

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 15th, 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. F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, C. E. TALMA, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., and V. C. GALE.

After prayers Mr. S. A. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 8th July, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Colonial Treasurer his Financial Report for the month ended 30th June, 1947.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — I have the honour to present a Message from His Excellency the Governor which reads as follows:—

Message No. 23/1947.

His Excellency the Governor
To

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to transmit for the information of the Honourable the House of Assembly a copy of a Despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the subject of Closer Association between the British West Indian Colonies. The Despatch, together with the Memorandum referred to in paragraph 13 therein and other relative documents, has been published in

a White Paper, copies of which will be presented to the Honourable the House of Assembly as soon as sufficient copies are received.

2. In the meantime His Excellency the Governor would be glad if the Legislature would consider as soon as possible the selection of three persons to represent Barbados at the Conference in accordance with the request contained in paragraph 4 of the Despatch.

3. His Excellency the Governor has been notified by the Secretary of State that the Conference will open at Montego Bay, Jamaica, on or about Thursday, 11th of September.

HILARY BLOOD,

Governor.

Government House,

Bridgetown,

15th July, 1947.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Report on the breakdown of the electrically driven bore-hole pump at the Belle Pumping Station.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of £45. 2. 11. at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee as a refund to the Ministry of War Transport of passengers, maintenance, etc., of Regimental Sergt-Major W. S. Cameron and his wife and child in connection with their return journey to the U.K. at the expiration of his contract with the Barbados Volunteer Force.

Mr. ADAMS (On behalf of Mr. CRAWFORD): Resolution to place the sum of £75,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the following purposes:—

- (a) to meet the cost of extending the runway at Seawell Airport, of reconstructing that portion of the runway which is now unfit for use, and of constructing a road around the end of the runway when constructed;

- (b) to meet the cost of a scheme for levelling the area known as Constitution Swamp and expenses incidental thereto;
- (c) to make grants to the Commissioners of Highways of parishes;
- (d) to meet the cost of constructing and repairing access roads to and on the Pine Plantation;
- (e) to meet the cost of engaging staff on contract for periods not exceeding 3 years in order to supervise these and other schemes of capital works.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the Executive Committee.

Mr. SPRINGER: Bill to amend the Clerical Service Act, 1944 (1944-27).

Mr. ADAMS: 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.

Mr. TALMA gives notice of a Bill to amend the Solicitors' Act, 1896—6.

Messrs GARNER and WILKINSON enter the House and take their seats.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting:—

Is Government aware that certain lands, part of Harrison's Plantation in the parish of St. Lucy, are now being sold?

2. In view of the proximity of this Plantation to Selah Boys' School will Government take prompt steps to acquire a portion of this land, to provide adequate play grounds for the pupils of this School?

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting:—

1. Whether the amount collected by way of taxation on motor spirit has more than doubled within the past five or six years?

2. Whether the amounts collected on motor vehicles of all descriptions have been also substantially increased?

3. If the answer to (1) and (2) above are in the affirmative, will Government take the necessary steps to reduce the taxation on motor spirits by at least three pence per gallon, so that some relief can be afforded to the ever increasing masses of the travelling public?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, a Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, a Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the Executive Committee is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, A Bill to amend the Clerical Service Act, 1944 (1944—27) is read a first time.

COMMITTEE TO REVISE RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— Before the Orders of the day are called I ask leave to move for the appointment of a Committee to enquire into and make

recommendations as to the necessity for amending the Rules of Procedure of this House.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that a Committee be appointed by Your Honour to consider the necessity for and to make suggestions as to amendments to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Procedure of the House of Assembly.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that a Committee be appointed for the purpose mentioned above is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I appoint the following members a Committee for the purpose:— The senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Adams), the senior member for St. George (Mr. Springer), the senior member for St. Philip (Mr. Crawford), the junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker), the junior member for St. James (Mr. Wilkinson), and the junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Gale). I shall associate myself with this Committee.

MR. SPRINGER ADDED TO SEATING ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to add the name of the senior member for St. George (Mr. Springer) to the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the seating accommodation of visitors and the better acoustic properties as well as other improvements to the Chamber. The honourable member was on a Committee appointed for the same purpose on a previous occasion.

BARBADOS GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee on the Bill to make provision in relation to the Barbados General Hospital.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to move that Clause 13 be re-considered.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 13 be re-considered is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman,—When the Clause was being considered at the last meeting certain amendments were moved. These amendments have been considered by the Government and I now beg to move that Clause 13, as printed, be deleted in order to substitute an amendment which the Government is prepared to accept as follows:—

"13. (1) The Chairman shall summon a meeting of the Committee at any time at the request of the Medical Superintendent or within seven days of the receipt of a requisition signed by any three members and shall do so at least once in every three months.

"(2) Such requisition shall state the object for which the meeting is required to be summoned."

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 13, as printed, be deleted and the words proposed by the senior member for St. George be substituted therefor is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that Clause 16 be now considered.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 16 be now considered is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPRINGER: In this case the question that gave us some trouble was whether the Clause, as worded, would fit in with the existing practice of payment

of fees for medical treatment at the hospital. The point was that doctors' fees normally are paid into the office but they are not paid into the Treasury. As the Clause is at present worded, all fees, including medical fees, would be paid into the Treasury — which would cause some delay in getting it back out to pay to the doctors—and in order to deal with the problem I beg to move that the words "on account of the Government" be inserted after the word "received" in line 1 of this Clause.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,— I beg to accept that amendment.

The question that Clause 16, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

RATES OF INCOME TAX BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of income tax for the year 1947 and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the laying of the said tax.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Honourable members will be glad to hear and to have read that the Government does not propose to increase the rates of income tax this year (Mr. BRANCKER: Shame! what about the incomes in the higher brackets?) That is not to say that the Government may not increase the rates, if that is the point that is worrying the junior member for St. Lucy. But honourable members will know, as well as the Government knows, that until we have a thorough fiscal survey, it is inadvisable to change the rates which have, so far, stood us in good stead during the war years and, in spite of some objections in the Press, have shown that previous Governments have been sound in their finance when one considers the possibility, perhaps even the probability, of what is euphemistically called a recession in trade but which the more realistic members of the community call a depression. The rates, as honourable members will see, are the same as last year's and I do not think it is necessary for me to do more than to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that despite the various schemes and various projects for creating employment and for causing Barbados as a whole to appear more attractive to tourists and to be more sanitary, yet the fact remains that the balance in the Treasury is fairly substantial. There are so many people out of work and the cost of living has gone up to such a great extent that one can hardly think that the present Government would not have seen fit to allow the average man and woman a reasonable amount on which to live, apart from taxation of any kind whatever. How can £150 a year be regarded as a fit and proper sum on which the average man or woman can live?

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to point out to the honourable member that this is a Bill to fix the rates of income tax.

Mr. TALMA: Yes, Sir; it is all wrapped in one.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point you are raising does not form part of this Bill.

Mr. SMITH enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. TALMA: I appreciate that point but this is probably my only opportunity of commenting on a matter of that sort. The Executive Committee, Sir, could have sent down something supplementary whereby the whole income tax system could have been changed and the average man or woman would be granted more than £150 on which to live.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in discussing that point.

Mr. TALMA: Well, Sir, I can approach it from another angle. The rate on the first £100 should not be 9d., as set out in the schedule but should not be 3d. My contention is that £150 is not a fit and proper amount on which to live and I hardly think it is fair and equitable that anyone who is in receipt of £150 should have to pay 9d on each pound. I regard these rates as being excessive, more especially those in the lower brackets. I regard the rate of 9d. on the first £100 as being excessive, exorbitant, and unreasonable because to-day the cost of living has gone up to such an extent that anyone working for £500 a year is underpaid and hardly able to pay any income tax at all.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and agreed to.

Clause 2. (1) Subject to the provisions of sections nine, ten and eleven of the Income Tax Act, 1921 and of any other enactment with respect to the rates of tax on companies and on persons who subscribe any policy of insurance (other than life) in and for the year nineteen hundred and forty-seven the graduated rates of tax set forth in the Schedule to this Act shall be the rates at which income tax shall be raised, levied, collected and paid to His Majesty, his heirs and successors for the use of this Island.

(2) On every complete pound of taxable income in each of the grades to which the different portions of any income are respectively assignable there shall be levied and paid a sum of money equal to the rate of tax appropriate to such grade.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that that be clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. GARNER: My opinion is that these rates begin from too low. I feel that the cost of living has gone up considerably and that a man who happens to work for £100 or £200 or £300 really should not be rated because it would require \$5 to do to-day what could be done with \$1 before. I thought that these figures would have been revised and a different scheme put before us but we have the same old system and the cost of living has gone up tremendously. I do not think that these rates are proper, not with the cost of living what it is to-day. For instance, it is stated in the schedule that the rate on every complete pound of taxable income beyond £100 and up to £200 shall be 1/3. I think, Sir, that is too high. A lot of people who are made to pay taxes cannot pay them; they are really working for the money but the cost of living is so high that they cannot save anything to pay taxes.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the honourable member to reserve his remarks until we get to the Schedule. Clause 2 really does not refer to the schedule.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3. Where the amount of tax properly payable by the taxpayer is less than five shillings such taxpayer shall be required to pay five shillings in discharge of his liabilities to tax.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that that be Clause 3 of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SCHEDULE.

RATES OF TAXATION UNDER THIS ACT.

On every complete pound of taxable income up to £100 at 9d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £100 and up to £200 at 1s. 3d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £200 and up to £400 at 2s. 3d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £400 and up to £600 at 3s. 3d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £600 and up to £800 at 4s. 3d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £800 and up to £1,000 at 5s. 3d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £1,000 and up to £2,000 at 7s. 3d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £2,000 and up to £2,500 at 8s. 9d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £2,500 and up to £5,000 at 11s. 0d.

On every complete pound of taxable income beyond £5,000 at 13s. 6d.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that that be the schedule to the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—On the second reading of this Bill I attempted to make a few points which are relevant to the schedule. The rates which we have before us to-day happen to be similar to those which were laid by what I understand to have been a Conservative Government and not by the present Coalition Labour Government; so the position to-day, Sir, is that a poor man who has an income of £150 per annum is being taxed on that income. In one breath you hear from well-known labourites that £150 per annum or \$60 per month is not regarded as a living wage and in the same breath you hear that people who receive that amount of income should be taxed; that is very inconsistent. This government has given its employees who are in receipt of \$80 per month a cost of living bonus with one hand and is taking it away with the other hand. These rates do not make sense as far as incomes in the lower brackets are concerned; they do not sound as good finance or good economics. If an employee who receives \$80 per month is, in the wisdom of the Executive Committee, entitled to a cost of living bonus, it stands to reason that something is wrong in the laying of these rates. I cannot conceive that anyone who is in receipt of \$60 per month can pay income tax; not to-day. It may have been all right years ago but certainly not to-day when the cost of living has gone up to such an extent. With those few remarks I beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed, in the hope that the Executive Committee will fix better rates than are contained in this schedule.

Mr. ADAMS: Before any other honourable speaks I desire to correct the implication which the remarks of the honourable member who has just sat

down may have formed in the minds of honourable members. These rates are levied on taxable income, not gross income. A single man who is working for \$80 per month pays \$9.00 and a married man with no children pays nothing until he is working for \$300 a year, in which case he pays \$9.80.

Mr. TALMA: These statements by the Leader of the House are misleading. A single man who is working for \$60 per month does pay income tax.

Mr. ADAMS: If a single man's gross income is £200 a year, he pays £1. 17. 6. A married man with no children pays nothing until he gets £300 a year and then he pays \$9.80. A married man with two children pays nothing until he is working for £400 a year, in which case he pays \$12.60.

Mr. WILKINSON: I agree with the senior member for St. Joseph that although some of us would like alterations in this schedule, it cannot safely be done until we have the whole financial position of the island examined. I thoroughly agree that nothing should be done in this respect until we get a financial report on the island of Barbados. Some honourable members, as the senior member for St. Joseph said, seem to forget that this schedule is to be read along with the Income Tax Act. These rates are levied only on taxable income. A man with an income of £150 a year pays nothing, although perhaps to the casual observer it would appear from this schedule that a man with £100 a year pays 9d; that is not so.

Mr. GARNER: I am going to second the motion for the postponement of this Bill because I believe the rate on incomes from £5,000 a year upwards should be 19/6 in the £ and that incomes of £100 to £400 should not be rateable at all. Let the tax be collected from the bigger fellows. A lot of people are burnt because it is known where they are working and what they are working for but a lot of other people in private life do not pay what they should pay and as I said before, a shilling can only purchase to-day what could be purchased with 6 cents before.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is seconding the motion for the postponement and, therefore, should state his reasons for the postponement.

Mr. GARNER: I may be a little dense, Mr. Chairman, but that is what I am doing.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of denseness; it is a matter of stating your reasons for the postponement.

Mr. GARNER: As I said before, I believe that those whose incomes are in the higher brackets should pay a much higher rate so that those in the lower brackets, at least up to £400, should not have to pay anything at all. These rates were in operation for many years and now that the cost of living is so high I think that the Executive Committee will do well to revise this schedule and send it back to us in a form which will enable us to vote for it.

Mr. MAPP: Speaking generally I think that the Government has done a wise thing in leaving these rates as they are for the present.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed. The honourable member's remarks will be either for or against the postponement. The question is that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

Mr. MAPP: I was saying that I think the Government is doing a wise thing not to tamper with these rates until a fiscal survey is made. I myself would like to see such things as unearned incomes taxed at

a higher rate than earned incomes. I too would like to see a system of surtax in operation whereby incomes of £5,000 and upwards will pay possibly 16/- or 18/- in the £ but you cannot make such proposals without going into the actual figures and that is what the Government tells you it is doing; it is awaiting a complete survey of our financial resources before making any change in these rates and I think that that is a wise thing to do. I would like, however, to throw out the suggestion that on the next occasion when the rates are before us, some difference will be made between earned and unearned incomes and a surtax imposed on incomes in the higher brackets.

The question that the schedule stand part of this Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of this Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

Dr. CUMMINS enters the House and takes his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed I want to hint to the Committee, especially the members of the Government, that it is my intention that the Resolutions should be taken as they appear on the Order Paper, unless leave is obtained to deal with them otherwise.

ADDITIONAL PUMPING MACHINERY AND MAINS FOR WATERWORKS DEPARTMENT

Mr. ADAMS: It is the duty of the House to obey blindly the ruling of the Chair (Laughter). I, therefore, ask leave to deal first with Resolution No. 3 in Committee of Supply.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution is for £5,000 to provide for the purchase and installation of additional pumping machinery and mains for the Waterworks Department and for expenses incidental thereto. Honourable members will see that the addendum is full and that all necessary information is contained therein. I am sure that they will be very anxious to pass this Resolution quickly because, as they must have observed from the notice that appeared this week-end, the fact that the rains have intermittently come does not warrant the Waterworks Department to relax in any way the regulation about watering tennis lawns, cricket grounds and so on. It is essential that we get this machinery as quickly as possible. We have been instructed that it is necessary to notify the Crown Agents immediately, otherwise we may not get this machinery and I, therefore, suggest to honourable members to pass this Resolution speedily. I do not know that I should say anything more, except to say that some of the criticisms of the Government and of the Waterworks Department which have appeared from time to time as regards this last occurrence has not been wholly justified, especially the reference in the Press to the terms of reference to Mr. Roddam and to his having to go outside of them. It is only fair to say that whatever

Mr. Roddam did, he did after consultation with the Government and however much I may sympathize with the desire of honourable members occasionally to criticize previous administrations and the Waterworks Department I do not think that any criticism of anything in connection with this incident is justified; it just happens to be one of those things which we cannot foresee. Even machinery will occasionally break down. I have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second the motion and I would like to take the opportunity to contradict a misleading statement that has been made in otherwise responsible quarters. It has been said that the Government was using this electric pump and had no stand-by; that is not correct. The electric pump at the Belle is, in fact, a stand-by pump and has been such for some time but owing to the fact that Bowmanston's water supply practically gave out this season, it was necessary to use both pumps at the Belle continuously and naturally there was no further stand-by. As we cannot tell how long the Bowmanston supply may persist in this condition and as we know that it will not be less than two years, probably longer, before the new machinery for Bowmanston and the other places arrives, the purpose of this Resolution is to provide now a stand-by for the present dual pumping arrangements at the Belle—something we could not possibly foresee in the past.

Mr. GALE: Mr. Chairman,—I think that all the members of the House will welcome this Resolution and pass it speedily. We know what we suffered a few weeks ago as a result of the other pump breaking down and we are very pleased indeed to see that the Waterworks Department is not allowing grass to grow under its feet but is making every effort to try and see that the situation which existed a few weeks ago does not occur again. I hope, as I said earlier, that this Resolution will be passed speedily.

Mr. COX: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I am not opposing the Resolution but paragraph 2 of the addendum states this:—"The recent breakdown of the electric pump was due to the wearing of the shaft bearings, as has been ascertained from the manufacturers, to the inferior quality of war-time materials and not to any negligence on the part of the supervisory staff." Well, it is strange that the manufacturers sent this machinery to this country knowing that it was of an inferior quality (A MEMBER: Who says so?) and did not warn the Waterworks Department as to the quality of this machinery. I, Sir, am not prepared to accept this after that has happened. If there was no notice or warning given before it happened I might agree to this but I really do not agree to it and, further, I feel that there should have been some extra bearings kept in stock so that if any of those which were in operation were worn out they could be easily replaced. I really do not agree to this excuse in this paragraph 2. Water is a very necessary item and I think that greater care should have been taken, not only from the manufacturers' point of view but from the point of view of the Department, to see that these bearings were well oiled and that spare bearings were kept in stock. I think you will find that garage proprietors keep spare parts, so that a part can be easily obtained if anything goes wrong with a motor vehicle and a similar thing should have been done in connection with this pump at the Belle.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to hint that we are very fortunate in being able to get this machinery.

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

EX GRATIA GRANT TO THE CASHIER IN THE G.P.O.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution which has been before us for some time now is for the sum of £78. 2s. 6d. to make an *ex gratia* grant to the cashier in the General Post Office in respect of an amount of money which was stolen from her. I have explained this matter fairly fully already but I will briefly say what the position is. The cashier keeps the money that she is using for the payment of Money and Postal Orders in a drawer under the counter which has its own key. On her left is a table on which is kept a tray for money that is to be sent to the country branches. The cashier goes to the safe which is outside the cage, opens it, takes out the money to be sent to the country branches, locks the safe and puts the money in the tray on the table which is provided for that purpose. Two clerks then check the money which they put in a bag, seal the bag and go and register the money. That is the system that has been followed. Before the clerks came for this particular sum of money the cashier had occasion to leave the cage and she locked it taking the key with her. On her return she found that the money had been carried away. The matter was reported at once to the Police and the Criminal Investigation Department has stated that it is an outside job. Some people think that it is an inside job but I, as the representative of the Government, have to say what our Police Authorities say, that is, that it is an outside job. I have visited the place myself and I have seen that it is possible for the theft to have been committed from outside, when nobody was in the room. We must remember that the Assistant Cashier was at breakfast at the time and nobody was in the room. As I said, there are some people who believe it was done inside but even if it was done inside, this cashier does not employ the clerks in the post office; the Government employs them and if the Government has a clerk inside that is carrying away money from another clerk, surely that is not this cashier's responsibility. Whether it is an inside or outside job, it cannot be possible to put the responsibility on this cashier and, therefore, I feel that the amount should be refunded to her. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—I have listened to the honourable member but through no fault of his I could not hear all that he had to say. On the last occasion this matter was postponed for further consideration and it was explained that the reason for the postponement was that it should be referred back to the Executive Committee to see if they would withdraw this Resolution and substitute one for the refunding of the whole amount because we accepted—at least I accepted—the assurance of the junior member for St. John, an assurance which I understand him to repeat to-day, that there is absolutely no blame at all to be attached to the cashier in respect of this loss. If that is so—and we have to accept it, coming as it does from the official spokesman of the Government—if absolutely no blame can be attached to this lady in this particular matter I cannot see that we will be justified morally in not refunding the entire amount. If she is to some extent at fault, then by all means refund her only 50% of the amount; that is my attitude in the matter. I do not see on what grounds the Government, having regard to its explanation through its spokesman, can justify their action in refusing to refund the whole amount and bearing in mind the decision of the majority of this House to send this Resolution back to the Executive Committee for them to reconsider the matter and refund the whole amount. I do not know if the Government feels that the

House would not vote the whole amount and that, therefore, half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. For that reason I am going to support this Resolution to refund half of the amount and my attitude is governed by the explanation which has been given. We hear it stated all around "All the information has not been given. Why is the Government not disposed to refund the whole amount? Is it that the Government feels that this cashier is, to a certain extent, to be blamed or that it is an inside job?" But I really cannot pay attention to these rumours in the light of the explicit, unconditional unqualified statement of the junior member for St. John that there is absolutely no blame to be attached to the cashier. I am still of the opinion that if that is so — and I have no reason to doubt it, despite the rumours we hear—we should support this Resolution for half of the amount, inasmuch as the Government has not sent down a Resolution for the full amount.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Like the junior member for St. Lucy I expected really to hear something more from the junior member for St. John in the matter. I do not believe any other member of this House could put it as strongly as the junior member for St. John has done and this is exactly what he says: On investigation, they have discovered that this lady actually locked the cage; in short, she did everything humanly possible to secure this money but that the expert has told the Government that this is an outside job. Well, if that is the admission by the Government, namely, that everything possible was done by this cashier to secure this money and on the expert advice it has come to the conclusion that the money has been carried away by some person or persons outside, how can we reconcile that statement by the mouthpiece of the Government with the Resolution before us which states "to make an *ex gratia* grant to this cashier"? Something must be radically wrong, if the Executive Committee believes that it is true that this clerk did everything possible to secure this money and is still going to make her pay half of the amount. If the Executive Committee really and truly believes that this clerk did everything possible to secure this money, then it would be its duty to come here and say "Pay every cent and not half of the amount." I am not convinced. The junior member for St. John said that he visited the place and saw the possibility of this money being taken from outside; therefore, if all the facilities at the disposal of this clerk have been used and still this money has been taken away, it strikes me that it would certainly be the fault of the Government and not the clerk; in that case, something, in my opinion, is being hidden when the Government refuses to refund her the whole amount. I find myself unable to vote for this Resolution as it stands. I repeat that I would vote for the refund of every cent of this money on the statement of the junior member for St. John that this cashier did everything possible to secure this money. I regret I cannot support the Resolution; it is not logical.

Mr. TALMA: I am still in favour of voting this sum of money. I regard the Government as being contributorily negligent in this matter in that there was not a safe inside the cage in which this clerk could have locked the money. I am saying that the Government has been very slack in providing proper office equipment. The lady has no safe in the cage; if she had a safe in the cage she would have put the money into it and locked it. The Government needs to bring all its office

equipment up-to-date; all the old office furniture which has been there for fifty years or more should be dumped and modern equipment provided in the offices.

Mr. SPRINGER: I just want to make it clear to the junior member for St. Lucy and the senior member for the City that the expression by the junior member for St. John about negligence on the part of the Government is his own personal opinion. I seconded the motion for the passing of this Resolution and I began by saying that this is a sympathetic vote. I made it very clear throughout that the Government has not sent it down as a matter of government policy. The Government feels extremely uncomfortable about it and it is a matter for the House whether it is going to agree to the Resolution or not. I have never taken the view—I can only speak for myself—that the lady concerned is entirely free from negligence but I do not propose to debate that any further. It would appear that two or three members who insisted on the last occasion upon this Resolution being referred back to the Executive with the view of having the amount increased have now reached the stage when they do not propose to vote anything at all. Let us stop talking over the matter and vote one way or the other.

Mr. WILKINSON: The senior member for St. George made the remark that this is a sympathetic vote but I am afraid that he should not use the taxpayers' money for purposes of sympathy. I am not yet satisfied that this is either an outside or an inside job. The position, it seems to me, is this. Certain Heads of Departments are decided that it is an inside job. I cannot believe that somebody would jump over the counter between the hours of 11 and 12 in the daytime, go over the cage and take away this money without being seen by anybody. I do not think enough emphasis has been laid on the fact that this cashier has a drawer in which she could have put this money and locked it; therefore, I do think there is some negligence on her part. We should not establish a precedent by passing this Resolution.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The senior member for St. George said that what I stated is my own personal view; it is my personal view. But I am not the only member of the Executive Committee who holds that view. There may be differences of opinion among the members of the Executive Committee just as there are differences of opinion among the members of this House. I feel that every cent should be refunded to this cashier and I am not the only member who feels that way.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not want to prolong this debate but I should like to say this. Even twins differ and there has never been a Cabinet or Executive Committee or Executive Council on which all members see eye to eye; so that when a Cabinet or an Executive Committee in its collective wisdom sends down a Resolution to the House, it is asking the House to pass it because, as the junior member for St. James has put it, Heaven only knows whether this is an inside or an outside job. It may have been negligence on the part of the cashier not to have locked this money in the safe and to that extent the Government says that she has not done everything possible and decides to refund her half of the amount. A member of the Post Office staff has informed me that on some previous occasion he has seen a boy standing in a queue with a bit of wire pushing it through the cage trying to pull out bank notes and that when he was spoken to he walked calmly away. When you hear that, it is quite possible that a very

nippy fellow could have taken away this money from outside. I appeal to the Committee to pass this Resolution as it stands.

The question that this Resolution do now pass is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, COX, SMITH, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, and Mr. SPEAKER—11

Noes: Messrs. MOTTLEY, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—4

Mr. FOSTER enters the House and takes his seat.

LOAN TO THE BARBADOS CRICKET ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for the sum of £5,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making a loan to the Barbados Cricket Association (Incorporated) towards the rebuilding of the pavilions at Kensington Oval. Honourable members, I am sure, do not need to hear the ancient history of the destruction of the pavilions at Kensington Oval by fire nor of the attempts by the Barbados Cricket Association to get these pavilions rebuilt with money obtained from the public of Barbados and from the cricket loving public of other West Indian Colonies. Every Barbadian, I think, is a cricketer—actual or potential—or even an umpire of the game. We all feel that this is not a matter of politics but is a matter, if I may use so elaborate an expression, of national pride. It would be disgraceful if we, who have a reputation second to none in the British Empire for loving the game of cricket, were to see an M.C.C. team fail to come to Barbados because we did not have pavilions to accommodate them and the sporting public. It is perfectly true that it may have been said—I, too, openly confess that I have been among the number who said it—that the wealthy members of this community who are erstwhile cricketers ought not allow this Association to reach the stage of having to ask the Government for a loan but having said that, I do say that we must face reality. If these gentlemen have other calls on their purses and are not prepared to put up money as a gift or even as a loan to the Cricket Association to rebuild these pavilions I think we ourselves, as a Government, should do everything possible to encourage every kind of sport, more especially the national sport of the Barbados public. Honourable members will note that the Executive Committee is making this loan conditional on a similar sum being raised by public subscription; that is, on the pound-for-pound or dollar-for-dollar basis. That obviously, as honourable members will see, is done with the object of encouraging those responsible for collecting funds to rebuild the pavilions, to do their utmost to get as much as they can from the public. If the Government is willing to lend £5,000 on the condition that they collect £5,000, obviously they will be more energetic than if that condition were not attached to the loan. There is at the present moment no suggestion that any interest should be charged on this loan and I do not think that any honourable member will object to that because it is really for the good of the island generally. I hate to use the word "prestige" but the prestige of the island demands we should not let so binding a sport as cricket between the different islands of the Caribbean, between the outside world and ourselves, die for the sake of a loan of £5,000 by the Government. I say

that in passing, not that I think honourable members need that as a spur to vote this money. It is noteworthy that even a South American Republic recently voted, by our standards, a large sum of money as an outright gift for the encouragement of sport in that Republic and, therefore, it is not too much for us in a place like Barbados to ask members of the Legislature to vote for the granting of a loan of this nature. As honourable members will see from the addendum, so far £3,936 has been raised by voluntary subscription and since the Cricket Association made this appeal to the Government, they have made a further special drive to raise that sum to £5,000. Before I sit down I would just like to say that if there is any doubt in the mind of any member of the public outside as to the position of the Cricket Association and the control of these grounds, Pickwick Club have these grounds only by special lease and at any time the Barbados Cricket Association can call on the Club to hand them over when tournaments are about to take place; so that the Cricket Association has given the assurance that any responsible body like the Amateur Athletic Association can have the use of these grounds if and when they desire to hold athletic and cycle sports. If, therefore, honourable members have any doubt that these grounds are for the sole use of the Pickwick Club, they may remove that doubt from their minds. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the Government itself may have some voice in the control of the grounds as participants with the Barbados Cricket Association. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GALE: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution. As the senior member for St. Joseph said, cricket is the national game. We know how much the public of Barbados looks forward to tournaments with teams from other colonies and especially to a visit from an M.C.C. side, and Kensington Oval to-day is the only cricket ground that can be used for such tournaments. We must remember that Kensington is known throughout the world where cricket is played and we want Barbados to be proud of these grounds and the accommodation which we have to offer. Again, we hear a great deal of talk about social welfare, and games and I think that it is right that this Government should help to rebuild these pavilions in order to be able to carry on the great cricket tradition at Kensington. Before I sit down I would like to pay tribute to two great cricketers who really helped to put Kensington on the map. I refer to the late Sir Harold Austin who was former Speaker of this House and the late Mr. L. T. Yearwood who was also a member of this House, both of whom were responsible to a great extent for Kensington Oval belonging to the Barbados Cricket Association to-day and for the grounds being enclosed as they are at present. Through the generosity of those two gentlemen Kensington Oval is what it is to-day. I do not think it is asking too much of the Government to grant this loan to rebuild the pavilions.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I do not consider that the Government has gone far enough. Cricket is the national game in the West Indies and I fail to see why a millstone of £5,000 should be put around the pauper's neck, because the Barbados Cricket Association is a pauper. In order to be able to repay this money in ten years, the Association will have to charge people higher entrance fees to see cricket, otherwise they cannot raise it to pay back. If this Government to-day advances this sum of money by way of a loan to the Cricket Association, it will only mean that the Association will eventually go back to it and say that they cannot pay it back. Why, therefore, put this millstone around the Association's neck?

It is only a waste of time. This should be a free gift. All forms of sport, including sports for even the children of the elementary and secondary schools, are held at Kensington Oval. It is practically our national park and I do not consider that this millstone of £5,000 should be put around the neck of the Cricket Association. I think the Government should make this amount a gift and not a loan.

Mr. TALMA: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring these points to the attention of the Committee. Barbados has always boasted of its cricketers in bygone days as the Leader of the House mentioned a few minutes ago. To-day, the ones who play cricket are usually drafted from the poor class; so to expect Mr. George Challenor or some other wealthy cricketer in this island to put his hand in his pocket and pay for the rebuilding of the pavilions at Kensington is unreasonable. When, therefore, a Resolution such as this comes before this Committee, what we have to realize is that we are doing something to encourage the playing of cricket in this colony and are at least allowing Barbados to present a proper front to strangers when they come here to indulge in certain forms of sport at Kensington Oval. The man in the street has nothing to subscribe to this building fund but with a loan like this he is contributing his share by way of the taxes which he pays on the food he eats and the clothes he wears. This loan, therefore, is not out of order and, in my opinion, instead of its being a loan it should be a gift to the Association.

Mr. GARNER: I am sorry that I cannot see eye to eye with the member who has just sat down. Cricket, they say, is the national game and, as I know, some very wealthy people play the game and it is a shame that those people are not kindhearted enough, are not philanthropic enough as to give this money to maintain the status of the game; that is how I feel about it. There are many small cricket clubs all over the island and the members of those small clubs have to get money as they can in order to keep them going. If Kensington belongs to the Big Six, why should they not contribute this money and not ask the Barbados Government to lend it to them? It looks absurd to me that the people who possess so much wealth cannot contribute some to provide sporting facilities for the young people of this colony. It is something bad to come here and ask us for this money to make a loan to this Cricket Association.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the honourable member's attention to paragraph 3 of the addendum which states that the Association has so far raised the sum of £3,936 by voluntary subscription.

Mr. GARNER: I read that, Mr. Chairman, but this loan does not bear any interest and God knows if it will ever be repaid. I cannot do anything about it but I am only voicing my opinion and stating my views in the matter. I think it a shame that the wealthy people who play cricket, who indulge in the game of cricket should let a Resolution like this come before this House when there are so many other things to be done in the interest of the people. For instance, we have no auditorium in this City where poor people can go and listen to a little music freely. What is wrong with the people of this island who make money? What are they going to do with it? Can't they give away some sometimes instead of displaying that spirit of holding and grabbing all? I read the remarks of the Chief Justice in which he made the statement about so much crime going on and I have the answer for that. These small fellows who are coming along see the big fellows grabbing and they are trying to get some too; that is what it

is. Let us start a crusade; let the ones on top let up a bit; give a little bit here and there and you will see how it spreads as leaven leavens the whole lump. I am going to vote for the Resolution but I am only saying that it is bad that there are so many wealthy people in this island and they would not contribute this £5,000. As a matter of fact the Association should get £15,000 by way of cheques from these wealthy people. It is a shame. I register my protest but I am going to vote for it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—What Lord's and Wembley mean to England, what Adelaide and Melbourne mean to Australia, what the Yankee Stadium means to the United States of America, Kensington Oval means to Barbados. The junior member for St. Philip struck a good note when he referred to the small cricket clubs which play on the village greens but the goal to which their members look forward eventually is Kensington Oval; that is the place where they want to show their worth and we have crystal proof of that in Everton weekes. He started to play cricket as a member of one of these small clubs and to-day he is among the first flight of West Indian batsmen. When the honourable member speaks about an auditorium I should like to remind him that we can only do one thing at a time. There are many other things which should be done and I do not think that any of us will live long enough to see done all the things that are necessary to be done, human life being what it is. We have to decide this Resolution on its merits. As regards the past, while it is true that people who played cricket in the past were rich, many poor ones are playing it to-day but they cannot provide the money to keep the game going. Cricket is the main sport for which the Cricket Association is seeking this loan but cricket is not the only sport which is indulged in at Kensington Oval. When we remember Douglas, the cyclist, Lynch, the quarter miler, Cyrus, the high-jumper, and the feats which they performed at Kensington Oval we must repeat and say that it is really our national field of sport and that it is used by the public as a whole. A world's cricket record was recently broken at Kensington Oval—I believe it was the first world's cricket record that was broken there—and a poor taxpayer gave his only fowl cock in appreciation of that feat. Until we learn to appreciate efforts such as these, we will never be able to see matters of this sort in their true perspective.

Mr. BRANCKER: I share the view of the junior member for St. Philip that this is essentially money that should be contributed by the well-to-do. Just as we read of the Challenors and the Austins in the past, to-day we read of the Goddards and the Peirces, people of financial standing in the community, but it seems to me that the wealthy people of to-day are not pulling their weight as the well-to-do people did in years gone by. The Senior member for St. Joseph rather anticipated the point that was causing me great anxiety when he said that there was no danger that these grounds will be solely for the use of the Pickwick Club but I feel that this Club which, I understand, claims to be exclusively Aryan may expect certain privileges which other Clubs in this island may not have, as far as Kensington Oval is concerned. I did not fear that they would take all these pavilions for themselves and say that the general public may not enter but I was fearing—and I am still to a certain extent of that feeling—that Pickwick Club may exert a certain amount of authority over these pavilions when they are erected, whereas other Clubs may be debarred

from using them. If the House votes this money and something goes wrong with the Spartan and Empire pavilions, we hope that Pickwick Club will understand that Spartan and Empire Clubs would make use of these grounds during the time that their pavilions are out of repair; that is the only way in which this Pickwick Club will understand that this is not for their exclusive use. This loan is asked for in the name of the Barbados Cricket Association but unfortunately the Association is erecting these pavilions on grounds which are leased by the Pickwick Club. So, Sir, let them understand that so far as this House is concerned we have no interest at all in the Pickwick Club; it might go out of existence as far as we are concerned. It is purely from the standpoint of providing facilities for the holding of tournaments at Kensington Oval that we are voting this money. As the junior member for St. Michael said, cricket is the national game. Every Barbadian likes to play or watch or talk or hear about it, so by all means let us provide the facilities. The only unfortunate thing is that we are providing those facilities on premises which are leased to the Pickwick Club and if plain words are not spoken to-day, they will attempt to have dominion over them.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to say that Pickwick Club has no authority over the pavilions erected by the Cricket Association. Pickwick Club has its own pavilion at Kensington Oval and when one pays a fee to enter the Oval one goes into the Association's pavilions. The Club has absolutely no control over the Association's pavilions.

Mr. ADAMS: There is just one further point I would like to make, in case it is said that it was not brought to the notice of this Committee; it is this. Kensington Oval is owned by the public of this colony, not by the Cricket Association or the Pickwick Club. It was bought by public subscriptions and vested in Messrs. Norman Leacock, George Challenor and A. S. Bryden as trustees. I may say that Pickwick Club had the first option of buying the land but they gave up their option on the condition that the trustees lease the grounds to them with the knowledge that the Barbados Cricket Association could take the Oval over whenever there is to be an intercolonial tournament or a visit by the M. C. C. or a sports meeting by a responsible body like the Barbados Amateur Athletic Association. So do not let the idea go abroad that the Cricket Association owns Kensington Oval; it is really as much public property as Queen's Park.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE *re* LABOUR COMMISSIONER'S CHIEF CLERK'S COURSE OF TRAINING.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £107 to be advanced from the Treasury (to be subsequently refunded as a free grant under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act on the terms and conditions stated in the Message from the Honourable the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor dated the 14th December, 1943) to supplement Resolution No. 39/1946 to cover the cost of a course of training in the United Kingdom for the Chief Clerk of the Labour Commissioner's Department. The Secretary of State for the Colonies fixed the subsistence allowance for this officer at £1 per day and it is pointed out that it was enough. I have never in my life seen a more detailed statement of expenses than has been forwarded in this case before Colonial

Development and Welfare was satisfied as regards the expenditure incurred by that officer; every minute thing was set out. From our point of view it is only a formal matter and I have much pleasure in moving that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

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

PAYMENT OF WAGES TO ARTISANS EMPLOYED
AT THE HOSPITAL.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for £300 to be placed at this disposal of the Hospital Board to enable the Board to pay wages to the artisans employed at the General Hospital during the period 1st April to 11th September, 1946, at the approved rates of pay. The addendum states that the artisans employed at the General Hospital were granted increased wages from the 12th September, 1946, on the basis of the new rates of pay. Increased rates of pay were granted to similar employees of the Government with effect from the 1st April, 1946. The artisans employed at the Hospital have now asked that similar treatment in respect of the period 1st April to 11th September, 1946, be extended to them by retrospective payment of their wages at the increased rates and this Resolution is to give effect to their request. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reports the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER in each case, the five Resolutions are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to question No. 51, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (a)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to resume Government Business. The Government Business with which I propose to deal are the Resolution and the two Bills of which I gave notice this morning. It will also be necessary to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am objecting to the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a).

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

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

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am supporting the motion for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) for the purpose of

dealing with the Resolution for £75,000 of which notice was given this morning. This Resolution is the result of an Address which was introduced by the honourable junior member for St. Philip and subsequently passed by this House, and through this Resolution it is proposed to carry out certain schemes by which employment will be provided. I certainly cannot agree to the suspension of the Rule for the purpose of dealing with the Bills of which notice was given this morning and of which we have not got any copies.

The question that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with certain business of which I gave notice this morning.

Mr. WILKINSON: I agree that we should deal with the Resolution for £75,000 —

Mr. SPEAKER: It is open to honourable members to oppose any matter with which they do not agree.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, Rules 88 and 89 were suspended.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: I do not think that this Resolution will give hon. members any trouble. This is merely acceding to the request of the House to start with some work quickly. I have not read any of the debates which took place when I was absent from the island and I do not want to throw cold water on anybody's proposals; but some of these schemes could have seen the light of day earlier if material was available at the time when the Executive Committee agreed to undertake them. I do not want to decry any move which has been made by any honourable member of this House to speed up works, but it is not to say that the Government did not have it in mind. I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee to deal with this Resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SCHEMES OF CAPITAL WORKS TO
RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. ADAMS: I will read the whole Resolution and the Addendum to it so that honourable members can see that this is a Resolution which we can pass without any trouble. This is a resolution that the sum of £75,000 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the following purposes, namely;—

(a) To meet the cost of extending the runway at Seawell Airport, of reconstructing that portion of the runway which is now unfit for use, and of constructing a road around the end of the runway when extended;

(b) To meet the cost of a scheme for levelling the area known as Constitution Swamp and expenses incidental thereto;

(c) to make grants to the Commissioners of Highways of Parishes;

(d) To meet the cost of constructing and repairing access roads to and roads on the Pine Plantation;

(e) To meet the cost of engaging engineering staff on contract for periods not exceeding 3 years in order to supervise these and other schemes of capital works.

The Addendum reads as follows:—

"In an Address passed on the 17th of June the House of Assembly asked that the Government undertake, with all possible expedition, large scale schemes of capital works in order to relieve unemployment.

2. Provision has been made in the Annual Estimates for a full programme of work for the Department of Highways and Transport; similarly the Public Works Department will be occupied for several months with work for which funds have already been provided or which are of such an urgent nature that they should be given priority. The amount by which the programmes of these departments can be extended depends primarily on the number of additional engineers which can be obtained. It is accordingly proposed to engage immediately two engineers on contract for periods not exceeding three years, and the Secretary of State has been asked whether suitable officers are available and what salaries and conditions of service should be offered.

3. Schemes which involve the importation of any appreciable quantity of equipment and material—this applies particularly to iron and steel—will not be able to be undertaken immediately.

4. This resolution is to provide funds to enable work to be started on the schemes mentioned therein. In some cases detailed estimates are not yet available and it is possible that additional funds may be required. The following notes are explanatory of the various schemes mentioned:—

(a) Runway Extension. It is proposed to extend the present runway westward by 1,000 feet, i.e. to the limit of Government owned land, and to reconstruct 200 feet of runway which has been condemned as unfit for use. The runway will then be 6,000 feet in length and capable of receiving large passenger aircraft.

(b) Constitution Swamp. The area between the bridge on Constitution Road and the old railway bridge (above Victoria Bridge) will be levelled and drained. The land so levelled will be suitable for use as a recreation or sports ground but not for building purposes. The levelling will remove the present insanitary conditions, but flooding will continue to occur after heavy rain. Such flooding will be diminished if the span of the Victoria Bridge is widened, but the statement in paragraph 106 of the Ten Year Development Plan that the work cannot be undertaken until the present Victoria Bridge has been widened is not strictly accurate.

No detailed estimate of the cost is available. It will be necessary to acquire certain land now owned by the Dean of St. Michael, and some light railway trucks and hand wagons will also be required for the work.

(c) Grants to Commissioners of Highways. In April this year parishes were asked to con-

sider which tenantry roads in their respective parishes are in urgent need of repair and to submit applications for grants to enable them to undertake the work. Applications have been received for sums totalling almost £20,000. It is proposed to make grants to Commissioners of Highways from time to time as and when detailed schemes have been submitted to and approved by the Government.

(d) Pine Plantation Roads. Tenders are being invited for the construction of access roads to the Central Stock Breeding Station at the Pine Plantation and for certain of the major roads on the Plantation.

(e) Engagement of Engineers on Contract. The Secretary of State has been asked whether suitable engineers can be obtained immediately on contract for a period not exceeding three years; and, if so, what salaries and conditions of service it will be necessary to offer."

As regards the last part of this Addendum I should just like to say this. As honourable members are aware, the Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department have their hands full. In the absence of proper supervision, the sort of thing from which we suffered in the old days, it is really impossible to undertake huge capital works. It is advisable to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can put his hands on any engineers on contract for no longer than three years and what salaries we should pay. We are asking the Legislature to grant this lump sum now to cover the cost of these schemes, and the Legislature will be informed of what the Secretary of State says as to the engineers he can get and what we have to pay. In view of the urgency of the Address which came from this House, the Government is asking the Legislature to grant us this £75,000 which will not cover everything, but it will enable some work to be started especially when the parishes send in detailed schemes for the tenantry roads. We can see the possibility of their requiring £40,000 or £50,000 and work on these roads may be proceeded with as soon as the Government approves of what has been asked for. Honourable members will see that these schemes involve proper supervision and in some cases the importation of material which it is difficult to obtain; but in so far as it is possible to start work immediately, the Government is prepared to start immediately. This is no credit to the present Government because the past Government during the War period has had these schemes or most of them in mind. In the past, as the honourable junior member for St. James will be able to tell the committee, schemes have had to be held up through our being told not to expect cement, steel, personnel, etc., for a couple of years. Now that the Government and the Legislature consider that this is a matter of urgency, the Government is only too glad to make a start as quickly as possible. If honourable members wish me to read over any portion of the Addendum I shall be happy to do so. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GARNER: I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution to-day and I am very glad that the Government has moved with such haste in this matter. This is one occasion on which I want to compliment those who have had to deal with the Address passed by the House, and I hope that they will find every one of

these schemes workable. I hope that both the technical and the casual workers will find employment for a couple of years.

Mr. S. A. Walcott: When this House passed the Address mention was made of the East Coast Road, but I have not heard anything said about that to-day. We all know that this road can be done without the supervision of any engineer. I should like to know from the Leader of the House if the construction of this road will be considered when these engineers arrive. This House was of the unanimous opinion that that road should be done. The construction of this road will provide more employment than any of these schemes.

Mr. HAYNES: I will support this Resolution; I cannot vote against it when its objects are so good. The unemployment question is a very pressing one and I am somewhat disappointed to discover that no mention has been made even of the survey of this East Coast Road. I shall be pleased if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will give us some information on the matter.

Mr. SPRINGER: I can assure the honourable member that one of the first jobs of the engineers will be to make a survey of this road. We cannot start work on this road without surveying it. A mile by mile survey will have to be made.

Mr. MAPP: With regard to the tenantry roads, I see that it has been left to the Highway Commissioners to send in their estimates. I hope that they will hurry up and do so and let the Government get ahead with the work. The Select Committee of this House which met the Director of Highways and Transport was assured that he had a scheme whereby these tenantry roads would come under his supervision, and we will have an engineer appointed to look after these schemes. I hope that that scheme will be put into operation and let us make a start on these tenantry roads because the people in the parishes are complaining very much.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the Highway Commissioners are charged by the Government with the duty of presenting them with details in relation to these roads, I should like to point out that it is essential that they should work in the intertests of the people concerned. There is a habit of repairing roads up to certain people's houses and that is something which should not continue.

Mr. BRANCKER: The honourable junior member for St. James is a member of the Advisory Board in respect of the Department of Highways and Transport, and I would commend to him that he advise the Director to refer to that list of tenantry roads in St. Lucy, St. Andrew and St. Michael with which we dealt some years ago, but in connection with which hardly anything has been done so far. I should like the Director to pay attention to these roads.

Mr. WILKINSON: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph will appreciate that it is very difficult for honourable members to swallow a big thing like this by just hearing it read out. The acoustic properties of this House are not very good and we did not all hear what was said. I think that I am correct in saying that the honourable member pointed out that unless we get engineers from Canada or somewhere else very little work will be done by the Department of Highways and Transport. If that is the case why is there so much hurry? We have been trying for two years to get an engineer for the Department of Highways and Transport and no appointment has yet been made. Some of these schemes cannot be carried out in this weather: I think it would be madness to start work on the Constitution

River in this weather. We can, however, start work on the tenantry roads; the Highway Commissioners could undertake to do certain work in certain parishes. I am not opposing the Resolution, but from what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph says, I do not think that there is any hope of this work being started in the near future. I think that it is right to ask for a small amount with which to start and let us have our Resolutions by a week's notice as usual. I do not think that the engineers can be obtained so easily.

Mr. ADAMS: The Secretary of State for the Colonies might say that there is Mr. So and So in Trinidad and he is quite willing to come up. It is not a matter of waiting for an engineer from England.

Mr. BRANCKER: I would not like the Department of Highways and Transport to get the impression that this House will condone any marking time on its part. We have to endeavour to effect improvements to some of the bad tenantry roads in this island and we do not need a Bachelor of Science or highly-skilled engineer for that purpose. We have competent supervisors and labourers to do the work. Do not let the honourable junior member for St. James carry the idea to the Director of Highways and Transport that this House feels that as soon as these engineers are obtained, it will expect him to proceed with this work. We are expecting him to proceed with it at once because we have competent supervisors and competent labourers to do the work.

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

The Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Resolution in Committee.

The House resumed.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

MESSAGE RE CONFERENCE ON CLOSER ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE B.W.I. ISLANDS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Other Place to the following effect:—

*The Legislative Council
To*

The Honourable House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to refer to His Excellency's Message No. 23/1947 of the 15th of July regarding the representation of Barbados at the Conference which will take place at Jamaica in September next on the subject of the closer association between the British West Indian Islands, and to enquire whether the Honourable House of Assembly are in agreement that two delegates should be chosen by the House of Assembly and one by the Legislative Council.

S. C. THORNE,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
15th July, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to deal with this Message as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to deal with the Message.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the House agree with the proposals set forth in the Message.

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) BILL.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly be taken as the next Order of the Day. Honourable members will remember, even those who were not members of the last House, that an Address was passed by that House asking the Governor to send down legislation to provide for the remuneration of its members. I read now from the "Objects and Reasons of this Bill:—

"The House of Assembly in an Address dated the 16th April, 1946, asked His Excellency the Governor to send down legislation to provide for the remuneration of its members, and in accordance with the terms of the Address, a Bill was sent down sometime towards the end of the last legislative session but was not dealt with due to lack of time.

The present Bill, except in the case of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, proposes an increase in the remuneration originally suggested for the members of the House. It further provides for a specific salary for the member holding the office of Chairman of Committees and for the member recognised by the Governor as the Leader of the House.

It is proposed that salary should not be paid to any whole-time officer of the Crown who may be a member of the House of Assembly.

The Bill purposes to have retrospective effect as from the 1st December, 1946".

In short, in April last year this House passed an Address asking the Governor to send down legislation to provide payment for its members. It was suggested that the payment should be £200 a year for ordinary members, £400 a year for the Speaker and £300 a year for the Deputy Speaker. This Bill has made an addition of £50 a year in the amount for ordinary members and provision has been made for the Leader of the House and the Chairman of Committees. The post of Leader of the House did not exist in April, 1946, when the Address was passed by the House. In the present Bill it is suggested that the Chairman of Committees should be paid the same £300 a year as the Deputy Speaker and the payment of the Leader of the House is put at £350 a year. The Bill reads the same as that which was sent down last year except for the additions already mentioned, and no whole-time officer of the Crown who may be a member of the House, is eligible for payment.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is going too far; he cannot claim that there is any great urgency on this occasion. To ask this House to pass this Bill after five minutes' notice without even allowing honourable members to have a copy of the Bill, is asking too much of them. I strongly object to having his Bill rushed through in this manner. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, this matter has been under discussion for a long time, and yet copies of the Bill have not been sent around. If this is the way in which public business is to be conducted, we had better do away with the House of Assembly altogether.

Mr. GALE: I quite agree with the honourable junior member for St. James. Why is this matter being rushed through? This Bill has not even been printed and circulated; it has only been introduced this morning and I do not know why the honourable Leader of the House is trying to railroad it through the House this afternoon. I object to that.

The question that this Bill be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, TALMA, RAMSAY and Dr. CUMMINS—13.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, thirteen honourable members voting "Aye" and five honourable members voting "No".

The next Order of the Day was called:—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. I explained it out of time. Except for the alterations which I have mentioned, the Bill is the same as that which was sent down during the last session but there was no time to deal with it.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SMITH, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, TALMA, and RAMSAY—12.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT, GALE, and WILKINSON—6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, twelve honourable members voting "Aye", and six honourable members voting "No".

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

Clause I, the title Clause, was read and passed.

At this point, it now being 3.30 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and stated that it was now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of the Rule 61 (b).

Mr. HAYNES: I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: An objection having been taken, I shall have to put the question. The question is that leave be granted to the honourable member to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b). 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. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, TALMA and Dr. CUMMINS—13.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, thirteen honourable mem-

bers voting "Aye", and six honourable members voting "No". The honourable member may therefore make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: DR. WILSON, MESSRS RAMSAY, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, and Dr. CUMMINS—14.

Noes: MESSRS. BRANCKER, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, fourteen honourable members voting "Aye", and five honourable members voting "No". When the time for Private Members' Business arrived, the House was in Committee on the Bill to provide for remuneration of members of the House of Assembly.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were in Committee on this Bill Clause 1 had been passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. (1) Subject to the provisions of section three of this Act members of the House of Assembly of this Island shall be remunerated as follows:—

(a) The member for the time being holding the office of Speaker shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of four hundred pounds per annum.

(b) The member for the time being holding the office of Deputy Speaker shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of three hundred pounds per annum.

(c) The member for the time being holding the office of Chairman of Committees shall be entitled during his tenure of that office to receive salary at the rate of three pounds per annum.

(d) The member for the time being recognized by the Governor as the Leader of the House, shall, so long as he continues to be recognized as such by the Governor, be entitled to receive salary at the rate of three hundred and fifty pounds per annum.

(e) Every member other than the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees and the member recognized by the Governor as the Leader of the House, shall be entitled to receive salary at the rate of two hundred and fifty pounds per annum.

(2) All salaries payable under this Act shall be paid from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive by equal monthly instalments.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am in thorough disagreement with this Bill; the manner in which this matter has been force upon this House this afternoon is a disgrace to a community like Barbados (Cheers).

Not only that we have not got any Bill before us, but the time for Private Members' Business has been taken away. Why force this matter at this speed? I think that this Bill should not be entitled a "payment of members" Bill, but "a raid on the Treasury". That is what I think it should be called. I am objecting to the salaries that are proposed to be paid to members of this House. We have been sent here to take charge of the taxpayers' money, and in this way we are the policemen in charge of it. Today we are sitting around this Table and taking the money and putting it in our own pockets. If we sent out our servants in charge of money and they said that they were worth more for carrying it on the road, they would be faced with trial at the Court of Grand Sessions if they took out any of that money. I say that members of this House are putting their hands into the pockets of the taxpayers and taking out money. This matter has not been put before the electors; I have been around to several parishes and the matter was shelved all the time. I have put it to my electors and they have told me: "Don't vote for the Bill" and I am sticking to that. I consider that these representatives of the people are afraid to put the matter before their constituents. If they do it they will not receive the votes. (Mr. SPRINGER Time will tell). That is correct; time will tell. I think that this is a perfect raid on the Treasury. You can see by the very manner in which this matter has been forced upon us this afternoon that they are afraid of something. They have not even sent out a copy of the Bill and the sections are read by the Clerk in a great hurry. I cannot even remember the amounts that are proposed to be paid to members of this House. I am thoroughly opposed to this Bill and I hope to say something more about it before it is passed.

Mr. WILKINSON: I cannot remember the amounts which have been read out. I think that the amount proposed for the Speaker is £400 a year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the Clerk to read the Clause again.

The Clerk read over the Clause.

Mr. WILKINSON: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for asking the clerk to read the Clause again. It is proposed to pay the Speaker £400 a year, the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees £300, the Leader of the House £350 and ordinary members £250. I am thoroughly objecting to members of this House being paid; I think it is a great pity when there are persons who are willing to come forward—and there is still a large number of gentlemen who are ready to come forward and give their time to the business of this House—that this proposal has been put before the House. Even if you are going to pay members, are the figures which have been read out the correct figures? This is a little personal, but I consider that the Chairman of Committees has more work to do than the Deputy Speaker. I have been Chairman of Committees on more than one occasion and I know the amount of work which has to be done. I think that the Chairman of Committees should be paid more than the Deputy Speaker: the amount for the Deputy Speaker and that for ordinary members should be reduced. If by any chance the Speaker is unfortunately ill, the Deputy Speaker will draw his salary. I think that it is repugnant to have to talk about salaries for members of this House; that brings it down to a very low level. The salary scale suggested is not correct: however before making any motion, I should like to hear the Leader of the House on the point,

Mr. GALE: Like the honourable member who has just sat down, I am not in favour of members of the House being remunerated. In big countries members of Parliament are paid because they have to leave their homes and attend sessions of Parliament a long way from where they live. Those members have to pay boarding expenses—they have to live in hotels so as to attend sessions of Parliament—and I think I am correct in saying that that is why people in large countries are paid as being members of Parliament. In Barbados that is not the case; honourable members do not live at any great distance from the House of Assembly. As far as the proposed salaries are concerned, I think that they are on a very generous scale. If honourable members are to be given out-of-pocket expenses for attending the House, they should be satisfied with £100 a year because it was never intended that we should be professional politicians. If we are talking about remuneration, we should give some remuneration to people who, perhaps, can ill afford to give up their time to attend the House. However, I am afraid that I cannot agree with what is proposed to be paid in this Bill; I think that the proposed salaries should be reduced.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I never intended to say anything in connection with this Bill because I made my speech when the House passed the Address to the Governor relative to this Bill being sent down. But after listening to the honourable junior member for St Michael, I am compelled to speak. The honourable member is wrong when he states that the principle of paying members of the House is based upon the distance which they live from the Assembly Chamber. There are places all over the world where people live in the actual areas of the assemblies and they are paid. When the honourable senior member for St. James makes such a bold statement to the effect that the members of this House did not put this matter before their constituents, I say that that is not true. I challenge the honourable member to say that he has visited every place where meetings have been held and how he can say that the matter has not been put to the constituents? Mention was also made of this matter in the Press and it has been mentioned repeatedly at meetings. It is not true to say that the matter was shelved. The large majority of people who comprise the members of the House to-day are people who pay taxes; they are unlike the honourable junior member for St. Michael who is sitting in the House to-day and whose business is still going on. The same thing applies to the honourable junior member for St. James. When such members go to England for six months the business of the House is left to a few people. I would like to point out that this House has been doing more work now than it used to do before. You have to meet often because you are representing the people; they arrest you in the streets. I feel that we shall have to do more work; we shall have to meet more than once a week so that the public will realise that we are not taking anything as a gift but that we are working in the interest of the people. I think that that should be made clear.

Mr. HAYNES: Personally, I feel that this is the wrong time to bring forward this Bill. When conditions in Barbados are in a satisfactory way then we, like any company, can sit down and say that we can draw director's fees. When we look around this island and see so many things to be done, it seems a pity that we should think of ourselves first. The next thing is that the members

of the Government who have framed this Bill have never remembered the electors who have sent us here. The electors have to go to the polls at great cost to themselves at times to vote for us, and to-day we are voting ourselves a salary but we are not remembering these people. I think that the electors take the place of jurors in a Court of Law. The jurors are paid and the electorate should also be paid. However, nothing is mentioned in this Bill about that. I feel that this is a very one-sided matter and for that reason I will not support it.

Mr. SPRINGER: I have been very amused by the remarks that have come from that side of the House this afternoon. Let me deal in the first place with the honourable member who has just sat down. He thinks that the electors should be paid. Well, I do not know of any precedent for that; I do not know if he thinks that the present electorate is too heavy a drain on his exchequer. We have to get away from this attitude of getting something for nothing. If you want to reform this place you have to get people to do it and pay them to do it. You cannot expect a horse to pull a load without giving him any oats. In days gone by, people like the honourable senior member for St. Andrew with their extensive acres and their factories and businesses, represented the people in their own interests and in the interests of their own families and friends. What would have been the sense of paying them when their policy was to keep down taxes and spend no money? It was not even their concern to increase the salaries of the people who worked for them. There were days when salaries were increased by 10% and prices went up 50% and immediately after the first World War there was a system of retrenchment when policemen worked for £40 a year. That was the policy of the Government in those days; the representatives of the people in those days could afford to go on as they were going on. Nowadays the people have chosen different representatives and we are determined that lack of finance shall not be a bar to any suitable person in the eyes of the electorate coming forward and representing the people. It is fantastic to suggest that the salaries offered in this Bill are attractive. They are not, but the man who has ability to represent the people and who is satisfactory to the electorate, will have some security if he is prepared to sacrifice some of his time—at least he will be saved from starvation or serious loss when he is representing the people. As far as the electorate is concerned, they have decided this issue at the last election. The Address which asked that members of the House be remunerated was passed since April last year and nine-tenths of the people who passed it are here again this session. The Bill was put before the House by the Government and the people who drafted it and spoke for it have been returned. It is correct to say that this matter was discussed at public meetings. As a matter of fact, I can say that ever since I was a member of this House—I have been a member of it since 1940—some of my constituents have been under the impression that I was being paid. They think that the people who are elected to the House get \$80 a month and pay no taxes, and they are surprised to know that that is not the case. As far as the remark that this Bill has been hastened before the House is concerned, that is a misrepresentation of the grossest type. This is now the middle of July: we have held back from in-

introduced this Bill for the last eight months and have brought forward measure after measure before tabling it. This Bill should have been tabled long ago because it is merely a repetition of that which was introduced during the last session. In Halsbury's Statutes of England you find this stated:—

"From henceforth none of the said knights, citizens, burgesses and barons nor any of them that hereafter shall be elected to come or be in any Parliament do not depart from the same Parliament nor absent himself from the same till the same Parliament be fully finished, ended or prorogued, except he or they so departing have license of the Speaker and Commons in the same Parliament assembled, and the same license be entered of record in the book of the Clerk of the Parliament appointed or to be appointed for the common house; upon pain to any of them so departing or absenting themselves in any other manner to lose all those sums of money which he or they should or ought to have had for his or their wages....."

In 1514 by the common law of England, in the 16th century, Parliament had a right to receive wages. There was introduced a Bill in which it was stated that you had to sit until the end of the session of Parliament otherwise you will lose your wages. That was made statutory in the reign of Henry the Eighth. It fell into disuse but it was revived in comparatively recent times. There is no new principle in this Bill; there is nothing disgraceful about it and it has the sanction of antiquity. This is in line with the English Parliament and which is referred to respectfully even by those honourable members on the left. It is really a waste of time to debate this matter; I am only speaking now because some of the present members were not here during the last session when the matter was fully threshed out, but most of the members in the last session are here to-day. The Bill is the same as the one which was introduced in the last session except for the alterations which have been mentioned. It is now proposed to pay ordinary members £250 a year instead of £200, the Chairman of Committees is to be paid £300 a year and the Leader of the House £550 a year. As far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, that is clear and plain. As long as you accept the principle of democracy, the right of all classes to represent the people, there is the question of sacrifice to be considered. Honourable members will notice that the Clause says that every member shall be entitled to receive salary; it does not say that he shall receive salary.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is unusual for me to say anything on any measure, but I should like to say this: the remuneration which is proposed for the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees does seem to be somewhat high as compared with what is proposed for the member of the Government. I have been a member of the Government on a previous occasion, and I think that the duties required of the member of the Government are somewhat heavier than those which are required of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. That is the only point I wish to make. I would like to add that I think that the members of the House are entitled to some remuneration for the time they give in the service of the colony. The work has become increasingly heavy, and I myself often wonder how some members of the House are able to

devote their time to legislative work. I do think that they are entitled to some remuneration for the time which they devote to the business of the House.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: If I understand the honourable senior member for St. George correctly, I think he said that wages were paid to members of Parliament since 1514 but that fell into disuse. I may be wrong, but I think that When Mr. Lloyd George introduced this matter of payment of members in the House of Commons, he made the point that the payment was in respect of members who would not be able to see after their business at all. He even went further and would not agree that representatives of boroughs should be paid. Now this House of Assembly does not even represent a borough in England and representatives of boroughs in England are not paid. You are taking out \$30,000 a year of the taxpayers' money and I think that is a very wrong step to take today.

Mr. COX: Before the question is put, I should like to say that I think everybody knows how I feel about this question. Whether I am paid or not, as long as I happen to be elected as a member of this House I am prepared to do everything that lies in my power to improve the conditions existing among the unfortunate people. I heard the honourable senior member for St. Andrew speak against this question of remunerating members and say that we should attend to the hard-working people first rather than ourselves. Well, that shows that something is wrong somewhere; because if the people who have worked so hard for the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable Junior member for St. James are hungry today, and they have worked for all these years—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that anything to do with what is before the House?

Mr. COX: If the honourable member is so generous and he feels that honourable members should not be paid, I do not see that he should draw any salary as Churchwarden.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is that to do with what is before us?

Mr. COX: I will not say anything more in connection with this matter because everybody knows how I feel about it.

Mr. WILKINSON: The honourable senior member for St. George has suggested that this is not a matter of indecent haste because they had this Bill in mind for eight months before sending it down. Of course, we did not know that. What I think is a disgrace is that it should go into the records of this House that a Bill of such importance has not appeared on the Order Paper. It is going down in the annals that this Bill was introduced by the Leader of the House in the morning and pushed through in the afternoon; and we could not hear what the Clerk was reading and it had to be read over two or three times.

Mr. ADAMS: This House with the approval of every right-thinking person in the Caribbean area, let alone this colony, pushed through as quickly as possible a Resolution carrying out the suggestion contained in an Address passed by the House that the Government should undertake certain unemployment schemes. Only this morning the Government sent down the Resolution for a sum of money, acceding to the request of the House. In April last year this House passed an Address ask-

ing that honourable members be paid for their services and that the members of the Executive Committee be paid an extra amount. As the honourable member on my right has pointed out, the majority of the present members of the House were members of the House then. It is reasonable to suppose in spite of the fantastic memory of the honourable senior member for St. James, that if the electors did not approve of this, they would have kicked us out at the last election. We have been hearing the school-boy argument this morning about being put in charge of money to carry along the street and taking out some of it and putting it into your pocket. There is nothing in that argument; rather than talk about indecent haste, honourable members should congratulate the members of the Executive for having spent time in getting something through for the hungry people who now find themselves in positions of which they never dreamt in the last three centuries. If this were a new Bill, something which honourable members knew nothing about, none of us would have asked that it be dealt with in all stages today. Where then is the indecent haste? It is because honourable members knew about the Resolution which we have just passed and were in agreement with it that it was dealt with today. I should like to say this. I cannot really cover this question properly without seemingly referring to myself but we are looking forward to the time when persons who represent the interests of the people will come forward in greater numbers as members of this House, much to the regret of those honourable members on my left. People like the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable junior member for St. James with their vast expanse of acres and their sugar works have for 200 years been able to come in here and pass whatever legislation they wanted in their own interest. We are going to see that those who represent the interest of the people are able to stand for election year after year and we are going to see that they have some feeling of security in that they will receive some compensation for what they lost at their trade or occupation while they are fighting for the people here. I am glad for this opposition to-day and I will join the honourable junior member for St. Philip in the appeal which he sometimes makes here. If those of us who range from the top corner of the Table down to the honourable senior member for the City do not see that it is our duty to stick together and fight together for good, God help this island.

Mr. TALMA: I want to make this position perfectly clear. At the last election I was asked if I was in favour of members of the House being remunerated for their services and I replied that if a Labour House was to be retained the members would have to be remunerated. I did not intend to say anything in this matter but I cannot sit here and not deny the allegation that at election time I did not want to be paid and when the elections are over I want to be paid after securing a seat. I have been a member of this House for three years; I was a member of the Select Committee which sat to consider the question of remunerating honourable members since 1945. As far as members of the House of Commons are concerned they are paid £1,000 a year, they get free travelling allowance, etc., and they pay no income tax. If the Government sees fit to remunerate us we will be able to conduct our campaigns more on the lines of our friends on the left and we will give full satisfaction to the electors in the future.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I rise again to stress the point that this matter was not put before the electors. The mentality of some people is very peculiar. I guarantee that this matter was never raised at the public meetings which were held about the island. (Mr. SPRINGER: That is not true. I raised it myself in St. James). The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has spoken about members sticking together and fighting together. Of course they will do that to-day because they are taking money out of the Treasury and putting it into their pockets.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a very strong statement.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: It is a correct one though. We must except that honourable members will stick together to-day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No contribution of mine can prevent this Bill from being passed to-day but I must make my position clear as to why I am voting against it. It is absolutely true to say that, as far as I know, the matter was put before the electors during the last campaign and in going over the parish of St. Michael together with the honourable junior member for St. Michael I pledged myself to vote against this Bill. Having been elected as a member of this House I will vote against the Bill in keeping to my pledge. I have discovered that not only in big countries but in the West Indian Colonies, members of the Legislature are being paid. One thing seems to have been overlooked in this Bill; it is that some special remuneration should have been proposed for the Leader of the Opposition. (Mr. ADAMS: If we knew who he was we would have done that). In England the Leader of the Opposition is given special consideration. The Leader of the Opposition might be a wealthy man; the Leader of the Opposition here is a well-to-do person. Specific amounts have been mentioned for the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees and the Leader of the House but nothing has been said about the Leader of the Opposition. Is it not a fact that in other countries special consideration is given to the Leader of the Opposition? The Leader of the Opposition may not always be a wealthy man like the honourable junior member for St. James. There would be no democratic Assembly if the Government did not have a recognized Opposition. You cannot do anything unless you have a recognized opposition and you must have a recognized Leader of the Opposition. I am not just talking in the air as some honourable members may think; they do not know anything about it. I quite appreciate that members of the Opposition in this House have been drawn from people in a certain walk of life. I should like to say that there are those who fought for election to this House one of their express objects being that they would be remunerated for their services. Speaking for myself, I made it clear that if I were elected as a representative for the City, I would oppose this remuneration for members and I am voting against this Bill to-day.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON; Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, COX, MAPP, FOSTER, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, TALMA, and Dr. CUMMINS.—10.

Noes: Messrs. MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and Mr. SPEAKER.—6.

Clause 2 was passed.

Clause 3 was read and passed.

Clause 4 was read as follows:—

4. This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of December one thousand nine hundred and forty-six.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not think that honourable members should receive back pay; I do not think that we should go as far as that.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) BILL

Mr ADAMS: I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the Executive Committee be taken as the next order of the Day

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The next Order of the Day was called:—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the remuneration of members of the Executive Committee.

Mr. ADAMS: This Bill is also in accordance with the wishes of the House as expressed in an Address which was passed last year. I thank the honourable senior member for Christ Church for reminding the House that this question of remunerating honourable members was considered by a Select Committee since 1945 apart from what took place at the subsequent elections. This Bill provides that the members of the House of Assembly who are also members of the Executive Committee shall be entitled to receive salary at the rate of £250 per annum. As in the case of the Bill which has just been passed, no member of the Executive Committee who is also a whole-time officer of the Crown, is entitled to receive payment for his services as a member of the Executive Committee. That is to say, the Colonial Secretary will not be paid for his services under this Act; neither the Attorney General if he were allowed to have a seat in this House nor any member of the Civil Service who may be allowed by the Government to stand for election to this House will receive any payment for his services as a member of the Executive Committee. If a member of the House were also a member of the Executive Committee and at the same time a member of the Civil Service he would not get any extra payment. The "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill are as follows:—

"The House of Assembly in an Address dated the 16th April, 1946, asked His Excellency the Governor to send down legislation to provide for the remuneration of the unofficial members of the Executive Committee at the rate of £200 per annum, and in accordance with the terms of the Address a Bill was sent down but was not dealt with due to lack of time.

2. This Bill now seeks to provide for the remuneration of the unofficial members of the Executive Committee at the rate of £250 per annum.

3. The Bill purposes to have retrospective effect as from the 1st December, 1946."

The only difference between this Bill and that which was sent down last year is that an addition of £550 has been made in the remuneration for the unofficial members of the Executive Committee. The members of the House who are also members of the Executive Committee will be paid an extra £250 per annum. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: If I understand the position correctly, this will mean that the honourable junior member for St. John will be getting £500 a year, and it so happens that he is drawing a pension. (A MEMBER: He ceases to draw his pension). How many civil servants are getting £500 a year? Are we paying out this money without having had time to read the Bill? The public knows nothing about it and it has not been rehashed lately. We may see many letters appearing in the Press about this matter. I cannot see why the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has had to push through this Bill this afternoon. I think that it should have been dealt with in the ordinary manner, in a decent manner as I call it.

Mr. SPRINGER: It is extremely unfortunate that the honourable junior member for St. James so forgot himself as to make that personal reference which he has made. The honourable member has been a member of this House for many years, and he ought to know that under the Pension Act if a person who is in receipt of a pension, draws from the Treasury emoluments which together with his pension are in excess of what he used to receive in respect of his substantive job, he ceases to draw his pension from the date of the receipt of those emoluments. I am very sorry to think that the honourable junior member for St. James, of whom I had a much higher opinion, should have descended to make that reference this afternoon.

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. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clause 1, the title Clause, was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. (1) Subject to the provisions of section three of this Act, members of the Executive Committee shall each be entitled to receive salary at the rate of two hundred and fifty pounds per annum.

(2) All salaries payable under this Act shall be paid from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee by equal monthly instalments.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like to ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph if the members of the Executive Council will come under this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: As the Bill reads they will come under it as long as they are not whole-time officers of the Crown.

Clause 2 was passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. CUMMINS, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by CUMMINS in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER POSTPONED.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now revert to Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. James:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to a Deep Water Harbour for this island. The honourable member is not in his place.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The next Order of the Day was called:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, 1935.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I esteem it a special privilege and honour to move the second reading of this Bill. Such amendments as are proposed in this Bill were introduced in England by Mr. A. P. Herbert, a private member of the House of Commons, and despite all the representations and allegations which may have been made relative to the Divorce Law it is only a very feeble-minded person who would think that what has been decided in England and what has been proved to be very successful in England should not be adopted here. I cannot see that the amendments which we are at present introducing should fail in this island which is called "Little England" and which always tries to adopt and bring herself into line with the English practice. Therefore, the object of this Bill is to bring the Divorce Law into line with the present English practice. It is very difficult to prove adultery in any Court of Law and it is proposed to extend the grounds on which a divorce can be granted by the addition of desertion for three years immediately preceding the presentation of the petition, cruelty and incurable insanity, the insanity being regarded as incurable after continuous treatment for a period of five years. Why should any spouse go through life with such drudgery and inconvenience, why should one's life be made a burden to him or to her when certain innovations in the Divorce Law have been introduced in England and have been giving satisfaction since 1936? When two parties desert each other, one of them may go to the United States of America, for instance, and under the Divorce Law there that party is entitled to a divorce on the ground of desertion; whereas the party here in Barbados will have either to commit bigamy or live an immoral life, as it is called. A hardship is therefore suffered by the party in Barbados. This Bill is attempting to make the granting of a divorce easier; it is a means whereby immorality will be discouraged and it will be the means whereby the rich, the middle classes and the poor and the humble will be able to obtain a divorce. Very often the middle classes and the poor people are as moral as anyone else and they are anxious to lead as good a life as possible, and on account of the fact that adultery is the only ground for divorce, that privilege is denied them. I have introduced in this Bill a Clause with which I shall deal later. I hardly think it necessary to elaborate on the various grounds for obtaining a divorce which are now be-

ing included in this Bill which was passed by this House during the last session. It was introduced by the present Leader of the House, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, who piloted it through and it had a very easy passage, but owing to time when the Bill was passed by the House, it was impossible for the Other Place to make it law. I am hoping that the same interest and assistance which was meted out to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on that occasion will be meted out to me, and that this Bill will secure just as easy a passage as it secured during the last session. There are many people all over this island who are awaiting the passing of this Bill because they are living in drudgery, and there is much confusion existing when persons try to tell men and women how they must live. Very often these matters end in the Law Courts and sometimes at the gallows. I think that the oppositionists to the Divorce Law should be told that immorality is not to be encouraged and that people should live in a free and happy manner as God intended them to live. Letters have appeared in the Press in connection with this matter of divorce and it is very fortunate for us that we have not got many Roman Catholics here. We should bring our society abreast of the times and not be lagging behind. At present, we are ten years behind England in this respect, and I am trying to bring this law up to date so that all sorts of immorality, brutality and even cases of murder will cease and people will be able to lead a happy life and enjoy freedom for the remainder of their days. There is one Clause in respect of which I expect a certain amount of opposition, but I hope that this Coalition Labour Government will give their assistance. This in relation to Clause 16, the last Clause of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member should leave that until the House is in Committee on the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: This is in connection with the principle of the Bill. It is all very well and good to extend the grounds for obtaining a divorce, but at the same time we must also extend the facilities for obtaining a divorce to poor people. There is no point in passing this Bill whereby only a special few will be able to obtain a divorce and the rank and file will not be able to avail themselves of the facilities granted. I am hoping that this Coalition Labour Government will see fit to include this Clause whereby poor people will be able to take advantage of these amendments to the Divorce Law where, in suitable cases the Chief Judge provides—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member should deal with that when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. The principle of the Bill is not affected by the removal of—

Mr. TALMA: I should like to bring to the attention of the House that there is a Committee sitting in England in connection with amendments to the Divorce Law. I think that it has been recommended that a period of six months is a long time between the granting of a decree nisi and a decree absolute—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not in this Bill.

Mr. TALMA: With those few remarks I commend the second reading of this Bill to honourable members, and I hope that it will receive the treatment which it received on the last occasion.

Mr. ADAMS: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill both because of the last remarks made by the honourable member and because of the other things which he has said. In spite of contrary ecclesiastical dogma, the principle of extending the grounds for

obtaining a divorce beyond the ground of adultery. is one with which I hope we will agree today, those grounds being desertion, cruelty, and incurable insanity. A husband who has deserted or who is cruel to his wife or who is incurably insane has more effectively destroyed the marriage bond than one who may have intermittently lapsed from virtue. I think, Mr. Speaker, that all the members of this House, those who are now present at any rate, will agree that this is a Bill which is deserving of their support, and I have very little doubt that all the members of this House will give this Bill their support. I have much pleasure in seconding this motion.

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. TALMA, seconded by Mr. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 15 inclusive were read and passed.

Clause 16 was read as follows:—

16. (1) A person who desires to sue or defend as a poor person must obtain a certificate from the Law Society or from the Chief Judge of this Island.

The certificate must state (1) that poor person is not worth Fifty Pounds or in special circumstances One Hundred Pounds (excluding his wearing apparel, tools of trade, and the subject-matter of the proceeding) (2) that the person's usual income from all sources does not exceed Two Pounds or in special circumstances Four Pounds a week, and (3) when the wife is the poor person, in addition to (1) and (2) that the woman and her husband are not worth the amount specified and that their joint income does not exceed the amount specified and that it is reasonable that she should be admitted to sue or defend as a poor person.

The Committee of the Law Society or of the Chief Judge which issues the certificate may call for an affidavit by the conducting solicitor.

(2) The pleadings must be settled by counsel and proofs of the witnesses must be furnished to him except in proceedings for alimony and maintenance.

(3) Compromises can be effected only with the leave of the Court or of the Committee of the Society.

(4) A solicitor on discovering that his client is no longer a poor person must at once report the matter to the Committee.

Poor persons are not liable for Court fees, unless the Court otherwise orders.

Counsel and solicitors must not take any fees nor payments for out of pocket expenses, nor office expenses, except with the sanction of the Committee.

Mr. TALMA: There are two amendments which I would like to make to this Clause. I ask leave to amend this Clause by inserting after the words "matter to" occurring at the end of line 2 of Sub-clause (4) the words "the Chief Judge or"; and by adding at the end of the Clause the words "or the Chief Judge of this Island".

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

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member has been as successful as he deserves to be so far, but I suggest to him that this Clause cannot stand. There is no such thing in existence as a Law Society. In England a Bill of this sort has in it the Law Society which ex-

ists by Royal Charter or something of the sort. You will have to put in the definition of a Law Society here. I see no hope of the resurrection of the Law Society; even if the Law Society did exist it would be the duty of the honourable member to tell the Committee that the lawyers and solicitors are perfectly willing to appear for poor persons for nothing. If you do not do that, you will be in effect telling every lawyer and solicitor that he has to appear for poor persons for nothing. Without the Law Society existing we do appear and give advice to people who are poor persons and the lawyers and solicitors are christian-minded enough, or whatever is the correct adjective, to work over and over again for nothing. The Ex-secretary of the Law Society has just reminded me that the Law Society is incorporated but it is non-existent, and he will bear me out that it does not seem as if the Law Society will raise its head in the future. I suggest that we do now report progress and see if the Chief Judge will agree that he alone should make whatever rules are necessary and issue this certificate. I am not saying this in any critical way, but I do not think that of the members of the Law Society and anybody is financial. There is no secretary and no meetings are being held; but if the honourable member has the assurance of the Chief Judge that he will issue the certificate, I suggest to the honourable member that he should get the assurance of the lawyers and solicitors that they will work for nothing. What I am principally pointing out is that mention is made in this Clause of the Law Society which is not likely to function again and the honourable member is putting something superfluous in the Bill. I hope that the honourable member in charge of the Bill is in a position to tell us that he has the assurance of the Chief Judge that he will act under this Clause, and also the assurance of the Bar and the solicitors that they would be willing to give their services free. You cannot compel barristers and solicitors to work for nothing.

Mr. TALMA: I have had an interview with the Chief Judge and I am hoping to have a final interview with him. Under Clause 9 of the Principal Act provision has been made whereby the Chief Judge can have the privilege of making rules and regulations especially in cases which are brought *in forma pauperis*, but there is no case as yet in which any discretionary powers are exercised, where poor people are granted any form of relief. On the last occasion I was told by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who introduced the Bill, that provision has already been made for these cases. Provision has been made for these cases in a way, but I am afraid that there are no rules and regulations. This is not a slur on the general public, but I think that we should adopt the English practice whereby rules and regulations relating to poor people are now being incorporated under Clause 57 of the Principal Act. This is not a question of leaving things to the Chief Judge who is already over-worked. The position is that in England provision has been made in the Act in respect of these cases, and I was hoping that when we are going about a change in the Act we would do it in the proper way. I quite appreciate the position of the legal luminaries; they will be receiving less fees. I should like to point out that in Clause 9 of the Principal Act, provision for these cases is made in respect of suing but not in respect of defending. I beg to move that Clause 16 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that we should report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

The question that Clause 16 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 16 as amended was passed.

Mr. SPRINGER: I ask leave to re-commit Clause 15.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to re-commit the Clause.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that this Clause be amended by deleting the word "three" in line 1 and inserting the word "seven"; and by deleting the words "the Matrimonial Causes (Amendment) Act, 1936" in lines 1 and 2 and inserting the words "the Principal Act". Clause three of the Amendment Act, 1936, is now incorporated in the Principal Act.

Mr. TALMA: I accept those amendments.

Clause 15 as amended was passed.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

The House resumed.

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

SELECT COMMITTEES DISCHARGED

Mr. SPEAKER: I discharge the following Select Committees:—The Select Committee appointed to prepare a Draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 1/1947 relating to Barbados contributing to the Caribbean Tourist Association; the Select Committee appointed to prepare a Draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 14/1947 relating to the services of an Instructress in Handicrafts for six months; the Select Committee appointed to prepare a Draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 19/1947 relating to an error in Resolution No. 45 of 1947 in connection with the Cotton Spinning Plant; and the Select Committee appointed to co-operate with the Committee appointed by the Honourable the Legislative Council to consider and report on the Bill to impose a levy on Sugar and Fancy Molasses.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 22nd day of July, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 22nd day of July, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.