear. Some people seem to be in doubt that they might not get a pension for the service they are performing now when the Act has been passed.

1.05 p.m.

I say that the priests are in a better position because all the priests who were in before the passing of the Act are entitled to a pension; but, as I have said, all of them should be entitled to a pension in perpetuity. Because of what I have said I would be very glad if the Hon. Premier would say that they are all entitled to a pension. I think that would clear the air and clarify up the very big doubt in the minds of those people. I have spoken to some members of the Local Government and they also are in doubt. Some say that they do not know. Some of them feel that they do not have the funds to enable them to provide for pensions because the way in which they now receive funds does not provide for such pensions.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am not in a position to give the hon. member the information which he is now seeking, but I am promising him that I would look into the matter and inform him at the next meeting of the House what the position is.

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

HEAD XLI - SOCIAL WELFARE

Head XLI - Social Welfare - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the item under this Head is to do with travelling expenses to Social Welfare Officers. According to the Note, the post of Senior District Welfare Officer has recently been added to the Establishment of that Department but even without that, it seems that the other officers have been in need of an addition to their travelling vote in order that they may carry out their duties as required.

I beg to move that Head XLI stand part.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the sum of \$26,621 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60, No. 40

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this next Resolution is also Supplementary Estimates and I will deal first of all with Head XVI, Prisons. The items set out under it are Item 18, Provisions; Item 23, Incidentals; and Item 27, Travelling Expenses. As far as the item Provisions is concerned, the sum of \$4,000 is required and we know that because of the recent drought, certain articles of locally grown food are in short supply and they have to be supplemented by more expensive items from abroad. Another reason for an increase under this item is because of the increased number of prisoners

who were granted special diet because of one reason or the other. Another reason is because the sum of \$5,000 from 1958-59 was brought forward to the current financial year and this amount had to be paid out of the vote for the current year.

I beg to move that Head XVI stand part.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Premier can give us the cost of feeding an inmate at the present moment. I am thinking of the way in which these supplementary Resolutions are coming today to us. Today, we have been asked to deal with hundreds of thousands of dollars in supplementary Resolutions and unless hon. members of this House insist on getting facts and figures, there will be, as I have said in the past, a tendency on the part of Department Heads to say, "Send down for supplementary money; we will get it." I can see that tendency occurring every day even in other spheres of Local Government. There is that tendency to say that we have not got any finance for that but add on one thousand dollars or two thousand dollars, whatever the case may be, for that thing. I think the Hon. Premier or some other Hon. Minister who should be watching this money of the taxpayers most carefully should see to it that it is not costing so much to feed a person at Her Majesty's Prison as in comparison with somebody at the Colony Club. I would like some information as to what it costs. I feel more attention would have to be paid by hon. members of this House to this matter. Of course, it is the Ministers' responsibility. I need not remind them that it is their duty to watch the public purse, but I still feel that more attention should be paid to these matters. I should be grateful if I get that information.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: If I may explain, Mr. Chairman, I will say that it is cheaper to feed a person at Her Majesty's Prison than at any of the institutions of Government. I think the cost is between 70 cents and 72 cents a day. The hon. senior member for St. George also asked one or two other questions; one was whether we are guarding the taxpayers' purse and another was as to whether this institution is run on parallel lines with one of the hotels of this island. It is not correct to say that the increase of the cost of provision is due to this institution being run on parallel lines with one of the hotels. Certainly, this increase would not make it cost as much as \$3.50 and \$4.00 per day. As I have said, the rate is about 70 cents per day to feed a person there and that is lower than any of the other institutions; therefore, I think the hon. member need not have any fear at all as regards what it is costing us there. It is a fact, as the Hon. Premier explained, that we have a number of inmates at that institution whom because of one reason or another, we are up against a much higher cost for feeding because of their being given a special diet. That cannot be controlled and I do not believe any hon. member would want to control that. I think I have answered the questions to the satisfaction of the hon. member.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the answer that it is 70 cents per day for feeding a person at this institution. That sounds extremely reasonable to me, but not being a quick mathematician I will now sit down and hope to find some corresponding facts between the 70 cents per day per person and the \$31,000 which we have voted in the Estimates plus the \$4,000 which we are about to vote and the number of inmates in the Prison throughout the period.

1.15 p.m.

That seventy cents and \$35,000 seem rather a lot to me which has got to be explained.

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (2) - GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head XXIII - Medical (2) - General Hospital - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the first

Item under this Head is Item 86 "Substitutes for Officers and Servants on leave". I think it is well known to hon. members that a new system of keeping records has been recently introduced during the present financial year at the General Hospital. The arrangement was considered to be a temporary one and the persons employed were paid from the vote under this Item. This amount of money \$6,000.00, is required so as to supplement the original vote of \$20,000. These salaries amount to \$7, 368 per annum and it is estimated that an additional sum of \$6,000 will be required until the end of the financial year.

The next Item is Item 87 "Provisions". The note sets out that the expenditure for 1958-59 was \$352,983. The amount provided for 1959-60 is \$300,000. Efforts have been made to keep the expenditure within this figure but it is apparent that, unless radical changes are made in the diets for patients and nurses, the expenditure will exceed the vote by approximately \$30,000. The position is aggravated by further increases in some items of food.

I think that this vote is in a little different category from the former vote because this vote deals with sick people and in respect of every patient at the Hospital who is considered from the point of view of illness, it may be a question of a different diet. As to the next item, Item 88, "Drugs and Dressings", the Note explains that the vote will be exceeded because of the increased use of medical gases now that the Anaesthesia service is fully staffed and is being fully developed; and also because of the high cost of some preparations used for the treatment of patients. Mr. Chairman, these are unavoidable items. Because we now have a full-time Anaesthetist and more operations are being done, consequently more anaesthesia is required. We do know that drugs cost a lot of money; they are very expensive; but although they may cost a lot of money we cannot avoid giving a patient the drug which you think will meet his or her particular case. The next Item is Item 89 "Surgical Instruments and Equipment". This Item refers to the expansion of the anaesthesia service; more X-ray films are needed because almost everything is being X-rayed nowadays and that is in common with Hospitals all over the world.

The next Item is Item 91, "Linen, Clothing, Uniform". The Note sets out that owing to the increase of work in the sewing department, it has been necessary to employ the services of a temporary assistant seamstress. This post was considered to be not an established one but we are now considering having such a post established. The next Item is Item 99, "Minor Repairs to Buildings and Plant", and the amount required is \$2,000.00. This money is to pay the salary of an additional electrician who was and still is, not established. He is employed on a temporary basis, but steps are being taken, as from the next financial year, to make this post an established one. The last Item is Item 103 "Debt Collection". The Note sets out that the Debt Collectors' commission and Court Charges incurred in respect of the collection of outstanding Hospital fees total \$1,607 for 6 months. It is estimated that an additional sum of \$500 will be needed to meet expenditure under this item for the year. Apparently the Debt Collector is more active than formerly and more money is required to pay him. (Laughter.) I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (2) - General Hospital - stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think that all hon. members of this Committee appreciate without any trouble the argument that the cost of provisions in Government Institutions has risen during the past year and I do not think that there would be any quarrel because additional funds have to be provided for feeding the patients and staff at the Hospital. I am wondering whether some method could not be worked out whereby, perhaps to an even greater extent than is now possible, the produce on Government Farms could be earmarked for feeding in the Institutions. Presumably, where the diet for patients in the Hospital has got to be such that a considerable amount of vegetables have to be consumed, it might be as well for the Govern-

ment to discover whether, or to what extent, these vegetables, or more of them, could be produced on its own farms. The Government Farms are not only there for experimental purposes but they produce livestock as well as food, and there should be a settled policy that as much of the produce of these farms as can be obtained, should be earmarked directly to the feeding and diet at these Government Institutions. I am not saying that because it is not now done, but I am wondering whether it could not be done to a greater extent than it is being done now. 1.25 p.m.

As a matter of fact, it might even help the situation, if it were known definitely that on Government farms they are producing particularly for Government Institutions. Down at the Mental Hospital, for instance, quite a lot of what is consumed there is produced on the farm. The Hospital, of course, being a different kind of Institution and situated differently, cannot produce its own food, and therefore has got to get it from outside the Institution; but milk and vegetables should be made available to that and other Institutions, not perhaps in the quantities required, but to a certain extent. If that could be done, the Government Agricultural Stations would be fulfilling two functions, not only their primary one of raising the agricultural level in the community, but also of producing what could very conveniently be used by Government Institutions.

I just draw to Government's attention that it is worthwhile experimenting with it to a greater extent than is done now to see whether economies could be effected, and whether more abundant supplies of provisions could be made available through the extension of that particular service.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think I need say very little on the questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I am aware that he is familiar with the procedure at these Institutions. At the Mental Hospital everything produced on the farm there is used in that Institution, and I can say, Sir, that last year for the first time from the herd of cattle there we were in a position to supply the requirements of that Institution with all the milk needed; hitherto it was bought on contract.

In addition to the milk available from the farm of the Mental Hospital, I think the hon. member knows that we use labour for producing most of the bread for the Institution. I do not know what he expects me to say with respect to the General Hospital. The idea of the Pine is not to run and operate it as a dairy; that is not Government's policy. The idea of having an upgrading of animals and to make sure that you have a livestock industry is not a dairy in the sense of the word "dairy" in producing milk or making it available for the Institution of the General Hospital. I do not know if behind all this he has anything else to say by way of suggestions, but it will probably make him happy to learn that most of the milk used at the Prison hitherto was more or less imported, but we now have three cows there and are looking forward to another to fulfil the requirements of that Institution with the milk used in the Institution.

The question that Head XXIII - Medical (2) General Hospital, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXII - Highways and Transport, was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The amount, Sir, is recoverable, and is to reinstate the roads dug up by the Waterworks Department and other Corporations. As the Note states, the funds provided under this vote are almost exhausted, and additional funds are required in order to carry out the work of reinstating the highways on which certain recent major excavations have been made by the Waterworks Department and the Natural Gas Corporation.

I beg to move that Head XXXII - Highways and Transport, stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Leader of the Opposition is not now in his place, but I see that against his own note he had here marked a question to be asked of the appropriate Minister with respect to this Head. He wonders whether when both the Natural Gas Corporation and the Waterworks have to....

Mr. BRANCKER entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, what concerns me and I suppose most road users in connection with these Departments, Corporations and so on which are continually digging up the road is that not only do they seem to take such a long time about it, but there seems to be no attempt at co-ordination amongst these various organisations. What you find will happen is that the Waterworks will dig up the road; their work is normally emergency because there is a broken main and they have to dig up the road to repair or replace a main, although it very often happens that they are laying additional mains; and one finds that just as soon as they are finished, the road is dug up again by the Natural Gas Corporation or somebody else. That portion which has for so long been dug up and in process of repair is dug up by some other Organisation; but I think Government should advise the responsible Minister, the Minister for Communications, to circularise or invite the Heads of the Natural Gas Corporation, the Engineer of the Waterworks and any other body which from time to time has or may have to dig up the roads to have a meeting at his office and come to some arrangement as to exchanging ideas amongst themselves and let each other know what their plans are and where they propose to dig up or expect to have to dig up in the very near future, so that, if I may put it this way, one excavation may do for two or three Companies which find it necessary to excavate an area of road.

As you know, Sir, with our narrow roads and very considerable amount of traffic, and particularly the very large buses which are now on these roads, it is sheer horror at times to be driving along some of our main highways with a portion dug up and a one-way traffic inconveniencing the public, and I feel it can be ameliorated if the appropriate Minister will have a word with the various organisations and try to arrive so far as applicable at a plan for doing work when they have to do work on the same highway, so that one excavation would suffice for both companies, or all companies could do what they want to be done at the same time whilst the road is being dug up to provide the maximum convenience for road users, and to ensure that the minimum inconvenience is suffered by people who of necessity use our roads, particularly Highway No. 1 and the Worthing, Rockley, St. Lawrence Highway. There is hardly a time when something is not being done to this road or to the same portion of these roads by one or other of the different companies which have in the course of their operations to dig up the roads. 1.35 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I, too, have found out that there was a lack of co-operation between the two principal departments concerned - the Highways and Transport Department and the Waterworks Department - but I may tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that we have already consulted the public utilities and the position has improved recently in that we have agreed that some advance notice, say six months, should be given to the Ministry as to what the programme would be like and what roads would be dug up. I think that, more or less, may be the answer, because if we know beforehand we can plan for co-ordination and lessen the conflict which we used to have in the past. I do know that it has happened in the past that the Highways and Transport Department would lay down a road and then the Waterworks immediately afterwards would go and dig it up. That, sometimes, is unavoidable because it may happen that the Waterworks Department did not get their materials for doing the work on that road until after it was done. Although sometimes you may calculate to do something at a particular time in the year, because of one reason or another your calculations do not always work out correctly. However, wherever possible, when we can co-ordinate, we will do it. There are emer-

gencies which occur but it is perfectly true that in some cases there was a lack of co-operation. But we are trying to obviate it and I can assure the hon. member that in the future wherever possible, such work would be co-ordinated.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$93,588 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60 No. 41

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is one of Supplementary Estimates and I will deal with it Head by Head.

HEAD XIV - JUDICIARY

Head XIV - Judiciary - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The first item under this head deals with Witness Expenses and according to the Note, the amount voted has proved inadequate to meet payments and is exhausted and it is estimated that \$1,500 will be required to meet commitments to the end of the financial year.

I think this is due chiefly to the sitting of the Assize Court last month.

I beg to move that Head XIV stand part,

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

Mr. DOWDING: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring a matter to the attention of this Committee and the public. I feel it is a very serious one - one which necessitates some definite action. This vote is for the paying of witnesses and I have recently come across two cases of doctors who have refused to undertake the treatment of an individual because they say that when they are called as witnesses, they have to spend hour after hour in the Court. One of these cases, Sir, was a very serious case which eventually had to be taken to the General Hospital. To me it is terrible to think that even a doctor can refuse, but I understand that today a doctor is just as much the same person as the television repairer or the tailor. He is no longer thought of as a man who must at all costs assist human beings.

I know that doctors have their problems but this is one problem which can be settled by airing in this Hon. Committee. I am again stating that there has been the case of where a doctor was a witness in the Court and when he went there to give his evidence he found that the lawyers in the particular case were not present; so he had to come back home and go again. I think the Hon. Premier would appreciate what I am saying. I think it is a bad thing that in this good island of Barbados there are so many doctors who refuse to be a witness because the facilities in the Courts do not provide for the looking after expeditiously of an accident case or a case which involves a doctor which may be brought into a Court.

If it is a fact that something is wrong, surely an effort by the Hon. Premier should be made of ascertaining that when a doctor, who is a busy man, is looking after his calling as a witness in Court, there should be some kind of facilities made to expedite his presence in Court and that something is done to stop what I know the majority of them are saying, that is, "We will not attend to any accident case or any case which is liable to go to Court because we cannot waste our time in Court."

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would not like what the hon. member who has just spoken to go as an individual

statement. I have all respect for doctors. As the hon. senior member for St. George has said, they have their problems but they too have to look to doctors when they grow ill. I think it is nothing short of being disgraceful and criminal to patients when some people who are more or less in a critical condition have been refused to be seen by doctors just because the case may become a police case. I think any of us in here can be involved in anything likely to be a police case because we are not immune from that; and if that should happen to any of us and we have to seek the aid of a medical man, I think nearly all of us in here would find that our doctor would not turn us away but would come to our call. But because of that, I think as socialists we cannot create a privileged society because it is against a privileged society that we lay our foundations. Socialism is for those who are not in a privileged position; therefore, we feel such persons who are injured or in a critical position should be given the right to have medical attention. It is true to say that some of our people become involved in police cases in which they should not be involved, but that is the tendency which you get in a community which is of a low income standard and where the standard of intelligence is not at its highest. But in defence to that, it is still incumbent on medical men that they should be willing to render their professional skill to persons who are in need of it.

Let us settle the other matter now on its own footing. Let us say to the Courts and to the Magistrates that the method of dealing with justice needs overhauling and that you cannot keep people too long in Court, especially busy people like doctors who cannot afford to waste their time in Courts. Let us say to the lawyers that there is no point in taking on more cases than you can get through with; and if you have more than you can do, let juniors do some of the work for you. We cannot make people who are called upon to go to a Court as a witness look upon it as some people look upon it, that is to say, some people look upon the Court as a happy place of reminiscence. It is all right for those people who work for their living out of the Courts but all of us do not work for a living there; therefore, those of us who do not work for a living there would only regard it as a place for the administration of justice. 1.45 p.m.

We feel that the administration of justice should be expedited, that everything should be given to all concerned and we should not be afraid for the administration of justice to be meted out. I say that quite seriously because if a doctor refuses to attend to a patient where a Police case is involved, we do not know what might happen. If one hears that a doctor will not attend his brother or other relative he might take the law into his own hands. That is the sort of vengeance which he will take. I know that the Premier is a member of the Medical Profession and these are things on which you have to take a view. There are numbers of people in Barbados who have no doctor in the sense of having a family doctor; the average man regards that the doctor is the last man to whom he should go, just as some of us regard the Court as the last place to which we should go. In fact, the lawyers would have to die if they had to depend on working in the Courts for a living as far as some people are concerned.

I feel that the matter which the hon. senior member for St. George has raised is not a light matter because it has been drawn to our attention a case where a person was taken to a doctor and that person was bluntly told that if it is a question of speaking on the part of the doctor, if it is a police case, the doctor is not going to see him. I think that this is a matter which should be rectified because we do not know to what extent suffering may be prolonged and it may be a question of the loss of a limb and complete rehabilitation is not given. I feel that in a place like Barbados we should do all we can to rehabilitate people as soon as we possibly can and do not allow people to feel that they cannot be seen by a doctor and that all the cases of illness must go to the Hospital.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the last speaker, I must say that a doctor's time is limited at times because his time is most precious. It would not

profit a doctor to go to the Court and sit down for two or three hours irrespective of whom he is waiting on. In the case of a doctor the loss of ten minutes here might mean his not being able to save somebody somewhere else. When a doctor has been summoned to the Court, a proper time should be arranged for the lawyer and the doctor to meet at that particular day and at that particular time. If the case is not going to be finished on that day, then the doctor should be in a position to give his evidence, and go away to do his duty. A doctor is a physician and we should not put any imposition or impediment on a physician. Wherever we are and we become ill, we are going to call for a doctor; and whether he be an expert or whatever he is, we have to seek his aid. I think a proper time should be arranged, either by the Magistrate or the Judge, for the doctor and the lawyer to meet at that particular time because there may be many calls awaiting the doctor's attention. I think that that is quite reasonable.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I could not allow remarks of the hon. and gallant senior member for St. George to go unchallenged. As I understood him, he was suggesting that the Premier might take some action, or intimate in some way or other to the Magistrates as to the trial of cases and that they will allow or not allow doctors to go and give their evidence. One of the things which we must avoid in a democracy is any suggestion or hint that the Executive is tampering with the administration of justice or is trying to drop hints or intimations to the Judiciary. That is one of the things for which we have fought for so many centuries in this Commonwealth of Nations and we have got it now as an undisputed fact that there should be no attempt prompted by the Executive, however indirectly or well meaning, to interfere or tamper in any way to try to influence the administration of justice or the manner in which the Courts are run. The Executive must have nothing to do with that. I quite realise what the hon. and gallant senior member for St. George is getting after. He feels that the Magistrates and the Courts should enter certain things and perhaps he spoke more quickly than he thought, and that the way to get this information to the Courts is by the Premier. However, the Premier is well aware that if he attempts to do that, he would be getting first class material for the bureaucracy around the length and breadth of this country, which we never had before. Then one might carry the matter a little further and suggest who must be acquitted and who must be convicted. Mr. Chairman, do not let us provide any small aperture to enable the Executive to say that they have a directive or suggestion from the House that they should drop hints to the Courts as to the order in which cases are to be called, and so on.

Sir, that is what the hon. and gallant senior member for St. George has overlooked. The medical profession today has a class of persons in which there is nobody who is doing badly - a class in which those who are doing the least well are doing extremely well and the others are doing even better than those. Every medical man in Barbados today is working for thousands of pounds per annum. There is no question about that; the Medical profession is on all-fours with the Solicitor's profession in this island. Everybody is making money in the Solicitor's profession as in the Medical profession. The attitude of the doctor towards a Court case is that he leaves his office, drives to the Court and is not kept waiting; as a matter of fact, the medical practitioner is treated too kindly by the Court. As soon as he arrives, the earliest possible moment after that - it may be ten or fifteen minutes after - whatever case is going on is adjourned; the people are asked to stand down and the doctor is allowed to give his evidence. 1.55 p.m.

He is treated almost too kindly, but it is because he has left in his office ten or twelve patients at so much per patient. The Hon. Premier can help us, having been in the profession for a few years, as to what they are charging nowadays; but when they go to the Court the most they get is \$3, \$4, \$5 or \$6, and that is to the hon. member a mere bagatelle of what he would get by remaining in his surgery; and because the amount is so small and because they seem to worship the dollar much more, I feel that they seem not to remember the oath of Hippocrates which

they took when they became medical practitioners. His concern seems to be in so many cases, money and the ledger, and because of that, Mr. Chairman, he does not like to go to the Court and do his duty, and turns away patients who go to him with any matter which might involve litigation because it represents an hour of his time in going to the Court and giving evidence. When he arrives in the Court he is attended with the utmost despatch; as soon as he arrives in the Magistrate's Court, the lowest Court, he is given prompt attention. Sometimes we of the legal profession wish we were treated with the exceptional kindness with which the medical profession is looked after. It is thought that the hour that he is going to and from the Court to give evidence he could stay in his office and write out six prescriptions giving ten minutes at the most to a patient, and that would represent about \$4 each, which is \$24 as against \$5 or \$6, and that is how they look at it these days.

Mr. Chairman, it is for the same reason that you will find you cannot get the majority of doctors to come out at night. They have made so much in the day that they are not prepared to lose any of their night's sleep or miss their afternoon golf or their evening's bridge. You just have to be satisfied with their services between 8 o'clock and 4 o'clock with an hour off for breakfast and some period for lunch, and then they can be the busiest of the busy practitioners and cannot find time to go to the Courts, and so refuse to take certain cases - which is most lamentable; and if it is a question of passing legislation which would make him go to the Courts, then the House with a medical practitioner as Leader should pass legislation to require a doctor not to refuse to accept any patient, whether or not accepting that patient and diagnosing him may involve the doctor to attend the Magistrate's Court to give evidence, which is his duty as well as anybody else's. So, Sir, if the Hon. Premier would perhaps take this matter up at the level of the Barbados General Medical Council of this Island, he might well be able without legislation to persuade his professional colleagues that it is their duty to attend to any case which is worthy of attention which is brought to them, whether or not it might involve them in having to attend the Magistrate's Court.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On Resumption,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Orders Nos. 1 to 10 inclusive under Private Members' Business, were called.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I have an Order under Private Members' Business, but I cannot deal with it today. I would like to have it drawn up because it is very important. Would I have to wait until the Order Paper is being fixed?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. The House will now revert to Government Business.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE

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

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

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, on the same point that has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I have myself had a personal experience of that situation in which some time ago I did attempt to assist someone who was involved in an accident. I took him to one of the doctors who was at the time a Parochial Medical Officer, and I was asked if the person was somebody from that parish, because otherwise he should have to spend that long time in the Court which would be necessary because of a possible Police case. From my point of view, the injury was not very severe and the accident not a very serious one. I took heed to what the doctor said and conveyed the patient to the Hospital, but nevertheless it is a case in point from which I have had personal experience and from which I can corroborate the remarks made by the other members on this point.

I am wondering, Sir, even though the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has given some very strong hints that it should not be in the province of the Premier or anybody in the Executive to interfere with the administration of justice - I am certain that would not be attempted - whether some kind of arrangement could be made probably for the expedition of cases in which doctors happen to be involved.
2.35 p.m.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that doctors are very well accommodated as they are now in the Courts. Therefore, I wonder if this cannot be worked out through an organisation of some sort. I would like to feel that the Bar Association and the Medical Association can at least work out some kind of liaison by which you can handle Police cases in which doctors are involved so that you will not get a case in which doctors will say, "I do not feel inclined to attend to this patient because it is going to be a Police case."

I think it is a matter of professional ethics. These two organisations should let it be known that medical attention would be given whenever it is called for in accident cases and that there will be a matter of expedition in case doctors have to attend the Courts. That should be dealt with according to the ethics and the understandings between the two professions. It is not just a question of members of the House of Assembly sounding off on this particular point. If a case can be proved that members of the public found themselves embarrassed by being denied medical attention just because a doctor may say that the time which he would have to spend in Court on account of the matter would not encourage him to give that medical attention, I would certainly like to feel that in responsible organisations like the British Medical Association and the Bar Association they should give some proper pronouncement on this matter and they should have some proper liaison between them.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Premier replies, I would like to clarify some remarks of mine in the light of the speech of the learned and hon. junior member for St. Lucy. From what I learned from the tone of his speech today, I do not consider doctors to be money grabbing golf players. I do believe that there are a number of doctors who are still fundamentally honest, good human beings. Of course, we have heard nothing from him of what is the position as regards the members of the Bar. If a case has been postponed in Court - and that has been proved on more than one occasion - I say that it is very hard for a doctor to turn up today to give evidence in that case and then find that he has to return tomorrow and so on. As I have said, I do not believe that the Judiciary is of such a nature that they place an iron curtain around them so that even a suggestion made in this House on a matter in the public interest is such that no attention will be paid to it.

This is a very simple matter. There is not a member in this House who does not know that doctors have refused to attend to patients because they fear the matter would be a Police case, and it is a fact that doctors give the reason - which is a sound reason - that their time is being wasted in the Court.

It is a matter which can be dealt with by airing it here. I am not suggesting for one minute that these doctors are hard-hearted and they refuse to go out at night to calls but stay at home playing bridge or playing golf. They are men who, if appealed to in the right way, will take to heart the public interest and try and do something about this matter.

Mr. SEARLES: Sir, I did not intend to join in this debate but on account of the situation which has arisen I rise to say that it is beyond any doubt that the matter lies between the medical fraternity and the legal fraternity. I myself have experienced with the legal fraternity that when one side of the case comes in Court to carry on, the other side does not come; and if in such a case a doctor is involved, naturally, he would say that he is not coming again because he does not know when they would want him to give evidence. There is something which I feel should be done. I feel the legal fraternity and the medical fraternity should come together and see how best the public needs can be served.

I say this without fear of contradiction. A doctor says that he is not coming because of so and so; but the fact is that is not looking at it from the man's point of view but from his own pocket. The same thing applies to the legal fraternity. They look at it from the point of view of how much they can get out of it and because of that between the two of them the public suffers. I am not going further because I am afraid of my treading on dangerous ground.

I am suggesting that the time has come when the medical profession must realise that they are there in the interest of the man who is suffering and something must be done by them to alleviate the man's suffering. Money must not be made the principal factor, but what you can do to aid.

I am also saying this to the legal fraternity. Mr. Chairman, it is true that we cannot live without some sort of money, but we can still do without this lot of pounds, shillings and pence in the Savings Bank and in other banks in the world. I will therefore stop short at this particular point and say: "Let us come together; let us in love and unity do whatever we can for the good of this country, and see what we can do to alleviate the condition between the poor unfortunate man who wants something done and the other man who wants something to receive." With those few words I will now take my seat and vote for the money which is contained in this Resolution.

Mr. BRANCKER: I will assure the hon. member that since he has left the legal profession there have been no complaints of members of that Association being more concerned in pounds, shillings and pence than in his time.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I take great exception to the remarks made by the hon. member. I have never been a member of the legal fraternity. I would say that God has endowed me with a gift to see right from wrong, and where right is, to put it, and where wrong is, to put it. 2.45 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I never thought that I would have lived to hear the hon. member disclaim any affinity with the legal profession, so often have clients of mine brought correspondence to me addressed to them bearing the name - I would not say the signature - of the hon. junior member for St. James. As to the point made by the hon. and gallant senior member for St. George in his second speech in connection with, and apropos to, my remarks about medical men, I think I had made it quite clear that I am not referring to each and every medical man in this island, but to a certain element in the medical profession. If anybody comes to me with wounds or injuries I tell him to what doctor he can go, knowing that there are certain doctors in certain districts who will take any sort of patient whether or not it means giving evidence in Court or whether or not it may mean the doctor having to come out at night. All legal practitioners know who are the doctors who will come to the Court and

who will come out at night, and likewise we know those who refuse to go to the Court and those who refuse to do night work.

It is a very simple matter so long as you know who the doctors are. The hon. and gallant senior member for St. George must understand that there are certain members of the medical profession who will not take cases involving Court work. Only quite recently a person was taken to a certain doctor and the doctor said: "I cannot do anything because it might mean my going to Court." He telephoned another doctor who quite willingly examined the patient. It is a matter of the outlook of the doctor, his hardness or otherwise of heart, and his refusal to do any work which does not at the time bring him as much money as some other type of work will bring him. For one to leave his surgery and give evidence in a Court, that involves a period of between an hour and an hour and a half; and even at that, there is no delay at all because as soon as a witness gives evidence in another case, the Magistrate adjourns that case, as I have already said, requires the parties in that case to stand by and says: "Let me take the Doctor so that he can get away", and his evidence is taken so that he does not have to spend any time.

When we speak about cases having to be postponed because the lawyer was not there, if the doctor arrives and the lawyer is absent, the doctor's evidence is taken but he is told: "If your evidence is such that when the lawyer arrives and he expresses the desire to cross-examine you or to elicit more information, you will be required to come back in the interest of justice." But in order to accommodate the doctor and in the interest of saving his time, he is allowed to give his evidence and there may be no necessity for him to come back. Furthermore, there is provision made in certain cases that a certificate from the doctor is sufficient, and unless there is a demand for that doctor to come to the Court and be actually questioned by the lawyer on the one side or on the other, there will be cases in which the doctor no longer since the amendment to the law, comes to the Court at all personally to give evidence; his certificate is sufficient. Let us face the facts and realise that in this community today, there is a certain section representing, perhaps, less than fifty per cent of the medical fraternity, who are not disposed to take any sort of case which will cause them to go to the Court, because they are too busy otherwise and are much more lucratively employed by not coming to Court. However, that does not apply to all doctors. If the hon. and gallant senior member for St. George would like me to give him a list either privately or orally of those doctors who will and those who will not take cases which may involve their coming to Court, I will give him that list at any time so as to save him from having to take anybody to a doctor who will not attend the Court to give evidence after having examined the patient.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this whole debate has taken such a turn and is such a huge joke that I am wondering whether I should reply. When an hon. member was speaking - I do not quite remember who he was - about doctors and the fabulous fees which they get, I was reminded of a joke which applies to lawyers. The joke was like this: A lady was travelling on a boat on which there was also a lawyer. The lady's bag fell overboard and there were two or three men who were wondering who should retrieve the bag. The lawyer jumped overboard and went after the bag and while he dived down a shark passed over him. The joke was this: professional ethics, one shark passing over the other. (Laughter) I was very much reminded of that when the hon. member was speaking. As I was about to say, an hon. member has observed that there should be some attempt made to compel doctors to treat this or that person; well, I do not think that you will get that provision even in Soviet Russia today. In Soviet Russia you have freedom of choice, that you can serve whom you should serve and when you should serve them. After all, in a free country like this, you must be allowed a choice as to what time, what period, what case and under what circumstances you should treat a patient.

I am still doing a little practice - I grant you that - and I doubt very much that any doctor would see a patient who is seriously injured, as some hon. members seem to imply, and refuse to help that patient even if he sends the patient to the Hospital afterwards. I am quite sure that the doctor will give some relief in a serious case. I do know that there are certain doctors who do not want to be engaged in frivolous cases like those in which people abuse and then strike each other. In simple cases like that, they would take up the doctor's time in going to the Court. I do know that there are some doctors who try not to interfere in cases of that sort and a doctor would say: "You people should settle your differences and do not have recourse to the Courts." In the same way that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy remonstrated or protested about anything by way of compulsion where the Courts are concerned, I, on my own behalf, or on behalf of my profession, would voice my protest along that line.

2.55 p.m.

Doctors are individuals and have a freedom of choice, and in a free country they will maintain that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to re-enter this debate because I thought I had made my position quite clear, but now that the Hon. Premier has stated what he did, as a member representing the community and not a member of the legal profession or a member of the august profession of medicine, I have a very grave responsibility.

Now someone has to reconcile what can be regarded as these two domains on which the medical profession and the legal profession want to stand. I agree with the Hon. Premier that we are living in a free society; but if we are living in a free society without observing certain of the rules which a free society involves, it means that we can all react with that freedom of choice, which implies a lot of things. I am sure that if I say from a worker's point of view that a man should be free to work or not to work and you take it in the context that he should disregard any opportunity to work, then there would be a lot of emergency legislation being passed.

I do not think that a doctor is in any different position from any person in a profession, if the profession he is practising is so going to endanger the life and safety of the community that you cannot pass legislation to deal with a situation. Similarly, if the hon. member means that the administration of justice is something you cannot touch, I agree with him that it is not for the Executive to say what the fines should be or who should be prosecuted; but what we do say is that if the working of the Courts, which is a different thing from saying who should be fined and who should not be fined, means that people cannot go to the Court and give evidence and a lot of time is being wasted, I do not see that we have any right to say that that is something that should not be put right, and whether or not it is going to be put right by the Head of the Judiciary, we say that something has to be done.

What the Hon. Premier said shocked me. I cannot reconcile the Premier's avowed philosophy as a Socialist and his idea of being a medical man. A medical man owes it to the community to attend to people just as another man owes it to the community to do work, and a medical man is in no different capacity by attending to sick patients. If it is going to be a question of what they choose to do, and if that is the dictum under which they are going to practise, God help us.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, I never said so or intended to convey that that is the dictum of everybody; it depends on the circumstances of the particular case.

Mr. WALCOTT: I entirely agree that it depends on the circumstances. I do not think any of us in here would be so frivolous as to indicate that just as in the cases which the Premier brought where an ordinary village fracas takes place and somebody gets the slightest indisposition, a doctor should come out at any hour whatever. I do not subscribe to that sort of impossible situation; but

I would say that he should deal with those genuine cases of serious accidents which occur, and the situation has been reached where because of the difficulty in the Courts some doctors do not become involved in matters where a police case can be brought out of the accident. There is not always a fine but sometimes it is an ordinary automobile accident where somebody is involved, and as you know, if an automobile accident takes place and involves serious injury, the police will have a case even if it is no more than prosecuting the driver for dangerous driving, even though the other person may not worry with a court case.

I think it is healthy, Mr. Chairman, in a community, especially a small community, not to allow any person to feel that he is privileged from the point of view of the profession of which he happens to be a member, and in these small communities there is too much of that. That is why I take exception to any point of view that we live in a free society and that some people are free to do as they please while others can be restricted in their movements in one way or another. I do not believe that a doctor is a superman, nor do I believe that he is not entitled to all the things to which any other normal man is entitled. He is entitled to a certain amount of rest and leisure, to his golf and bridge if they are part of his pastime; but there is one thing I would say, and it is that he knows that he has a different responsibility in the community in that he is a man who has undertaken a profession which has to deal with life and death, and in these circumstances the reaction of human beings is going to be different from people in other capacities. You may postpone going to a case if you can, but when a man is in a serious accident or any person is ill, you know the mental dislocation that takes place, and sometimes a doctor is the only person who can give any kind of reassurance; so if a doctor turns his back on people in these circumstances, it makes it very difficult.

I agree with the hon. member who said that the time has come for the BMA and the Bar Association to reach some decision. It should be outside the realms of any sort of compulsion, and should be purely on a voluntary basis, which is an excellent way of arriving at a settlement to these things. I must say that I could not be a representative of the working-class - and they sent me here - and know that these are the people in the majority who are going to suffer when a doctor refuses to come out to them, because people like ourselves do not have that sort of worry; it is the man who is not known, the man without any particular family doctor, as well as the man who is likely to get into the village fracas that we have to see is given the sort of treatment and facilities in a community and in a society at which we are aiming. These are not the days of bush doctors or witch doctors; these are the days when we respect the medical profession; and if the medical profession is part of the society in which we live, we expect from members of that profession the treatment you would get in any civilised society, whether it is Russia, Communist China or the United States of America.

3.05 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have to re-enter this debate but I feel extremely strongly on this matter, and the trend which the debate has taken is absolutely amazing. We on the one side are drawing a curtain around the legal luminaries and on the other side putting up a society of freedom which allows any doctor to have his choice.

Sir, I wholeheartedly believe in freedom. But when you, Sir, or any hon. member thinks of a case where a man was attacked and beaten brutally and then is taken to a clinic or a doctor's office and is refused assistance and that you say is freedom, I will be sooner in Russia than here. There is a point when even East meets West. I know that members of the medical profession, if they happen to pass by a case of injury, would stop and give assistance; but that is not what I am talking about. All that I am asking is this - and I am not asking you to compel anybody or to pull the foundation of the Judiciary to the bottom by interfering with it politically - that each and

every one of us who are in the highest position in this colony do our best to ascertain that a medical practitioner has not got to fear in the back of his mind that whenever he goes to the Court he is going to be held up in doing what the majority of them do at all times, that is, to assist in alleviating human pain. That is all I am asking. If that is unreasonable, then, this is not a free country.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to rise again, but after hearing what the hon. senior member for St. George just had to say I would like to add this. I remember of the days when I was quite a young man that there was a very learned doctor who was called Dr. Colin Bowen. On one occasion, he was invited to a dinner party and while he was on his way the telephone rang, and, answering the call, he found out that it was a lady who needed his help. He turned to his wife who was also preparing to go to the dinner party and said: "This either means my making as a doctor or my undoing. You can go to the dinner party; I will go to the call." The call took him the whole night and he had to leave and go for his wife when the dinner party was finished. You can well see that he was a doctor who forgot his own personal affairs by his not going to the dinner party; and if I may add this, I am asking the medical profession to take a leaf out of his book. I do hope that my words today will not go unheeded and that the medical profession will realise that they are there to save humanity.

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (3) MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head XXIII - Medical (3) Mental Hospital - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with the Mental Hospital. Item 25, is Temporary Nurses and a supplementary of \$420 is sought for them. It appears that a certain amount of money was provided in the Estimates for the employment of three temporary nurses to take care of the varying number of patients on the female side.

Mr. HOLDER left the Chair and Mr. BRYAN took the Chair.

I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that a certain amount of money was provided in the Estimates for the employment of three temporary nurses to take care of the varying number of patients on the female side. However, due to the increase of female patients, it was found necessary to engage an additional number of female nurses and this sum of \$420 is to provide payment for them.

Item 35, deals with provisions. As can be seen from the Note, the daily average population at the Mental Hospital has risen from 733 in 1958-59 to 760 in November, 1959. In addition to that, certain basic items of food have increased in cost over the price paid in 1958-59. In order to meet requirements for the remainder of the financial year, supplementary provision of \$15,000 was asked for to supplement the amount already voted.

Item 37, is for Cleaning, Water and Light. This increase of \$4,700 is asked for because it was found necessary during the current financial year to meet extraordinary expenditure amounting to \$3,388 in respect of arrears of water rates for the previous two financial years. In addition, there has been increased consumption of electricity used for treatment purposes owing to the increase in numbers.

Item 38, deals with furniture. According to the Note, the largest item charged to this vote is for repairs and replacements of cots. During the present financial year the cost of making cot covers has increased by some 60% and the cost of canvas by some 30%.

Item 42 is Incidentals. There has been quite a number of breakdowns of the ambulance which they use for bringing in patients and on account of that they had to hire cars; therefore, more money would be needed towards

this item. There has been also an increased cost of manuscript and account books and newspapers as well as an increase in labour cost for incidental repairs.

Item 43 deals with uniforms. Again there is an increase in the cost of material for making uniforms and the increase is 10% over the figure of 1958-59. There is also an increase due to the providing of uniforms for 24 temporary nurses for whom no provision was made in the Estimates.

I beg to move that Head XXIII (3) stand part.

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

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

3.15 p.m.

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (7) - HEALTH CENTRES

Head XXIII - Medical (7) - Health Centres - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head there is a new Item "Station Wagon". This station wagon is required for the Health Centres. A Board of Survey inspected the station wagon and declared that it was unservicable, and since this inspection took place the vehicle was involved in an accident resulting from which the Insurance Company concerned have carried out their terms of insurance and have settled the claim in respect of the damaged station wagon. So, Sir, not only was this vehicle declared to be unservicable but it was also involved in an accident and that, of course, finished it up. I beg to move that Head XXIII - Medical (7) - Health Centres - stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this Head, there is a new Item "Public Assistance". The Public Assistance Board which has been authorised by Section 3 (1) of the Public Assistance Act, 1954, has been appointed, and the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 29) Order, 1959 authorised the appointment of certain staff to be attached to the Board. Supplementary provision of \$2,000 is now required to meet the cost of office furniture and equipment, travelling expenses, salary of the Messenger and other incidental expenses of the staff attached to the Board for the remainder of the financial year. I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little explanation from the Hon. Premier, now that the Board has gone into action, as to exactly what are their duties and how are they finding things.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the Board has gone into action but I cannot tell the hon. member how they are finding things because they have not yet made a report.

Mr. DOWDING: I am grateful for that reply. I do hope that it is fully realised that this is further local government taxation on the taxpayers, for which we are now voting more and more money, and I am wondering if it would be wise to ask the Board to report as soon as possible.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I want to assure the hon. member that they are doing all they can to report as soon as possible.

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

HEAD XXX - INLAND REVENUE

Head XXX - Inland Revenue - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Relative to this Head, there is the Item "Refunds of Income Tax and Death Duties." The Inland Revenue Commissioner states that due to the low profits of the sugar industry for the income year 1958, substantial refunds of income tax have been made in cases where tax is normally payable. The amount voted is inadequate and supplementary provision of \$50,000 is asked for to meet commitments to the end of the financial year as and when they arise. I beg to move that Head XXX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, again I am sorry that my colleague who wanted to ask a question on this matter, is not now in his place, but as a matter of fact something has puzzled the Shadow Cabinet when we were considering this matter and it is this. The explanatory note states that this money is required due to the low profits of the sugar industry for the income year 1958. That explanation is a bit baffling and we hope that the Premier will enlighten us on this point. As to this Income tax, from whom was it to be paid? From the companies or the individual people? It does seem to us that the companies could only have paid the tax on their profits, and if there were no profits to be declared, obviously the companies would not have been liable, at least, not to that extent. I wish that the Premier would explain to us from whom was this tax liable and to whom is this refund or these refunds being given.

Mr. WALCOTT: Before the hon. Premier replies, I, too, would like to ask him something in connection with this matter. I believe that the note to this item is improperly worded; this does not apply in certain cases because you do not refund income tax where profits are to be declared. This note states that due to the low profits of the sugar industry for the income year 1958, substantial refunds of income tax have been made in cases where tax is normally payable. The note should have read: "Due to the lower income in profits or earnings". It has to be made clear whether you are speaking percentage wise or income wise. In 1958 the income in the sugar industry was not as high as it was before therefore people were not taxable to the extent to which they would have been before; hence a refund is due to them. You are now getting experience in the P.A.Y.E. system and now you have to take a deduction from people's wages. The only people to whom you would have to give a refund would be the people from whom you took a tax from their wages. You cannot have an estimate based on the fact that you know that a man's salary would be increased. In 1958 it so happened that you had to pay back more people than you had to pay back previously. In 1957 the crop was a record one of over 200,000 tons; but if you are talking about 1958, then the tax would have to be placed on people who receive incomes and not on those who make a declaration of their profits.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In reply to the remarks of hon. members I want to say this: the Commissioner of Inland Revenue has pointed out that it is necessary to refund shareholders tax paid by local companies on dividends; it is also necessary to make payments to taxpayers who satisfy the Commissioner that an error has been made in their returns. He goes on to say this: "Due to the low profits of the sugar industry for the income year 1958, substantial refunds of income tax have been made in cases where tax is normally payable. As a result, the amount voted is inadequate and supplementary provision of \$50,000 is asked for to meet commitments to the end of the financial year." Those are his words.

Mr. WALCOTT: We accept that, but you declare what dividend is made after you have submitted your balance sheet. When you make a refund, it means that a man has paid more than you expected he would have paid.

3.25 p.m.

In declaring a dividend in the sugar industry that is based on their normal returns. You do not pay out dividends on the

basis that you expect profits will be heavy; you only pay dividends after you know what the profit is; but I believe that in a certain year you may have to remit more than you thought the amount would be as a result of the low earnings of the sugar industry. I do not know how the Commissioner works it out because from the Act we passed I do not know that you deduct any income from a man based on dividends. At the end of the year, after you had declared what your income was, you pay on that; therefore it could not have been deducted already, because when you deduct on a matter of profit, it could not be done unless the dividends have been so deducted by the Company; that would have to be based on the fact that you did not know what the profit was going to be. It is really a matter of how the Commissioner arrives at that. You can get a rebate on the dividend, but it looks to us as if it would be low earnings rather than profits. Of course it does not make any difference because the note to the Addendum is not anything illegal; it is purely a matter of the words used.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it is merely a generalisation and that is due to the low profits of the sugar industry.

The question that Head XXX, Inland Revenue, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, the Resolution for the sum of \$79,774 was passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1959-60 No. 42

Head XIII - Legislature - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Item 19, Sir, under this Head is for refreshments. The note sets out that an additional meal (lunch) had to be provided for members of the House of Assembly consequent on the passing of the new Standing Orders of the House, and an increase in price was also awarded the caterer. As a result this amount is needed to meet commitments to the end of the financial year.

Under Item 29 two Bills for the purchase of spare parts and twelve Microphone stands had to be met from the provision under this Item. This expenditure could not be foreseen, and the amount is required to meet commitments for the balance of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head XIII - Legislature, stand part.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

Head XV - Police - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$110 so far provided to pay fees for appeals to higher courts and to meet costs awarded by the Courts against the Police Department has been exhausted. Additional funds are required to meet outstanding costs in respect of cases lost by the Department.

I beg to move that Head XV - Police, stand part.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

Head XXXI - Labour - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The sum of \$75,000 is asked for to supplement this vote and it is due roughly to an increase in the number of people emigrating abroad, both to the United States and to England. The number of repatriations was also greater than was expected.

I beg to move that Head XXXI - Labour, stand part.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this is a Head under which I am going to take the opportunity now of drawing to

the attention of the Minister of Labour that on this question of emigration we are passing through a period in which I would suggest that every effort should be made to expand it wherever you can and wherever there is a willingness for you to do so. I do not know if there is any official statement made in the appropriate quarters, but I read in a newspaper some time last week that British Honduras was willing to accept Barbadians into that country.

We all know that there is no question of a population problem in British Honduras; the place is approximately 8,000 square miles and the population is not as much as the population in St. Michael. It is one of the sparsely populated areas of the Caribbean. I think in these things, Mr. Chairman, if you want to do something you have to meet the people face to face and let them know. I find that sometimes my correspondence can be very useful if people do not want to meet you and discuss these things. There is a tendency in certain official quarters that if they are not enamoured about a certain scheme they call it off, but I feel that Barbadians should not be unwilling to grasp at any opportunity for a job wherever that work is, and I think the Minister of Labour and the Government as a whole would be well advised to pay a visit to British Honduras. I am of the opinion that because of the Barbados tendency the Barbadian Ministers sit down too much and expect these things to come home to them.

3.35 p.m.

They are not going to come home to you. You have to spend some money and go to places and investigate. May be, you can pay a visit and see if the corresponding Minister there can help you. It is true that British Honduras is not a self-governing place as we are, and the Governor there has more power than the Governor of Barbados has. However, it is still worthwhile that the Minister should go there and examine what possibility there is in that country for emigration and he can notify them beforehand so that they would expect him coming there to discuss such matters with them and to see what possibilities there are for opening up a field there in which nothing has been done yet.

We will have to take the initiative in these matters. I remember years ago, about seven or eight years ago, that there was a possibility which was mooted about of British Honduras being willing to do something for Barbadian workers if they come there, and I think that now we are in need and our population is becoming a serious problem, apart from anything else, some examination should be made in British Honduras of the possibilities there. I read in the newspaper recently that they would take Barbadians and Jamaicans. I know the British Honduras and Jamaicans are not the best of friends but I do not think there is any question against the acceptance of Barbadians. I believe if the Jamaicans were in favour of the British Honduras as we were, they would be ever so willing to jump off and go there. It is my view as a Barbadian that there is the tendency even in the Federation for others to look at a Barbadian as a very difficult man for them to get along with and I would say that Barbadians working in other units of the Federation are there purely on the basis of merit and not on any basis of love. Barbadians live under an enduring pressure. The tendency here is that jobs and opportunities are closing in and I hope that the Government would take a positive approach towards looking for opportunities elsewhere, not only in British Honduras, and seeing people here and there and talking about this matter. They should go all around and ask: can you tell us why it is that you do not want Barbadians? They should say to them: "We can send you some labour; we can settle you with a labour force." In this age we must look for every employment opportunity. There is a big migration taking place from Europe to Australia, but I am not going to ask you to go to Australia and ask them to take us because I do not want you to ask anybody who does not want you. However, there is a movement of people from Europe to Australia.

We would like to see that same movement in our island. Though British Honduras is not part of the Federation, I do think that the Barbados Government should send a Minister to British Honduras to see if there are any opportunities of getting employment for our people there. We are now voting an additional \$75,000 towards this item and I am sure that

not one member of the public would say that you are spending money in a field in which you should not spend it if it requires a Minister to visit there and see if there are any possibilities for our people going there.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, while on this subject of emigration, I believe from the information which I have received that if we are in a position - and I am going to agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter - we should see whether any surplus population can be disseminated in British Honduras, British Guiana or even Trinidad. Why I say Trinidad is because I have lived in Trinidad for a short period and during that time I have discovered that while it is a wealthy place, it is not fully developed. There is a lot of land in Trinidad which can be brought under productivity and I believe that if there were a movement of the surplus population of Barbados to any of those three places, there would be no unemployment whatsoever. I go further. If it is possible for the people of the world to move as they would like, there are sufficient places in the world for everybody to make a living for themselves. Let us take British Guiana. They have not started yet to go beyond Georgetown, and if it is possible, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has suggested, for this Government to send one of its Ministers there and to the other two places which I have mentioned so as to find out what can be developed, we would be able to do a lot for Barbadians. With these few words, I do hope that the Government would take into mind what has been stated and let us see some good things coming out of it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, in reference to these remarks which have been made on emigration, I think this is something which this Government has to do when it comes to emigration. The money which we are about to vote in this Resolution towards it, I do not think there is any man in this House who would object to it because we must realise that in Barbados we are very thickly populated; we do not have any extension of land for our own people and every year our population is increasing, therefore, whenever we have an opportunity we must try and find out what ways and means we can find to emigrate some of the population.

I have read in the newspapers recently that British Honduras will immigrate people from Jamaica and Barbados especially because they know that this island is over-inhabited and because they want their population to increase. They have fertile soil there and they would give each immigrant a certain amount of land as well as money. An opportunity like that is a good one and, as I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter say, this Government should send out a Minister to see the regulations and the provisions which would be provided for the emigrants which we send from this island to that country.

I remember some former years ago that this Government did send out emigrants to St. Lucia and it bought a vast amount of land there for them; but before our people could settle down the American Government went there and purchased that land and scattered our people abroad. I think it is well-known that this Government had to provide money to bring them back here and up to today not one of our people is settled there yet.

We should send out men to countries, wherever it be, whether it be to America, British Honduras, British Guiana so that they may bring us back good word. We have read in the Good Book that they sent out spies and they saw that it was a land of milk and honey and they brought back some of the grapes and showed the people and said that that showed it was good land; therefore, it gave the people courage to go towards that land. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, it is right to send out ambassadors to look after our welfare. I do know that a Barbadian is one of the hardest men in the world to please when we send him out. You have to see to it what he has to eat, to wear and even to put on his feet before he goes there. A Barbadian would leave tomorrow morning and go to England, America or Canada; but when it comes to his going to one of these small countries, he is in doubt.

3.45 p.m.

I will say in connection with emigration that I would vote for that wholeheartedly. I think that this is a good advance.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there are just two questions which I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Labour in connection with this matter which is before the Committee. One of those questions is this; I have noticed that, in recent times, in the last year or two, the people who go out on contract to the United States of America do not seem to remain there as long as some of them used to remain in previous years. I would like to know if the Hon. Minister could tell us the reason for that. Is it that the weather conditions are always interrupting the length of contract or it is the policy of the employers to change the workers and therefore send for them in smaller numbers at a time? The second question is this: sometime ago the House was very much concerned with the report.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but would he repeat that question?

Mr. TUDOR: I was asking why is it that the contracts are so short for some of the people and whether the employers want to have fewer of these people more frequently. The second question, as I was saying, is this: that sometime ago the House was very much concerned about the statement that a lot of our people who had gone out to serve with the London Transport Executive were not as well equipped as they should be, and in consequence of that, the Government decided to set up training classes in certain parts of the island where people who go to these classes could undergo preliminary training. Would the Minister say what is the course of training and whether it is proving satisfactory?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister answers those questions, I want to say that it slipped me just now to speak about a remark which was made in the Senate of the Federal House to the effect that the workers who go to America are lazy. I would like to say that that is against any of the reports which I have received even out of the mouths of the American employers. I was in the United States of America last year; I was up to a place through the courtesy of the International Cooperation Administration; I visited the Shade Tobacco Company where a large number of Barbadians are employed in Connecticut; and the report which I got is that the employers were very satisfied with the work of West Indians. I think that it was a tragic thing for someone to make such a statement, someone who, I do not believe, has ever been to the United States to investigate on this matter; I think it was tragic to make that serious indictment against the workers. Moreover, speaking for our own Barbadians, for those who went to the London Transport Executive, the English people have been very complimentary about the conduct and behaviour of these people on the buses; they happened to be an excellent advertisement for Barbadian labour. I think that one can say that in defence of one's countrymen and workers that the statement that the workers are lazy is a serious indictment against them; I have had it straight from the horse's mouth that the employers have been very complimentary about the workers. Our pressure is not one of laziness but in other directions.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad for this opportunity to inform the Committee as to the activities of the Government in connection with emigration as a whole. While I can appreciate much of what has been said by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, on the other hand, I do not appreciate the criticism which he made that the Government should not sit down and pass on paper correspondence, so to speak, but that the Government should send out delegations and try to get people settled elsewhere. I hope that the hon. member will not take any offence at what I am going to say now because I do not want to be offensive. I hope I will not be offensive at any time between now and the Elections. (Mr. WALCOTT: Why the Elections?) I made that remark, Mr. Chairman, on the humorous side. However, I am sure that the hon. member will agree that when he was a member of the Executive Committee we not only wrote, and he, as the Trade Unionist who really prosecuted the policy of the Government at the time, knows that the Government not only carried on various correspondence be-

tween the countries and Barbados but we also sent out delegations. I think he will remember that one of the first delegations which was sent out when he and I first became members of the Executive Committee, was one to Ciudad Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I made reference to correspondence with particular reference to British Honduras. We have never sent any delegation to that territory, and that is why I said that it was a question of going to the spot. I have never known a delegation from Barbados going to British Honduras and being on the spot.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was giving the background. I wanted to show how, step by step, not only in a theoretical manner but in a practical manner, the Government has had under consideration for all of these years this question of emigrating people to the various territories. We are well aware of the fact that if we are to attain a higher standard of living in Barbados, we have to do more than increase our productivity; we also have to export people; otherwise, every effort we make in producing more will be neutralised by the growth of population.

I was saying that ever since the Government was conscious of that matter and as far back as 1949 the Government sent a delegation to Ciudad Trujillo in order to get people settled there to work on farms and things of that sort.

3.55 p.m.

The Hon. Premier and two other gentlemen whose names I do not now remember formed a delegation to that country. We have been for all times not only corresponding on paper, but wherever we were accepted we have tried to send delegations.

Now as far as British Honduras is concerned, I know that the hon. member has a good memory, but perhaps he has forgotten that what was largely responsible for Richardson having lost his seat was the fact that he was in favour of Federation in which case people from Barbados and the over populated territories could migrate to that territory; and I remember well that the British Honduras Government at one time strongly and severely criticised the Colonial Office for what appeared to them to be an attempt by the Colonial Office to foist Barbadians and people from other populated territories on them. That came out in the Press and we have no reason to doubt it because we have also corresponded with British Honduras, and it was impossible for us to get anybody over there by way of emigration.

As far as British Guiana is concerned, I believe the population is still something like 3.7 people to the square mile, but even in British Guiana - and I regret to say it though it is a fact - if it were a question of migrating Indians to that country that would be a very easy job. I have visited that country on two or three occasions and on each occasion I discussed the question of Barbadians emigrating to that country, and I have been told by lots of employers especially those who deal with cutting wood in the forest that they would be glad to employ Barbadians, because as they said, and as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has also said, they are very good hard-working, conscientious people, and that is true. They tell me in no uncertain manner that one thing they can rely on where the Barbadian is concerned is that if his time is up at four o'clock and there is anything they would like continued after 4 o'clock, even for long hours, the Barbadian would be willing to go on as against the British Guianese who would chuck in his tools at the end of his regular time.

I have met people in the United States, England and wherever I went, and I found that they had nothing but the highest praise for the Barbadian's work, and I agree that I thought it a very disgraceful display of ignorance when I read for myself that a Minister without portfolio in the Federal Government has referred to West Indians as lazy, idle people, and things of that sort. On each occasion, whether it be considered a joy ride or not, that I visited

England, Geneva or wherever the case may be - and I have also gone to the United States - I saw the employers and asked them what are the conditions and what they think of the employees, and they have absolutely nothing but praise for the workers, and especially Barbadians. That has been my experience and I am sure that all those who have had any contact with employers abroad will say that they said that.

I have read like the hon. member that British Honduras may be willing at this stage to accept some West Indians, perhaps Barbadians and Jamaicans. That, I think, Sir, has been brought to their attention by the Colonial Office. The Colonial Office has emphasised that in order to develop that country it is absolutely necessary to have people in that country and that the few people - six to the square mile - cannot develop the country as it should be developed, and therefore it is absolutely necessary to have people in that country if it is to be developed. As a result of that, I presume, Mr. Chairman, they have decided now to have some West Indians - Barbadians and Jamaicans. I think as far back as 1950 we have had a good report on the British Honduras situation, and we have made attempts as far back as 1949 and 1950 to get Barbadians settled there but without success. Some member mentioned Trinidad, but I am sure that if he has been keeping up to date on what is happening, he will see that rather than Trinidad accepting us in their midst now although it has been a declared policy, they are sending people out. When Dr. Williams made the statement that he was willing to accept freedom of movement, and that was at the Inter-Governmental Conference of which I was a member which took place in October last year, I thought it was a very magnanimous decision to make in the light of the present prevailing circumstances, but he did say it and I believed him and I still do believe that it is his desire to open up, - of course it is the only logical thing to do because the Federal Capital is sited in Trinidad - and I think it was agreed when the Conference took place in Montego Bay for the selection of the Federal Capital that people from the various territories connected with the Federation would be allowed to come in at least to work on the various projects which would come up from time to time. How can you shut people out when you say you are the Capital and say on the other hand that you are willing to accept them? I do not know how they are going to answer it, and I can only hope that this hunting of persons and pushing them on boats for the various territories will stop.

The Minister of Communications and I spoke to somebody who was very influential in that Party and intimately connected with it and he gave us the assurance that he would speak to the Premier, the Hon. Dr. Williams, about it. We feel very worried to know that our people are being hunted and hounded down and put on boats and sent back home.

4.05 p.m.

As a matter of fact, it seems to us an anomalous situation, when the Minister for Home Affairs in Trinidad is going to Curacao and Aruba to represent West Indians who are not nationals who are forced out of those countries and to appeal to the Government of those countries to see that those people are given an opportunity to remain there for some time until they are able to sell their belongings for a reasonable cost without throwing away what they worked so hard for over such a long time, that the same Minister is saying to the same kind of people who are in Trinidad "Get out on a boat". We do not know how they are going to answer that and how that can be reconciled; however, I think with a little noise here and there that Trinidad would soon back down from their present policy of hunting and collecting West Indians who are not Trinidadians and sending them back to their territories.

That is the position as far as Trinidad is concerned and I do not think we can hope to have any large-scale emigration to Trinidad under the present situation until a decision is made with respect to freedom of movement, customs union, and so on.

Further, I have been in communication with the Chief Minister of Dominica. As you know, Dominica has a large

area which is very sparsely populated. It has very good arable land and so on and the Chief Minister of Dominica is willing to put to this Government the question of allowing quite a large number of Barbadians to come and settle there. While it is true that he has not given us an official invitation, it is our intention to send a delegation of our people including workers there to see what can be arranged for the emigration of our people to that territory. We are prepared to approach the Government of Dominica.

Now again, to bear out my argument, we wrote to St. Thomas of the Virgin Islands some time last year when we heard that there was a likelihood of some of our domestics being employed in that country. That was the time when we heard that some used to get across the border from Antigua to get there. We wrote to the authorities there and asked that we be considered and that they allow us to send some of our domestics there as we now do in Canada. I want to say that nobody is more *au fait* than I am on this matter because I know for a fact that every time we attempt to select people for Canada, the quota is only 42 but that we have at least 140 to 150, more or less, who have passed all the tests and who are qualified to go, but we can only get out 42 of them. We are trying from every angle to see how we can get these people out. As I have said, we went to St. Thomas and since then we have written them. The last thing which we have done is to ask them to let a delegation come from this country and discuss the matter with them, but we have been told about two and a half months ago that the tourist season is almost finished - which I did not fully accept - and that they will write us again later on and let us know. As vague as that is, we have not been able to get the delegation going.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure this Hon. Committee that we have made every possible attempt - and we have been making every possible attempt - to get our people out of this country, because we know for a fact and for a certainty that with our limited economy we cannot provide for them a standard of living which can be regarded as reasonable with this ever increasing population. We have gone further than any other country has gone and I want to repeat it because some people are too apt to forget that this is the only Government in the whole area that annually provides loans for persons and families to find work outside of the colony. Not another country has done it, not even British Guiana, Jamaica or Trinidad. Although we have set the example since 1954 no other country has followed us up to now in providing loans for people to go out of the island.

We have gone a step farther. As I told the House after visiting England last year and discussing the question of sending more Barbadians to England to work on the London Transport Executive, I found some difficulty in recruiting suitable people because many of the persons who came forward and expressed their willingness to go were not of the required standard which was demanded by the authorities. I came back here and got the Minister of Education to agree with me, as well as the Cabinet, to have training classes for these people and we have started since last year to train people for the London Transport Executive. May I say again that this training does not cost the individual one red half cent. The Government is paying for that training so that all that is necessary is for those persons who are willing to be trained to go forward and join the classes and get their lessons.

That is the position; so you will see that as far as this Government is concerned, and this Ministry in particular because this Ministry has to deal with it, this Ministry has done everything that is humanly possible and that can be expected of a Socialist Government to do. And that is, not only to get people out of the island, but also to pay to send them out of the island. We do that because we are well aware that when you export your surplus labour although it may be a bit costly in the first place to train and send them out, yet at the same time you are actually killing two birds with the same stone in that you are reducing the population so that those who remain can barter and get a better wage and, in addition, those people whom we send

out will be able to send back remittances here to help swell the national economy of the country.

As far as the question posed by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy as to why the emigrants who go to the United States come back in such large numbers and so soon and he wanted to find out whether it is a question of the weather or the employers wanting fewer workers, I want to say that neither is responsible for it. It is neither the cause of the weather nor is it the desire of the employers to have them come back home before their contract is ended.

I want to speak very frankly on this question this afternoon.
4.15 p.m.

I will answer the first question by giving this illustration. There was a chap who lived in Connecticut for approximately four years but, as you know, the American Government is not going to allow a person to remain in that territory for longer than four years, because if you remain for five years, you have the right to claim nationality. Therefore, the United States Government will not allow you to remain for five years. This individual - and there is more than one case like this - although he came back here and was fortunate enough, being a good worker, to be recruited soon afterwards; it would surprise the hon. member to know that after this individual went back he only remained for something like a week. There could be no excuse in saying that it was a question of weather conditions, nor of the payment for work. I may say that Connecticut and Wisconsin are two of the best areas in which there are some of the best employers in the United States since they pay the highest wages in the United States. Between last year and earlier this year we had as high as 74 workers coming back here out of a total of about 1,128. The highest number we have had coming back before then was 47 in 1958. We had 58 in 1957 and in 1959 we had as high as 74.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that some of these people who go to be recruited, as the American employers say, only went on a joy-ride. I want to say here and now that it is not fair, first of all, to those persons who are desirous of going to the United States of America to work and maintain their families here, for a sweet-skinned fellow to be selected in place of a man who conscientiously wants to work and whose desire is to go and work. It is not fair to deprive that fellow out of a job or of a chance to get up there and it is also not fair to the Government. Up to now, the Government has had to write off something like over \$10,000 for persons who only go out for three or four days a week for two or three weeks and then come back here. It should be borne in mind that the advances which are made to these people are the taxpayers' money. We have to pay their passages from here to Jamaica, because the recruiting base is in Jamaica; so that for everyone who gets on the plane to go to Jamaica, the Government has to pay his passage there; and when he comes back before he is able to refund that money to the Government, it means that the next thing that the Government has to do is to decide to write off that money. Up to now, the Government has written off something like over \$10,000 as I have already said, and now the Central Caribbean Labour Organisation has had to put up something like \$20,000 U.S. dollars for that sort of thing. You have people going away without official leave and also coming back to the country before the time has expired, and that is breaking the contract. Recently, we have had a very strong and serious quarrelling from the American employers. As you know, Sir, a Conference was held in Jamaica quite recently at which there were employers and Labour Commissioners of the various territories connected with this Scheme present and some very strong things were said; and Barbadians were the worst offenders of them all where returning home before the contract period had expired is concerned. All we could do was to offer our apologies and tell the Conference that we would do our best to minimise that situation. But that is not good enough. While we are able to get out as many people as we do get out sometimes, it is largely due to the fact that the American employers do not really favour

the Mexican and Puerto Rican workers so much. If they find that it is a loss to them to lose so many emigrants who return home before the contract period expires, they will become fed up and our chances of getting people into the Scheme will be lessened to a great extent.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to appeal to those workers to realise what a serious situation is facing us more particularly this year because we have had a drought. If, by chance, people have been called up, it is their duty to uphold the tradition of this country. They should not run away and deprive the employer of his money which he has spent in recruiting them to go to work for as much money as possible.

The hon. member also asked about the Training Scheme. I can assure him that this training scheme is a success. As a matter of fact, about three weeks after we started, we were able to collect something like over thirty of these persons and send them off to England; they did not have to remain in the classes for the prescribed time of six weeks. Of course, it is our intention that, as soon as one can pass the examination, to get him off as quickly as possible because, as I mentioned sometime ago, the London Transport Executive wanted approximately 1,000 people, and any number which we can get trained would be accepted as soon as possible.
4.25 p.m.

Now the training, as I said takes the form of general knowledge, but more particularly one must be able to understand the English language a bit, and also to be able to convert or rather to be fairly quick to convert pounds to dollars and cents or vice versa. As you know, in travelling on these buses, if a man gives you a pound and the ticket is for nine pence, a fellow has to be quick to know to give him back nineteen shillings and threepence. They are taken through these courses and as soon as they can pass the examination, they are passed out and they are on the next boat.

Mr. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way on a point of explanation, I understand - I do not know how true it is - that the requirements of the London Transport Executive is something like 70 persons a month if they could get them. I do not know if it is true, but if it is so, could we train enough in that time?

Hon. M. E. COX: Under the present circumstances, I believe they take more than 70 persons. They will take as many as we can send up and as often as we can send them; so it is not really at this stage confined to so many per month; but up to now I regret to say we are not able to keep up to the quota, so to speak. As a matter of fact, in the last talk I gave, I had hoped to see a few more of these classes started in different areas, St. Andrew, St. Lucy, St. Philip, St. John or wherever we could get them coming forward. We are only too glad to get them trained because it does not pay us to keep people walking about the streets of this country.

I hope I have answered to the satisfaction of hon. members on the various points that have been raised, but I do say that this Ministry is very concerned indeed over the fact that quite a substantial number of persons, after being fortunate enough to be selected to go to the United States, go over there, and to use the very term that the Americans used to us, "for a joy ride". We cannot afford to have these joy rides, and I must say here and now that if this thing were to continue I would have absolutely no alternative than to ask the Cabinet to agree to bring down restrictions similar to those which now obtain in the case of persons going to England. As you know, persons going to England have to have guarantors to sign for the money loaned to them after which they are able to go. Government does not recover this money at all, and if that continues we may be forced to bring down restrictions, because the individual is not in a position to pay after having spent only four weeks or four days over there, and therefore the Government is asked to write off that money, which, small as it may appear, could be put to some good and tangible use.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the Minister for the replies he has given, and I think that hon. members would sympathise with the point of view of the Government on this matter. It is to the advantage of everybody in this colony that people who go to the United States should be as good as they could be, but I am wondering if it is a case that the early return of some of these workers is due to the fact that they are not working as conscientiously as they are expected to do. Perhaps that is what Senator Liburd had in mind when he made this statement; perhaps representation had been made to the Federal Government on this problem. Could the Minister say whether it was this which was drawn to the attention of that particular member of the Federal Government? If so, it is not only a Barbadian problem but a West Indian problem. Perhaps it is not only the Barbadians who are giving this trouble, but many more workers from the other islands.

If it is not Barbadians alone of whom these complaints are made, perhaps it would be as well for the Minister to consult with his opposite members in the Unit Governments and Federal Government as to what could be done to check this state of affairs. I sincerely hope that the complaint from the employers is not confined to Barbadians alone, although I am sorry to hear that even Barbadians are bringing that particular censure on themselves. Could the Minister say, for instance, whether similar complaints, if he knows, go to the other Unit Governments about their workers?

Hon. M. E. COX: I do know, Mr. Chairman, that there are other cases in other territories; but what I would like to impress upon the Committee and the hon. member in particular is the fact that those who remain, especially Barbadians, do well and work hard; so it could not be a question of being lazy. It is only a question of a fellow going off for a few free weeks to see how the country looks and coming back; but I must confess whether or not representation was made to the Senator that in my opinion it was an indiscretion on his part.

The question that Head XXXI - Labour, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXXII - Highways and Transport, was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I think it is well known Sir, that there is an amount put in the Estimates every year for workers with the Highways and Transport Department to pay for the damage done to their clothes while on the job. Very often they get soiled, and apparently it is irreparable, by the colas and so on. Anyway, Sir, \$150 was put in the Estimates and there is only now a balance of \$22.89, and as the note says, there are outstanding claims amounting to \$71.70. We are therefore now asking for this supplementary vote to carry on to the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head XXXII - Highways and Transport, stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this amount I gather is to deal with such cases where there is the normal damage to clothing in the course of the duties of members on the staff.
4.35 p.m.

Under this same Head, Claims for Compensation, I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us if he has any knowledge of outstanding claims of persons who have been injured. I happen as a lawyer to know that one or two cases were referred to the Personnel Officer of the Department of Highways and Transport. It is strange that they would be sent to the Minister rather than to the Attorney General who would be the better person to have them checked upon and to see what he would agree to recommend that Government should pay or whether he thinks that the matter should be fought out in the Law Courts. I have in mind the

case of a constituent of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. We are still waiting to hear something about that matter but we are not going to wait much longer. Anyhow, I have mentioned it now because I know that the Hon. Leader of the House takes a careful note of all these things and no doubt he will ask his colleague if he has not received any information from the Personnel Officer of the Department of Highways and Transport or if there were no cases which were referred to him. I presume, if he did receive it, he would send it on to the Attorney General's Chambers. The case to which I refer is the case of a gentleman from Chalky Mount and it was hanging fire for a very long time.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the appropriate Minister is not present, but I too would like to know something about the outstanding claims because in my constituency there is a man by the name of Douglas who was walking.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. This Head has nothing to do with that. It deals with persons who have got their clothes dirty with colas; but if the hon. member cares to ask the Hon. Minister concerned privately, he will explain.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the amount of \$80,805 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1959-60 No. 44 OPERATION OF TRANSPORT SERVICES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution which was given notice of this morning is to supplement Part I, Current, Head XXXVI, Transport Services. As hon. members would have noted from the Annual Report of the Transport Board and from last week's debate, once again, we are asking for a subsidy to meet the deficiency on the operation of transport services. We had included in this year's Estimates the amount of \$50,000 for that purpose, but the working deficiency, as hon. members would have seen last week, as noted in the Annual Report, is \$173,104.27 as against \$236,015.00 for the preceding year. As I have said, \$50,000 was included in this year's estimates and that amount from \$173,104.27 would leave \$123,104.27. We are asking for \$141,500 instead of \$123,104.27 because we are asking for a subsidy to meet the deficiency to the end of our current financial year as against the Board's financial year.

Sir, we have had this matter debated at length on Tuesday last and there is nothing which I can usefully add today. Hon. members are quite aware of the position. The amount which we put in the Estimates would have indicated that we hoped that the annual deficiency would only call for \$50,000 but, as hon. members would have noted, the deficiency is more than has been expected. Although, as I hinted last time, the amount of losses on the final quarter of last year was very hopeful, yet the Government is watching the situation very carefully. Again, I will say that there is nothing more which I can usefully add today than what I said of the last occasion; therefore, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister said that there is nothing which he can usefully add to what he said last week. But I hoped that this matter would have been regarded as of sufficient importance to the Cabinet that they, since we last discussed transport in

this House, would have come to a decision about these buses. We surely cannot go on indefinitely with a Minister or a Government unable to make up their minds on this matter.

As I have said on the last occasion, to run this service economically, they must run the entire passenger transport system of Barbados. They must come to the decision to run all, and they will thereby get the materials, the buses, the accessories and spare parts at the more reasonable price and whatsoever else they want if they have the entire units in their charge.

They must of course check up on the administration inside the office, because I have no doubt, with the information at my disposal, that there are too many square pegs in round holes and too many people to do the same thing. There is too much overlapping; hence in the office it is so easy for money to disappear and there is no redress in the Law Courts.

There must be some time limit to the date that the Government should come to some decision. After all, if they cannot come to a unanimous decision, they must agree to differ and if the Minister in charge cannot be easily got around, well then, he knows what the constitution of the Cabinet calls for. He must resign so that some backbencher will be able to take his place.
4.45 p.m.

It is inconceivable in any other part of the world that such an interminable thing is taking place and a Government cannot make up its mind. I notice that the amount which we are asked to vote today is \$141,500 to supplement the provision in the Current Estimates. We have to consider this amount which is now to be voted; we have to consider the amounts which we have already voted in respect of the transport service and we cannot overlook the fact that within the next fortnight we will be asked to vote \$180,000 to meet the deficiency in the operation of the Transport Board in the coming Financial Year 1960-61. We have all been given our Estimates and, of course, this item is one of the first things for which we would have looked. There we have it staring us in the face; and whereas we are asked to vote this \$191,000, we will be asked to vote under the same Head for the same purpose and only for the next financial year, an amount of \$180,000 to meet the operating deficiency of the Transport Board. Mr. Chairman, we just cannot go on like this. We are not being driven; we are running headlong down the stream without any serious attempt being made by the Government to come to a decision.

There are occasions when members of the Cabinet have irreconcilable points of view and the point of view of the majority of the Cabinet has to stand. If a Minister conscientiously finds that he cannot agree to or accept the decision of the whole Cabinet, he must observe his duty under the Convention and tender his resignation; and the Premier could ask some backbencher to accept the Ministry which the other member has found impossible any longer to carry on, because his policy and that of the rest of the Cabinet are not the same. They cannot see eye to eye. It is a question of carrying on, vacillating shilly-shallying and getting nowhere until the end of the legislative session. What must be of paramount importance is not the purpose of the individual members of the Cabinet, but what is best for the island as a whole; and in arriving at that, you must not only see what will provide the most efficient service but also that we keep as rigidly as possible to the Conventions connected with Cabinet Government under the Ministerial set-up. I would like to have a pronouncement here this afternoon as to the date when the Government intends to have a Cabinet meeting called with only that one thing on the Agenda and let them adjourn for a cup of coffee and come back and not stop that historic session of the Cabinet. When they have come to a decision and a Minister finds that it is against his conscience, let the necessary readjustment be made in the Cabinet and the Government will go on. It is long past the time when a decision should be made and that decision notified to members of the public.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would not add much to what I have said already, because we have had a full-dress debate on this matter. I do agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there must be a positive statement made as to the policy of the Government for the future. I have been reading and seeing a lot; Barbadians are very hazy about stating definitely what the position should be. A lot of writers have been writing on this subject but they write all around it. I have indicated in the last debate and I will indicate again. The Hon. Minister said that they are getting advice from Mr. Cadbury; well, I am of the opinion that if you have a man of Mr. Cadbury's calibre, then you should set up a Committee; and if he is willing to be Chairman of that Committee you should make a searching investigation into the Transport Board from the time it operated as such and see definitely what would be his opinion about it. Barbados is getting to the stage where people are afraid of telling you anything because they are afraid of what would take place. The rumour I have heard is that there is a lot of corruption at the Transport Board and that it is not only a question relative to the conductors but also relative to the administration. The Transport Board is no place for a man who is looking for a job. We want big men; we want two or three big men there. You definitely have people at the Transport Board who should not be in the positions in which they are. If you want people to run a business, you must have people with the courage and breadth of vision to be able to say: "This is the thing I am going to run." As I say, you want men of vision, men who believe in public ownership. You cannot have people who do not believe in public ownership running a public concern, because they will want to prove that that is wrong.

There is that lazy thinking in Barbados that the Government should not run anything, and if that is so, then the Government should resign. I want to say that there is no business in Barbados which budgets for 21 million a year; and if you cannot run business, then you cannot run the Government because the Government has the biggest business in the colony to run. You will go to every Board and you will find losses. It is not that I am advocating losses, but you will have people who have not paid back money and that is a loss. If you had a quasi concern in which you had to make a profit and loss account, that would be money lost; if you are renting a man a house and the rents dropped by so much money, it is just like people in the Bank. If the interest or money loaned is not repaid, then you have to lose; you have to foreclose. Rent is used in one instance, interest in another and profits in another, but it all turns out to be the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, as I have already stated, I am a believer in public ownership. I do not believe in going back to private ownership. I have read a little pamphlet, and I will lend it to members, which members of the Labour Party wrote about public ownership.
4.55 p.m.

We are playing into the hands of private investors in Barbados who say they could not make money in this same bus business; but what is now being blown up, and it is blown up higher than what it is, is that Government is afraid of taking the view that if some man over there needs firing you should fire him. I am a Trade Unionist; but I do not believe, if a man cannot do a job, you should keep him. If a man cannot do a job, let him go home. If somebody is going to beg for a chance for him, that is a different thing; but do not tell me that as a Trade Unionist, I want a man to hold down a job when he cannot do it. I would tell him to get out of the place because I do not have time for nuisances.

I want to tell the Government that I am a believer in excellent supervision and I would pay \$5 or \$10 more than the normal charge to a man if he is going to be a good supervisor. I realise the essential value of a supervisor, because a supervisor cannot be a thief. If he can carry away more than an ordinary man, then you know what you are in for. But I take a serious view, Mr. Chairman, because there is a general tendency now which has been circulating around the Board - we said we were above Trinidad,

and I would like to see that position maintained when it comes to corruption - that from top to bottom people carry away money. When you get a situation like that, it is not a good climate for the island. If the man at the top is doing these things, why make the small man the scape goat? I would like the Minister to go into this matter seriously, use the best brains he has and have a searching investigation.

Members say they are not satisfied with this Board, but I know that if you gave it to a private industry tomorrow you are going to provide them with the same amount of \$140,000 which you now have here, though you are going to provide for it in a different way; that is, you are going to lower the gasoline tax, road tax, and all these things in order for them to run the service; and their case would be, if you could not run it, these are the conditions under which they will run the service. The Government has an excellent opportunity of running a service; and they should see, if the Act wants amending to put others on the Board, if it needs more administration, find out who controls your motor mechanic section and so on and get somebody. I have been hearing all sorts of rumours about batteries and tyres, and I will tell you that if I happened to know that a man was suspected of carrying away something somewhere else, I would not want him. If he is a man who gets into rackets, this is not a place for racketeering.

There are some people in responsible positions in this island, Mr. Chairman, who look on lesser mortals in smaller positions and expect them to give them a tyre and feel it is all right, and that it is only part of living. I am not a believer in that. I am a Trade Unionist and I do not go in, as Dr. Eric Williams said, "for deals", because a bus driver does not give me a free ride, a spare tyre or a battery. I do not want anything free. Everything I want I am going to work for and go to a store and buy. I can say that because nobody can buy me. No smaller man can come and say I owe him an allegiance. I do not want my motor car repaired at a Government place; it must be done somewhere where I can be sent a bill and I can pay for it, because if you do something to my car for which I did not ask and you are dismissed, I would tell them to lock you up.

The hon. junior member for St. James says he does not like the Senate Committee, but the American system is better than the British when it comes to investigating certain things. I have been hearing that people are not satisfied with how the Transport Board is being run. If they are not satisfied, they should carry out an investigation of the running of the Transport Board so that an independent group of people could go in and see how it is run, the number of fares and how things are accounted for, what sort of administration there is and whether it is good enough for the job you have to do. If you have that sort of investigation and an impartial person or Committee says it is an excellent organisation and you cannot have a better one, then you can say it is something you will have to subsidise and bus fares should go up; but do not leave it to waste away.

I understand that the Transport Board is making money on certain routes but on others it is losing; so it is an overall operational loss in view of the structure which you have. I feel that if an investigation is set up into the workings of it, people will give evidence, because the travelling public should be made to understand that if you are travelling on a bus it is your duty to pay the fare. No person should expect to ride free. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because in another respect I heard some hon. members in this House are telling workers not to pay back money which they borrow from the Housing Board. I never went in for that sort of business. How can you tell a man to borrow money and on the face of it tell him not to pay back what he borrows? It is telling a man to be dishonest man.

This is a very serious matter, and it is the first matter in my time in which the Government has tried to do something; so that if the Government is trying to do something it must be taken in a different context,

because I know it would be cheaper in some quarters for the Government to give out work. It would be cheaper for some private person to build a road than for Government, but it might be a road like the Sandy Lane Road. When I said that some time ago hon. members laughed at me and though I was making fun, but I am sure that members must have driven over it and are satisfied that I was not that wrong when I said that the road is not all that good. (Hon. M. E. COX: It is settling.) By the time it settles, it might disappear in some places.

Mr. Chairman, that analogy was to show the difference between public ownership and private ownership. I came along in Barbados and found that roads were done and repaired by the Vestry, but they could not be compared with the type of roads that were built after the Government took over.

5.05. p.m.

They used to do the roads and find work for the people in a different way. Similarly, it was with housing, and public buildings. You gave all that out on contract but you have stopped that and have set up a Department to deal with them.

What I would like to get, the Hon. Minister may not be able to tell me precisely. I said that one of the reasons is because of the wages being paid to people in the transport service. As a matter of fact, the current wages paid to people driving motor vehicles in Barbados are so low in comparison with what other people get that we are lucky that we do not get more accidents. I consider that these are people who deserve a better treatment than that. Why should these people get a wage lower than \$3.00 a day? If you pay a scavenger \$3.00 a day, certainly these people should be paid more than that. You give an added income to people as you want better recruitment. We do it in the Service. Where would you classify a Conductor? You can look at any of the I.L.O. classifications and you will see the wages of men working in road haulage. I know many a teacher left teaching to do road haulage because road haulage was such a lucrative job that he found out that was a job at which he could work.

The Hon. Minister of Trade explained earlier when dealing with another Resolution that we are recruiting people in Barbados to go to London to drive transport which is run by the Government. The means of getting employment for Barbadians is public ownership. He also mentioned that we are training people to go into jobs which are run by public ownership. Because of that, you cannot allow the people in Barbados to say that you do not believe in public ownership. I wonder what the people would say if the Barbados Government in this matter would go back to private ownership. I know that the people in England would say that since this is your idea, let the immigrants you have there come back home. It would surely rebound.

I, too, am afraid of the losses, but in England the railway people just got some more money. I know that it suits private owners to say that the Government is not paying as much as they are paying. When we go to negotiations with them and we tell a private employer that we want so much money for a worker, the private employer says that he is paying more than the Government. But if the Government is paying more, he will tell you: "Oh, you know the Government can tax the people." The Transport Board is a quasi-Government Department. It is something which the Government has created. It is for that reason that I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he says that it is a pity the Government did not have the whole thing.

What I would like to say to the Hon. Minister of Labour as well as the Hon. Minister of Communications, because both are responsible for this particular item, is that the same recruitment system which they are using for people who go to England to work on the London Transport service should be used here. It is true that one will not need to have that knowledge of conversion in pounds, shillings and pence. Of course, you give lessons to a dunce. As a school-boy, I could add pounds, shillings and pence easily. That

is something which you did in the third standard. As a matter of fact, you had to rattle off the table of pounds, shillings and pence as if you were rattling off a recitation. It stood me in good sense because when I go to London, I am not at a loss as to what change I should get back, and I believe with the knowledge that I have gained that I can go to Japan where the yen is the currency and would not be at a loss as to what I should get so long as I am told the conversion.

Why is it that the people whom we send to the London Transport Service work better than those whom we have in our transport service? It is true that a man behaves better when he is far away. Why is it that we get such exemplary reports of our people in England and here they reduce a conductor to nothing? The truth is that you have been aiming at a higher standard of export; but at home where you are paying a low wage and where wages are depressed, the tendency is for the people to emigrate to the place where they can get higher wages.

You have here primary, secondary and higher education. You start off by saying that for one to be a clerk, he must be able to read and write. If you treat a conductor as a semi-illiterate by putting him to work in a low wage category and you say that it does not matter, how can you hope to get a man of a certain mentality doing that work? You can get a man of a certain mentality doing that job by offering a better system of wages in that category of employment. I, personally, do not value how much money a man makes in his business. I value how many people who are working for him are able to get pairs of pants, shirts, and so on, out of his employment. All of us can be successful business men if we decide to keep a low standard of wages. I can tell you that the reason why private people have been able to make their buses pay is because they do so by the blood, tears and sweat of the people whom they employ. I would say that a Barbadian is a very docile person, but a docile person is a very difficult person to handle when swung around. Private people will only pay better wages if they are forced, and we as representatives of the people must see to it that a proper standard of wages is maintained. I am satisfied in my mind that we cannot be a party to any underwriting for low wages; therefore, if we have to say 'yes' or 'no' to a system which is going to help the workers, we will have to do it. I say so not because I represent workers; We must say 'yes' to something which is right and 'no' to something which is wrong.

We of the Union went to the Transport Board and we put up a reasonable proposition to them as regards the workers. We pointed out that although the Board had shown a deficit, yet the increase which we were asking was the lowest which we think we should negotiate for; and although it was higher than what the Government gave to its employees, to people in the same category of employment, yet we could not regard that which the Government gave as one which we should negotiate for. As a matter of fact, we got higher increases for workers in other private employment. We regard \$3.00 a day as the least minimum wage which should be given a man.

Now, apart from the workers' side, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Government should not sit down and allow the situation to go on, that because transport service is run by a Board, it should go on willy-nilly and you should not carry out a searching investigation into the running of it. It is not beyond the Government to carry out a searching investigation. I speak here with full authority on behalf of the workers. We are not going to support anybody whatsoever where a Union member or a non-Union member who is going to work for a Board or any private employer is not prepared to give honest work to the people with whom he is working and for the money which he is receiving. Any worker who is guilty of dishonesty in any form or the other must be willing to lose his job. We make no compromise with that. Sometimes in a case of rudeness, we will ask an employer to overlook that. You do have calculated dishonesty in some of these cases because you have instances where a man calculates how the Government's money is going to go out by stock and other ways.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I say that because as soon as you put a lot of things in any place it is felt that they were never purchased; if you take up about twenty of them it is felt that they were not bought. That tendency must be stopped. On the question of having too many people employed, well, I would like to see everybody employed; but if you only want two people you are not helping the situation by employing six people. If you have too many people up there, then say that you have too many people for the work which you have to do. If you have some Civil Servants who have the aptitude for this sort of thing, it may not cost the Government anything more to second them. I do not believe that in going back to private ownership, you will be better off. It has been reported of me in the Press, and I hope that the Press will take this opportunity of clarifying the statement - I have been reported in a way as if I feel that private ownership should not exist. I am a believer in public ownership but that does not mean that private ownership should not exist. That was spoken in the context of a public essential service like transport.

I should like to say that about twenty-five years ago it would not have made any difference to the public life if a bus never ran, but the changes in the patterns of life make certain things essential. For those who can remember, Mr. Cozier would come with a bus to Bridgetown from Speightstown in the morning and park until four o'clock in the afternoon and then go back to Speightstown, and you would have to get from Christ Church to Bridgetown however you liked. The tram-car only went as far as St. Lawrence and also to Lands End. In those days, Mr. Chairman, it did not matter if you did not have a transport service; but today, if the transport system were to break down, you can see what would happen. The country is developed, and therefore public transport today is different from what it used to be in those days when you had the "Diamond T" bus. This public transport can be owned and run by the public just as the Waterworks service is owned and run by the public, The Postal Service is still a private affair in some places, but we have passed that stage; we must have the Government Post Office run by the proper authorities. Those of us who have a strong Socialist philosophy notwithstanding the Government in power - any of us who subscribe to the Socialist philosophy knows that we can make this transport service run, not on how much profit you can make but on the basis of efficiency. Mr. Robinson is the Chairman of the London Transport Service and I do not think that they have changed him. Some weeks ago there was an increase in the wages of the railway workers. You know what a hue and cry was made in 1945 when the Labour Party came up with the policy of the nationalisation of the railways. It is the policy that nowadays you have transport run by public authorities because you feel that you cannot allow things to be put in the hands of private people. If this subsidy is given to the Transport Board, it must be given on the basis of the Transport Board providing the workers with a decent standard of wages connoting to something in 1960. If a man cannot get a minimum of \$3.00 a day for industrial work, then that industry is not worth while continuing. If a searching investigation is carried out at the Transport Board and it proves that the conductors are dishonest, I, as a Trade Union member, am willing to say: "If you cannot collaborate, you must provide a means of removing that danger; you must get buses where you use the slot system." Some people would say that we should pander to the workers and give them whatever they want. I do not like this cloud which is hanging over people; let us have an investigation into the Transport and remove such persons who are incapable of doing the job. I would say to the Hon. Minister that if Mr. Cadbury is capable of undertaking the task, then he should be asked to do it. If he is not willing to do it, then you should find ways and means of having a local Committee of such persons who are capable of carrying out an investigation and reporting their findings and bringing this matter to an end in one way or in the other.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to think that every now and then we have to be granting money to the Transport Board and to hear that there is so much confusion over the Board. I believe that when-

ever we have a report from the Board the blame is put on the old buses; but I would like to say that if the old buses, which are working now for the Transport Board, could talk like any of us, they would cry and say: "We are making our full benefits; we are able to pay for ourselves, our taxes, for our tyres, for our gas and those who are operating us". As I said sometime ago, the water is leaking out of the tank. The Minister knows that this service is not a profit-making concern; we are losing money. However we turn, we are losing and I am asking the Minister to get down to bed-rock facts and try and find out where this water is leaking out. The rain is falling but whose garden is it watering? It is watering somebody's garden and causing the vegetables to grow (*Laughter.*) 5.25 p.m.

The only possible means of finding a remedy is to find out into whose garden it is running. Everybody knows that the Minister of Communications is the cause of the Transport Board running today, and he knows that it is not profiting the Government. We would be able to invest the money they are losing in building more schools, repairing more roads, extending water mains, building hospitals and other things. Today we are asked to vote \$141,000. The hon. member for St. Lucy said just now and I checked it in the Estimates that we will have to vote \$180,000 for the same Transport Board. What is the Transport Board doing? Is the Manager of the Transport Board looking out to see how other private concessionaires are running their buses? To whom are they crying and who is subsidising them? Where are they getting money from every now and again to buy new buses? Are their buses not making that money? Why can't the Transport Board do that too? I am certain that there are men who would be glad to take over these buses and run them and make a profit. There are many outside waiting with their hands open to receive them if you will turn them over, and I am sure they will make a profit.

When the railway train was being operated by Government, everytime it left Bridgetown for Belleplaine it was run at a loss, and when it returned it was run at a loss; the private concessionaires bought motor trucks and conveyed their produce all over the island, and then the Government abandoned the railway train and the people were getting their produce into the City by their own vehicles. If the Government would turn over the buses to private concessionaires, they will run them and make something from them. It is plain to see that the Government is running half of the buses while private concessionaires are running the other half. The private concessionaires are making money but the Government cannot make any, and every now and again we have to subsidise the Transport Board. What kind of Transport Board is this? If we go on like that we will take all the money we possess and leave none to build schools or roads. It is a disgrace to the Government every now and then to be coming for \$100,000, \$200,000 or \$1/4 million for the Transport Board when the schools are breaking down and the poor children are like sardines in a pan waiting for expansion. People would be glad if you would repair the roads so that they can bring out their canes, but you are putting all the money in the Transport Board and it is going under the earth. If the appropriate Minister is not careful, the people will have to victimise him for what he is doing. He is allowing evil to exist, and the only possible means of our future existence in Barbados is to try to eradicate that evil. It is not good to be granting so much money to them. You are bringing in new buses and the old ones are causing you to lose money, as you say. It is not the old buses; it is that the money is not going into the Transport Board. Every now and again the private concessionaires are bringing in new buses and we cannot bring down a tyre. What are we going to do if we allow that to exist? Soon and very soon we will have to fall on our knees; so I am asking the Minister to get to the root of it, try to search deeply and see where the water is running out of the well and try to stop it; otherwise we will all thirst.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, we have been over this ground on so many occasions that I do not think I can say very much more even in my reply. I should just like

to say in reply to the Leader of the Opposition who, I notice, is not here that he talked a lot about constitutional propriety and what not, but I do not know what gave him the idea that the Government is in a constitutional crisis or at logger-heads. The hon. member opposite should be the last person to talk, because obviously if one took his speech and the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, there seems to be some conflict as well; but whatever we come down here to do we are collectively responsible for. We act collectively and whatever may be our differences before hand, as soon as we come here we accept what the majority agrees to; so I do not see where all this talk about constitutional propriety comes in.

I stated our position quite clearly last time and I will say to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that I am as anxious as he to give a statement of policy, and I would like to tell him that the examination which he has asked for and says should be conducted is being conducted right now by Mr. Cadbury. He is an economist, and that is the kind of examination you want. He is a man who is not only in theory an economist but a man who has had practical experience in this kind of undertaking, and I need not tell the hon. member and the House that to get really impartial people who could conduct the type of investigation into this concern in this island would be very difficult. They would all start out 99% prejudiced against the Government, and therefore when I tell him that Mr. Cadbury is doing what he would want in the line of investigation, it is a plain statement of fact. I can say that in the very near future our policy will be announced. I do not know whether he thinks it is a matter for the Cabinet. It is a matter of going into details, figures and the running of the Board, examining things and advising us of the best to do in the light of past experience. 5.35 p.m.

That is what is being done; and very soon, as I have hinted, I will be able to announce what the future would be like.

I should say this also in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I too have read of the stories of corruption and I have had them investigated on every occasion. Take the matter which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy drew to the attention of the House on the last occasion about the matter of charters. We saw that in a certain newspaper and we had it investigated. I was told when it came to charters that people would pay down deposits on them, and when the charters were sent out the Board found it difficult to collect the balance. Since the new Manager has come on, he has stopped that. The money must be paid before the charter is sent out. All these things have been tightened up. We had these things investigated because if you get these serious charges circulated, people will hold that there is corruption at the top and the people at the bottom would say that if they at the top carry away money, why cannot we carry it away too. We are only too anxious to block these holes and to see that more confidence among the employees is maintained and if it is not maintained, is restored.

It is a difficult task in this island. Rumours get around and fiction takes hold more than the truth and they have a deleterious effect. I do take these rumours seriously and I want the House to know that we have them investigated on all occasions. After all, members of the Committee should appreciate that as long as you have public enterprise on the one hand and private enterprise on the other hand, you are going to have the enemies of public enterprise saying things about it which simply is not true. It happened in England with the London Transport. They hurled accusations against it not only in public but in Parliament. Two years ago they had an investigation into it and it was found out that things were not as bad as some parliamentarians, especially members of the Opposition, were making them out to be. Things in our Transport Board are not as bad as some people are making them out to be. This being a democracy and people being susceptible to rumours, tales and fancy stories, you will get that sort of thing happening, especially by the enemies of public enterprise.

We too know that everything is not watertight; but I wonder if that hon. member thinks, if we hand them back over to private enterprise, that it will be a success and will be a fool-proof system. Nothing can be a greater fallacy than that. I wonder if he realises that people in Speightstown ten years ago when I was a kid - a little longer than that; 20 years ago - were paying 18 cents to go to Speightstown. It is 20 cents now. The Transport service in St. George is still run by private enterprise and the people up there complain all the time about the system. We know that the Concessionaires of that route are not making any money, but should we ask the Concessionaire of a route which is supposed to be making money to go over there and take over that route at a loss? What private enterprise would go down to Speightstown which is only a penny more and run it? It is all stupidity. Hon. members tell you that the St. Andrew route makes money but by doing what? Do you know that the people who live down there say that the route should be stretched to other areas but the owner says that it would not pay? The people down there come to me every now and then. Whenever a complaint is made the owner runs the buses up the hill for a day or two and then stops them. If it means going into her pocket she stops them. The hon. member said that they make profits but at whose expense? They make profits at the expense of the workers. They work them long hours and for a very small pittance. They also work their family in the business. They tell the Conductors sometimes that they must bring in so much every week and if a conductor does not bring in that amount he is fired. It means that if he carries a normal number of passengers today, he must overload tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why I am dwelling at some length on this is because these are fallacies which have to be cleared up. I am dwelling on this because imperfections do not help a case. We have just come back from Puerto Rico where there are no loopholes in their transport system. You have one straight fare to pay in San Juan and there is absolutely no conductor taking up fares. They work the slot system and that is almost fool-proof. But the answer to that is that you must have the confidence of the public. I will tell you that in Puerto Rico if any member of the public sees anything going wrong with their transport system, the matter is reported. A conductor there is not supposed to place money in the slot machine. If a passenger wants change, the conductor makes the change and the passenger is supposed to place the fare in the slot machine. If the conductor places that fare in that machine and somebody else sees, they would report the matter. Can you think of that happening in Barbados? We have not been led up to that stage yet.

Of course, everybody has his own answer and some people are saying that something is fundamentally wrong with public ownership. However, I am not dwelling on that now because we will soon be returning to this whole question in the very near future. A policy statement would be made, as I have said last week, soon.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER the passing of five Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

5.45 p.m.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 25) ORDER

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. 25) Order, 1959".

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is a Resolution to approve a Civil Establishment Order. Section 12 of the Police Act, 1908, permits the reduction in rank of a member of the Police Force as a disciplinary measure, but there is no authority in the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1956, for the payment of salary to more than a fixed number of officers in each category. That is to say, if there are 100 Corporals and as a matter of discipline, a Sergeant is to be reduced to rank of Corporal, when he has been reduced to that rank, he cannot as the position now stands, get the salary equivalent to that of a Corporal, since there are a limited number of Corporals in the rank according to the Act.

The object of this Resolution is to amend the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1956, to remove the number of Corporals in order that a Sergeant may be reduced to the rank of Corporal and get the pay of a Corporal. I think that that is quite clear. In order to do what I have just stated, the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1956, will have to be amended and that is the purpose of this Resolution. When that is done, we will still have the over-all Establishment, the number being 660. As I have said, it is only in order to effect that change and it is only for disciplinary purposes that that will be done. That is the object of this Resolution. It will be necessary to pay officers in excess of the fixed number in such cases.

It is also proposed to provide in the case of a vacancy in any rank below the rank of Inspector, for the carrying out of extra staff in any rank below that in which the vacancy occurs, provided that the fixed total number of officers in the rank in which the vacancy has occurred and subordinate ranks is not thereby exceeded. That again will apply to officers below the rank of Sergeant. Using the same rank of Sergeant, there may be a vacancy in that rank. For some reason or other, especially since men are trained and they have to sit their examinations before they are promoted - in fact they are promoted on the results of the examinations - if there is a vacancy in that rank, you may put an experienced Corporal to act in the rank of Sergeant without affecting the over-all figure.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Hon. Premier would have been more full in his explanation as to the reasons why it has been thought necessary to bring this Resolution down to this Chamber. This Police Act, 1908, has been in existence on the Statute Book for 50 years, and I am wondering if any difficulties have recently arisen in respect of the working of Section 12 of this Act which have caused the Government to bring down this Resolution. Has it happened in the past that men have been demoted, but when they have been demoted, the rank to which they have been demoted did not have its full complement, and therefore there was room for them in the rank to which they have been reduced, and automatically, they drew the salary of that rank? Is it feared or has it happened, either recently or at all, that men have been demoted and there was no room for them in the rank to which they have been reduced, and, in consequence, they have constituted an extra number to the complement of that lower rank? Is it that, as you cannot pay for more than so many Privates, so many Corporals and so many Sergeants, they have continued to draw the salary of the rank from which they have been demoted, even although they have been placed in the lower rank?

5.55 p.m.

I would like to know, Sir, what is the real reason behind all this. As you know, in Barbados there is always some reason for certain things. Sometimes the reason is sinister and subtle; sometimes it is very manifest and above board, because after all for 55 years this section of the Police Act has been in operation; it has permitted the reduction of the number of the Force, and we have never been asked to provide any authority for the payment of more than a fixed number of officers in any rank such as we are being asked to do now in the Resolution before us.

The Addendum states that "it may happen that the rank to which a member of the Force is to be reduced is already up to strength and in order to avoid embarrassment it is proposed to bring the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1956, in line with Section 12 of the Police Act."

What is meant, Mr. Speaker, by the expression "in order to avoid embarrassment"? Embarrassment to whom? It really is not likely to cause embarrassment to the Policeman who is to be reduced if he is reduced and wearing less stripes and if he is still drawing the salary of the rank from which he just came. It would not be causing him embarrassment. Who would be the subject of embarrassment which this Resolution speaks of trying to avoid? It would at least be a punishment to a man to be reduced in rank, in status to look less important, to have fewer people to give orders to, to have to take orders from more people, to be called by a lower title than that which he previously held; that in itself is a very severe punishment and adequate punishment without interfering with the salary to which he has become accustomed, in respect of which he has been budgeting, and which in these days is a salary he probably has difficulty in living on, far less to be required to live on a smaller salary.

It is true we live in an age of evolution, and although there may be no reason fifty years ago to consider a Resolution of this kind and there is need now, my colleagues and I on this side would like to know what is the source of this embarrassment which this Resolution is seeking to avoid, and why has it become necessary in this year of grace 1960 for us to consider this Resolution. Is there more in it than meets the eye? Is there any reason that has not been disclosed to us or is it a routine measure which might well have come before us fifty-eight years ago, but has only reached us in 1960 though this could have been on the Statute Book since 1908? You know, Sir, Section 12 of the Police Act says: "In every case of serious misconduct or neglect of duty on the part of any member of the Force, except the Deputy Commissioner, the Superintendents, and Assistant Superintendents, the Commissioner shall cause a written charge or complaint to be delivered to such member of the Force, and shall thereupon proceed to hold an investigation on oath into the truth of such charge or complaint, and if it appears that the offence is of too serious a nature to be dealt with by him under the powers by this Act conferred on him he shall transmit the evidence and proceedings to the Governor with a recommendation that such member of the Force be deprived of his good-conduct badge or badges, or be reduced from his rank or grade to another rank or grade below his own, or be dismissed from the Force. On receiving such recommendation the Governor shall make such order thereupon as to him shall seem just."

So I gather, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of this Resolution, if it is passed, it follows automatically that where the rank to which the man has been demoted already has its full complement or does not have its full complement, as a matter of course he would not only suffer the punishment and the disgrace of demotion, but will automatically suffer a loss of his salary and he will be drawing the salary of the rank to which he has been reduced. But I wonder, Sir, why and how that phrase crept in that "in order to avoid embarrassment" it is proposed to bring the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1956, in line with Section 12 of the Police Act? I wonder if the Hon. Premier who is in charge of Police affairs would clarify that phrase in this context, and if he would take

this Chamber into his confidence and explain what is the real reason why this matter now finds itself before us.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the point of embarrassment, I am informed by the Commissioner of Police, was that on one or two occasions when the Law was put into effect, because of the limited number of Corporals - one hundred - as set out in the Order and there happened to be a reduction from a higher rank, the appropriate salary was not payable because the Auditor General did not have any authority. That is the embarrassment. That has happened on about two occasions recently and that is why the amendment to the Order is sought in this Resolution.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT)

(No. 26) ORDER, 1959

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 Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 26) Order, 1959."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order, Sir, is in connection with the Education Department, and is for the creation of a post of Assistant Accountant at a salary of \$2,640 - \$3,360, and the addition of one post of Clerical Assistant at a salary of \$912 to \$1,392.

The Education Department is asking to have these officers for one or two reasons. First of all, they are responsible for the expenditure of \$3 1/2 million and the accounting is not properly done. There is an Accountant, but he is not able to carry out the full duties of his office; so an Assistant is required; and they have asked, in as much as they are responsible for this amount of money and in their opinion there is no adequate checking, that the post of Assistant Accountant be created in order that they can be more fully and adequately staffed to take care of this accounting. They go on to say that professional officers in the Department have to a large extent been preoccupied with non-professional duties in connection with Oversea Examinations (the number of examinations and candidates have increased), the newly instituted screening test, and the work of the Student Advisory Committee. All these form additional work which is thrown on the Department and take up the time of the professional staff so that they cannot do their own work; and also we are hiring an officer of a high calibre to do the work of some person lower down the scale, and for those two reasons they are asking for these two officers.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

6.05 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, so far as the explanation given by the Hon. Premier goes, it is very satisfactory. We can all imagine that the Education Department because of the vast amount of work it does and the vast sums which are disbursed there every year would require some proper and thorough system of accountancy; but what I want to know is this, and this is a matter more for the Hon. Minister of Education than for the Hon. Premier: why has it taken so long for separate provision to be made for handling the Oversea examination work? As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, for the last three or four years, complaints have been brewing of the dissatisfaction which is experienced both by tutors and pupils taking the Overseas examinations, of the delays which they meet in doing business with the Department and the fact that their enquiries which are often of a routine nature are not properly answered, also that there is a considerable amount of uncertainty in giving them advice when information is sought, and that in consequence of the uncertainty and lack of decision which seems to come from the Department, people intending to write the Overseas examinations are not always sure of their ground and because of that much valuable time and sometimes money is lost.

Then, too, there is the complaint which I have heard again from people taking Overseas examinations that for some reason or another they are not quite satisfied with the manner in which the time-table of the examination is sent out. They realise, of course, that the time-table must correspond with that of the United Kingdom, but it is not always necessary for examinations to be taken at the same date and hour in Barbados as they are written in the United Kingdom; and in consequence of that some pupils are put to a great inconvenience in writing the examinations. They wonder if the Department cannot make some variation of time where it is convenient without doing any damage to secrecy or confidence or the integrity of the examination itself.

There is another point in connection with the Overseas examinations. In the Government-aided schools, it is well-known that the cost of Overseas examinations written by the pupils of those schools are borne by the Government. Obviously, they are grant-aided schools; but there are other secondary schools which are not grant-aided but whose pupils write and are prepared for the same examinations. It is not the fault of the parents of those children in the non-grant-aided schools that their children are not in grant-aided schools. It is rather the lack of grant-aided schools which keep them out of them and force them into private secondary schools. But at the same time the parents of children who are being taught in private secondary schools are taxpayers and it is their money, or part of it, which maintain the Government schools; therefore, both in theory and in practice, a parent of a child who goes to a private secondary school is faced with an added burden because as a taxpayer, he has to provide education for somebody's child who is not his own and he has to provide education facilities for his own child at another secondary school. Part of his taxes help to keep the Government grant-aided schools; yet his own child in the school where it attends has to pay its own examination fees.

I wonder whether the time has not come for the Government, if it has not found it possible to subsidise the non-grant-aided schools, to give some assistance in the writing of examinations to children in non-grant-aided schools. If the schools are on the list of the Department of Education, I see no reason why the children of such schools should not have their examinations paid for them, provided the Principals and the Heads of those schools give the guarantee that those entries are the ones most likely to be successful. It is possible that there can be a confab between the Minister of Education and the Principals of those schools as to the basis on which assistance will be given by Government for defraying the cost of Overseas examinations. It is a question of principle which is at stake. The parents of the children who attend a private secondary school are themselves taxpayers, and in their capacity they have to pay for the facilities of their children who are at private secondary schools and also for the children of parents who are in Government-aided schools.

6.15 p.m.

They not only pay school fees, but also examination fees, and it is clearly a question of principle at stake. I do not think that parents should be penalised for themselves as well as for others; if you cannot subsidise secondary education, the least that the Government should do is to pay the examination fees for the pupils who attend non-grant-aided schools. I throw out to the Minister; I would be grateful if anything is being done in that direction and to know how soon can these parents expect that particular kind of relief.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, this debate is not necessarily one on the policy for education, but I should not like the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to feel that his is a voice crying in the wilderness on this particular subject. The point which the hon. member has just raised has been well taken, and I would like to lend my support in that direction. Some thought, I think, has been given to the matter, and I do not know when implementation will take place on that particular score. The Government will be well advised if they can see how quickly they will get a

matter like that handled. One could possibly talk at length on this matter, but on that particular point one would like to get an answer as quickly as possible.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, relative to the question posed by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, I am to say that an old proverb still holds good today and the one to which I refer is that which says: "One thing at a time and that done well, is the very best rule, as many can tell." That is, the whole matter of the educational system of Barbados has been more complex than quite a number of people realise, and it will take a reasonably long time before everything can be straightened out. For the short time during which I have been in the Ministry, I have been going full speed ahead and I think that I can say, without any attempt at boasting, that things are taking shape.

With respect to this question of the payment of fees for external examinations, fees for private secondary grammar schools, I would say that the whole question is now under consideration. In a few days, at the most, I hope that the public will be able to see or to hear what is the first step which I will take in order to deal with this most important matter. I do not conceive the idea that it would be the best thing for me to do, to rush madly in dealing with this question without trying to find my bearings or trying to find the true perspective of the state of affairs which exists in all private schools in Barbados. Therefore, the very first step will be a thorough investigation into the workings of these schools and then I shall be in a position to make the necessary recommendations where giving the necessary help in one way or the other is concerned.

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

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION "THE CUSTOMS TARIFF (CONDITIONS FOR SPECIAL EXEMPTION FROM DUTY) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) (Amendment) Regulations, 1960".

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a very simple one. It seeks to bring into line certain items which should be imported into this island free of duty. As hon. members will see from the Addendum, at present material for making pyjamas, shirts and certain underwear is allowed to be imported into the island duty free. The reason for that is primarily the fact that this type of manufacture employs quite a few local people; it provides employment for local girls. The Government has agreed by an Act of the Legislature in 1955 to allow these items to come in duty free, but, as you will see, the persons who import these items have to satisfy the Comptroller of Customs by way of keeping books and making accurate accounts and returns to the Comptroller of Customs from time to time. That is specifically set out in Regulations but we are asking that items like handbags and satchels be allowed to be imported duty free with the same provision being made under the Customs Tariff Exemption from Duty Regulations. The Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:-

"Under the Customs Duties (Material for Handbags, etc.) Order, 1960, which has been laid in the Legislature, manufacturers of handbags, satchels, belts or containers of all descriptions from plastic or leather materials are also permitted to import certain materials free of duty. In order, however, to safeguard the revenue it is proposed to make this concession subject to conditions similar to those imposed on the garment manufacturers, by amending the

Customs Tariff (Conditions for Special Exemption from Duty) Regulations, 1955.

In accordance with Section 2 of the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, the amending Regulations must receive the sanction of the House of the Legislature."

The matter is as simple as that; this provision will create employment for girls who find it difficult to obtain work after they have left school. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

BARBADOS TURF CLUB (IMPOSITION OF DUTY) (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to proceed with Order No. 8 as the next Order of the Day.

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

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 Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is an amendment to the Barbados Turf Club (Imposition of Duty) Act, 1941. Hon. members will remember that we have a consolation ticket which is sold for 24 cents and there is no currency in that amount now. This Act sets out that when any ticket is sold for over 24 cents, a tax of six cents is paid on it.

6.25 p.m.
The purpose of this amendment is to change that 24 cents into 25 cents in order to facilitate the currency and also that the duty of 3 cents can be collected on a 25 cent ticket instead of 6 cents as at present stipulated in the Act.

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

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to proceed with Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to proceed with Order No. 4 as the next Order of the Day and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 27) ORDER, 1959

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No 27) Order, 1959".

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order, Sir, is in connection with the Department of Science and Agriculture and provides for the creation of a new post of Assistant Seeds Store Clerk, the creation of an additional post of Assistant Foreman, Central Livestock Station, the establishment of the post of Assistant Soil Conservation Officer, the creation of a new post of Conservation Assistant and the creation of a new post of Secretary, Soil Conservation Board in place of one post of Senior Clerk.

The Seeds Store, as you will know, Sir, is a revenue-bearing Department. Considerable revenue is collected from the sale of these seeds and they are now considering extending and having a branch of this Store in the market to facilitate those persons who go to the market and are desirous of purchasing seeds, instead of having to go to the Agricultural Department.
6.35 p.m.

With regard to the Assistant Foreman, there are now 160 head of stock at the Agricultural Stations, 18 of which are bulls and the permanent staff is: one Foreman, one Assistant Foreman. It is considered that these two employees are unable to handle this number of cattle, and especially since bulls very often resent the attention of a person to whom they are not accustomed. In general, this Assistant Foreman will assist in the work at the Station.

Now, on the Soil Conservation Scheme, when that scheme was first started, the officers employed thereon were appointed on a temporary basis and it is now proposed to put them on the permanent establishment. The post of Soil Conservation Officer (\$4,560 - 6,240) is established already and it is now proposed to establish the posts of Assistant Soil Conservation Officer (\$3,528 - 4,392), Conservation Assistant (\$2,112 - \$2,880) and Secretary, Soil Conservation Board (\$3,528 - 4,392).

It should be mentioned that the post of Conservation Assistant replaces the temporary post of Soil Conservation Overseer (\$,632 - 2,400) and that the post of Secretary Soil Conservation Board, replaces a post of Senior Clerk. Provision had been made for a Senior Clerk to carry out the duties of Secretary to the Board but it has been discovered that the duties are beyond what should be expected of an officer of that status.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 28) ORDER, 1959.

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. 28), Order, 1959."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is another Civil Establishment Order, this time in connection with the Waterworks.

The Order provides for the replacement of the post of Mechanical Engineer and the two posts of Assistant Engineer in the Waterworks Department by three posts of Engineer at the scale set out in the Addendum.

The present engineering staff of the Department is comprised of one Chief Engineer, one Mechanical Engineer and two Assistant Engineers. The Government has been advised that the title of "Assistant Engineer" is inappropriate in this Department and should exist only in departments in which junior qualified staff assist executive staff. The Engineering posts in the Department require full professional qualifications and are executive in nature. It has accordingly been recommended that the permanent staff should consist of one Chief Engineer (\$8,160), three Engineers (\$4,560 - 7,200).

Now that electrification of the pumping system has been completed it is no longer necessary to have a Mechanical Engineer in the Department of a standing higher than that of the other Engineers. The Secretary of State has also reported difficulty in filling the vacant post of Assistant Engineer on the present salary scale and it is proposed to accept the recommendation that the post of Mechanical Engineer and the two posts of Assistant Engineer be replaced by three posts of Engineer on the salary scale \$4,560 - 7,200.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1960

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) Order, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, this is another Civil Establishment Order. The Federal Chief Justice requested that a certain number of shorthand writers be attached to the Supreme Court, and this Order makes provision for the appointment of two and their salaries will be on a scale of \$2,112 x 96 - \$2,400; \$2,640 x 120 - \$2,880 (QB) \$3,000 x 120 - \$3,360.

It is desirable that shorthand notes be taken of the proceedings at the trial of any person on indictment, and essential that a note be taken of the presiding Judge's charge to the jury in cases of appeal to the Federal Supreme Court. I believe there had been some difficulties in that especially with the reporting of the summing up of the Judge and his charge to the jury.

It is not expected that the two officers will be occupied in taking and transcribing shorthand notes all their time. When available, their services will be utilised in cases where accurate *verbatim* reporting is required and put to such other useful purposes as may be necessary from time to time.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. STA. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND IN THE CITY OF BRIDGETOWN FOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works

and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of an area of land in the City of Bridgetown for the purpose of highway improvement for the use and benefit of the public.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members are aware of the place where this land is situated. It abuts and bounds on Hart and Suttle Streets, on lands now or late of Ethel Kennedy, on lands formerly of J. M. Ward but now of Plantations Ltd., or however else the same may abut and bound together with the messuage or dwelling-house and the shop and all other buildings or erections thereon.

Hon. members are quite aware of the traffic hazards in that area of Bridgetown. It is a very narrow street and last Saturday morning we saw the difficulty in which the large buses, the diesel buses, tried to negotiate that narrow street and we agreed that something should be done about it.

Sometime ago, Plantations Ltd., started work on premises on that street and as we saw the difficulty which would arise as regards the narrowness of that street we had a talk with the owners, Plantations Ltd. Of course, there was nothing to prevent them going ahead with their work but with their public spirit, they co-operated with the Town and Country Planning Officer and we decided, on the recommendations of that Officer, along with the Director of Highways and Transport that the property should be acquired and that street should be widened.

I also want to arrange it so that when the Deep Water Harbour is completed, there would be a steady flow of traffic at that point which would assist greatly in easing the difficulty now experienced in the Bridgetown area.

This Resolution has been rendered necessary not because of the price but because of the difficulties in the title. They are unable to produce a good and marketable title and it is put under the Land Acquisition Act so that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may acquire a good and marketable title.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. STA. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 8th March, 1960 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I just want to say, as members on the opposite side are not here, that at the next meeting we will begin consideration of the Annual Estimates.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 8th March, 1960, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.45 p.m.