

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.*Thursday, 13th December, 1934.*

The Council met pursuant to adjournment, His Excellency the Officer Administering the Government, SIR CRAWFORD DOUGLAS-JONES, Kt., C.M.G., President, in the Chair.

PRESENT.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. P. W. King (Acting).

The Hon. the Attorney-General, Mr. Hector Josephs, K.C., B.A., LL.M. (Cantab.), LL.B. (Lond.).

The Hon. T. T. Smellie, O.B.E. (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. F. Dias, O.B.E. (Nominated Unofficial Member).

Major the Hon. W. Bain Gray, M.A., Ph.D. (Edin.), B. Litt. (Oxon), Director of Education.

The Hon. J. S. Dash, B.S.A., Director of Agriculture.

The Hon. R. E. Brassington (Western Essequibo).

The Hon. E. G. Woolford, K.C., (New Amsterdam).

The Hon. E. A. Luckhoo (Eastern Berbice).

The Hon. J. C. Craig, D.S.O., M.E.I.C., Director of Public Works.

The Hon. E. F. McDavid, M.B.E., Colonial Treasurer (Acting).

The Hon. W. A. D'Andrade, Comptroller of Customs.

The Hon. J. Mullin, M.I.M.M., F.S.I., Commissioner of Lands and Mines.

The Hon. B. R. Wood, M.A., Dip. For. (Cantab.), Conservator of Forests.

The Hon. J. A. Henderson, M.B., Ch.B., B.Sc. (P.H.), (Edin.), D.T.M. & H. (Edin.), Surgeon-General.

The Hon. N. Cannon (Georgetown North).

The Hon. Percy C. Wight, O.B.E. (Georgetown Central).

The Hon. J. Eleazar (Berbice River).

The Hon. J. I. De Aguiar (Central Demerara).

The Hon. Jung Bahadur Singh (Demerara-Essequibo).

The Hon. M. B. G. Austin (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. F. J. Seaford (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. Peer Bacchus (Western Berbice).

The Hon. J. L. Wills (Demerara River).

The Hon. E. M. Walcott (Nominated Unofficial Member).

MINUTES.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 12th December, 1934, as printed and circulated, were confirmed.

UNOFFICIAL NOTICES.**DOUBLE INCREMENTS.**

Mr. WILLS, on behalf of Dr. SINGH, gave notice of the following questions:—

Are there any officers on the estimates for next year, 1935, who are to receive a double increment? If so, how many such officers are there?

What is the name of each of the officers put down on the estimates for double increment? (b) What is the length of service of each of the said officers? (c) How long has he filled the present position he holds? (d) What was his position immediately before he was promoted to the present position? (e) What are the special qualifications, if any, of each of these officers put down for double increments? (f) What are the reasons for the double increment in each year? (g) What have been the promotions of each of these officers during the last five years, giving the actual salary drawn by the said officer during each of the said last five years? (h) Have any of these officers been promoted to posts which were reduced in status and/or emoluments immediately before the promotion of the present holders? If so, give the particulars in each case stating the department in which the said reduced post occurred?

Will the double increment set down change the class of any of the officers set down for

double increment? What is the class held before the double increment, and what will be the new class after the double increment?

What is the increase caused by the total of proposed double increments?

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and resumed consideration of the Estimates of Expenditure to be defrayed from Revenue during the Year ending 31st December, 1935.

TRANSPORT AND HARBOURS DEPARTMENT.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is customary under this Head to consider the Appendix, which is Appendix A.

Sub-Head I.—General and Administrative Charges.

Mr. SEAFORD: I would like to refer to the matter I raised yesterday, the lack of co-operation between the various Departments. There is sea defence work going on on the East Coast and the Transport and Harbours Department and the Public Works Department are both Government concerns. I know that the Transport and Harbours Department is supposed to be run as a business concern, but if they could carry sea defence material without making any profit at all it is saving money to the Government and should be done. I do not think when they are carrying material for Government they should insist on their pound of flesh and compel other Departments to pay money outside. I would be glad if the Directors of the Transport and Harbours Department would go into the matter and see if any arrangements could be come to between the two Departments.

Mr. AUSTIN: This matter was considered at a meeting between a Committee and the Transport Board and we were told by the then acting Director of Public Works that it was impossible—it would cost very much more to transport broken granite, cement, greenheart and all the material required at Nog Eens by rail, and then he admitted that if he had known that the work was as serious as it was it might have been done. I think it could have been done if they had laid down a line

across the road at Lusignan to the sea defence works and conveyed all the material required for the protection of that particular part of the coast. The Hon. Mr. Smellie and the Chairman of the Transport Board were also present, and I think they will support what I have said in respect of the endeavour to obtain a cheaper transport of material from Georgetown to the point which was likely to suffer from the inroads of the sea.

Mr. SMELLIE: Do I understand the hon. Member to say that the matter was discussed in August? I only arrived in the Colony on the 19th of September, and I know nothing about the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN: I did not mention August. The matter was discussed at a recent meeting of the Board. It was in connection with another Committee of which the Commissioner of Lands and Mines was Chairman. I would like to make that correction.

Mr. WIGHT: The matter was discussed by the Transport Board too. The question of the wear and tear on the road by lorries and the licences they pay also came up. I quite agree with Mr. Seaford. The matter has been dealt with at length, and what the last speaker has said is perfectly true. The acting Director of Public Works considered it too expensive a process even taking into account the wear and tear on the road. The Commissioner of Lands and Mines will tell you that at the other meeting it was almost decided that the Transport Department should get a crusher if it were possible, and that it should handle all the transport.

Mr. SEAFORD: That was what I was going to say. The materials imported should be landed direct on the Transport Department's wharf, and the stone crushed and taken up by rail. It would save all the handling in Georgetown. I do not intend to go into details.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Here we have the Transport Department saying "It can not pay because we are not part of the Government and therefore we cannot see the wisdom of taking materials when it would not pay a company." Anybody who took the trouble to know what he was talking about would see that materials could be landed at Lusignan in a couple of hours

by running a rail. Against that there were lorries smashing up the public road which cost so much, but the Transport Department is ultra-Government and it would not pay them to carry it. This is not the only direction in which money is being wasted, and in which money can be saved, if the Departments were not so over-fastidious about showing the profits they are going to make or what they can save, though they are saving nothing. The Colonial Secretary said that Government could not do as business men. Government can lavish money and throw it away, but business men cannot do that because they have to make profits. Government can push their hands into the taxpayers' pockets, but even that has a limit. The result of that would be that the Colony would close itself if Government cannot close down. If the Transport Department took the matter in hand seriously they could save a considerable amount on the cost of transportation, and when they begin to do it from that end they will find a great number of things that can be remedied.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think the hon. Member for Berbice River has been attacking the wrong person. The General Manager of the Transport and Harbours Department informs me that he has done so on several occasions, and that when the Nog Eens work started he approached the Public Works Department but his proposal was not accepted. The Director of Public Works said it was cheaper to transport materials by road, and no blame is to be attached to the Transport and Harbours Department or anyone. The matter was gone into and it was decided by the acting Director of Public Works that it was not economical. There was no question of making profit.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I quite agree that nobody is to be blamed, but the taxpayers' money is going. That is the kind of argument we expect from Government in these matters. Government is not governing the country. We have it from the Colonial Secretary that nobody is to be blamed, but there is a serious indictment against somebody. Who takes the blame?

Mr. WALCOTT: In fairness to the Manager of the Transport and Harbours Department I must say that some months

ago I asked him why his Department was not handling the transportation of the materials to Nog Eens and he told me he had taken the matter up with the Public Works Department but he was told that it was not economical to do so. It is only fair to the Transport Department to say that.

Major CRAIG (Director of Public Works): It is only fair that I should have a word to say in this matter. I have not got the details with me but I think when we started relief works on roads in that district three years ago I entered into an arrangement with the Transport Department to transport stone and found I could just manage it in addition to doing a certain amount of work in providing storage for the materials. With regard to this work I thought it would have been economical to carry the materials by rail, but it was found not to be on account of the additional handling involved, the distance from the railway and the lack of rolling stock to transport the materials necessary.

Mr. CANNON: I am very pleased to be able to say I congratulate Government. I think Government ought to spend another couple of thousand dollars on this vote. The taxpayers are not paying it; it is the British Government, so spend as much as we can. I have given up attempting to save a penny here because it is not appreciated, and what is more, it is a useless task. Add another \$100,000 and I will support it.

Mr. AUSTIN: I would like to say on behalf of the Directors of the Transport and Harbours Department that there is no lack of rail on which to transport the materials to the point at which they were required. It is a question of friction between the two Heads of the Departments concerned.

Major CRAIG: I can say definitely there is no friction. The present Manager and I get on very well. There has never been any friction.

Mr. AUSTIN: I was wrong, I was referring to the acting Director of Public Works. This thing could have gone through quite amicably and economically, as the Hon. Mr. Seaford has always suggested, if the two Departments would work

together. They do not. The Directors of the Transport Department have endeavoured to push the matter for all we were worth but unfortunately there was a little bit of trouble on both sides. There was the question of punts going to the Public Works wharf with stone and not being able to discharge, and the question of demurrage and charges of that sort which they did not want to bear the burden of. I observe the General Manager of the Transport and Harbours Department present, and if his views were obtained I think the Council would obtain the idea that the transportation of the material necessary for that particular work could have been arranged between the two Departments quite easily and economically.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I had no intention of joining in the debate. As a matter of fact I have listened rather amused, but it seems to me that an inquiry is necessary. We cannot have Departments quarrelling among themselves, especially when co-operation is so necessary. I am surprised to hear that as the result of friction between the Heads of the two Departments a large quantity of material was not transported to the scene of operations by the Transport Department. There can be no doubt about it that a lot of money is being spent in the transportation of materials for the sea defence works. We see lorries careering up and down the East Coast road making 12 and 13 trips per day. There has been an increase in the number of lorries. It seems to me that the point has been reached when an inquiry might well be made. One hon. Member yesterday remarked that information has to be extracted from the Government. It seems to me that we will have to use an anaesthetic.

Mr. AUSTIN: I think the Commissioner of Lands and Mines will bear me out that these lorries which are employed by the Public Works Department to transport materials bring back passengers who should travel on the railway. We have been told that it is not a matter for the Transport Department but for the Police to look after. Anybody who travels along Vlissingen Road or the Thomas Road will see these lorries returning to the City about 6 or 7 o'clock at

night laden with passengers. We are told that the Police would not stop them at Plaisance therefore they are entitled to travel by the lorries.

Mr. CANNON: I am sorry the hon. Member has raised that point. Why shouldn't human cargo be taken in the same way as stone or cement? If those poor people can get a lift to Georgetown why shouldn't they avail themselves of it?

Mr. MULLIN (Commissioner of Lands Mines): The inquiry suggested has already been made by the Committee appointed by Your Excellency and it is a case where it is easy to be wise after the event. What struck the Committee at first was whether it was economical for material to be transported by lorries along the East Coast road when there was a railway running along the Coast. It must be borne in mind that the explanation given by the acting Director of Public Works was quite a reasonable one—that the work at Nog Eens began in a very small way; it was a very hurried job; the sea suddenly broke through and emergency work had to be undertaken; material had to be rushed to the site very quickly and as cheaply as possible. In an emergency you cannot go very deeply into economics. As the work grew the matter was taken up with the Transport Board. The difficulty was not in transporting the material on the railway but to get it to the actual site of the work expeditiously. If anyone had known it was going to be as big a job as it has turned out to be at once organisation of transport would have suggested itself. But when we went into the matter we found that it would have taken a considerable time to erect bins to take the stone, sidings and possibly a rail down one of the dams. All that would have taken considerable time.

Another point was that the work was practically at an end in so far as transportation of material was concerned, and it would not have paid at that late stage to put that organisation into operation. Therefore the Committee on going into the matter with the acting Director of Public Works and the General Manager of the Transport Department came to the conclusion that it would not be practical to change the system at that stage, but that for all future works arrangements should

be made for transportation by rail. We were all caught in an emergency, and a change over at that stage would have involved heavy outlay and loss of time whilst the people who bought lorries especially to contract for that work would have been left with those lorries on their hands, or the garages would have had to take them back. It would have created a distinct hardship on those people which might or might not be taken into consideration. But even so if there had been time to do the organisation necessary it would have been done.

Another point that arose in regard to stone was that at present it is landed at the Stone Depot in boulder form. It is crushed there and loaded into lorries. If it was being transported by rail it would have to be taken by lorries to the railway and loaded into the trucks. The Committee therefore went into the question of the possibility of having a crushing plant on the railway frontage, and we are still going into it. Plans and estimates are being prepared and it will form one of the points in the report of the Committee now sitting. Apart from that the matter has been gone into with the Director of Public Works, the General Manager and members of the Transport Board, and it has been decided that in the case of all future works on the East Coast the material required will be transported by rail. I think it is a case where both parties were taken by surprise.

Mr. CANNON: Did the hon. Member say that the transportation of material has ceased?

Mr. MULLIN: It is almost at an end at Nog Eens.

Major CRAIG: It will last about three or four months yet.

Mr. CANNON: I hear the lorries passing my house in the morning and at night, and I have the numbers of the lorries that pass. As far as I can see it will be a fair way into the new year before we see the end of this job. I wish to call attention to the fact that the matter has evidently been referred to a Committee which is investigating and will report, but the work at Nog Eens will be completed before the Committee reports. I merely mention that to show the value of Committees.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I am quite surprised to hear that there is a Committee enquiring into the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not a Committee specially enquiring into the matter, but into the question of transport generally.

Mr. WALCOTT: For the information of that Committee I may mention that I understand that the Public Works Department is paying the owners of the lorries \$2 per ton to transport stone, sand and cement from Georgetown to Nog Eens, and the same lorries are bringing rice from Mahaica to Georgetown at \$1.50 per ton. Perhaps the Committee will enquire into that.

Mr. CANNON: Unfortunately the owners of lorries are paying a licence of \$1,000 or \$2,000, an absurd amount. They are doing Government work and I am surprised to hear they are bringing down rice and human beings, but the licence they have to pay is unreasonable.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I am not in the position of some of the Electives who, being members of the Transport Board, know a great deal about the inner working of the Department. I have on more than one occasion drawn Government's attention to the fact that the County of Essequibo is not represented on that Board. Demerara and Berbice are represented, but for some reason which I do not know the Government has studiously avoided appointing a representative of Essequibo to the Transport Board. I have never asked Government to appoint me to any Commission or any Board since I have been an Elected Member, but I am not ashamed to confess that I have asked Government for several years to put me on the Transport Board in the interest of the people of Essequibo, who have asked me if it was not possible. The only reason I can see why I am not on the Board, or why Essequibo is not represented, is that I would make myself a nuisance to the Government by the representations I would make to the Board with regard to the grievances which Essequibo suffers in regard to transport and other matters in connection with the steamer services. I am not going to say anything more except that the ways of Government are very wonderful and puzzling in many instances.

MR. DE AGUIAR: There is one other question I would like to ask. I would like to know whether the General Manager of the Transport Department has considered the question whether he would be able to transport the materials to the site of the works at a figure equal to the present rate being paid to the lorries. That is the only way we can get the matter settled.

THE CHAIRMAN: When the work started and it became obvious that it was going to assume much larger proportions than was anticipated, the question of the transportation of material came up, and it seemed to me that obviously the correct thing was that one Government Department should carry the material of another Government Department, and that what was paid as freight would go from one Government pocket into another. I went into the matter very carefully with the acting Director of Public Works and found that he was able to get the stone transported by lorries direct from the Stone Depot to the site at a very reasonable rate. I understand that he also discussed the matter with the General Manager of the Transport and Harbours Department and the Transport Board, and that it was found to be cheaper to use lorries having regard to the handling and the cost of making necessary arrangements that would be involved by rail transportation. It was therefore decided that as far as Nog Eens was concerned it was cheaper to carry the material by road. Apart from that it must be remembered that the owners of those lorries are paying a very high licence to Government, and that has to be taken into consideration as a set-off against anything that would have been saved, because the actual cost of the work would have been greater if the Transport Department had been used. The fact is that the transporting of the material is being done at a very competitive rate, and the money is going to relieve a certain amount of unemployment. In addition to that Government is obtaining certain returns in the high lorry licence. If the lorries are bringing down rice at a cheaper rate, that is the owners' concern. They are entitled to transport freight from anywhere they like.

I think the Commissioner of Lands and Mines has fully dealt with the matter. The Committee of which he is Chairman

is not going into this matter particularly, but into the general question of the Transport service to see whether further revenue cannot be gained by the Department, and also the competition which the Department is suffering from unlicensed launches and other craft on the river.

The Director of Public Works will be able to state that over a certain distance it may be cheaper and more economical to transport material by railway. Hon. Members must consider the question of handling. I understood from the acting Director at the time that it cost almost as much to carry the material to the railway, where it would have to be dumped before loading, and from the railway to the site, as to transport it from Georgetown to the site by lorries. It is a matter for those officers to decide and I leave the decision to them. I think the work is being carried out as economically as possible.

MR. DE AGUIAR: It seems to me that those men who own the lorries are philanthropists and are evidently running their lorries at a loss. I understand that some of them have actually paid for those lorries out of the money they receive for this work, and it seems to me that the Transport Department or the Public Works Department could have done the same thing.

MR. AUSTIN: It seems hardly any use for the Committee, of which the Commissioner of Lands and Mines is Chairman, to sit any longer because we admit that the lorries are competing with a service which we have been asked to back up and support, just as the Committee has been asked to discard launches and boats from the various rivers. We have a motor service running parallel with the railway line, and we have been endeavouring—although the Chairman of the Committee might not like to say so—to stop that not only for the reason that one Department should help another, but also on account of the damage those lorries do to the roads. We have taken into consideration the duty on cars imported into the Colony and on the gasoline used, and we have reached the point at which the majority of the Committee suggest that a heavier tax should be imposed on those lorries because under present conditions they are allowed

to transport material to the Coast and to bring back passengers who should travel by railway to Georgetown.

Mr. ELEAZAR: If there was ever necessity for an inquiry this debate has demonstrated it. You have the Chairman and another Member of the Committee declaring that the thing can be made to pay, and the Director of Public Works saying it cannot. I think something should be done. I was not aware that the lorries were private property; I thought they belonged to the Public Works Department. I have seen several of them taking what a donkey cart can carry. Apparently they were not properly loaded in order that they could return quickly. Quite a large sum of money is being lost because the Transport Department would not undertake the work. We have been asked to mulct the buses in \$600 licence in order to drive them off the road, and now we are allowing lorries to destroy the road. One cannot say here everything he knows, but as in this direction so in several others large sums of money are being spent for which we get no benefit. Things have been happening at Nog Eens from the inception of the work, which are not well.

Mr. WIGHT: As far as an inquiry is concerned it would be a waste of time. The matter has already occupied a considerable amount of time. When I was appointed to the Transport Board I took it up with the General Manager who went into the matter most minutely, but at the meeting of the Board the acting Director of Public Works countermanded a great deal of what the General Manager had pointed out. I sat in the morning at my window and counted 25 lorries, and I drew the attention of the Board to it. I am told that a chauffeur who worked for \$7 per week at the Public Works Department gave up his job and bought a lorry, and he is making between £3 and £4 per day. After minute calculation we found that the installation of the requisite plant would bring the cost up to more than the railway could do it for. It was also taken into consideration that the roads were being broken up, and that the buses were only paying a quarter's licence. That was where the trouble came in. People converted old motor cars into buses and are making handsome profits. It was also

brought to the notice of the Transport Board that the work at Nog Eens would not last longer than the end of December.

Major CRAIG: Not by me.

Mr. WIGHT: Now we hear from the Director of Public Works that the work will go on for some months. It is a matter the Colonial Secretary should take up with the General Manager of the Transport Department. I am inclined to the opinion and I recommend to the Government that the Colonial Secretary should be relieved of the position of Chairman of the Transport Board. No doubt we are fortunate in having the officer we have now, but his time is really wasted. I think Government should consider the advisability of appointing an officer below the status of the Colonial Secretary to serve as Chairman of the Transport Board. I desire also to pay a compliment to the other members of the Board who are all conversant with the requirements of the Department. We are lucky in having a man like Mr. Wong on the Board. I think Your Excellency should take the matter up before you vacate the Chair.

Major CRAIG: I do not think there is anything I can say. I will be quite willing to say something later.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understood you were going to explain that it would be carried by rail as far as Buxton.

Major CRAIG: The material would have to be loaded at the Stone Depot into lorries and taken from there to the Georgetown railway station and loaded into trucks. It would then have to be unloaded at Buxton and loaded into lorries again and carried to the site of the work, which in my opinion would be uneconomical. I discussed the matter with the late General Manager of the Transport and Harbours Department when we started the relief works and there was the question of transporting stone from Georgetown to the road. We found then that the lorries were a cheaper means of transport than the railway, taking into account the handling involved in transporting the stone from the yard to the site of the work. One hon. Member said that the lorries did 12 or 13 trips per day. The return mileage to Buxton is 22 miles, and any lorry doing 22 miles at 15 miles an hour would take 18 hours to do 12

return trips, without taking into account the time for loading and for breakfast. The number of loads that these lorries carry is 4 or 5 per day. They have been restricted to that number and I do not think they are making any great sums of money. There are a number of hired lorries which can bring rice or anything back. The Public Works lorries cannot take rice or any other material for that matter, neither can they take passengers. If we could take back rice we could reduce the cost of transporting the materials, but we do not enter into competition with private lorries.

Mr. SEAFORD: I have seen them several times carrying passengers. They pick them up in the early morning and bring them back in the evening.

Major CRAIG: Public Works lorries?

Mr. SEAFORD: Private lorries.

Mr. WALCOTT: I see the Public Works lorries, not the hired lorries alone. Both do it.

Major CRAIG: I would like you to give me the numbers of the lorries when you see them the next time.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will do so the next time, but I think you have the Police Force for that purpose. It is another case of lack of co-operation between Government Departments.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I have just heard that these lorries make at the most 4 or 5 trips per day. I think it a wonderful thing if they can make 13 trips, but I have not heard anything that would help me to arrive at the great profits that they may be earning. I would like to know how they are paid, by ton or by the trip?

Mr. CANNON: By mileage.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: If it is a fabulous sum that enables a chauffeur in a few weeks to pay for his lorry, or have a small fortune, I would like to hear from the Government what is the scale of payment.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Why is it necessary to take the material to Buxton and not to Lusignan? Isn't there a siding at Lusignan? Why pass on to Buxton?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the Commissioner of Lands and Mines has explained that the work at Nog Eens is practically finished, but there is work being done at Buxton.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: May I have an answer to my question? Surely there is some member of the Government who can answer it. What is the scale of payment, how much per mile?

Major CRAIG: I said earlier that I would be only too glad to give that information later on. It is done by the ton mile. I will be able to give the figures this afternoon.

Item I—General Manager (\$4,000-\$4,800 by \$240), \$4,800.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I move the reduction of this item by a penny so as to be able to say what I wish to say as regards this Department. Government still persists in fooling itself that this is not a Government Department, and it seems to me that that attitude is only to enable Government to squeeze the under-dogs who are employed in that Department. Those men actually have to contribute to the Government's Guarantee Fund some portion of their emoluments. What right has Government to make them contribute if they are not part of the Government? Isn't it clear to everybody that the Transport and Harbours Department is a Government concern, and is it fair to have these men there at the mercy of the Directors without any hope, no matter how long they may be employed? The Directors can always dismiss an employee and he cannot ask for an *ex gratia* allowance. An officer was transferred to Rosignol station and asked for an increase of salary, but instead of increasing his pay he was transferred to the Mahaicony station and the man at Mahaicony was sent to Rosignol because he could not claim any more pay. Both of those men were entitled to some consideration. Another General Manager might have dismissed the man who dared to ask for an increase of salary.

There is nothing for the employees of this Department to look forward to. Some men have died and their relatives have received *ex gratia* payments, but that is not good enough. They should not be left at the mercy of the Directors. It is

a public utility service, not a profit-making concern, and the employees are taxpayers. I do not think anybody can respect a Government that continues to act in that way. The men cannot be expected to work with that contentment one should expect of them. They are there in fear and trembling, not knowing what will happen to them and their families. Government has failed to classify these employees after several years. Even a private firm, Messrs. Booker Bros., a few days ago paid a portion of the premiums for the insurance of some of its employees in order that their relatives would get something when they die. Government cannot even consider that and is content to allow these men to work without any hope at all. I know that Your Excellency will not be here to initiate anything that you may think of doing, but the Heads of Departments will be here, I hope, for many years to come—some of them, not all, because I hope some of them will be sent to Palestine and other places on promotion. (Laughter). Surely Government can decide upon a fixed policy which can be carried out. I cannot appeal to the new Governor because he will say "I must look around." This policy is a dangerous one for future Administration.

If there was one remark in the Colonial Secretary's speech yesterday which was objectionable it was when he said he would like to see this Colony continue under Crown Colony Government. If he does not know it it only shows how much interest Government Officers take in their jobs. He must know that during the regime of the old Combined Court every time the Court met the budget was balanced, and we were told all the time that we could not touch the Colony's securities. Then Crown Colony Government came into vogue, every penny of that money was utilised but Government cannot balance its budget up to now. Why do Government officers say they would like Crown Colony Government to continue? It is because they have "cushy" jobs.

I am appealing to Your Excellency on behalf of those employees of the Department who are getting \$40, \$60 and \$80 per month. The Directors may give them an *ex gratia* sum of two or three months' salary after 30 or 40 years' service. Why should an employee who has served in the Department from its inception not be

entitled to a pension? There is a gentleman in the country to-day drawing pension from the Government who has never served this Department for one day of his life. He is an old man who worked with the Demerara Railway Co., and when Government took over the railway his services were dispensed with because he was too old, and he was given a pension—for what? He never served Government for a minute, but those who have served Government all the time are not to get. Government cannot afford to allow officers to feel that they are being unfairly dealt with. I appeal to Government, and through Government to the Transport Board, to see whether something cannot be done for those men. When they reach a certain salary Government should make them pensionable or adopt some form of insurance as Bookers are doing. I think it is a happy idea on the part of a private firm. They are thinking of the future of their employees. The employees of the Transport Department are not the only sufferers. There are others who are nearly as badly off as they are, but their case calls for immediate consideration. It would be unfair for them to approach the new Governor. I appeal to Government to do something for those men.

Mr. LUCKHOO: I desire to support the hon. Member for Berbice River in his advocacy of the claims of those men. There is no doubt that we have a number of responsible officers who have served the old Demerara Railway Company for 14 or 15 years and yet have no security of tenure or claims to pension. I am quite aware that *ex gratia* payments have been made to the relatives of deceased officers, but I would like Government to enquire into the position of those responsible officers, the periods of their service, the nature of their duties and the salaries they receive, and say whether they should not be placed on the Fixed Establishment. Government would then be doing them justice. The hon. Member referred to the case of a man who enjoys a pension although he has never served Government. I think he refers to Mr. Wrong. I do not know the circumstances of that particular case, but what I am stressing is that Government should enquire into the position of those employees who served the old Railway Co. With respect to the other class of officers the

question of pension rights of the employees of the Transport Department should be gone into carefully by Government in order to ensure that their claims are secured in some definite Ordinance.

With respect to the Transport Board I wish to make one or two observations. I see on page 9 an item "Extension of New Amsterdam Stelling, \$2,000," which was approved in 1934. There is no provision in the estimate for next year for the extension of this stelling. I do not know whether the General Manager of the Department has furnished any recent report on the condition of the stelling, but I do know that it causes a great deal of inconvenience for the ferry steamer to go alongside at low tide. Something will have to be done. That brings me to the shed on the Rosignol side. The Berbice Chamber of Commerce has made representations to Government with respect to the extension of the shed, which is an absolute necessity, and I hope that steps will be taken with the large vote available, to extend the shed to the wharf so as to enable passengers to get from the railway station to the stelling under cover. All we have got from Government is a mere acknowledgment of the letter and a promise that the matter will be attended to. It is not fair to the Berbice community. I feel that Berbice has not been properly treated in connection with certain communications addressed by that Chamber to the Government. Government should give a definite undertaking that the matter will be attended to during next year. It is painful to see women and children drenched by rain in trying to get from the steamer to the train and *vice versa*.

I note that some statement has been made about the dredge and the maintenance of it. Your Excellency knows that there has been some difference of opinion as to the improvement of the New Amsterdam harbour. I think I was told by the late Governor that the dredge would be used exclusively in Georgetown, except when required in the Canje creek. The mouth of the creek should be kept open and navigable. That is an undertaking given. What about New Amsterdam itself? There has been a great deal of discussion, and I think a very largely signed petition was addressed to this Government

sponsored by the Berbice Chamber of Commerce, advocating that something should be done to the harbour. We should have the use of the dredge in cases of emergency in order that we should not be cut off from Georgetown. Boats of heavy draught cannot enter the harbour, and that adds to the cost of shipping produce to Georgetown, because we have to do it by means of lighters or sailing craft. If ships of large draught could enter the harbour we would be able to transport produce direct from New Amsterdam to Trinidad. We have been favoured with visits of the s.s. "Trinidad," but they are now very few and far between, and there is no guarantee that the vessel will return. After all Berbice has claims on Government. We produce over 40 per cent. of the sugar exported from the Colony, and our rice crop can bear favourable comparison with other parts of the Colony, so that we have legitimate claim to consideration. With respect to the Line of steamers trading between Trinidad and this Colony it was suggested that Government should give some subsidy in order to make conditions somewhat easier. I remember the days when ocean-going vessels entered the harbour of New Amsterdam. We had direct communication with London. Today we are cut off. It has affected all employment in Berbice.

With respect to the estimates as a whole they seem to have been carefully prepared. I must pay a compliment to the General Manager who is very energetic and is doing everything to provide for the convenience of the public. On account of the very heavy licence a good many buses have been taken off the service, and he had to provide convenience for the travelling public. He is doing his very best, but there are one or two directions in which improvements can be made, and if those matters are brought to his notice I feel sure he will give them his attention. I maintain that the point urged by the hon. Member for the security of the Officers of the Department deserves consideration by Government.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I wish to join in the appeal made by the last two speakers. The railway has been taken over by Government between 12 and 13 years ago and there is still insecurity of the staff. It is

a matter for regret that representations have been made not only by members of the staff but also by Members of the Council and yet no definite decision has been arrived at. The members of the staff have not been told whether at some future time they will be able to call themselves Government servants. But there is a little ray of hope because I note with pleasure in the Estimates that the Commodore and Stellings Superintendent has been placed on the Fixed Establishment. I do not know whether I should take the note literally. It says "The present holder of the post. . ."

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member might deal with that when he comes to the item. I have allowed the hon. Member to wander away from the vote. He must try to confine his remarks to the item under consideration.

MR. DE AGUIAR: I shall confine my remarks to the item. I merely wished to point out that so far as members of the staff are concerned there is a little ray of hope because some change appears in the Estimates. As regards the New Amsterdam stelling I would like to tell my hon. friend that a mere acknowledgment is about all the Chamber of Commerce can hope to get until the financial condition of the Colony is restored. In the meantime we can only fritter away money on the Forest Department and things of that kind. I sympathise with my friend. There is a great deal of inconvenience at New Amsterdam, and it is a matter that Government might give attention to. If a steamer service for the benefit of the public is to continue something should be done to relieve the position.

MR. WILLS: I heartily support the observations made by the hon. Member for Berbice River. There can be no doubt that the Transport and Harbours Department is owned by the Government and to say that Government is not responsible is futile. Something should be done in order to make the employees feel satisfied with their position and give of their best. *Ex gratia* payments to their relatives when they are dead are not good enough. An employee should have something to look forward to when he retires and not have to go on his knees. It is regrettable that some of the employees in the Trans-

port service are greatly handicapped and are suffering under a disability. They can be dismissed at the whims and caprices of the General Manager. I will refer to an incident within my personal knowledge. An employee of the Department happened to be a witness in a case. He went to Court and gave his evidence, and the case was dismissed. He went back to his work and the next morning he was dismissed. He asked why and was told that the Police Inspector had reported that he had not given his evidence satisfactorily. A man who had served about 9½ years was given marching orders not for any offence pertaining to his work. When representations were made to the Board he was given a week's pay. That is hardly the kind of treatment one would expect at the hands of Government.

All is not well in that Department. Employees can be dismissed at a moment's notice without being in a position to say a word for themselves. The General Manager must be complimented on the efficient manner in which he has handled and hopes to handle both the steamer and the railway traffic. There is no doubt about it that due to the efforts of the Manager the railway and the steamers are doing very well. It is gratifying to note that along the East Coast the train service can hardly cope with the demands of the public. That is the kind of thing the public expects and hopes that the Manager will keep up. If I may be allowed to suggest the reason for the increased traffic I think it is the cheap fares. I believe that if you cater for the public and give them cheap fares you will get larger returns. I noticed that some time this year, for some reason the Manager issued instructions as the result of which the fares across the ferry, which affect the working man, were increased. Milk vendors and others whose occupations bring them across the river to Georgetown by the early boat to return by the last boat in the evening, have had their return fare increased from 6 cents to 8 cents. I do not know whether it has dawned upon the Manager that because a large number of persons are using these boats they should be taxed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must realise that I am allowing him a great deal of latitude to discuss this matter

under an inappropriate Head. If he says it now he will not say it again.

Mr. WILLS: I appreciate the kindness of the Chairman. I will make a general appeal that as regards the ferry fares, while the public appreciates the effort of the Manager to accommodate them he might consider the advisability of returning to the cheap fare for working people crossing the river.

THE CHAIRMAN: Government has listened with interest to the remarks of hon. Members who have spoken and consideration will be given to them.

Item passed.

Item 24—Travelling Expenses and Subsistence Allowances, \$220.

Mr. ELEAZAR: In the old days the Captains of the Government steamers got board when travelling on the rivers, but I understand it has been stopped. It is a great hardship on the Captains. It is a small amount and as I see the General Manager present I hope he will see his way to restore it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the matter has been considered by the Board, but I have no doubt they will consider it again.

Mr. LUCKHOO: I should like to support the appeal of the hon. Member.

Item 26—Pensions and Gratuities, \$1,600.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I would like to know whether this is a fund at the discretion of the Board.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is just an amount put on the Estimates from which pensions and gratuities are paid by the Board during the year. I believe that Mr. Wrong is paid out of this, and any others that may come up. If the Board after considering the remarks made by hon. Members, decide to start a Pensions Fund of their own, perhaps this vote will come out. I understand that they have a Provident Society.

Maintenance of Stations and Buildings—

Mr. ELEAZAR: I desire to stress the

remarks made by the hon. Member for Eastern Berbice with respect to the extension of the shed on the Rosignol stelling.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: We propose to do that work next year. Provision has been made for it.

Traffic Branch—

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: With regard to freight charges for cattle on the Berbice railway representations were made last year to the Board and they were reduced to a certain extent. I am appealing again to Government for a further reduction to meet present conditions in the cattle trade. The freight on cattle is 100 per cent. more than it was in pre-war days, while the value of cattle has dropped by about at least 30 per cent. I am asking that consideration be given to this matter especially in view of the fact that owing to the flood and the succeeding drought the farmers have nothing to depend upon but their cattle for which they have to pay \$2 per head to bring them to Georgetown by railway. I think that charge is high for 40 or 50 miles. I appeal to Government and to the Transport Board to see whether they can reduce the charge.

Mr. LUCKHOO: I am going to support that appeal because representations have been made to me by large cattle dealers on the Corentyne Coast. We must see to it that the people are given better facilities and cheaper rates to bring their cattle to Georgetown. At present there is no export trade in cattle to Surinam or Nickerie as in the good old days when steamers took large shipments of cattle to Surinam where large profits were made. The only outlet is Georgetown in the face of very severe competition by Rupununi cattle. Some people have nothing else to depend on but their cattle, their crops having been ruined by the flood. Government might ease the situation by reverting to the old scale of freights. Mr. Haly has pointed out the anomalies in the present schedule in view of the very low price of cattle. There should be direct and frequent shipments of cattle to Georgetown, and if any help can be given it will be very acceptable to the people.

Mr. SEAFORD: I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. Members who have spoken, but the point that has struck

me is this: are hon. Members sure that the farmers will get the benefit of a reduction of the freight charges, or the butchers? Unfortunately, all over the world freight rates have gone up although produce is lower than it ever was. It seems to me to be one of those difficult matters which nobody has been able to handle.

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: Freight rates are added to the cost.

Mr. SEAFORD: I appreciate that, but the butchers will say "You are getting a reduction on your freight, we will give you so much less for your cattle."

Mr. ELEAZAR: Two dollars a head is too much. One railway waggon is allowed to carry only 10 head. I suggest that the tariff on the waggon be reduced from \$20 to \$18.

STEAMER SERVICES.

Item 1—Captains and Mates, \$11,200.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: At the last Annual Session I made a plea that the Captains of the steamers be supplied with breakfast by the Transport Department. Your Excellency promised that the matter would be gone into by the Transport Board, and I got a reply that the question was thoroughly gone into but it was regretted that the Directors could not see their way to do it. That was not the first occasion on which I had brought up what I consider a grave hardship on these Captains. I remember that when Messrs. Sproston ran the steamers their Captains were supplied with breakfast and lunch. Those men are out in all weathers and have to get their meals as best they can. The excuse given is that the Transport Department does not do the catering, it is done on contract. I consider it extremely mean on the part of the Directors that for the sake of a few dollars these men are denied breakfast. They are most capable men and are deserving of better treatment. If Government intimates to the Board that it should be done it would be done. Later on I expect to hear about the personal allowances to these unfortunate men. I feel very strongly on the subject and I hope Government will see that in 1935 a sum is provided in order to give these Captains breakfast and lunch while travelling on the steamers.

Mr. LUCKHOO: I desire to support the hon. Member's appeal. Your Excellency has already given a promise that the matter will be looked into. These Captains are always on duty, and I know the great inconvenience they are put to.

Dr. SINGH: I desire to make a similar appeal on behalf of the engineers. I think they should be treated in the same way. (Laughter).

Mr. ELEAZAR: That is why we cannot get anything. We are asking for something the Captains used to have. The engineers never had it.

The Committee adjourned for the luncheon recess, and on the resumption Mr. Woolford was present.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question raised this morning with regard to meals for the Captains has already been considered, but I have no doubt that the Transport Board will go into the matter again in the light of what has been said.

Item passed.

TRAFFIC BRANCH.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I appeal to Government to see whether it cannot reduce the freight rates from Essequibo. Your Excellency and Members of the Council are fully aware of the conditions in Essequibo to-day. I do not only refer to the Essequibo Coast but also to the islands of Wakenaam and Leguan. I think the present freight rate is 10 cents per bag of rice from Aurora, and I think it is the same from Wakenaam. On 12 bags of rice of 180 lbs. each it works out at \$1.20 per ton, which in my opinion is excessive. Before the session is closed Your Excellency will receive a petition with respect to the sea defence rates. These freight rates are more than the people of Essequibo can bear. Here is an opportunity for Government to show some sympathy with the people of Essequibo. I would like to have some assurance in the matter, and not what I term a vague promise. I ask that early steps be taken to reduce the freight rates even by 20 cents per ton.

Mr. CANNON: I am going to throw in my lot with the last speaker. I had the necessity to be about the people at

Suddie, Wakenaam and Leguan quite recently, and I am satisfied that they are having an awful time in making two ends meet. It seems to me that the day is not far distant when Government will be asked to do something for them so as to keep body and soul together. At least, if the farmers can be assisted by the reduction of the cost of transportation it would be a move in the right direction. If Government is losing a certain sum of money on transportation what difference would it make if it lost a little more in helping the people? I feel that any relief that might be given to the people in that part of the Colony should be given instantly, and I hope Your Excellency will do something in the near future to assist them. In the meantime this trivial suggestion might well be considered.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I would also like to support the plea for a reduction of the freight rates on rice. I think it should be made a business proposition. If the rates were reduced the Department would secure a higher percentage of freight. The Department cannot get the same amount of freight that is carried by smaller craft, punts, etc. A punt goes alongside every out-going steamer or a wharf, and in that way handling is minimised. I think the freight rate on a bag of rice by punt from the Essequibo Coast is 9 cents.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: It is as low as 8 cents.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: If the freight by steamer is 10 cents it is obvious that the steamer will get very little, if any at all. From my own experience I know that the steamers only obtain rice freight in very strenuous circumstances—if one is in a hurry to make shipment. There is also this point that when a punt is unloaded alongside a steamer it saves the shipper 4 cents per bag which is charged as wharfage by the steamer agents. In addition to the higher freight rate by steamer the shipper has to pay cartage and wharfage. It seems to me that some relief is necessary, and if the Department would only look upon it from a business point of view its freight returns would be very much increased. Perhaps it might be made a seasonal charge so as to cope with the traffic during the crop season.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I would like to

endorse what has been said for the very good reason that when I was in Wakenaam and Leguan during the last by-election I was asked to do certain things, and I promised to do everything I was asked, among them being to encourage Government to provide cheap freight for milk from Leguan. It is a very difficult position, I admit, because you compete with the punts when you lower the freight, and on the other hand you compete with the people who buy the stuff from the producers. But if a punt can bring a bag of padi to Georgetown for 8 cents the steamer should be able to bring it for the same figure or even a little less. I cannot conceive of the possibility of a person preferring to entrust his goods with punts and schooners which are at the mercy of the wind and waves. Whatever goes by punt is a loss to the Transport Department because the steamer travels with that amount of freight less.

Mr. WALCOTT: Besides putting those poor puntmen out of employment I am afraid that the steamers would have to pay a premium to get freight so as to make it worth while bringing rice by steamer. In other words the Transport Department would have to give the steamer a bonus of one cent to make it worth while. It is physically impossible unless the steamers can go into the canals and take up the rice. The Transport Board went very carefully into the matter some years ago.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I am very pleased and gratified to hear the solicitude of the hon. Nominated Member for the puntmen, but perhaps he is not aware of drainage conditions on the Essequibo Coast. He ought to know because old iron and rice consigned to him have been held up for a week because the sea punts could not get out of the channel. If there were none of those difficulties in regard to shipping produce by punts the situation in Essequibo in regard to freight rates would be very much altered to the benefit of the people there, but the trouble is that one never knows when he can get the sea punts out of most of the koker channels on the Essequibo Coast. Transport by steamer is faster and more certain, and I submit that the arguments by the hon. Nominated Member do not apply at all. He is talking with his tongue in his cheek (laughter) when he refers to the difficul

ties and how much cheaper it would be for the people to send their goods by punts.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I would not say that he was talking with his tongue in his cheek, but I say that the steamers will still run without this freight, and if the rates were reduced the steamers would still be getting something, and it would not cost any more to run them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Both hon. Members have missed the point. If the steamers brought rice free it would still cost the shippers more for transport than they pay the punts now to bring it all the way, because you have to take into account cartage, wharfage etc. As far as the remarks of the hon. Member for Western Essequibo are concerned I think that the Government has a drainage scheme on in Essequibo, and I am surprised to hear that the channels are frequently blocked, and that the hon. Member does not see that they are kept clear. (Laughter).

Mr. BRASSINGTON: The hon. Nominated Member's knowledge of the Essequibo Coast is nil. In the first place the drainage scheme was designed and carried out by the Government. If there are any difficulties—and there are many—they are due to the Government. At the present moment the total crop of rice on the Essequibo Coast is carried by Government steamers and sea punts. If the people of Essequibo had money they would buy sufficient punts to take their produce, but unfortunately they have not the money to buy a fleet of punts. That is the whole question. If there were no sea punts an extra steamer would have to be run to cope with the rice crop. Hon. Members should get authentic information before they make criticisms regarding the unfortunate people in Essequibo.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members will realise that I cannot give any assurance in regard to the reduction of the freight on rice, but I have no doubt that the Transport Board will go into the matter again.

Item passed.

BARTICA-POTARO ROAD SERVICE.

Item 3—Maintenance and Repairs, \$12,000.

Mr. SEAFORD: I take it that this sum is for the lorries that run on the road. Does it allow for depreciation?

Mr. McDAVID (Colonial Treasurer): Item 7 is Depreciation.

Mr. SEAFORD: How many lorries are there?

THE CHAIRMAN: Eighteen.

Mr. SEAFORD: And only \$3,200 is put down for depreciation? Apparently the life of a lorry on that road is very short.

Mr. CANNON: Where can I find the corresponding saving supposed to be covered by this amount? In other words, there was something said about so much money made on this road. I would like to know where it is shown, or whether it has been deducted from the figures submitted to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be found on page 12 under Receipts—Bartica-Potaro Road.

Item 7—Depreciation, \$3,200.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this item be increased by \$1,000. The figure of \$3,200 was based on a three-year life. It has now been decided to work on a two-year life of a lorry, which would increase the item by another \$1,000.

Mr. SEAFORD: What is the price of the lorries?

THE CHAIRMAN: Roughly about \$1,000.

Mr. SEAFORD: It is \$9,000 a year. I am sure the amount for depreciation is not correct. It is making a profit into a loss.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is impossible to give the information right away because some of the lorries have been replaced and some are absolutely new. If the hon. Member would like to have the information I would get the Department to work it out.

Mr. SEAFORD: The average life of a lorry is two years, and if it cost \$1,000 it means that the annual expenditure for depreciation is about \$9,000. It is turning a profit of \$2,800 into a loss.

Item increased to \$4,200.

HARBOUR SERVICES.

Item 4—Hydrographical Surveyor and Pilot, \$2,160.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: This is a new item on the Fixed Establishment. The officer is obviously a Pilot, and the maximum salary of a Pilot is \$1,920. I am against any increase and I do not mind what the Government or the Transport Department likes to call any of its officers.

Mr. SEAFORD: May I remind the hon. Member that at a Sea Defence Board meeting some months ago it was agreed that the Board should share in the cost of hydrographic surveys. It was pointed out that if we knew something more about our foreshores we might be able to take measures to prevent the collapse of the wall as happened on the East Coast. It was decided to ask Government to allow us to engage the services of this officer.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I propose to move that the item be deleted. One expects an explanatory note to determine whether it is a matter of necessity. I understand that the officer is only toying with it.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I agree, with the hon. Member. It is not only a new item but there is no explanation given whatever.

Mr. McDAVID: This officer is a Pilot and has statutory rights to pension conferred by the Ordinance. I understand he has been selected to do hydrographic survey work as well. He has not been put on the Fixed Establishment but merely retains those rights although he has been specially selected to do these duties. In addition the Sea Defence Board is paying a proportion of the increase in salary, which is being paid into the revenue of the Transport and Harbours Department.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Is he a Pilot still in the Service?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: He is doing this work in addition to his work as a Pilot owing to his special knowledge.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Is he to get an increase in salary?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes,

owing to his special knowledge. Mr. Davis, in addition to his work as a Pilot, is assisting in this survey work and therefore it is thought he should be paid an extra £50.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I am still not satisfied. Is this officer at present employed as a Pilot or is he doing this survey work? What is he doing at present?

Mr. SEAFORD: I might remind the hon. Member that we have had several surveys, and this officer has been doing the work. He has been paid by the Sea Defence Board for the work he has been doing.

Mr. ELEAZAR: The question has been asked, what is the officer doing at present? Is he doing the work of a Pilot or a surveyor?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I said he is doing a Pilot's work and this. He has been doing both for the last three months of last year in addition to his duties as a Pilot. I can give no further explanation. I do not know whether the hon. Member understands me now.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I ask what is he doing at the present time? (Laughter).

Mr. WOOLFORD: The officer is at present a Pilot on the Fixed Establishment of the Colony. He is Mr. Davis who is a Pilot with a knowledge of hydrographic survey work. He is combining the offices at very little cost to the Colony. At such times when he is not performing the duties of a Pilot he will do hydrographic surveying.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I do not desire to question the officer's capabilities as a hydrographic surveyor. I am not competent to express any opinion as to his abilities in that direction, but what I do say is that if an elected Member has any responsibility or any rights as such it seems that our rights have been ignored. At the last Annual Session the Council voted a certain sum for the officer to be employed as a Pilot. I cannot find out yet how long he has been doing this hydrographic survey work. At any rate money was not voted at the last Annual Session for him to do that work, and I contend that Government should have come

back to the Council to vote this extra money which I assume he has been getting. He is not getting the salary we voted last year, \$1,920. Government has taken him off the job for which his salary was voted and put him on another job without the slightest reference to this Council. I cannot stand for that.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: This officer is being called upon to do special work in addition to his substantive work. Immediately as he is selected for that work, which as far as I know is an experiment, £50 is added to his emoluments and is made pensionable. That is my only objection. If the Sea Defence Board is paying him £50 as a special amount that item should be shown separately so that Members would be aware of the special payment which should not be pensionable. After all this work is only in the nature of an experiment. The Sea Defence Board might find that the services of the officer are no longer required, and might refuse to subscribe their portion of his salary. In the meantime he has got on here for additional pension rights.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I move the deletion of the item until Government has made up its mind. It seems to me that the worst thing for Government to do is to appoint Members of the Council to these Boards. When one is appointed to the Forest Trust he votes against everybody, and when another gets on the Transport Board he tries to double-cross others. If the officer is wanted for this work then somebody else is doing his work as a Pilot. How is that person being paid?

Mr. DE AGUIAR: Provision for the £50 should be made in Appendix D where it is shown that the Secretary of the Sea Defence Board receives £50. That is where the £50 for this officer should appear.

Mr. WOOLFORD: The services of this officer are not only being required for sea defence work, but also in connection with the harbours of Georgetown and New Amsterdam in contemplation of proposed dredging, and it is a matter of computation as to how far a proportion of his salary should be pensionable. I personally have some doubt about that, and to that extent the criticisms are just. It is a matter for consideration whether the officer, who has

just started to perform these duties, should have his extra remuneration made pensionable at the outset. Whether his special services should be made pensionable at so early a stage is open to doubt. I am inclined to agree with hon. Members that the extra amount should not be pensionable.

Item as printed agreed to.

Dredge—

Mr. ELEAZAR: I am afraid that the dredge is going to cause a plenty of trouble when it arrives. I have a recollection that the late Governor went up to New Amsterdam and discussed with a number of us the possibility of dredging the New Amsterdam harbour. Whilst the discussion was going on it became evident that the dredge which it was intended to order would be too small altogether for use in New Amsterdam. It was therefore decided to order one double the size or double the price. That is how this dredge has been ordered at this price. Now that the dredge is about to come out it has been said that it will not be taken to New Amsterdam at all. I call that a breach of faith. It is said that other gentlemen outside have expressed the view that something else should be done. When the dredge comes I will stump the country and see if I cannot get the people to wake up and take care of themselves.

Mr. CANNON: You cannot do that. It cannot be done.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I have mentioned the matter now because the dredge is not very far from coming. I feel sorry to think that a Governor should confer with the people who are concerned and get them to consent to double the size and price of the dredge, and when the time arrives for it to be brought out they are told they will not have it at all. The Governor has gone and will not be here when it arrives.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: What I am concerned about is the sum of \$1,680 to be paid to the Dredge Master. Is there nobody in this Colony who is capable of working the dredge? I have very fresh recollections of the dredge operating in the Pomeroon river. There was a Dredge Master there who was paid a considerable sum per month under the supervision of

the Public Works Department. I saw that gentleman some weeks ago and he asked me if I could help him to get employment. I believe he is a competent and capable man. I have only spoken to him twice in my life. I think when employment of this sort is available Government should look around to see if there is anybody in the Colony who can do the work. I think the man is a Dutchman named Millard. Government evidently has a high opinion of him because he was employed for about five years. As regards the purchasing of the dredge I suppose the Crown Agents will do that, and they will send out the Dredge Master. We have been left without a vestige of power or authority. The sooner we realise it the better.

Mr. CANNON: Do I understand a Dredge Master is coming out to the Colony?

THE CHAIRMAN: He is coming with the dredge I understand.

Mr. CANNON: Is it sailing out?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is coming under its own power.

Mr. CANNON: If the Dredge Master is coming to remain here I will move the deletion of the item.

THE CHAIRMAN: He will remain here.

Mr. CANNON: I move the deletion of the item.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I second that. When the dredge was asked for and the idea was to get an expert Dredge Master from England it was suggested that we should have a man on a two-year agreement with the idea that he should train local men to operate the dredge. Perhaps Government knows about the man I referred to.

THE CHAIRMAN: That matter has been gone into and we cannot find anybody in the Colony who has any experience of handling a big sea dredge.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I made no comment on this gentleman's ability, but I have arrived at the opinion that he must have ability otherwise the Government could not have had him in its employ for five years. I am assuming that he is a

very capable man from his length of service.

Mr. ELEAZAR: It seems to me that certain people come to this Colony and assume a mighty lot when they assume that nobody in the Colony can do certain things. When experts come from abroad they learn the job at other people's expense. On what authority was the statement made that a man cannot be found in this Colony to operate a dredge? I am afraid that Government assumes too much, and it is always against the local man. Misfits are brought here from time to time and we have to foot the bill. What happens at the end of the two years? Suppose the Dredge Master proves a failure and sinks the dredge or sinks himself?

Mr. CANNON: I beg to withdraw my opposition. I quite forgot when I started that the Imperial Government is paying for it.

Item passed.

EXTRAORDINARY EXPENDITURE ON RE-NEWALS AND REPLACEMENTS.

Item 3—One Steamer to replace s.s. "Arapaima," \$100,000.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: Can Government give the Council any information as to the type of steamer it is proposed to purchase, whether an oil burner or what? I am not asking the question out of curiosity. For an expenditure of \$100,000 we should know what sort of steamer we are getting and where it is going to operate.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It has not been definitely decided, but it is suggested that we should get a steamer fitted with a Diesel engine.

FURTHER EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT.

Mr. SEAFORD: One turn table was imported last year. Is it necessary to get another next year? I think if you run the locomotive up with the smoke box one way the next day you can reverse it. Another thing is the extension of the Workshop. \$11,000 is a large sum to spend on a building in one year, and \$11,520 for additional machine tools is

also a large sum. Is another turn table necessary? Can't these things be done one at a time?

THE CHAIRMAN: As regards the turn table I think the hon. Member will recollect that Mr. Cooper recommended that at least one should be purchased as soon as possible owing to the fact that the engines were wearing their bearings on one side. It is said that it is necessary to have another at the Rosignol end in order to have the desired effect in turning the engines around.

Mr. SEAFORD: With one turn table in Georgetown an engine can be turned around every other day.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is said to be also undesirable to run some of those engines on the reverse. The full journey run on the reverse is not good for the engines. It costs more to maintain them. As regards the hon. Member's reference to the cost of the additional tools and the Workshop extension I am afraid I know nothing about that.

Mr. CANNON: Is there anyone coming out to instal those parts? (Laughter).

Mr. AUSTIN: The Workshop was recently inspected by the Directors and if the Hon. Mr. Seaford went round there he would, I feel sure, condemn it as dangerous. I was astounded to see the various machines going, the number of people operating them and the little passages through which they have to pass to get from one place to another. I was astounded that there were no accidents, but if we do not do something now there will be an accident, in which case we will have to pay compensation. I am certain that the Hon. Mr. Seaford would not allow such a state of affairs on a sugar estate.

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. Member has missed the point. Apparently this is required for additional machines. My point is is it necessary to have these machines at the present time?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I understand from the General Manager that it is necessary to have additional machinery. He is simply waiting for a place to put them.

Item 7—Stelling at Morawhanna, \$1,500.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I have only been to Morawhanna once. This is a hardy annual and I am very glad to see the item on the Estimate.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

Mr. CANNON: With your permission, sir, I beg to move that item 7c under the Head "Colonial Secretary's Office" be re-committed. I refer to the item "2 Class I Clerks, \$3,594" which was reduced yesterday to \$1,878. I wish to make my position quite clear in this matter. Since we adjourned yesterday it has been brought to my notice—I think your Excellency said so during the debate. I do not say I disbelieved you but I wanted to make sure what you said was true. (Laughter) I therefore ask you to allow me to read what I said at the Annual Session on the 14th of December, 1933. This is what I said:—

"I am prepared to give my vote in favour of the appointment of a local officer. I am in agreement that such assistance is necessary, but you are not going to get anyone to come out here at £500 who is going to be of any assistance to the Colony or the Colonial Office."

I opposed the importation of a gentleman from the Colonial Office and gave an undertaking that if a local officer could be found I would give him my support. I ask you to allow the item to be re-committed and it will have my support. I am not going to go back upon what I said.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I have never heard anything of the kind. Yesterday we had evidence convincing enough that this officer could be done without. We did not strike it out because we did not believe a promise was made on a former occasion. It was not because we disregarded the promise but because after considerable argument it was proved that the office could be run without an additional clerk. I would be surprised to know that the hon. Member voted yesterday as he did because he thought he had voted the other way last year. I think he voted on what he heard yesterday. I hope Government will not accede to his request. It would be a dangerous precedent,

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can move that the item be recommitted. It need not be seconded.

Mr. CANNON: I formally move that the item be recommitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: I accede to the request that the item be recommitted. I now put the item as printed.

Mr. SEAFORD: Have we the power to recommit any item?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. SEAFORD: We will be here until 10 years hence. I understand that we voted in favour of this appointment, but the one we did not vote for was the officer to replace Mr. Hill.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: I remember the debate last year very well, and I think the hon. Member for Georgetown North will find that I vigorously opposed the bringing of any clerk from the Colonial Office to assist here. I think I said that it would be found that instead of assisting he would have to be taught by the senior men in the office. My position is that I do not wish to be a party to any injustice to any official, especially to a junior officer, and I am quite willing to give my vote for the appointment of this clerk if there is any likelihood of an injustice being done.

Mr. CANNON: I move that the officer be appointed in view of what was decided on the last occasion. What I said then I say again. I am prepared to give my vote in favour of the appointment of a local officer. If it is to be given to a local officer Government will have my vote.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I wish to move the amendment I moved yesterday, that the item be carried out at \$1,878. It is unnecessary to cover the ground again. I think the hon. Member for Georgetown North was fully convinced that at the present moment the intention is to appoint two additional officers to the Colonial Secretariat. There can be no question about that. If the hon. Member presses his motion I shall have to move that the item be carried out at \$1,878.

Mr. ELEAZAR: And Your Excellency will give me permission to ask that the

estimates for the Forest Department be recommitted. One or two Members were absent when the division was taken and so we lost, and we had to accept defeat. Some Members are not here to-day who voted against this item yesterday. Is it therefore fair to recommit it now? Your Excellency will be creating an unprecedented procedure. Government cannot allow that kind of thing; we will be here forever. If the hon. Member gave his word last year and sees reason to change now but cannot change his views I do not know what sort of man he is. There should be a limit to this sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: It all depends on the ground on which the item is recommitted. It seems a reasonable request to make and it is also reasonable for me to accede to it.

Mr. SEAFORD: Is there any objection to my asking for a recommitment of the Forestry vote? A certain decision was arrived at in this matter yesterday, and because it pleases Government they are prepared to recommit the item to-day.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the position. The point is that the hon. Member has asked that it be recommitted and I am now asking whether he wishes it voted upon. The hon. Member has made a statement. He need not wish the item voted upon.

Mr. CANNON: I wish to have it put to the vote. I think all these estimates should be increased ten-fold.

Mr. WIGHT: I am not questioning Your Excellency's ruling, but this is a very bad principle to work on. Suppose we ask that any item be recommitted?

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall have to take our chance on that I am afraid.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Are we going to obstruct Government? I will ask for the recommitment of the Forestry vote, and I will talk until to-morrow morning, and talk sense all the time. (Laughter).

THE CHAIRMAN: I will first of all put it to the vote that the item be recommitted.

The Committee divided and voted:—

Ayes—Messrs. Cannon, Dr. Henderson, Wood, Mullin, D'Andrade, McDavid, Major Craig, Woolford, Brassington,

Professor Dash, Major Bain Gray, Dias, The Attorney-General, The Colonial Secretary.—14.

Noes— Messrs. Walcott, Wills, Peer Bacchus, Seaford, Austin, De Aguiar, Eleazar, Wight, Smellie.—9.

Motion carried.

Mr. WIGHT: I ask that the voting on the item be adjourned until to-morrow so that we might get a larger House.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can move to-morrow for a recommittal of the item again. I will now put the item as printed.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I wish to speak on the amendment moved by the hon. Member, and I am asking Government to allow the discussion on this matter to remain over for another day because Government should do nothing to hamper the business of the Council. The Members who voted yesterday against the reduction of the item are not here to-day, and there is no guarantee that they will change their minds. I do not think it would be a good thing that those who would not change their minds and are not here to-day should be left out in the cold.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not anxious to take any advantage of the absence of hon. Members by taking a snap vote, as long as it is understood that the item will be recommitted on some day convenient to the Council. I think it is desirable to fix a time when the motion should be taken.

Mr. DEAGUIAR: I think it should be left at the discretion of the mover of the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. Member to name the day and time when he would like to have his amendment put.

Mr. DEAGUIAR: I am not in a position to do so now, but I will inform the Clerk of the Council.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: There is precedent for the recommittal of an item. It has happened frequently.

THE CHAIRMAN: And when there is

disagreement it is put to the vote. I do not want to take advantage of an empty House, therefore I would ask the hon. Member who has moved the amendment to inform the Clerk of the Council when he is prepared to go on with it.

Mr. SEAFORD: Items have been recommitted when there was misunderstanding, not because a Member of the Council wished to change his vote.

Mr. CANNON: I have no desire to change my mind. There was a misunderstanding yesterday when I gave my vote against the item. I did not remember the circumstances, and since we adjourned yesterday I have seen the Hansard report of what I said last year and I am prepared to stick to it.

Item held over.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES.

The items under this Head were passed without discussion.

IMMIGRATION AND REPATRIATION.

Mr. WALCOTT: Can't this work be done by the District Commissioner for Georgetown?

Dr. HENDERSON (Surgeon-General): Government has arranged that from next year the duties of the Registrar-General and Immigration Agent General will be performed by the Government Medical Officer of Health. Whatever might take place after that I am not in a position to say.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is it not possible to assign these duties to the District Commissioner? Surely a District Commissioner should be able to take care of this work and save a considerable sum of money?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member probably was not here when the matter was debated before. Hon. Members will remember that this office was considerably reduced because a certain amount of the work is being done under the District Administration Scheme. It is necessary to maintain this office in Georgetown because there are lots of people living in Georgetown who register their births and deaths at this office.

Mr. WALCOTT: But there is a District Commissioner residing in Georgetown. Why have this office as well?

Dr. HENDERSON: There is a great deal in what the hon. Member has said. I think it is a matter for consideration in the future as to how this Department could be incorporated in the District Administration Scheme.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question was gone into by me. The idea was to do away with the office altogether, but I pointed out that the value of the records is very great and there is no room to keep them in the Surgeon-General's office, so that they have to remain where they are at the moment. If we could afford to build a safe sufficiently secure at the District Commissioner's office it would be possible to do so. The hon. Member may find that it is not quite practical to close that office at the moment.

Mr. SEAFORD: I think the Surgeon-General told us that the work is going to be done by the Medical Officer of Health. Is he going to look after the records? It seems to me that his time would be much better occupied in looking after the health of the Colony.

Dr. HENDERSON: The office of Immigration Agent General has been tacked on to that of the Registrar-General, and the officer who should be the Registrar-General is the Government Medical Officer of Health. It will be taken over by the Medical Officer of Health next year.

SUPREME COURT.

Mr. WOOLFORD: I do not know whether I am in order, but I would like to call attention to what appears to me to be an anomaly in the matter of the Judges' salaries. I think, after 36 years' active experience, I ought to know something about the matter. The position is that the work of the Courts has now to be carried on by two Judges. At the moment there are three—there is an acting appointment—but in the ordinary course of things the work, in both the Civil and Criminal Courts, has to be performed by two Judges alone. Since the elevation of Mr. Justice Gilchrist to the Trinidad Bench in the year 1931 there has only been one Puisne Judge in this Colony, but a great many things have happened

since then. There has been almost a complete change in civil procedure involving an additional amount of work, not only in open Court but in chambers. That is being borne in upon practitioners continuously, and there is scarcely a day for that reason that one or other of the Judges is not engaged in that way. In some instances work of a very important character has to be done by the Judges in chambers as distinct from civil actions in the Courts.

I have risen to point out that this Colony is being overlooked by whoever is responsible for this state of affairs, and I cannot help feeling that it is unfair to a Judge to have to perform the duties previously performed by two Judges at the same salary which he got when the other Judge was here, and especially when an annual saving has been effected in the salary of one Judge. In other words, when Mr. Justice Gilchrist went to Trinidad Mr. Justice Savary was Second Puisne Judge. His salary remains the same but his work has been considerably increased. I for one cannot understand how it is possible for a gentleman, who was in this Colony not many years ago as a Police Inspector, to be now occupying the position of a Judge in Trinidad at a higher salary than our Puisne Judge. It seems to me that something is going to happen. We are either going to have our most talented Judges attracted to other Colonies, or we are going to be sidetracked by having, as we have had, Judges who—I have no hesitation in saying it—are unfit for their appointments from the point of view of legal qualifications. As a practitioner I strongly object to the salary of the Puisne Judge being maintained at so low a figure that it should not be an attraction to the best men to come here. They are being attracted to other Colonies by the pay those Colonies offer, and I desire to enter a protest at once against officers being appointed to this Colony who enjoyed in the Colony in which they have served a lesser salary than our Puisne Judge, and being elevated here, perhaps quite rightly but at the same time unjustly to this Colony in a way, at a higher salary. Appointments are being made to this Colony of persons who, in the Colony in which they last served, enjoyed a lesser salary than the Puisne Judge here.

I do not understand how these things are possible, and why the Puisne Judge

who is here was not appointed to or given the salary of the post of the Puisne Judge immediately before him whose work he is now performing. That does not make for satisfaction, and quite irrespective of whether it is Mr. Justice Savary or anyone else—I am speaking quite impersonally—the situation to-day is that we are maintaining a Judicial system that is unfair to this Colony, and in the long run is going to cause considerable dissatisfaction. We cannot afford to have mediocre Judges in this Colony, but I am afraid that is going to be the result. I do ask that some revision be made along those lines so as to put this Colony in the position to be attractive to officers who have real legal qualifications.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's observation will be considered by Government.

Mr. WOOLFORD: At the time I am speaking about one Judge was getting \$6,960 and the other \$5,760. The Colony has been saved the expenditure of \$6,960, the present Puisne Judge performing both his own work and that of the other Judge and still receiving the same salary. I do not think it is at all fair to that officer.

Mr. AUSTIN: Can you tell us, sir, briefly, what the hon. Member has been talking about. We have not heard a word at this end of the table. (Laughter).

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will have an opportunity to read it in the newspapers to-morrow morning. (Laughter).

Mr. AUSTIN: I do not think I will, sir.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I do not know whether Government will of its own motion insert in the Estimates some amount in order to give this Judge a solatium for the additional work he has been called upon to do. It is only because the Financial Commissioners decided that one Judge should be withdrawn and the Colony be run by two Judges, and that there should be no First Puisne Judge, that this officer remains the Second Puisne Judge at the same salary. Instantly one was removed the other should have been moved up, but that was not done. The present Puisne Judge has been doing a double portion of work for the same pay. That can hardly

be fair. I remember moving a motion, which I was induced to withdraw, for the appointment of a third Puisne Judge. A promise was made but was never redeemed. It is for us who know the circumstances to remedy the situation if we can. I happen to know that litigants are suffering because I think a mandate has gone forth that the Supreme Court will only sit four hours per day. It begins at 9.30 a.m., adjourns at 11.30 for an hour and a half for lunch, and stops at 3.30 p.m. Four hours per day for a Judge, why? The Judges naturally say they are overworked. Four hours per day is manifestly absurd, but if Mr. Justice Savary had carried out that mandate he would have been in Berbice until now, because he could not get through the cases he had. He gave as much time as possible.

Judges are conscientious so far as their work is concerned. They do not complain, but is it fair that we should sit here and allow this injustice to continue? I think it is within the province of the Council and the Government to remedy it. I do not see why Government should recommend that "Mr. So-and-So" should be given a Service Allowance, and when it comes to the Judges its hands are tied. I ask Government to give something, if even it is in the shape of a Duty Allowance, to this particular officer and insist that the Supreme Court should sit five hours per day. I hope Government will leave the matter open to Members of the Council to express their views. It is not that Government does not know that Mr. Justice Savary is not being fairly dealt with. The work of the Courts broke the health of the Chief Justice and very nearly that of Mr. Justice Savary, too. It is a pity that Members of this Council, especially legal Members, have to stand up and plead for fairplay to a Judge. It is not quite the thing. Government should do so of its own motion, but if we do not do it who else will?

Mr. DIAS: In the light of the assurance given the hon. Member for New Amsterdam that Government will consider the matter, I do not think I will address any remarks with respect to his representations in connection with the office of Second Puisne Judge in this Colony, though I desire to say that I absolutely associate myself with what he said in connection

with the emoluments of that particular office. The statement has been made that a proclamation has gone forth that the Judges have decided to sit four hours per day only. In the first place I say that four hours' sitting is nothing new. The late Sir Charles Major sat four hours per day, from 9 to 1 without a break, and although practitioners represented that they preferred to have the period changed he preferred to sit that way because he had objection to sitting in the afternoon on account of the heat. The period of sitting which now obtains was discussed by the Chief Justice on his arrival with the other Judge, and is the result of collaboration with a certain number of representatives of the legal profession who said it suited their clients very much better when the Court sat from 9.30 to 11.30 a.m. and from 1 to 3 p.m. For a man who has to tax his brain every day in considering points of law I think four hours per day quite long enough.

Special reference has been made to Mr. Justice Savary. We all know he has had a very bad run of ill-health for several months. To him has fallen every important and lengthy case in this Colony. He sat 26 days one case and a month on another, with his other work in between, and in addition he did a volume of chamber work of which the public never hears. Today I think he is paying the penalty for it because I do not think he is enjoying very good health. Unless a Judge is in good health you cannot expect to get the best out of him, and I think he took upon himself to work late in order to get rid of two or three cases. Nobody wants a sick Judge. I do hope that hon. Members will appreciate that the Judges are doing the right thing, and that the litigants themselves will realise that it is in their interest if the Courts are conducted as it is proposed to continue. It is nothing new; it has obtained in the time of the late Sir Charles Major.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Why not begin at 9 o'clock and take one hour for lunch? Why begin at 9.30 and take an hour and a half for lunch? I want the Judges to be fairly

paid. What I am concerned about is not the hours they work but that some extra emoluments be given to Mr. Justice Savary who certainly deserves some consideration. It would only be doing him justice.

Mr. CANNON: I understood the hon. Nominated Member to say that there was a meeting between the Judges and members of the legal profession, but I did not hear him say who represented the litigants. They are the people who pay the piper and ought to be heard.

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: Although not a member of the legal profession I would like to support the suggestion made by the hon. Member for New Amsterdam. What is obvious to one's mind is that the Judges have to administer justice yet justice is not being meted out to them. The treatment of this particular Judge is not what he should receive from the Government. I therefore join in the appeal that consideration be given this officer because it has been proved that he has been burdened with more work because of the reduction of one Judge. I think he deserves the sympathetic consideration of Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to the question raised about the number of Judges that matter is now being considered. As regards the remarks made about the salary of the Puisne Judge I think Government can take a little credit to itself in having anticipated the remarks made this afternoon by about 18 months or two years. However, the matter will be raised again in the light of the discussion this afternoon.

Mr. WOOLFORD: I should like to call attention to the proposed appointment of one Class I. Clerk. I would emphasise the fact that in the management of that office there should be someone appointed who has primary knowledge of book-keeping combined with legal qualifications, and it should not be difficult to find such a man.

The Committee adjourned until the following day at 11 o'clock.