THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th February, 1947.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN, (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LE V. WILSON, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, M. E. COX, H. D. BLACKMAN, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., W. A. CRAWFORD, D. D. GARNER, C. E. TALMA, E. D. MOTTLEY, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES.

Prayers are read and the Minutes of the last meeting having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. MAPP enters the House and takes his seat.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Report of the Inspector of Trees for the parish of St. George for the year 1946.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:—

Message No. 8/1947 from His Excellency the Governor:—

His Excellency The Governor
To
The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to present for the consideration of the Honourable the House of Assembly the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the financial year 1947—48.

2. The revenue is estimated at £1,574,793 and the expenditure, including extraordinary expenditure and expenditure from Resolutions passed prior to the 1st April, 1947, is estimated at £1,690,614. There is, therefore, an estimated excess of expenditure over revenue of £115,821.

3. The Colonial Secretary's memorandum which accompanies the Estimates explains the financial position. Differences between the approved Estimates of Expenditure for 1946—47 and the expenditure Estimates now presented for consideration are explained in the notes against the relevant items.

4. The estimated surplus on the 31st of March, 1947, is £970,976 and the estimated surplus on the 31st March, 1948, is £855,155.

HILARY BLOOD,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
17th February, 1947.

Statement showing the sums advanced by the Colonial Treasurer to the Colonial Postmaster for the payment of money Orders to the 31st December, 1946.

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £6,984 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1946—47 under Head XXIII, Medical Services (2) General Hospital, Appendix I. B., Surgery and Dispensary, by £158; C. Domestic, by £1,177; D. Salaries and Wages, by £5,464; E. Miscellaneous, by £185; in order to provide increases in pay for the Subordinate, Unestablished and Casual staff of the General Hospital on the same basis as is set out in the Schedule No. 64 of the 27th September, 1946, for the period from the 1st April, 1946, to the 31st March, 1947.

Resolution to place the sum of £2,170 at the disposal of the Hospital Board to pay with effect from the 1st of April, 1946, and until the 31st of March, 1947, a cost of living allowance to

(a) officers in the full time service of the Hospital Board who receive their salaries from the Public Treasury;

(b) officers who retired from the full time service of the Hospital Board at any time between the 1st day of April, 1946, and the date of the passing of this Resolution in circumstances rendering

them eligible for the grant of a pension or gratuity;

at the rates, and subject to the terms, conditions and exceptions, set out in the Schedule to this Resolution.

Resolution for £69 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1946-47 under Head VIII, Post Office, Item 12, Inland mails.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for £10,292 (A) to supplement the resolution in Column I of Schedule A to this resolution by the amounts in Column II of the Schedule; and (B) to provide for increased rates of pay to persons employed under the Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes in Column I of Schedule B to this resolution by the amounts in Column II of the Schedule.

Resolution to approve the Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under subsection (1) of section 37 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1943 (1943-2),

Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. SPRINGER enter the House while the above notices are being given and take their seats.

Mr. BRANCKER gives notice of the following Address.

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly views with grave concern the continued high price of petrol in this Colony.

2. The House begs to point out to His Excellency the fact that, so long as this article is priced as at present, the cost of living for all persons who travel by Motor Transport is of necessity kept high.

3. The House requests that the Government will take whatever action is deemed appropriate, with a view to effecting a substantial reduction in the price of this commodity, so that, *inter alia,* motor omnibus fares particularly in remote and impoverished country districts, may be appreciably reduced and also the cost of haulage of peasants' canes to the factories.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the government. As I am particularly interested in the first Resolution I shall leave the Committee when it is being considered.

On the motion of Mr. Adams, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

PURCHASE OF THE BAY ESTATE

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Committee while this Resolution is considered.

Mr. ADAMS: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of £65,650 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to purchase the Bay Estate and to meet legal and incidental expenses in connection therewith. I believe, Sir, that this is the first time, since I have been a member of this House, that I have seen an addendum to a Resolution so full as this. It is absolutely unnecessary for me to say anything, except to move that this Resolution do now pass. As honourable members will see from the addendum, the Committee, which considerd this matter towards the end of last month under the chairmanship of the senior member or St. Philip, reported fairly fully and as a result of the Government approaching the attorney for the owner of the Bay Estate, the owner has agreed to sell the property to the Government for £65,650. The conditions of sale are set out in the addendum and I have only to say that I share with other honourable members the pleasure of knowing that we shall soon be the owners of the Bay Estate. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WARD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. COX: I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution. In doing so, I should like to say that on this occasion, if on no other, the Government should be congratulated for the prompt and sympathetic action which it has taken in relieving the doubts and fears of the people living in that area. I feel, Sir, that the people of the parish of St. Michael, especially those living in the Bay Estate area, will long praise this Government, having regard to the circumstances in connection with other areas which have been recently sold and the hardships and inconveniences to which the people who live in those areas have been put. I have very much pleasure in seconding the passing of this Resolution and I hope that in similar cases in the future the Government will act just as promptly as it has acted on this occasion.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—I rise to support this Resolution and like the senior member for St. Michael I am very appreciative of the expeditious way in which the Government has responded to our request in the Address which we passed to the Governor on this subject. But one point which I should like to mention is this. It is all very well to be able to buy properties and pay cash for them as we have the cash now, but in the future we may not be in the same financial position and as I would like to see the Government purchase some properties in the other parishes for a similar purpose I am hoping that it will get not only a Land Acquisition Act but a Loan Act, like the Education Loan Act, placed on the Statute Book to provide the machinery for raising money to purchase properties. If the Government will do that, it will have the machinery ready to float a loan whenever it sees fit to purchase a property for settlement purposes and there will be no difficulty in the matter. I am counselling those members of the House who are members of the Government to consider carefully the point which I have mentioned and see if they cannot in the near future formulate a plan on those lines.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, there are just one or two observations I would like to make. The senior member for St. Michael, in seconding the passing of this Resolution, said that he hoped that in similar cases the Government would act just as promptly as it has acted on this occasion. Well, I want to make the observation that I sincerely hope we shall not have in the future entirely similar circumstances arising; that is to say this: While I support the passing of the Resolution and the acquisition of the Bay Estate I am not at all satisfied in my mind that the Government has not paid too much for it. Up to about a week before the House passed the Address calling on the Government to buy this estate, I was informed, and other members of the House were so informed, that the most that was offered for it was £50,000. Within a week the asking price was increased by almost 50 per cent. The Government has agreed to pay for £65,650 for the estate but in my opinion the

reason why the Government has to pay £15,650 more within a week entirely due to the fact that we openly in this House gave the Government carte blanche to buy the estate. The procedure should be this: If any member of the House hears in future of any property to be sold, he has free access to the Governor and he ought to go to His Excellency himself or through a member of the Executive Committee, if he likes, and ask His Excellency to immediately negotiate with the owner or owners quietly for the acquisition of that property. Honourable members will remember the procedure which was taken when the site next the Central Foundry's building was purchased. A special meeting of the House was convened but honourable members did not know what they were summoned for until they came here and the site was eventually purchased at a reasonable price without anybody knowing about it. If such a procedure had been followed on this occasion we might have got the Bay Estate for £15,000 less of the taxpayers' money. I sincerely hope that while everybody congratulates the Government for taking this step, we shall not in future be faced with entirely similar circumstances like these. Honourable members should endeavour to keep any negotiation of this sort on as secret a basis as possible and thus enable the Government to acquire the property as cheaply as possible.

Mr. WILKINSON: I want to support the remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down. I think, Sir, he will admit that I have a little more experience in matters of this sort than he has and I can assure him that what he has said is absolutely correct. The Government is always paying too much for land because we advertise when we want to buy it. I agree with the honourable member that if we had negotiated privately for this estate we could have bought it cheaper. Now, Sir, as regards the purchase of the Bay Estate I do not think there is anyone who would oppose it but I do hope that it will be used for the purpose for which it is bought. Unfortunately in the past this Government has bought properties for certain purposes and they have not always been used for those purposes. We have instances like Weymouth, Erdiston, the Pine plantation and so on. I should also like to give this note of warning: Every time this Government buys land in a parish it results in a decrease of the revenue of that parish. Honourable members will realize that the purchase of the Bay Estate by the Government will be a hard blow to the parish of St. Michael as far as its revenue is concerned and it is not unlikely that the parish will have shortly to come to the Government and ask for help by way of funds to meet its commitments. As regards the housing scheme I suppose that the senior member for St. Joseph has not had time yet to consider the laying out of this property but I am not keen on houses being built by the Government. I should like to see the land divided into lots and rented on a lease of 99 years to persons who can build their own houses. I am not enamoured in seeing a whole row of houses built on exactly the same style. I think a man who is about to build his house should decide on his own plan and take pride in building his house according to his plan. Of course, there will have to be regulations for the building of houses and persons will have to comply with those regulations but I do hope that we will not, as I have seen in England, Canada and Trinidad, have a large number of unsightly houses, all built on exactly the same plan. No doubt, the advice of the Town Planner will be sought in the matter. I was going to suggest that we refer this Resolution to a Select Committee but I observe from the addendum that this purchase is to be completed by the 28th day of February, 1947, and, therefore, I do not intend to hold it up; but it is a pity we have not had more time to put forward our ideas to the Government in this matter.

Mr. BRANCKER: As I said when I seconded the motion for the passing of the Address, it is absolutely essential that the Government should acquire land of this kind whenever it possibly can and as much as it possibly can until we eventually have all the available land in the community. But I am one of those who regard this price which we must of necessity pay, if we cannot get the estate for less, as too high. And we cannot risk leaving it to a special jury to assess the value because we know what a special jury did when that land at Spencers was to be sold; they assessed the value at £1,000 or more per acre. One cannot but deplore the attitude of landowners in this country in trying to extort from the Government, prices such as this we have before us today; it shows a lack of public spiritedness,—I am sure you, Mr. Chairman, will agree with me,—in not offering this estate to the Government for a humanitarian purpose at a figure much less than this.

Mr. TALMA: I merely rise to congratulate the present Coalition Government on actually doing something constructive in the shortest period of time. I congratulate the chairman of that Committee and I hope that the policy laid down by the present government will be continued and expanded, not only as far as the suburbs of St. Michael's parish but also as far as other parishes where similar schemes are needed are concerned. This reminds me, Sir, of an Address of which I gave notice not long ago in connection with land settlement and seeing that the Government has sent down a Resolution at such an early date in connection with the same matter I can feel more or less assured that some result will be attained, in so far as my Address is concerned. There is only one other point in this addendum on which I want to be quite clear. I refer to sub-paragraph 5 of paragraph 2. I observe that the tenancy of the Wanderers Cricket Club and the Young Men's Progressive Club will continue to the 31st December, 1948, but it appears, under sub-paragraph 6 of the same paragraph, that the tenants in Bay Street, Beckles Road, and Culloden Road, whose houses and other buildings are annexed to the freeholds, will have the right to remove the buildings when their tenancies come to an end. Now, in the majority of these cases, the tenancy is weekly or monthly or quarterly or possibly half-yearly, so I think that in fairness to these small tenants a proviso like this should be added to sub-paragraph 6 of paragraph 2 of the addendum:—"Provided the same does not terminate before December, 1948." That will afford protection to the small tenant who may not be in a position to remove his house at the end of his tenancy.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is within our prerogative to amend the addendum. We have to deal with the Resolution.

Mr. TALMA: I think, Sir, that I have succeeded in bringing my point to the attention of the Government. I think it will prevent a great hardship on the part of these poor tenants who will be forced off the land.

Mr. GALE: I too welcome this Resolution; it is a move in the right direction and I think that the Government has acquired one of the best localities in the parish of St Michael for the purpose of housing people. I would suggest that the Government in laying out this property, lay it out on lines similar to those which the City Council of Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, observed in connection with the laying out

of Woodbrook area which they bought many years ago; that is say, after constructing proper roads, they made the land available on a 99-year lease to persons to build houses of certain values in certain districts. I suggest to the Government that that is the best procedure to be adopted in settling people in the City and its suburbs.

Mr. COX: With regard to the remarks of the senior member for St. Philip I would like to say that perhaps he may be right in saying that the Government could have bought this estate cheaper but if he does not know, I can tell him that quite a number of land sharks, since the Government expressed its intention to purchase this property, went to the owner to prevent the Government from owning it; so much so that I said on one occasion that if we have to pay £100,000 for it we must buy it. Inasmuch as it would appear that this price is extravagant I have made some calculations and I discover that we are paying something like 6¼ cents per square foot as compared with the prices which have been charged for other areas. This estate contains 116 acres and we are purchasing it for £65,650; that is something like £566 an acre. Although the price appears to be extravagant, yet in the interest of the people the Government should purchase this estate. I would also like to remind the honourable member that one of the measures we had hoped to follow the passing of the Housing Bill was a Land Acquisition Bill in order that the Government would have power to purchase land at a reasonable rate. There is nothing more to say, except to repeat that we appreciate the attitude of the Government in this matter and we hope that soon—and very soon—there will be a Bill before this House to give the Government power to purchase land without difficulty.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Obviously the last speaker does not appreciate the burden of my remarks and I want to explain to him exactly what I meant. All I talked about was the procedure under which we are acquiring this estate. The honourable member was told that there is a possibility of the Bay Estate being put for sale. He came into this Assembly and moved an Address upon the floor of this House asking the Government to acquire the property.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I must draw to the notice of the honourable member that the business before the House is a Resolution for a certain sum of money. I shall be very grateful if the honourable member will confine his remarks to the same and not go in for any extraneous matters.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am talking about the Resolution. I am explaining to the senior member for St. Michael that instead of doing what he did, he should have—

The CHAIRMAN: The matter before the House is not what the senior member for St. Michael should have done but a Resolution for a sum of money. I suggest to the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Resolution and let us get on with the business.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are you suggesting that I am not talking on the Resolution?

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks which the honourable member is making result from the latitude which was previously given by the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am making remarks in explanation of the remarks I made at an earlier stage because those remarks were apparently unintelligible to some members who heard them. I said that instead of moving——

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is making remarks which are not appreciated.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Only by you. The position is this. A member of the House did not appreciate what I said and I am trying to explain it to him.

THE CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has a job.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And I am essaying that job. If this matter had not been dealt with openly in the House, the land sharks to whom the honourable member refers would not have known that the Government was negotiating for the purchase of the Bay Estate and would not have jogged the price. After the matter was made public then the land sharks came in.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I supported the Address of the senior member for St. Michael asking the Government to purchase this estate and I had hoped not to have to say even a word about it because it would be a matter of painting the lily; but such wild accusations have been made by some honourable members that I am bound to reply to them. In fairness to the honourable member of this House who happens to be an interested party in this matter I should like to say that it is within my knowledge that those accusations cannot but tend to give a different feature to the state of affairs. Now, I am prepared to say this: I am interested in land as an agent and as far back as four years ago when I made my ingress into the land business, I, on behalf of a client of mine, made an offer for the Bay Estate but His Honour the Speaker told me then, and even recently, that it was his desire that the Government should own this property. I know that as a fact and despite what the senior member for St. Philip thinks, with my knowledge of conditions I am bound to compliment the Government on this purchase. I also know, as a fact, that other efforts were made to purchase this estate long before the Government came on the scene and I know as a further fact that £65,000 would have been paid for it long before the Government began its negotiations with the owner. I, therefore, could not let the accusation by the senior member for St. Michael go unchallenged and allow it to be felt that persons interested in the sale of this property would associate themselves with any move to make the Government pay £65,000 for it.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member refers to an accusation by the senior member for St. Michael but I know of no accusation which that honourable member has made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The inference to be drawn from the remarks of the senior member for St. Michael is that after the Government actually decided to purchase the property, quite a number of people tried to get it. I can see from the nodding of your head, Mr. Chairman, that you appreciate that that is not true. I know that the solicitor engaged in the sale of this property, as far back as three years ago stated that whatever price may be offered for it, he certainly would prefer the Government to own it for the benefit of the people. As a businessman, I felt somewhat disappointed but I saw his reasoning and I see more clearly now the reason why the Government should buy the property. I do not believe, in the circumstances, that the price has been fixed at £65,650 because the Government wants the property and should be made to pay that price for it.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—While I am going to vote for this Resolution I too feel that the price is too high. £65,000 is a lot of money to pay for 116 acres of land! That is going some. And this Government not long ago during the last session tried to have all sorts of laws made to prevent people from buying land at too high a price or too cheaply.

THE CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not make reference to acts already done by this Chamber unless he is doing so for the purpose of having those acts disannulled. The honourable member must not cast any reflection upon what the House has previously done.

Mr. GARNER: I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, if you can show me any Rule to that effect. I am saying that during the last session this House sat around this table trying to make laws to prevent people from buying land too dearly or too cheaply. That is what I am saying and is there anything wrong about that? That is a fact and this Government is setting a precedent now by buying this estate too dearly. I have a perfect right to say that. After all, the money comes out of the taxpayers' pockets and many a poor workingman will not be able to buy this land if the Government purchases it too dearly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Honourable members must respect the ruling of the Chair and observe the rules of debate. The honourable member must not make any allusion to any act which has been done by this House unless for the purpose of having same disannulled.

Mr. GARNER: If the Chairman talks sense I will respect the ruling of the Chair but if the Chairman talks nonsense I cannot respect the ruling of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will not sit here as Chairman and let the honourable member make remarks of that nature. The honourable member must withdraw the remark "If the Chairman talks sense".

The junior member for St. Philip resumes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS (After a pause): I should like to tell the junior member for St. Philip that I have lost my temper more often, I suppose, than any other member of this House but while a member is speaking he is addressing the Chair and not necessarily the honourable member occupying the Chair. I suggest to the honourable member who lost his temper temporarily to say that he lost his temper, withdraw the remark and let us get on with the business before us. Surely any man can do that, let alone an honourable member of this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: While we have to bear in mind that the honourable member who sits in the Chair must be respected at all times, yet at the same time the occupant of the Chair must see to it that his rulings are such that they can be respected by other honourable members; he should not give rulings which will give rise to occasions of this sort. Now, Rule 123 of the Rules of the House says this: "No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded." Apparently that is what the Chairman had in mind when he made the observation which he made but the honourable member on my immediate left was not referring to any vote of the House; he was referring to a law of the land which was passed during the last session. If we are not to refer to laws which we regard as being improper, what are we here for? It is as much for the Chair to submit gracefully as it is for the junior member for St. Philip to do so.

Mr. GARNER: (After a long pause): Mr. Chairman,—While I do not agree with your ruling I admit that. I might have been a little bit hot and said certain things. For the sake of getting on with the business of the House I will withdraw what I have said (Cheers):

THE CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member carries on, I would like to say that the Chair unreservedly accepts his withdrawal and is very sorry for the occasion that may have caused the honourable member to make such remarks (Hear, hear).

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—As I was saying, I still believe that this price is too high and if the Government is to set the example and do the right thing by the people of this island it has to get it first and foremost in its head that these lands which it is buying at fabulous prices were bought for little or nothing and that the profit which the owners of these lands are making is far too much. What we need in this island is a Land Acquisition Act, so that we can acquire land when we want it. For instance, if we are going to have land settlement in the parish of St. Philip, are we going to give the owners what they want for it? I think we have to change our faces right about when we are thinking of buying land. In the last analysis, the Government owns the land; the land belongs to the people and we should not pay fabulous prices for it. There are many people who would like to own lots of land but cannot pay for them because the purchase price is too high. I am not going to say any more because I seem to be a voice crying in the wilderness but I hope some day to sit in this House and hear honourable members make a similar cry. I happen to live in the country and perhaps, to me, the price of land in the city is too dear when compared with the price of land in the country. I may be a novice in this respect but if we are going to buy properties for land settlement purposes we have to think about the prices we are paying for them.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I do not desire to say much but I cannot really follow the argument of the junior member for St. James. This property was advertised for sale before even, as far as I remember, the senior member for St. Michael raised the question in this House. We know that every spot of land in this island which has been sold during the last five or six years has brought a fantastic price and the purchasers are prepared to say nothing because they feel that somebody elsewhere—in Trinidad perhaps—is going to come and give £4,000 or £5,000 or more for them. What is the good, therefore, of remonstrating with the senior member for St. Michael or any other member for saying that the Government should be congratulated on buying this property? I do not think I should repeat what I am about to say now but the senior member for the City has, in effect, said the same thing. I was approached, as far back as November last year, in my capacity not as Chairman of the Housing Board but as a practising Barrister, concerning the purchase of the Bay Estate and the figure which was offered at that time was £50,000; so that when any suggestion is made about that being the price only a week before the question was raised in this House, I can state that £50,000 was being offered three months ago. I cannot see how anybody can be blamed for letting it be known that the Government is buying the property because it is human nature all over the world to make Governments and Companies like Railway Companies pay more for properties than anybody else pays. Lawyers in big countries can always hope to get more money in railway cases than in any other form of locomotive cases and juries are juries whether they be in Alaska or Barbados. I do not see that the Government really deserves any credit for doing what is its duty. Let me tell this Committee this. The owners of the Bay Estate wanted £75,000 for it and the Government beat them down to £65,000; so that the taxpayers have gained £10,000. That is known to more members of the House than

myself. When it is said of the Government, "Oh, you did well but you did wrong to pay so much for it", let it be remembered that the Government had to try and beat the owners down to this price. As regards the Land Acquisition Act, this Government is not going to take the credit for it, but a Bill was drafted during the regime of the last Government with the express purpose of preventing people from hitting the Government when they know that the Government is desirous of buying land. If you will pardon me, Sir, I would like to throw out the hint that later on the House may have to reconsider the Act that was passed to prevent exploitation in respect of land in Carrington Village because the Government has had to object to an assessment on the ground that the price was too high and on a second assessment the price was higher still. Honourable members must remember that as long as greed is one of the chief motivating powers in human conduct, so long will the Government have to pay more for a thing than it is worth. I got up to say that far from the Government having to pay £15,000 more we have saved £10,000 in this transaction. The junior member for St. Philip is entirely wrong to thing that he is a lone voice crying in the wilderness about these fantastic prices which are being given for properties to-day. I thoroughly agree with him, and other members of the Government also agree with him, that they are too high. But when the Government is treating with an owner, what is to prevent the owner from stating, unless he is on an oath of secrecy, that the Government is treating with him for such and such a price? What is to prevent an owner from telling a private individual "I have been offered £50,000; are you prepared to offer more?" and then go back to the Government and state that he has been offered £55,000? Unless the Government is prepared to resort to subterfuge, how can you stop people from releasing a higher price? I am glad for many of the things that are said to-day. I agree with the suggestion of the junior member for St. Michael in respect of the lease of the land for 99 years, so that people can feel that their children and grandchildren will own the houses which they build and I hope that the Housing Authority will adopt the suggestion that that is the way to encourage people to own their homes. I should like to add, in fairness to the Housing Board, that for years the Board has considered that the Bay Estate was absolutely necessary to the relieving of the congestion in Bridgetown but the Housing Board has not been officially aware that the owners were prepared to sell until about three or four months ago. I do not want to appear to be detracting from anything other honourable members are saying but I am very glad that there seems to be genuine unanimity, not only with regard to the purchase of the Bay Estate but with regard to what the conduct of the Government should be in making use of it and what the conduct of the Government should be in purchasing land in the future. I wish to assure the senior member for Christ Church and the junior member for St. Philip that the Government's attitude towards the out parishes is the same as it is towards the City and its suburbs. A Land Acquisition Act will come before this House shortly and I hope that honourable members, just as they are urgent about the improvement in the conduct of buying land by the Government, will pass that Bill within a short time after it is brought to the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not want to prolong this debate but in fairness to myself I must make a few more observations. When I accepted the Chairmanship of the Committee which reported on this matter, my instructions were that the property could be acquired for £50,000. The Committee regarded it as a bomb-shell when they were told that the owners wanted £75,000 and eventually agreed to accept £65,000 under protest because they felt that the Government is being taken for a ride. So when I say that the Government has had to pay £15,000 more than it should ordinarily pay I said it with a full sense of responsibility. Within one week the price went up about 50 per cent. I regret that the senior member for St. Joseph does not agree with me on this point but certainly if, as we have to do in future, we are acquiring not only properties but plantations, it will be far better for us to approach matters with as much secrecy as possible, rather than making a beginning on the floor of the House. The fact that this property was advertised does not mean that it is known that the Government was interested; it could be advertised for five years and nobody would know that the Government is interested. But the moment we come here and give an open cheque to the Government, are we not giving the land sharks an opportunity to offer more? That, I think, is patent. I am hoping that we will acquire several properties and plantations and even sugar factories before this session ends and I suggest that if any honourable member hears of any of these to be sold, the correct procedure, in my opinion, is to go about the matter as quietly and as secretly as possible and only come to this House after everything has been negotiated and settled.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION TOWARDS ERECTION OF NEW PAY WARD AT GENERAL HOSPITAL.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution seeks to grant the sum of £5,063 from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded from loan funds) to supplement Resolution No. 17 of the 13th February, 1945, towards the cost of erecting a new Pay Ward A at the General Hospital.

When the new Pay Ward A was about to be built, the Government made a grant of £3,150 to the Hospital Board to be added to the sum of £2,956 in the hands of the Board from the Austin and Fitz Thomas bequests of £1,000 and £956 respectively and £1,000 from the reserve funds of the Hospital; those make a total of £6,106. This Resolution asks for a further sum of £5,063 which, together with £6,106, makes a total of £11,169. The Hospital Board felt that the amount of money which was being spent for this purpose was rather high, so they had a survey made by the Public Works Department and it was discovered that there was a shortage of approximately 8,000 sq. ft. of timber. They were unable to secure the required sizes and, further, there was a wastage of 30 per cent. of the ten test which was used, owing to certain alterations in the plan. That is the reason why the Board has to come back to the House for this additional £5,063 to complete the erection of the Pay Ward. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. WILKINSON: Excuse me, Sir. The members of the Government expect to be criticised on this and I would not like to disappoint them. Honourable members must have passed by the hospital and seen this building. If this estimate is correct—and I have no reason to suppose that it is not correct—that building will be costing £11,169. My gracious! Can you think of a greater mismanagement of affairs than that? It is supposed to be a ward of a hospital and I have noticed that a very steep and narrow staircase leads to it,—a staircase up which it will be extremely difficult to take a stretcher case. In my opinion

the whole building is the result of a mistake. They made a mistake in the first instance and if they decided to scrap the building and start afresh, it would be cheaper in the long run. That building was being constructed for more than a year and really, Sir, to ask us to vote this £5,063 to complete what, I think, will be an unsatisfactory building is asking too much. I understand the honourable member who introduces the Resolution to say that it has been discovered that 8,000 sq. ft. of the lumber was stolen but I am afraid that that lumber was not the only thing which was stolen and that has resulted in this building costing the sum of £11,169. You, Sir, know something about building and you could never have anticipated that a building of that size would cost £11,169 We want a little more information before we can vote this money. I would like to know whether the Hospital Authorities are satisfied that if this building is completed, it will serve the purpose for which it is intended. From what I have seen, Sir, it does not look at all so to me.

Mr. GALE: Mr. Chairman,—I quite agree with every word that the junior member for St. James has said. I think that it is a scandal to come to this House and ask for £5,063 to complete a building which was originally estimated to cost £6,106. When that building was started, materials were obtainable for very much less than they can be obtained to-day and yet it has not been completed. That wooden structure has been there for nearly two years, unopened and deteriorating rapidly. I do not know who is responsible for looking after the buildings at the hospital but it certainly seems to me that something is absolutely wrong at that institution. A building which was estimated to cost £6,000 nearly two years ago is unfinished to-day and we do not know if the amount which is now asked for will complete it. I think, Sir, that this matter needs an investigation and a lot of explanation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I wonder if any member of the Hospital Board can deny this statement that I am about to make, that is, that this building is nothing but a death trap. Anyone who walks into the hospital premises will appreciate these facts: the tercentenary ward set apart with palatial surroundings to accommodate the higher-up and better-off people in this country,—people who can afford, economically, to pay for treatment in it; then there are the free wards for the people in the lowest walks of life. Now, they have been constructing a ward for the middle class people who have been clamouring for it for years and we are told that 8,000 ft. of the lumber has been stolen or lost or has strayed. I am wondering who is responsible for this death trap and whether the people who are responsible for building it would have constructed it as they have done if they had to be accommodated in it. To think of building a pay ward of that nature for the accommodation of middle class people I cannot find words to express my feeling in the matter. I understand that factory engineers were engaged to build this ward; persons who know absolutely nothing about even building a chattel house were put in charge of the building of this ward. If a proper builder, Sir, had been selected to build this pay ward A, we would have been in a very different position to-day. Like the junior member for St. Michael, I wonder if this amount which is now asked for will complete that building. It is not so stated in the addendum but the junior member for St. John was very frank in telling us that 8,000 ft. of the lumber has been stolen. I want to know something more about that. I want to know whether that timber was delivered at all and whether it was stolen from the hospital premises. What means have been adopted to prevent a recurrence of this shortage? Was there a Clerk of Works on the spot to see the lumber delivered? Has this 8,000 ft. been delivered at all? Has it been stolen from the premises? All those things I would like to know. The construction of this building was started two years ago and it has not yet been completed. Still people who need accommodation at the hospital are being told day after day "No Room" and while this building remains uncompleted, masons and carpenters with whom I come in contact are telling me that they cannot get work. I am not inclined to vote this money to-day, at least not until I have had some satisfactory explanation as to where this lumber has gone and am told who is responsible for this death trap. I am sure that none of the members of the Hospital Board would like to be placed in it if they were ill.

Mr. WARD: I rise to move the postponement of this Resolution because, as the honourable member who has just spoken said, we do not know whether the 8,000 feet of lumber was stolen or whether it has disappeared in the foundation of the building which was being laid for a long time. The people who are responsible for this building will have to give us some explanation before they can push it down our throats that it is worth £11,619 to-day. Most people know that everybody tries to make something out of the Government; everybody tries to steal from the Government if they can. We should have some information as to how much of the materials has been stolen and as to who is responsible for the erection of this building or this shortage of lumber; whether it was delivered short from the store or was taken from the hospital itself. That building in my opinion presents a most objectionable sight to anyone who visits the institution. The people who are responsible for building it have no knowledge whatever of constructing buildings. I, like the senior member for the City, regard it as something similar to a death trap and I feel that a building for the accommodation of sick people should be a very much better building than this is. People are willing to pay for treatment in that ward and I, as a member of this House, am not at all satisfied with the way in which it has been constructed. I am not voting for this Resolution unless I can get some proper information as to why we should vote this £5,063, and unless I am satisfied that it will complete the building. A few weeks ago, there were some buildings belonging to the American people in the market and this same Hospital Board said that they wanted some of those buildings for the purpose of establishing pay wards. I feel that we must get more information in this matter. I move that this Resolution be postponed and I counsel other honourable members to vote for its postponement. We are not experts; we are laymen but even a layman can see that there is something wrong in connection with the construction of this building. Eight thousand feet of lumber has been sucked up by the earth or has blown away; so we want to know where it has gone.

Mr. HAYNES: I rise to second the postponement of this Resolution and I think that other honourable members should certainly support the postponement of it. I have heard a lot of talk about wasting money on the Bay Estate but that is nothing when compared with what has been wasted on this building. This is scandalous. My idea, as regards the postponement, is this: we should have something concrete brought to this House in the near future, that is to say, they

should arrange with a proper builder to finish that building for a certain sum of money and when we shall have voted that money we will know what the completion of the building is going to cost. I am looking to see that not only £5,000 will be required this year but that by this time next year another £5,000 will be asked for to complete that building. I think that if we do not nip this matter in the bud at an early date and pay somebody a proper price to finish this building, we will not know where we stand. This happens to be the second scandalous building that I have had the privilege to discuss in this House. Some honourable members will remember the Cassava Factory, and that when we saw the accounts, the estimate for the erection of that factory was a mere flea bite to what it actually cost. This is the second of such buildings and I am afraid that unless this Resolution is postponed for a rock-bottom estimate to complete this building to be put before us, we will not know where we are. I am counselling honourable members —not that I want to see the hospital suffer because I agree that they need more room—to postpone this Resolution, so that a proper contractor can be asked to submit an estimate for its completion and let us know what we have to spend. I, therefore, beg to second the motion of the senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—It is very surprising to hear such remarks being made by certain members of this Chamber who were in the position, more or less to make suggestions or criticize in the manner in which they do, not only to-day but since the 13th Febuary, 1945, when this building was first started. It is only now we are having criticisms which could have been made at a much earlier date. Is it because they did not consider the interests of the type of patients who will take advantage of the facilities offered in that building? It is because they can easily pay $8 or $10 a day in the tercentenary ward? It would seem that the interests of the lower ones who can only pay 5/- a day are not considered. Unless this money is voted, the building will stay there and rot and a greater loss will be entailed. When the honourable junior member for St. James speaks about this building costing £11,619, he forgets that £2,956 of that amount is in the form of bequests; that is not Government's money. This building was started since February, 1945,—two years ago —and all honourable members on my left, with one or two exceptions, had all the opportunities to censure the Government and yet they said nothing. It is only now we are hearing censures and castigations are being made; so I counsel honourable members to pass this Resolution to-day.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to appeal to honourable members and ask them to realize that they owe a duty to the people of this country. Anybody who takes any interest in the administration or working of the hospital will realize that the position there is very critical. There is absolutely no space available for the accommodation of the present or potential patients. The construction of this building was started more or less under a different Board sometime ago; it was only recently that members like myself had the privilege of assisting in administering the affairs of the hospital; if, therefore, blame is to be attached it cannot be wholly attached to us because the majority of us more or less were not on the Board from the start of the building. I would like to suggest that we pass this Resolution in the interest of the patients who will be glad to be relieved of their mental suffering. As I said before, the hospital has outgrown its capacity to accommodate patients and the longer we stay to pass that money the worse it will be for the people as a whole. I am asking honourable members to view the matter from that angle and support this Resolution. As the senior member for Christ Church has said, if we do not pass this Resolution, the building will be rotting and nothing will be done to relieve the present congestion.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not want to anticipate anything the honourable member in charge of this Resolution may say but I do not suppose anybody in this House can say anything stronger than any other member of the Government may say. I heartily agree with the senior member for Christ Church. Let us pass this Resolution and then have the most searching enquiry imaginable. Honourable members know that this Government is not to be blamed for the state of affairs at the hospital but that will not stop an investigation even though their social and professional friends may be shown up. That is all I want to say. I counsel honourable members in the interest of the middle class who are going to be patients in that building, to pass this Resolution and then I should like to see the most thorough investigation take place even if it reaches the Law Courts.

Mr. WARD: I am not against the finishing of the building but from what we know about this Government as soon as we pass this money that is the end of the matter. I must correct the senior member for Christ Church who said that this Resolution has nothing to do with the Central Government at all and that the money belongs to the Hospital Board. If the idea is that because we want the building to accommodate patients we should spend £1,000,000 and let everybody carry away everything I am not in agreement with that. We should have everything done as efficiently as possible for the Government. Although I would like to seee the building completed I feel that the procedure of voting this money to-day and having an enquiry afterwards is wrong. I feel that if the money is voted, the Hospital Board will laugh at this House and say "We have the money and that is all we are concerned about." I myself am sympathetic towards the patients but a delay of two or three weeks cannot affect them. That building has been left unfinished for almost a year and they have now come for this money to complete it. I feel, Sir, that we should postpone this Resolution for two or three weeks at least and get more information in this matter. As the senior member for St. Andrew has said, they may come back for another £5,000 and say that this £5,000 cannot complete the building. We cannot take their word; let us have the enquiry before we vote this money.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Nothing will be gained by postponing this Resolution even for two minutes, to say nothing of postponing it for three weeks. I am going to read from a letter from the Hospital Board. dated 16th July, 1946, on the subject of their application for the grant of the additional sum which is needed to complete the construction and equipment of the new Pay Ward "A". It states inter alia:— "When the proposal for the erection of the new Ward was considered Messrs. Law and Connell advised the Board to construct the building of timber as the construction of stone would necessitate heavy expenditure on the foundation on account of the nature of the ground at the site. The sketch plan of the building in timber had been prepared at the Board's request by a member of the Town Planning Department of Development and Welfare in the West Indies and on this plan Messrs Law and Connell estimated the cost of the building at £4,500 and undertook to prepare working drawings and supervise the construction for 7 per cent of the total cost of the building." Well you

have heard who constructed the building; that it was constructed of timber purchased from lumber merchants in Bridgetown and that a member of the Town Planning Department drew the plan.

The letter goes on to state:— "The reasons given by Messrs Law and Connell for the increase of the cost from £4,500 to £8,500 are stated in my letter of the 29th May, 1946, and in addition to these reasons, it appears that the original estimate was inadequate."

As soon as that was discovered, the Hospital Board had the Public Works Department make a survey of the building and this is what the Assistant to the Colonial Engineer says:—

> "A careful survey has been made of the building, drawings, and quantities of materials used and this survey discloses that
>
> " (1) There is a shortage of approximately 8,000 sq. ft. of timber. This figure is arrived at after making allowance to cover the reducing of large timbers and bolting together of small size timbers owing to the difficulty of obtaining specified sizes. For example, R & S siding had to be cut from undressed boards, the rabbit and spring was done by hand labour at an additional cost of £144 (labour only) and the difference in material lost through this one unforeseen difficulty amounted to 2,000 sq. ft. of board.
>
> " (2) Ten test. The inability to secure required size sheets has resulted in a wastage of 30 per cent. There is a collection of ends which cannot be used in the completion of the work.
>
> " (3) Alterations to the original plan include (a) enlargement of the kitchen, (b) the removal of the office to the west verandah, (c) a dormer roof to accommodate the gear for a lift. The framing for this lift has been constructed but the open spaces have now been closed with pitch pine floor. (d) the provision of concrete tile covered floors in six rooms (tiles for which have been purchased), (e) alterations (a), (b), and (c) were made after the original plan had been carried out and necessitated shifting of two partitions and alterations to floors &c.
>
> "(4) Foundations of piers. The actual cost of building 42 piers and of flights of stone steps is £524. 16. 4. This, in my opinion, is expensive."

I do not think there is anything else I need say. What I have just read to you was submitted by the Public Works Department and they are prepared to complete the construction of the building for the money which is now being asked for.

Mr. WILKINSON: When did the Public Works Department submit those figures?

Mr. CRAWFORD: In September last year.

Mr. WILKINSON: Those will be all wrong now. Any honourable member knows that figures given in September last year are out of the question to-day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Whether this is a legacy handed over to the present Labour Board or not I would resign if I were a member of it. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, the Hospital Board allowing engineers to tell them that the reason why they should not construct this building of stone is because the foundation would be too expensive! Imagine a person talking about expense where the health of the people is concerned! If it was suggesed that it was impractical to have laid a foundation on that site, I could understand a statement of that sort but to tell me that it would be too costly to lay a foundation is nonsense. Honourable members of this Board seem to forget that we have the right to criticize. Now, Sir, 30 per cent. of the ten-test has been wasted. Imagine that! Well, a Board which could allow an engineer to advise them that it would be too expensive to lay a foundation for a building and then waste 30 per cent. of the ten test purchased are, in my opinion, fit inmates for the mental hospital. I am serious about this. I am glad that the junior member for St. John has pointed out how much is paid to the firm of engineers who constructed this building because 7 per cent. is not too much to pay for the drawings and supervision of the work. Before I decide to vote for this Resolution I would like to know whether these same engineers are going to complete the building, whether it is going to be run under the same administration and whether there is a likelihood of more lumber being stolen. Now the work is not finished and later on we may be told that this 7 per cent. is included in the total cost of the building. I want the members of the Government to tell me whether that is going to be so or not.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I will read another paragraph of the letter from the Hospital Board. It states: "Messrs. Law and Connell have agreed to charge for their services only 7 per cent. of the original estimate of £4,500 and including this charge, their estimate of the cost of completing the building is forwarded herewith." Messrs. Law and Connell will be paid 7 per cent. of the original estimate, not of the entire cost and, as I have said already, the work is to be completed by the Public Works Department and not by Messrs. Law and Connell.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—I cannot agree that this Resolution should be passed to-day. It is a blatant effort on someone's part to swindle the Government. Now, Sir, to say "Go ahead; take this money", we are more or less saying to the person who is responsible "You are O.K.; you are free." The senior member for St. Joseph has suggested that we investigate afterwards but I am suggesting that to do so would be putting the cart before the horse. What we should do is to have the investigation now, find out who is responsible and it may be that we may not have to grant this sum of money at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is no use hiding the fact that the state of affairs which has been revealed is unsatisfactory. I am glad, as has been pointed out by the senior member for the City, that it is appreciated that this is a legacy to the present Labour Board who inherits it. A case has been made out for an immediate investigation and I counsel honourable members to agree to the postponement of this Resolution. Public money is not found in the streets. Nobody is saying that the Resolution should be rejected because the building has to be completed. Either we are, by inference, suggesting that we are in collusion with the situation or we are going to be willing to agree that the matter be postponed and have a fuller investigation.

Mr. SPRINGER: Let me make a last appeal on behalf of the poor, unfortunate citizens of this country who need beds at the hospital. It is all right to make academic statements about having an investigation but let us take into consideration firstly the needs of the population. Every bed in that hospital—pay ward or otherwise, is occupied. If we increase the capacity of the pay ward we automatically release more beds for poor people as well as paying patients; therefore, let us have this building finished if we are not against its completion. It will

take several months to have an investigation and it is all very well to say that the building has been there unfinished for several months, and that, therefore, a further two or three weeks' delay will make no difference. It is open to the House to pass an Address to the Governor demanding an enquiry, if they like, and I would welcome such a step but let us pass this Resolution to-day to enable the Hospital Board to complete the building. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that the Chairman do now report the passing of one Resolution and ask leave to sit again is put and resolved in the affrmative without division.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. COX in each case, the Resolution that is passed in Committee of Supply is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A).

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business. I should like to say that I merely intend to attempt to finish the consideration of the Resolution with which we were dealing this morning.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be suspended in order to resume Government Business.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

AUDITOR FOR SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I leave the Chair, I should like to inform the House that an Auditor has to be appointed for the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. An Auditor is appointed annually as soon as possible after the beginning of the Bank's financial year. The Bank's financial year began in July last year, no Auditor has yet been appointed and the Bank's Report will be dealt with shortly.

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that some member of the Bank should make a motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the matter has not got to be settled to-day, I can make enquiries and come prepared to deal with the matter next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a matter for the House.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment took place, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment, we were considering a Resolution to grant the sum of £5,063 from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded from loan funds) to supplement Resolution No. 17 of the 13th February, 1945, towards the cost of erecting a new Pay Ward at the General Hospital. The honourable senior member for St. George was speaking.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman,—I was making an appeal to honourable members to the effect that whatever decision is taken about the desirability of an enquiry being made, all we have to decide to-day is whether we agree that this building should be finished or not. If we are going to have an enquiry, we can pass an Address here and now calling upon the Government to have the enquiry; but I do not think that we would be justified in delaying the completion of the building because it is greatly needed. It is true that several months have passed since work on the building was stopped, but there has not been any unnecessary delay. When the Hospital Board approached the Government giving certain information, the Public Works Department was asked to make a survey and give an estimate. As a matter of fact, the estimate given by the Public Works Department was higher than that given by Messrs Law & Connell on behalf of the Board. Further than that, only last week we had the estimate made by the Pubic Works Department confirmed by the Colonial Engineer, and, in his opinion, it should be adequate for doing the work. Further delay of course would probably mean that the estimate will have to be increased. However much honourable members may be of the opinion that the building should be scrapped, I counsel them to vote for the passing of this Resolution to-day. If, on the other hand, honourable members are dissatisfied with the work of the parties concerned in respect of this building—and I think that none of us at all is satisfied with the parties responsible for doing a good job—let us pass an Address calling upon the Government to appoint a Committee of Enquiry. Of course, that will mean that certain people will be held up—rightly or wrongly is a matter of opinion—to public opprobrium, and if they deserve it, that should be done. I conclude as I began: in the interest of the patients who are in an overcrowded building, I say let us finish this building as soon as possible if we are going to finish it at all. I would like to emphasize that it has been decided at the request of the Hospital Board, I think —I am not sure as to whether it was a stipulation by the Government—at any rate it has been agreed that the work is to be finished by the Public Works Department which has a staff which is supposed to be capable of doing work of this sort.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I cannot agree with the last speaker that we should have an enquiry after paying out the money; I think that we should have this enquiry before paying out the money. This is money from a legacy, and it is a criminal matter that has been spent as it has been spent. If we refuse to pass this Resolution to-day, we are not throwing out the Resolution; it will be censuring the Hospital Board, something which they deserve. Some of the members of that Board are new members, others are old members and they should take their licks as men.

Mr. SPRINGER: I do not like to make replies to speeches of this sort. The honourable member says something about censuring the Hospital Board, but he is quite wrong. I have a certain sense of loyalty to Boards to which I belong, and I am not going to stand in public and condemn the running of the Board. The enquiry can be carried out, and I am confident that when it is carried out, the members of the Board will not be held in any way responsible by the public. I cannot say any more than that. I would like to re-

mind the hon. member that if and when a vote is taken, it will not be a vote of censure on the Board. If an Address were passed calling for a public enquiry, I think that the honourable member would be sorry because some of his friends would be hurt. When it comes to the question of censure, the Board has the right to defend their character, responsibility and efficiency, at least. When the honourable member talks about censuring the Board, of which I am a member, I should like to ask him to place the blame where it belongs. I am contending that these two things are not bound together; if we agree that the building should be finished and that the enquiry should be made, we have not got to finish the building after making the enquiry; we can do both things in the proper order. If, on the other hand, the argument can be followed that we should decide to spend this money only after the enquiry has been made, then the honourable member is right. However, I cannot see how the result of the enquiry can decide whether we should finish this building for public use or whether we should leave it half finished. Whatever be the result of the enquiry, the spending of this money is for the benefit of the public.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: After listening to the honourable member, I think that an enquiry is more necessary. He seems to know something that should come out in public. I think that this Resolution should be postponed until we have this enquiry.

Mr. WARD: I feel that it was the duty of the Hospital Board to make an enquiry, if they knew that something was wrong, before they came to the House to ask for this money. If the Board feel that something is wrong, they should give the House the opportunity to ask that an enquiry be carried out.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am not suggesting that there has been any defalcation or anything of the sort; I say that certain people who hold themselves up to the public as professionally competent would probably prefer not to have too much of a fanfare about examples of their incompetence. There is nothing that an enquiry would disclose in general terms that has not been mentioned by the honourable junior member for St. John. It would more underline, accentuate and spread to a wider number of people what has been stated simply by the honourable member. That is the only purpose that it could serve. When the Hospital Board heard that the money was overspent, they called for an enquiry as to the cause of the overspending and the facts were told. Mr. Clarke, the contractor, was there and he made an estimate as to the amount of lumber there and the matter was reported to the Government. The Board asked the Public Works Department to give an estimate and they did so. We also had an estimate from Messrs. Law & Connell. The estimate given by the Public Works Department was greater than that given by Messrs. Law & Connell, and the Board asked the Public Works Department to finish the job. An enquiry will not disclose any more facts, but it will show the people who are to be blamed. In my opinion, it is more in the interest of the colony that the blame should remain where it is. When the honourable senior member for St. James talks about censuring the Board, he is going too far in the circumstances of the case. The honourable senior member for the City said that the Hospital Board should not allow people to cut up ten/test and lose 30 per cent of the stuff, but that is beyond the functions of the Hospital Board or any other Board. We have had estimates prepared by persons who hold themselves out to the public as professional persons in this line of work; we are told that we have to make a choice as between wood and stone; the professional people tell us that the building should be erected of wood, and what is the ordinary laymen to do but decide that they are going by the experts? If it has turned out that the experts were wrong, how are you going to say that the Board were wrong in following the experts? After a certain lapse of time, it is reported that the money has run out and the building is not finished. The Hospital Board were not supervising the erection of the building; we have people who are getting 7 per cent. on the job. How is the Board so negligent or criminal by placing confidence in the people who are doing the job? The enquiry would show up those people. As far as the question of the cutting up of the material is concerned, I say that it is not any part of the Board's duty to supervise the work; that is not the duty or the power of any Board. No one would go over the heads of a body of professional experts to count the sheets of ten/test ceiling and decide whether the carpenters or supervisors were given proper instructions; that is not the function of the Board, that is the function of the experts. If we have chosen the wrong experts, I submit that that is an offence that should be forgiven. If people hold themselves out to the public with prestige as experts and we accept them as others have done in the past, we hardly think that we should be blamed when we find that they are not as competent as they profess to be. Unfortunately we were faced with this position, but we have done all that we could have done in the circumstances. When we were presented with the original proposal, it was reasonably supported by people who should know their jobs; and when we were informed that the money was overspent, we could only find out what the position was. The deed was already done. We have not gone back to the same people; we had a contract with them, and they have said that they do not want it any more and we have now to decide whether the building should be finished or not. We are unable to pay another set of experts; we may not have any confidence in them. The position is that we either finish this building or we do not finish it. I counsel honourable members that there should not be any delay. The facts have been given; the whole course of the business has been outlined as fully as it should be, and if there is any specific item that can be given, we will give it. If there is any information that cannot be supplied, and it is essential information, then there would be a case for delay. On the whole, a vote of censure is not businesslike; I ask honourable members not to say, "I will postpone this Resolution because I have decided on postponing it." Let us take a statesmanlike view of the problem. We, as a Board of Directors of the island, should consider whether it is in the interest of the people of the island or not that we should have this building; we should decide once and for all whether we should have it or not. If it is necessary, then let us finish it; if it is unnecessary, then let us get rid of it as soon as we can.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have a very high regard for utterances made by the honourable senior member for St. George in this House, but I am not convinced one bit by his arguments. I quite appreciate his loyalty to the Hospital Board. I should like to say that, as far as I am concerned, the postponement of this Resolution is not censuring the Board. My idea is, as the honourable senior member for St. George has intimated, that an enquiry into this matter should serve a useful purpose other than exposing people. When I was elected here, I was elected with the definite understanding that if it were necessary to expose things, they would have to be exposed. Whether the people concerned are Messrs. Law & Connell or anyone else, if a proper investigation means exposure, they must be exposed. Certain enquiries were made and it was discovered that there was a shortage of material as has been mentioned by the honourable junior member for St. John, to the amount of 8,000 feet. What I would like to know is whether the honourable senior

member for St. George can assure this Committee that after finding out that there was a shortage, the Board took steps to discover how this shortage came about. They have found out that this 8,000 feet of lumber———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A certain explanation was given for this shortage of material. Whether that explanation is not sufficient——

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am worried about is this, Mr. Chairman: if the honourable senior member for St. George can tell this Committee that, after making an investigation, the Hospital Board were quite satisfied that this material went as a result of the cutting up, I would immediately decide to vote for the passing of this Resolution. The honourable member has told us that they made certain investigations; but can the Board tell us here and now that, as a result of the investigations they have discovered anything that would cause them to say to Messrs. Law & Connell "Your Contract or Agreement is now null and void, we will not pay because you are responsible?" After all, we are voting the taxpayers' money to carry out this job. I quite appreciate that an enquiry will expose somebody. We are not holding any enquiry if the Board are satisfied that they should not go any further. What I would like to find out definitely is whether this 8,000 feet of material went as a result of bad cutting or whether it was actually stolen. Who is responsible for it? After all, we have been told or it has been represented to us, that Messrs Law & Connell are actually paid 7% for the supervision of this work. If they are paid 7% for the supervision of this work, somebody ought to be responsible for the material which is ordered, and surely in a building of this size, 8,000 feet of lumber is too much to talk about its going in shortage. Mr. Chairman, the Hospital Board or Messrs. Law & Connell should be able to tell us that they have done so much in the circumstances as to satisfy this Committee in voting this money. You may go as far as to say that Messrs. Law & Connell are responsible for the state of affairs because they have broken their Contract. The enquiry may reveal that this firm was responsible for seeing that the material was there. My voting for the postponement of this Resolution is not censuring the Board, and I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. George should regard it in that way. It is merely satisfying this Committee that the money is being well spent. We are not satisfied that the money is being well spent when we are told that 8,000 feet of material has been missing and nobody has been prosecuted for it.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I would like to say that the Colonial Development and Welfare Department must have been fairly satisfied with the explanation given them, because they are going to pay this money. We are advancing the money but it is to be refunded by them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is that a correct statement? In other words, we are being told that the Colonial Development and Welfare Department has advanced this money, and it does not make any difference; we can vote the money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the Committee for the postponement—

Mr MOTTLEY: I am just making an enquiry the honourable junior member for St. John has made a statement, and it must be a statement of fact. He is responsible for the introduction of this Resolution. and I am certainly entitled to know about this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is at liberty to answer or not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I take it that I have the right to ask also.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I quite agree, and so has each honourable member.

Mr. BLACKMAN: What I have said is in the Resolution. I may be mistaken as regards the Colonial Development and Welfare Department, but it is stated in the Resolution that this money is to be subsequently refunded from loan funds.

The question that consideration of this Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in a "tie", nine honourable members voting "Aye", and nine voting "No".

The division was as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—(9).

Noes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs SMITH, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, TALMA and Mr. SPEAKER—(9).

The CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in a "tie", nine honourable members voting "Aye" and nine voting "No." I should very much like to vote for the postponement of the Resolution; of course, there is a peculiar Rule to which I do not at all times intend to adhere, but the conditions that exist must remain. I think that the ventilation of a case of this sort has done a tremendous lot of good, and I intend to vote that the Resolution be not postponed. The question, therefore, has been resolved in the negative. The question now is that this Resolution do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SMITH, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, TALMA and Mr. SPEAKER—9.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question has been resolved in the negative, nine honourable members voting "Aye", and ten voting "No." The Resolution is not passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

The House resumed.

APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR FOR SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—With reference to the question which Your Honour raised earlier to-day in connection with the appointment of Auditor for the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, I would like to say that I have got in touch with the Manager of the Bank and he says that it is within the purview of the House to make that appointment. I beg to move therefore, that Mr. C. K. Pile be appointed as Auditor for the Bank for the ensuing year.

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion which was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE BATHSHEBA—LAKES VILLAGE ROAD

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion at Question Time, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew was speaking on the Replies given him to his Questions No. 2 relating to the construction of

certain roads. Honourable Members who have already spoken are as follows:—The honourable senior member for St. Andrew (Mr. Haynes), the honourable senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Ward), the honourable junior member for S.. Joseph (Mr. Smith), the honourable junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Gale), the honourable junior member for St. James (Mr. Wilkinson), the honourable senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Adams), the honourable senior member for St. Philip (Mr. Crawford), the honourable senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Cox) and the honourable junior member for St. Peter (Mr. Ramsay). The honourable senior member for St. Andrew was replying when the time for the consideration of Questions expired.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—In continuing my Reply, I would just like to say that there is no use carrying this matter any further. The matter has been ventilated as far as the House is concerned, and I think the feeling is that the Government should realise that this road is necessary for the island. In the circumstances, we are relying on the member of the Government who is in charge of matters relating to transport to bring up this matter before the proper authorities and get this road started. As I have already said, the talk about not having equipment and so forth is "bally-hoo". Since this debate started, I have had a talk with the overseer in charge of the St. Andrew group of roads; I presume that he would have to look after this road, and he said this: "I am a young man who is willing to show myself, and I would be only too glad to undertake the supervision of this road and show that I can make a good job of it." Apart from that, the parish of St. Joseph has written to the Colonial Secretary offering their two rollers, Inspector, Supervisor and the labour force so as to assist in putting this road in order. Under these conditions, I do not see any reason for any further delay in the construction of this road. I am hoping that my words have not fallen on deaf ears and that the matter will receive the immediate attention of the Government. I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to withdraw his motion. If there is no objection, the honourable member will be granted leave.

Mr. SPRINGER: I raise a formal objection merely to say something which I wanted to say last week. Mention was made of rollers being available, and I have been asked to say on behalf of the Department of Highways and Transport that all the rollers could not be used because of the absence of spare parts; and though honourable members might have seen rollers in the yard of the Department, all of them are not fit for service. I beg to withdraw my objection.

The objection having been withdrawn, the honourable member was granted leave to withdraw his motion.

SCARCITY OF STANDPIPES IN ST. JOHN

Dr. WILSON: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss the Replies given to my Question No. 12. The Questions were:—

1. Is Government aware of the scarcity of Stand-pipes in several Districts in the Parish of Saint John?

2. If the answer to the above question is yes, when does Government propose to take steps to remedy this situation? Particularly in respect of certain districts such as Cliff Cottage, Belmont, Venture, Edgecliffe, Moores Land, Gall Hill, Welch Village, Roebuck Street and St. Marks Churchyard.

The Replies are as follows:—

1. Yes.

2 The Electric and Hydraulic Engineer to the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies is now examining a comprehensive scheme for the improvement and extension of the waterworks. As soon as his recommendations are received, the scheme will be submitted to the Legislature for consideration. This scheme includes districts in which the Government have received applications for additional standpipes or extensions of mains up to the 5th of May, 1946. The Commissioners of Health of the various parishes were also asked previous to that date to make any recommendations for fixing standpipes which they considered necessary in their respective parishes. These recommendations are included in the scheme.

In the proposed scheme, the districts of Cliff Cot, Belmont, Venture, Edgecliffe, Moore's and Dr. Gill's land are included. Gall Hill, Welch Village, Roebuck Street and St. Mark's Churchyard will now be considered for inclusion in the scheme.

First of all, I have to thank the Government for the interesting Replies which they have given to my Questions, interesting because of the fact that the Government has been taking some interest in the improvement of the water supply not only in the parish of St. John, but in the island as a whole. I would, however like to emphasize this point; the people of St. John have been suffering great hardships for a number of years, having to walk for a mile in some cases, in other cases two miles, in order to get to the nearest standpipe. Since the Government has not been emphatic as to the time when they expect to receive the recomendations referred to in the Replies, I am expressing the hope that the Electric and Hydraulic Engineer will soon complete his examination and submit his Report to the Government. It is stated in the Replies to my Questions that this Engineer is now examining a comprehensive scheme for the improvement and extension of the waterworks. I would like to suggest to the Government in view of the fact that there is a scarcity of water, that this Engineer be requested to redouble his efforts so that he might be able to get through his work in good time. I again thank the Government for these Replies.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second the motion. In view of the fact that the water supply is very short, I feel that the Government is not acting fairly to the Island. (Mr. ADAMS: We should pray for rain). In certain districts in St. Lucy there has not been any water for the last three weeks. What I feel should be done is that the Government should see that water is supplied in a district at least two or three times a week, because it is very hard that people in certain districts in St. Peter and St. Lucy have to walk for a distance of three or four miles before they can get water. Recently it has been announced by the Government that no water must be used for purposes of watering gardens, but water is not as scarce as they want to make out. Only recently people have been using water for the purpose of watering school gardens and people could not get any water to drink. On many estates the people had to be given water to drink and the water was not even clean. The policy of the Government is a wrong one: we are Barbadians—not Russians—and I think the Government should send water in those districts every other day or two so as to alleviate the suf-

fering of the people. Some of these people I repeat, have to walk for three or four miles in order to get water to drink. In my opinion, it is a most ridiculous state of affairs.

Mr. COX: So far as this question of water is concerned, there is a very appalling state of affairs existing in this island. Before I go any further, however, I would like the honourable senior member for St. Lucy to realise that the blame for this state of affairs cannot be attached to this present Government. I think that each and every member of this House knows the type of Government which we have had for all these years.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: It being now 3.30 p.m. of the clock, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ORDER POSTPONED.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the motion for the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor requesting him to take steps to nationalise the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation Limited. On the last occasion, a motion was made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip (Mr. Garner), seconded by the honourable junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Gale), that further debate on that motion be postponed. If those honourable members want to speak to-day, the honourable junior member for St. Philip has the right to speak now, and after him, the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

ST. MICHAEL'S PARISH LOAN BILL.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—As it seems to me that this Order is going to be rather controversial, no less so is the next Order, I am suggesting that Order No. 3 be made the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member will have to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Order No. 3 under Private Members' Business be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. GALE seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City.—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the Parish of Saint Michael in this Island to raise a loan not exceeding £8,000 to purchase a property for the establishment of a home for the accommodation of the destitute and orphan children of the said parish.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—The principles underlying this Bill are well known to honourable members. The bill seeks to allow the parish of St. Michael to raise a loan not exceeding £8,000 for the purpose of establishing a home for destitute and orphan children in this parish. For the past twenty-five years there has been a cry for the establishment of such a home. The stage has been reached to-day when there is such an onrush of social legislation, that no one can attempt to find any reasons why such a home should not be established. The necessity for this home must be apparent to honourable members as they go through the parish of St. Michael from day to day. A Committee of the parish of St. Michael was set up under the Chairmanship of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, and after going very thoroughly into the matter, and after inviting representatives from all the other parisnes, it came to the conclusion that the establishment of this home was a necessity, and although it was on parochial lines, it would have the tendency to serve the island. Associated with this Committee were His Lordship the Bishop and several other representatives of the various religious denominations. It was felt that while the parish of St. Michael was establishing this home, there would not be any objection to admitting destitute children from other parishes as long as they paid for them *per capita*. I feel that hon. members should have little difficulty in passing this Bill. We see to-day the necessity for taking off the streets these uncared-for and destitute children, and therefore we can see the necessity for a home of this sort rather than have a number of children placed in a Reformatory which carries a great stigma on them in later life. In the St. Michael's Infirmary there are quite a number of children whose parents are unknown, and those whose parents are known are definitely incapable of caring for them. It is felt that the rearing up of these children in these surroundings cannot be conducive to making good citizens of them, and therefore, the Vestry of St. Michael, after going very carefully into the matter, have presented this Bill asking the House to allow them to borrow a sum not exceeding £8,000 for the purpose of establishing this home. Perhaps honourable members would like to know the site for the proposed home; I agree that in a Bill of this nature honourable members should be told where and in what locality such a home will be erected. It was felt that this home should be erected within the suburban area so that when children are taken in, they can be within easy reach of schools and industrial centres where they can be taught trades and so on. The Committee comprising His Lordship the Bishop and representatives from other parishes together with members of the Vestry of St. Michael, visited several sites and ultimately selected a site at Black Rock and acquired estimates and plans for the erection of this home. I do not think that I could give honourable members much more information than I have given them, and I ask honourable members to support this Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GALE: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion. As Churchwarden of the parish of St. Michael in 1939-40, the conditions under which children have to live at the Almshouse were forcibly brought to my attention. The quarters are very cramped, and the children have to be near the grown-up people. At that time I brought up the question of having a separate building erected at the Almshouse for the accommodation of the children. After the matter had been carefully gone into, it was found that there was not enough room at the Almshouse on the site where we intended to erect this building. The builders told us that the foundation was bad, and that it would be very costly to erect a building there. I can say that there is a great need for a building of this sort. There are many children at the Almshouse, and it is not a nice thing for their welfare that they should be kept among the older diseased people at the Almshouse. The parish of St. Michael has decided to take this step and I hope that the other parishes will join with us in a short time and let us have a central institution for the care of these children. If the parish of St. Michael makes a start in this direction and the other parishes see their way to support it, whatever building is erected can be easily added to, and it would be very much better to have a central building for housing the poor children who

would be very much better looked after, than to have them in the Almshouses in the different parishes. Again, I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. GARNER: I wish to support this Bill today. I can well remember that the Churchwarden of the parish of St. Michael invited the various Vestries to send representatives to take part in the discussions in connection with this matter. I think that this is a very praiseworthy and laudable step inasmuch as it is proposed to take off the road many boys and girls who, perhaps, would be driven to poverty and crime if there was no place for them. There are many children in the Almshouses; some of them are there because of ill-health, some are there because they have no proper home and others are there because they are orphans. The building of this home will relieve a lot of hardship. To my way of thinking, there could be nothing better than to separate the children at the Almshouses from the grown-ups who are there in a very sad state. Some of them have wasted their days and the children will grow up in a bad environment if they are not separated from these people. I think that if we have this home under proper supervision, it will make these children become better citizens; it will remove them from around that atmosphere which will make them feel that they are the children of paupers. I think that they should be placed in a home where they will be associated with other children of their age so that they can move around more freely. I think that this Bill should be readily supported; the children of the poor, unlike those of the wealthy, have not got certain amenities of life, and by means of this home we can cater to them and help them to get away from the Almshouse atmosphere, and give them the feeling that somebody is looking after them. Many a boy and girl who have been committed to the Reformatory had to be sent there because there were opportunities for committing crimes, and if this home is there, the numbers at the Reformatory will automatically be reduced. Those of us who are most fortunate should protect the unfortunate and whoever thought of this idea can well be congratulated in making a move of this sort; because, as I understand the position, not only will the parish of St. Michael benefit from this scheme, but the other parishes also have the option to share in it if they pay so much *per capita*. That is a good idea. In the parish of St. Philip we have quite a few boys and girls in our Almshouse, and I am sure that it does not show very good grace to have them among the aged and incapacitated people. It is not a good thing that these children should be brought up among these people, and if, in time, these children can be placed in the home which is built primarily for children, I am sure that that will help them to become more useful citizens. I am sure that this is not a controversial matter: this Bill is a social measure and it seeks to remove what will otherwise be a certain percentage of crime on the street. It will also remove a certain amount of inferiority complex. I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Until the honourable senior member for the City spoke, I had some fears in connection with this Bill. When this suggestion was mooted some months ago, it seemed as if many persons wanted to confine the scheme to the parish of St. Michael. I am delighted to hear not only that this is not so, but also to hear the honourable senior member for the City speak of the possibility of taking in neglected cases, and even cases in which children may be removed from the Reformatory Schools. It is a strange coincidence—perhaps it is not so strange—that in reviewing the final draft of the Report dealing with the Government Industrial Schools, I stopped at the point where we are going to make a recommendation by means of which, if and when this children's home comes into being, there should be two-way traffic. That is to say that in this proposed new children's home, there will be some refractory cases. I am hoping that the Government will confer with the authorities who are responsible for the running of this new home, and that there will be agreement whereby not merely the neglected child should go to this home but also the refractory child might perhaps go to what is a completely new type of school to deal with these cases as unfortunate, and not as criminal cases. There is nothing more that I can say except to rejoice that the Committee which is dealing with this matter has been so broad-minded and far-seeing in the proposals which it is going to make with respect to the inmates of this home. I would like to make a suggestion, if I am allowed to do so, that just as the other parishes can contribute to this home, the Government can also contribute to it in consideration of taking small children from the Reformatory Schools; and doubtless on their part, they would be prepared to extend the principle beyond just members of the Vestry of St. Michael to include Government representatives or representatives of social welfare in this island, and also, I have very little doubt, representatives of the country Vestries who would be furnishing some of the money. I suggest that, but it might be superfluous; it might have been already dealt with. It does seem that we are entitled to praise ourselves both from the point of view of the Government and private members that at last we are getting some measures of social reform on the Statute Book.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am very glad indeed to welcome a suggestion of this sort, but I want to throw out a warning to the honourable senior member for the City. He has struck what is to me a very discordant chord. We are too often prone to decide public business in a private manner. We should not beat about the bush. The honourable member has suggested that this home should be erected at Black Rock; why Black Rock? That is the wrong approach to Government business; when we are going to do Government business, we should not pick out any particular spot. We want the best possible spot. I have in mind land which is most ideal from all standpoints. The honourable senior member for the City has wisely said, and I am in agreement with it, that representatives of other parishes have been consulted in the matter instead of deciding public business on their own. It is a wonderful idea to bring the various waifs and strays and destitute children from all the parishes, and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has thrown out a beautiful suggestion. The honourable member has suggested that the Government should contribute to this home. I advise that they do not buy any land in Black Rock; let the Government give them a piece of land at the Pine Estate. (A MEMBER: What about the Bay Estate?) The Bay Estate is too near to Bridgetown. A home for destitute people must not be near the City. A boy or girl may get away, get lost in the street and something may happen. You can carry them to Wildey, give them ten acres of land and the project can be self-supporting. They can go to church or to school at St. Barnabas or St. David's. I say, "Do not buy any land at Black Rock"; I hope this Committee has not committed itself to buying land there. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has suggested that the Government should contribute to this scheme, therefore let them give us some of the Pine Estate. We can plant agricultural stuff like yams and potatoes, and I repeat, the project can be self-supporting. The children can keep fowls also and so on. I suggest that this building be erected at the Pine and that it be erected on the extension system. We are going to have some negligent people, people who do not want to support their children, and we want to build on

this system. Let us lease the land at the Pine from the Government for 999 years, erect the building there and let us hold the money which we would have spent in buying the land for the purpose of building on a wing, or church or something like that. Do not let us buy any land at Black Rock. I repeat; let the Government give us land at the Pine free, gratis and for nothing. (Cheers.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I gave the honourable member a lot of latitude because I gave it to the honourable introducer of the Bill: but there was much said which is nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I realise that it was outside the point of the Bill. In reply to the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I would like to say that there was absolutely nothing done in any private way. How can anybody suggest that, in this Bill, there was anything done privately when I say that a petition has been forwarded from the Vestry of St. Michael asking this House for permission to borrow this money for the purpose of establishing this home? How can the honourable member say that this matter is being done in a private way when I have mentioned that besides His Lordship the Bishop, members of the Vestry of St. Michael and representatives of the other Vestries formed the Committee which surveyed the parish of St. Michael and eventually selected a site for the erection of the building? The Assistant Social Welfare Officer also visited this site, and nothing is being done in any private way. Whatever is done——

Mr. SPEAKER: What the honourable member means is that the matter should have come from the Government. I think he means that rather than that it was a private matter.

Mr. RAMSAY: I accept that explanation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not give it that interpretation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that that is what the honourable member means.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is all well and good if he means that. It is a fact that we consulted the Assistant Social Welfare Officer, Miss Arne, in the matter, and before there was any selection of the site, Miss Arne also visited the various places in the parish of St. Michael. Apparently the honourable junior member for Peter fails to realise that there is a Church in Black Rock much nearer to this site than St. Barnabas is to the Pine, and there is also good sea-bathing in Black Rock.

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

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GALE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY in the Chair.

On a similar motion, the Preamble was postponed.

The twelve Clauses of the Bill, the two Schedules and Preamble were read and passed, the word "June" being inserted in the blank occurring in Clause 4 and Schedule "A."

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GALE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

On motions of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GALE in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS *Re* COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO HEAD MESSENGER AND LIBRARIAN OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to give notice of an Address to His Excellency the Governor.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of the following Address to His Excellency the Governor:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to provide that the Head Messenger and Librarian of the House of Assembly be paid a Cost of Living Allowance as from the 1st day of April, 1946, at the rates set out in the following Schedule:—

SCHEDULE

Rates

On the first	£100	of	salary	or	part	thereof 40%
„ „ second	„		„		„	„ 30%
„ „ third	„		„		„	„ 25%
„ „ fourth	„		„		„	„ 20%
„ „ fifth	„		„		„	„ 15%
„ „ sixth	„		„		„	„ 10%

I should also like to ask leave to move for the passing of this Address this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to deal with this Address this afternoon. If there is no objection, the honourable member will be granted leave. There being no objection the honourable member may proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have been assured by the Auditor-General that we should have passed an Address in connection with the Cost of Living Allowance for the Head Messenger and Librarian of the House of Assembly just as we have done in connection with the Official Reporter of the Other Place and the two Official Reporters of the House. It is with that object that I am moving the passing of this Address. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

The Address was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to present this Address.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 25th day of February, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 25th day of February, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House was accordingly adjourned to meet on Tuesday next, the 25th day of February, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.