

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th March, 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. LEV. WILSON, Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES.

Prayers are read and the Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 25th February, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. MAPP enters the House and takes his seat.

NOTICES.

A Government Notice is given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for the sum of £10,000 to supplement Resolution No 52 of the 12th of September, 1946, to meet expenses in connection with the present emergency.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. BRANCKER: Of my intention to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to report on Head XXXII of the Estimates for 1947—48.

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are satisfied that officers who have resigned from the Government Service after the 31st March, 1946, during which the question of cost of living bonus was under consideration, rightly deserve a cost of living bonus on lines similar to those of officers now in service.

The House of Assembly therefore request Your Excellency to take immediate steps to send down legislation necessary to implement the abovementioned project

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

Whether Government will take immediate steps for the provision of suitable portable huts for watchmen of the Department of Highways and Transport for their use and convenience whilst on duty?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

Whether Government is aware that the Post Office in St. Lucy is neither conveniently nor centrally situated in this parish for the residents as a whole?

(2) Does Government propose to take any action with a view to remedying the above?

To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

Whether Government is aware of widespread dissatisfaction amongst persons in this Island eligible for service as Jurors at the Assizes at the scale of remuneration provided for them by law?

(2) Will Government take the necessary steps for the provision of adequate daily remuneration and travelling expenses for such public spirited persons as are required to do Jury Service at the Court of Grand Sessions?

Messrs. MOTTLEY, SPRINGER, CRAWFORD and TALMA enter the House while the Notices are being given and take their seats.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Mr. BRANCKER handed in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 7/1947 relating to the appointment of an Architect and Planning Officer.

PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF ARCHITECT AND PLANNING OFFICER.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave, before the Orders of the Day are entered upon, to deal with the Report which the junior member for St. Lucy just handed in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Report been circulated?

Mr. ADAMS: I regret to say "No", but in view of the urgency of the matter I am appealing to honourable members to deal with it to-day. There

was an unfortunate omission. Originally, no Select Committee was appointed to draft this reply to His Excellency's Message and one of the local newspapers gave the impression that this House had replied to the Message. The Other Place seemed to have acted on the assumption that the position was a *fait accompli* and that the Legislature had replied stating that they were willing to appoint this new expert. It is essential in view of the fact that there is someone who is willing to accept the post, according to my information, and is standing just awaiting immediate news from us; he may not be standing by too long because there is a scarcity of similar experts in Great Britain and, therefore, we should try and get through with the matter. I hope that honourable members will consider it in its entirety to-day and let us pass an Address in reply to His Excellency's Message. I would remind honourable members that the Governor in his Message pointed out the necessity for an early reply and I think I am correct in saying that his reason for doing so was based on what I have just stated about the difficulty of getting anyone if we do not grasp the present opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that the Report be taken as the first Order on re-assembly after the luncheon interval. In the meantime it can be passed around to the other honourable members.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

RATES PAYABLE TO FANCY MOLASSES PRODUCERS

Mr. ADAMS asks for and is granted leave to move that Order No. 8 standing in the name of the senior member for St. George be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Order No. 8—A Resolution to approve the following Rate payable to producer and Rate of tax payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on fancy molasses produced during the crop year 1946—47 fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board in accordance with Regulations 5 and 6 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Regulations, 1938:—(1) The Rate payable to the producer of fancy molasses during the crop year 1946—47 shall be not less than eighteen pence a wine gallon, (2) The Rate of tax payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board shall be one and one-half pence a wine gallon—be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that Order No. 8 be taken as the first Order of the day is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion when this Resolution was being debated, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew made a motion for its postponement and that motion was seconded by the honourable senior member St. James. Those two honourable members have the right to speak, if they wish to do so; if they do not speak now they will not be able to do so during the course of this debate. Will the honourable senior member for St. Joseph state whether there is any amendment to be made to the Resolution?

Mr. ADAMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker; instead of the word "eighteen" occurring in line 2 of paragraph (1) it should be "seventeen" and instead of the words "one and one-half pence" occurring in line 2 of paragraph (2), there should be the words "one penny."

Mr. SPEAKER: You will have then to ask leave to withdraw the present Resolution in order to substitute the amended one.

Mr. ADAMS: If I am in order, I will ask that the senior member for St. George, in whose name the Order stands, be granted leave to withdraw the Resolution and substitute the amended Resolution in its place.

There being no objection, the senior member for St. George is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. SPRINGER: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to delete the word "eighteen" occurring in line 2 of paragraph (1) and substitute therefor the word "seventeen"; also to delete the words "one and one-half pence" occurring in line 2 of paragraph (2) and substitute therefor the words "one penny". May I be allowed, Sir, to correct an error. Paragraph (1) remains as it is but in paragraph (2) the words "one and one-half pence" are to be altered to read "one penny." I take it that no further debate is likely to take place on this Resolution because everyone concerned agree that this is a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. LEWIS: There is just one observation I would like to make and it is this. When this House appointed this Board it appointed, as members of it, persons outside of the House because we thought that they knew what they were doing. This Board is supposed to have the facts before them and it is supposed to be able to submit recommendations to such a body as the Executive Committee. While I admire the members of the Board for admitting that some error was made or that some better judgment subsequently prevailed, I must say that on a previous occasion when this House was at pains to ask this Board to change its opinion, its members did not seem disposed to do so. While, as I say, I admire them for being manly enough to change their opinion on this occasion, I would like them to know that they are appointed on this Board because they should know what they are doing when they make recommendations to an important body like the Executive Committee on facts before them.

The Resolution, as amended is read and approved.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Government. As the first item under this Order is the consideration of the Estimates for the year 1947-48 I give the opportunity to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to make his Budget speech and to other honourable members to discuss the Estimates as a whole.

THE ESTIMATES FOR 1947-48

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I regret that on the first occasion when I have the honour to make what is, in effect, the Budget Speech we should not be up-to-date in our arrangements for putting the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of this colony before the Assembly. As I hope again next year to be making the budget speech—I make that statement out of all modesty—I trust I shall be able to do so, clearly, definitely and entirely along the lines which the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain would be adopting in presenting the Budget for the succeeding year. We have no immediate connection between the preparation and the exposition of policy as far as the Estimates of Revenue and Estimates of Expenditure are concerned. I will mention, for example, one thing that is always uppermost in the minds of honourable members. No one who knows when the Estimates of Expenditure are being put before the House what the Government's policy as to income tax is going to be and

I hope that by this time next year this almost, I may say, prehistoric arrangement of presenting the Estimates of Expenditure will have come to an end and that the House will be in a position to know, at the same time as the Estimates of Expenditure are being put before it, the taxation policy of the Government. In view of the limited time at the disposal of the Government between the recent elections and the preparation of the Estimates by members of the Executive Committee, it is difficult to do more than follow in the groove set for the last 300 years or so, put before honourable members the financial position of the colony,—the revenue in general terms of the past year, what remains from the present financial year and the estimated revenue and expenditure for the coming year,—to draw a comparison between previous years and the coming year and to point out the implication of those figures with, as is customary, some reference to outstanding points that may arise in the coming year's expenditure. It is usual for persons in my position in previous years, with the exception of the honourable member on my immediate right, to draw attention to the fact that in recent years the practice has grown up in the Colonial Secretariat of making a fairly detailed summary of the financial position of the colony in respect of revenue and expenditure and also to draw attention to the fact that a careful study of that memorandum makes it almost superfluous for the person who is conducting Government Business in the House to make a long speech. I shall endeavour to follow that example and to confine my remarks to a mere summary of the outstanding financial position and to anticipate, I hope intelligently, any criticisms and questions that may be addressed to me. It is too much to hope—although this memorandum and my explanation may be as full as possible—for the House to abandon its centuries-old tradition of using this opportunity to criticize the Government in adverse and, occasionally, acrimonious terms. After all, even in the House of Commons this is the only opportunity that backbenchers have for drawing to the notice of the Government its obvious shortcomings—obvious to everybody except the members of the Government themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker, doubtlessly honourable members have spent many hours in digesting these figures and I hope that I shall not bore them by a recital of them. But I would just draw their attention—perhaps logically it is out of place—firstly to the surplus and the deficit which may appear to them startling at first sight but which, on careful investigation, will be found to mean nothing more than paper calculations of items of revenue and items of expenditure. Honourable members will notice that at the end of the financial year 1944-45 we had a surplus of £828,777 as compared with £43,891 at the end of the financial year 1944-45. The estimated surplus for the current year 1946-47 is £970,976. This is calculated by adding together the actual surplus at the beginning of this financial year which is £828,377 and the revised estimates of revenue for 1946-47 which is £1,634,469, giving a total of £2,462,846; then by subtracting from this total the amount of the revised estimate of expenditure for 1946-47 which is £1,240,162, the estimated expenditure from Resolutions passed prior to the 1st April, 1946, which is £65,580 and the estimated expenditure from Resolutions, including emergency expenditure, passed during 1946-47 otherwise than in supplement of existing Heads of the Estimates of Expenditure, which is £183,128. If honourable members will add together £68,580 and £183,128, they will get a total of £251,708 which represents the estimated expenditure

from Resolutions passed prior to the 1st April, 1946 and the estimated expenditure from Resolutions (including emergency expenditure) passed during 1946-47 otherwise than in supplement of existing Heads of the Estimates of Expenditure. For instance, we have been able to include in this £251,708 the amount of the unexpected Resolution to purchase the Bay Estate and the balance is in connection with Resolutions passed prior to 1st April, 1946, and Resolutions which will be passed up to the 31st of this month. The total to be subtracted is £1,491,870 and that leaves the estimated surplus on the 31st March, 1947, of £970,976 which I have mentioned. The surplus at the beginning of this financial year could never be accurately given because the stated amount represents the actual Treasury balance less the amount of unpaid vouchers at the date when the memorandum is prepared. These unpaid vouchers have been estimated at £15,000; this sum is more or less constant in recent years, although it has ranged in some previous years—it is roughly £15,000 to £16,000—from £20,000 to £30,000, as honourable members will easily discover if they peruse the reports of the Colonial Treasurer and the Auditor General from year to year. In short, no matter who may be introducing these Estimates, we can only guess, if honourable members like the word "guess", at the estimated surplus because we do not know what Resolutions will be passed between now and the end of the financial year. In fixing the estimated expenditure from unpaid vouchers at £15,000, honourable members will feel that we have not gone too far out when, I repeat, in recent years the figure has been £15,000 to £16,000.

As regards the revenue for 1946-47, the original estimate was £1,288,820 and the revised estimate is £1,634,469; therefore, there has been an increase of £345,649. If honourable members will look at the Colonial Secretary's memorandum they will find set out there the reasons for this increase. They call for no elaboration. They are mainly under three Heads—Customs and Excise, Post Office, and Income Tax and Death Duties. We collected from Customs and Excise £203,400 and £23,800 respectively more than we expected. The increase from Customs is mainly due to import duties, the first cost of imported goods being higher than was expected. Nobody could foresee what the actual increase would be and as long as there is a percentage basis for the collection of Customs duties on imported articles, the amount of Customs duties will go up. As regards Excise, it seems that more people drank rum this year than the year before and, if I may say so parenthetically, the election cry about the crime which the Government committed by taxing rum and tobacco did not seem to prevent people from drinking more rum.

The second main Head under which there has been an increase is the Post Office. Many more men went to the U.S.A. and as a result many more stamps were sold to their relatives and friends who kept up correspondence with them, plus the fact that a set of Commemorative stamps which was issued was sold out. The estimate under this Head has, therefore, been increased by the large sum of £25,793.

As regards Income Tax and Death Duties, the third main Head under which there has been an increase in revenue, £36,000 has been collected under the former and £37,000 under the latter, more than was anticipated. Well, no one has yet risen in any part of the world who can, with any exactitude, forecast what will really be collected from income tax or death duties. Heaven knows who will die in the

course of a year; therefore, no one can forecast with any accuracy what death duties or income tax will produce, especially in an island like this where we are dependent on sugar and have not always been sure of the price which we shall get for our sugar in the British markets.

The estimated revenue, as honourable members will see on the printed cover of the Estimates, is £1,574,793; that is a decrease, on the revised estimate for 1946-47, of £59,676. The chief causes are again set out in the memorandum of the Colonial Secretary and I think it is right for the Government to adopt the Colonial Secretary's attitude of looking at revenue in a conservative way. We had better think that we are going to get £50,000 and collect £60,000 than to say we will get £50,000 and collect only £35,000. The three Heads under which this decrease of revenue is anticipated are again Customs and Excise, Post Office, Income Tax and Death Duties. As regards expenditure, the original estimate for this year was £1,085,594; the revised estimate is £1,240,162, an increase of £154,568. Again, the reasons are set out in the memorandum and this increase is largely due to the increase in the rates of pay of the subordinate and unestablished employees of the Government as from the 1st April, 1946, and also to the provision of a cost of living allowance to other Government employees with effect from the same date under what is doubtless going to be the famous Resolution No. 14 of 1947. I will add that as honourable members go through the Estimates they will discover that nearly all the increases in the estimated expenditure are due to the fact that we passed these Resolutions whereby the salaries of the Civil Servants and unestablished and subordinate employees will be greater in the coming year than they have been in the past.

Now the Government always puts before the House the mathematical results of its Estimates, in that they show what on the year's working will be the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. A deficit or surplus may appear as the case may be but it must be borne in mind that it is only an estimate. This year, because we are conservative in our estimates of revenue, and moderate in the estimates of expenditure we actually anticipate a deficit of £115,821. Honourable members need not be scared of that, for the reasons I have just given, namely, that the estimate of expenditure for unpaid vouchers and such Resolutions as may come to us between now and the end of this month are merely based on what has happened in the past and it does not necessarily follow that our deficit will be £115,821. We estimate that our revenue will be £1,574,793 which, as I said, is 59,000 odd pounds less than this year's revised estimate. For that reason we anticipate less revenue from Customs and Excise and Post Office—and if I may digress I would like to say that the outlook for emigration to the U.S.A. at present is not rosy; therefore, I think the Post Office is right in suggesting that we may not get the same amount of revenue as we got during the year 1946-47. Similarly with Death Duties. One or two deaths took place during this year which resulted in an increase in the amount of death duties but the circumstances in the coming year may not be similar as far as death duties are concerned. If you add the estimated surplus for this year, which is £970,976 and the estimated excess of revenue over ordinary expenditure for the coming year, which is £155,067 you will get a total of £1,126,043; if you subtract from this total the estimated expenditure from Resolutions passed prior to the 1st April, 1947, which has been put at £90,888

and the estimated expenditure from Resolutions passed during the coming year, which has been put at £189,000, you will get a balance of £855,155 and that represents the estimated surplus on the 31st March next year. This is how we arrive at the deficit. The estimated surplus on the 31st March, 1947, is £970,976. Having regard to the fact that we do not expect to get as much from Customs and Excise, the Post Office and Income Tax and Death Duties as we got last year, we estimate the surplus on the 31st March next year at £855,155; we, therefore, expect that on the year's working there will be a deficit of £115,821. I will remind the House again that no Chancellor of the Exchequer, no Attorney General or Leader of the House of Assembly of Barbados can do more than say "We estimate what is going to take place during the coming year from what has taken place in the past year and from what we can reasonably expect from the sugar industry." I do not think that as far as the actual figures are concerned I can help the House more than what I have just put to honourable members.

Before I sit down, however, I should like to say this. It has been customary in previous years to anticipate some of the criticisms which honourable members, in duty bound, will make on the Government's Estimates, to point out, whenever possible, the reasons which have actuated the Government in its policy and to suggest to honourable members why we are asking them to approve that policy and pass the Estimates as we have sent them down. This is a peculiar island, Mr. Speaker. It is a small island and there are numerous small birds flitting about and twittering here and there; of these twitterings the Government hears and can anticipate the comments and criticisms of its policy. I have little doubt, for instance, that there will be a certain amount of criticism as regards the Government's attitude of putting certain items of capital expenditure under Head, Public Works Extraordinary, in the Estimates. Well, it has always, if I may speak personally for a moment now, been a surprise to me that so many really intelligent people can year after year follow blindly what they read in a newspaper without inquiring whether the writer of the particular article or leader has any special knowledge of the subject or follow blindly what they hear in conversation with their friends without again inquiring whether there is any logic in what they hear or—I go even further and put it on a higher plane—follow some chance statement in some 2/6 textbook written by some hard-up economist putting forward some economic theory as to the form taxation should take and things of that sort. Economists, if I should use a hackneyed expression, are as numerous as the leaves of Vallambrosa. You get economists with theories of all sorts as to Governments' policies for controlling inflation and so on; there is literally a legion of textbooks by economists on this, that or the other subject but eventually the average man in the street and the average politician have to use their commonsense and say "Put me in the shoes of the Government, what would I do?" I have no doubt that the Government can stand any criticism of its policy. We hear and read that it is wrong for the Government to collect more money than it needs for a particular year; that it is an immoral, a dishonest, a wrong financial policy for Government to budget for more than it needs to carry on the Government for the next twelve months. When I hear and read that, I wonder at the mentality of the people who make or write a statement of that sort. You have to consider, I submit, in your financial arrangement not merely what you need for the immediate twelve months but what may be the state of your country.

what may be the state of the industry or industries on which you expect to raise revenue and what the future portends. In the first World War, we followed the advice of the ancient gentlemen who said that we should not collect in one year more than we need in the following year; that if our Civil Service is going to cost us £20,000, we do not let us worry about income tax; let us collect £20,000. The result was that millions of pounds, if I may use a vulgar expression, went down the drain through the Government not having income tax, not taxing war profits, not controlling profiteering and allowing local capitalists to invest money abroad. Not one cent of that money ever found its way into the Treasury of this colony. But during the last war we adopted a different policy and made hay while the sun was shining, with the result that we have in the Treasury a substantial balance which will be there for a rainy day. If there should be great depression and unemployment, we shall be able to resort to a comparatively full Treasury and although some honourable members may shudder I would like to say that this Government, as far as I know, has no intention of backing down from its policy of the last three years of taxing incomes heavily while the incomes are there because when the day of retrenchment comes we will have money already collected in the Treasury and not have to hunt about wondering where it is to come from. That is the first criticism with which I want to deal.

The second criticism is that we ought not to provide for capital expenditure out of current revenue but that posterity ought to pay for something that posterity will enjoy. Mr. Speaker, which of us does not do something which somebody else enjoys? Let me put it this way, the way in which the case is usually put. A man has two sons, one of whom is about to be married and the other about to go to a University. He has an income of £10,000 a year; he wishes to build a house for the son who is about to be married. Say they, he should go to the bank, borrow money for the purpose and pay interest on it because his child and grandchildren are going to benefit from the house and should pay for it; but the son who has gone to the University should receive his allowance year after year out of his father's current income. That is the argument of those critics who say that if the Government is to build a Fire Brigade Station, posterity must pay for it but if it is merely paying a Civil Servant, it can pay him out of the general revenue. It does not bear examination. If we are repairing roads, "of course our children and grandchildren," say the critics, "are going to make use of them; therefore let us repair them with loan funds; if we are buying the Bay Estate from which our children and grandchildren will benefit, buy it out of loan funds; do not use current revenue." I do not think it is necessary to stress that argument any longer. Let me repeat so as to make my point absolutely clear. We have to look for £10,000,000 to meet our 10-year development plan. We have a surplus of 800,000 odd pounds. Does it matter if we earmark the money in the Treasury and say "let us use that only for social welfare" but when we come to build Queen's College, or an agricultural station or cattle sheds, we should build them out of loan funds because our children and grandchildren are going to benefit from them? Does it matter whether they are built with loan funds or with the money in the Treasury? I appeal, therefore, to honourable members not to argue whether the money should come out of current revenue or loan

funds but to get behind the government and say to it "We do not care where you get the money from but for God's sake do something speedily."

As far as taxation is concerned I should like to anticipate the honourable members who are likely to say that we are raising too much out of Customs by stating that the senior member for St. Philip and myself are members of a Committee that sat with Professor Beasley on this very question of taxation, so honourable members can rest assured that we are as anxious as anybody else to see that the principle of taxation applicable to local affairs is put on a reasonable basis. When honourable members say that too much is being collected from Customs I ask them to believe us — the other members of the Executive Committee and myself — when we say that we are as anxious as anyone else to see that the incidence of taxation does not fall unduly heavily on the poor people's food and clothing. I also ask them to remember that taking off a penny from a package tax does not mean that the consumers will benefit because some greedy merchant will put the penny on every pound of rice that comes through the Customs on a boat. It is not possible to pass on some of that penny to the consumer and, therefore, it will result in a reduction of the revenue from Customs and at the same time increasing the profits of the merchants without benefiting the consuming public. I make these points because I have no doubt that honourable members in their zeal and anxiety to help in the debate may say things which result from the lack of careful investigation and I say that for the best possible reason. I have read some of the remarks I made in opposition on previous occasions and I am wondering whether I was sane when I made those remarks. When the present Attorney General was a member of the House, some amazing statements were made on occasions of this sort. It is the duty of honourable members to tear everything to pieces and if you read past debates, undoubtedly you will find that that has been the habit at the time of the introduction of the Estimates,—the habit of attacking the Government, which takes place even in the House of Commons — but that habit is not always helpful as regards constructive proposals for the running of the government of this country. (Cheers). I apologize for speaking so long. I shall welcome all the criticisms which any honourable member may make on these items of expenditure but I ask honourable members to speak in general terms now because they will have the opportunity, when the several items come before them in Committee, to speak in more specific detail of the short-comings of the Hospital Board, the Highways and Transport Board and the Waterworks Department. I thank the House for its careful attention to my attempt to explain the Estimates of the Government. (Cheers).

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second the motion that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—If I cannot congratulate the honourable member on introducing the Budget I must certainly congratulate him on introducing an entirely new budgetary principle. He has not elaborated on what the Government intends to do because he admits that it has not yet decided on any projects but he has stated what honourable members ought not to do. I have offered some criticisms of the Estimates from the time I have been a member of this House and I have done so with the sincerest of motives, not with any attempt to let my

constituents think I know something about what I am talking or to take the opportunity to show them that I am not dumb in the House or anything of that kind. There are certain things in a budget that have been tried in many countries and found to be wrong and they have been adopted in Barbados. It would seem that we model from these the system we should follow and that we must not criticize it at all. I assure the senior member for St. Joseph that any observations I may make are the result of an application of commonsense to the financial policy of the Government as I understand it.

The first thing that strikes me about the present budget is this. Although the Government is budgeting for an increased expenditure, it is budgeting for a decreased revenue. There has been nothing in the honourable member's speech to give us the hope that Professor Beasley's survey of the economic position of this colony is proceeding and is likely to come to a close and be helpful to the Government. The last person that attempted to tell us what our financial income was seemed to have been supplied with some wrong figures from the Government itself and could not find some of the money that he was looking for. I sincerely hope that that will not be the experience of Professor Beasley. We are at a stage in our history when we are sadly in need of an economic survey, something to assist the honourable member and other honourable members of this House and put the public's mind at rest that this Government is not merely muddling through and getting away with it but that it has a sound financial policy ahead of it. Now, Sir, we find, in going through these Estimates, that the Government very complacently and with a certain amount of admiration prints and publishes to the world that it has collected more from the Post Office than it budgeted for and it attributes that to emigration and everything else without any note whatever of a hope for a decrease in the rate of airmail postage from this colony to, at least, other British Colonies in the Caribbean area. It is a scandalous state of affairs, that this Government should be charging 8 cents for a letter by airmail to every other British colony whereas every other British colony can send a letter here by air for 5 cents. I think that in view of the fact that we are having a surplus in our estimated revenue from the Post Office year after year, it would be a great relief to the people of this colony to let them know, not that we do not expect emigration next year and are not going to get so much but that a definite effort is going to be made to reduce the cost of postage. I think it is a serious mistake on the part of any Government to regard its postal service as a revenue producing unit in its budget.

As regards income tax, the estimate from this source last year was puffed up as high as it possibly could be and still they collected more. The criticism, at the time when the budget was being introduced, was that they had no right to collect more money than they needed and I think the Government has deliberately puffed it up. In spite of that, they have collected more and I think we can speedily get to the stage when we can say we are going to give the people some relief from these taxes. I thought the time had come when a member like the senior member for St. Joseph in charge of this budget would have informed us that some distinction will be made, in the collection of income tax, between earned and unearned incomes. The honourable member has made a statement to that effect for many years and I do not think he regards that as one of

his previous statements to which he referred to-day. I hope that as Leader of the House, he is going to pursue that policy and see that a distinction is made between earned and unearned incomes. There is nothing in the Government's survey of last year or in its budget for the coming year to show that a super tax will be collected on incomes above a certain figure. This Government has not collected any Excise Profits Tax during the recent emergency and that is one of the things which the honourable member, if he lives long enough, will regret in the same way as he regrets they did not have an Excise Profits tax during the first World War. I think we should be told that there is going to be some sort of super-tax on super incomes which, we hear, are being made and that earned and unearned incomes will be placed in separate categories, so that a distinction can be made in the tax collected. I do not understand it myself but it is something that has been tried in other civilized countries and I think we should try it in this. The Government seems to be budgeting for the continuation of the emergency expenditure. I sincerely hope that this Government has in view the getting rid of, as speedily as possible, this emergency expenditure and that if they can possibly use the services of the persons in these emergency departments they will do so. Draft them into the Civil Service and extend the Service to include departments to look after Workmen's Compensation, Social Insurance Schemes and put them to useful employment so that the taxpayers will be more satisfied that they are paying them for work that is done in their interest. It is absolutely time for us to forget the last War and get back to what I hear termed a state of normalcy as quickly as possible. I think there should be no attempt to carry on these emergency departments beyond the state of their usefulness. It is very difficult to get rid of things of the kind but if they can be put to some more useful purpose they should be.

The honourable member rightly anticipated some criticism of the inclusion of capital expenditure in the Estimates of this colony. I would like to let him know that I am one of those who are entirely opposed to that method. When we have our new ministerial position placed on a sound footing and when we are paying our Ministers reasonable salaries for the extreme lot of work they will have to do and when they are really and truly supervising the Departments of this Government, perhaps then I will agree that capital expenditure can be put in the Estimates for such things as the construction of buildings. At present, I doubt very much if the Ministers of this State have the time at their disposal to pay due regard to public expenditure, not that anything will go wrong but that they will be able to carry out the policy which they come here and tell us they are going to carry out. I think they do what they are doing to the best of their ability with the time at their disposal and, in the circumstances, they can do no more. I am not prepared to vote the taxpayers' money for future expenditure without first being in possession of details of the plans for that expenditure. Mr. Speaker, I think that our Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure should give us an idea of the ordinary replacements of machinery and things of that sort; that is all we want. The House of Assembly prides itself on the fact that it controls the purse strings of this colony and I warn honourable members that it would be a most serious and retrograde step they will be taking if they give up that control. It has been drawn to my attention that people who find it irksome to come to the Legislature for all the money

they want, tuck things away in the Estimates in this manner and they can give a very lucid explanation of what they meant at the time even though they may alter their plans afterwards. I think the most they can do is to give a forecast of the capital expenditure and social services and things of that sort which they intend to embark upon during the period under review.

I see here, Sir, that the Government has already budgeted for an increase in the grants to the Commissioners of Highways for the upkeep of, I take it, parish roads. I think that is the result of an Address passed in this House sometime ago and I compliment the Government on translating the wishes of the House into quick action. Well, Sir, if it did not act on that advice and it still increased the grants, it would seem as if somebody anticipated it. Reverting to the question of including capital expenditure in the Estimates I would like to assure the senior member for St. Joseph that my reason for not agreeing to it is that I think it absolutely unnecessary. This Legislature hopes to devote even more time to the conduct of public business and I think that any large scale public expenditure should be brought to it for its close scrutiny as time goes on during the session, so that honourable members can keep a check on what is happening and that they do not wake one fine morning to find themselves confronted with a great deal of expenditure which their children will have to pay. The present people controlling the Government of this colony will have to be very careful that when they are collecting taxes they are not induced to budget for money that is not for immediate use and for large scale expenditure which they might have to abandon during the course of the year. I am asking the present Government not to abandon the old system or not to be too quick in introducing its new financial policy until it has had time to get more accustomed to the running of the colony. I feel that it might be induced to do that to the detriment of the colony and I am sounding, Sir, a note of warning, apart from the fact that I myself am not enamoured with the system.

The honourable member has referred to the creation of surpluses and to the suggestion that loans should be raised to finance schemes for which posterity should pay. I am not against the creation of surpluses but the history of the creation of the biggest surplus with which this Government finds itself is that it results at the end of a year's working, at the beginning of which the Government budgeted for a deficit. The Government never told the House of Assembly that it had it in mind that if it collected more than it expected it would go even further than that and create a reserve to be invested outside the colony; it actually found itself with money that it knew it would not get. I would like to know when this Government has come to us with a plan showing that it intends to budget for general revenue and expenditure and that it intends also not to relax taxation but to deliberately create a surplus at a time of emergency for the purpose of spending when times are hard. If that were its policy, whether we agree with it or not, it would definitely be a businesslike manner of dealing with the situation. That is the point I am making and I ask the honourable member to accept the criticism in the spirit in which I make it. The honourable member must not feel that because there is a surplus, the Government should not borrow money for long-term financial planning.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member but I do not think the honourable

senior member for St. Joseph has suggested that that should not happen.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member said that he had heard and read the Government being criticized for not doing that and he also made reference to "penny dreadfuls" by economists which some of us may have read as to the form taxation should take.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph was making the point that as long as the money is there, there is no need to borrow money. I do not think that he gave the impression that money should not be borrowed if needs be.

Mr. LEWIS: I will give him the pleasure of letting him know that I feel that as long as there is a surplus there, I do not agree with borrowing money, because it is no use having money lying down on which you get no interest and borrow money on which you have to pay interest. Loan funds should only be used on long term planning schemes like the housing scheme which is definitely a scheme towards which the people who come after should contribute, having found it already there for their use. It is not a wrong policy to do that and I think the honourable member will someday come around to that view because a Government that has its people's interests at heart must always be in debt. A Government that is not in debt is in my opinion a foolish Government.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, a statement at the bottom of page 2 of the Colonial Secretary's memorandum to the effect that the estimated decrease in respect of the package tax is due to the tendency to import goods in larger packages. Well, Sir, I really think that the Government is accusing importers of trying to get around the package tax by importing goods in larger packages. It has been my experience that that is a wise thing to do; it is well known that in many of the countries from which we import our goods, there is a shortage of wood for making packages and it would be very dangerous for merchants to import their goods in larger inferior packages. I do not know where they got that information from but from my personal experience I would say that this looks like a deliberate attempt to accuse the merchants of getting around the package tax or the Government official who gleaned this information went out of his way to see large packages and not small ones. I feel that is something to which attention should be paid. If a person can make a statement like that to justify a decrease under a particular Head, it should be based on sound judgment and observation. I hope it is, but I have given my experience to this House to show that it does not strike me as 100 per cent true. Mr. Speaker, there is one last point which I should like to make for the benefit of the senior member for St. Joseph and it is this. I have seen in another colony in these parts the practice carried out of getting the Heads of the various Departments to come to the Legislature on the occasion when the Estimates are being considered for the purpose of supplying information which might be wanted by members. I know that the honourable member is a busy man and I know that he has asked that questions should be handed to him beforehand. I would like to assure him that although he thinks that every member, like himself, has gone through these Estimates I have not had the time to do so and I know that with the best will in the world he will not be able to answer all the questions although he will get very capable assistance from one officer. I am wondering whether this Government could not consider allowing Heads of Departments to visit the

House during the consideration of the Estimates for the purpose of explaining, either themselves or through the Leader of the House, the various points that arise. Honourable members have had during the consideration of the Estimates, to be content with very scant information on questions they have asked and, naturally, have had to take into consideration that no one officer can carry all the information in his head and have been very generous in excusing the particular member introducing the Estimates. I should like to compliment the Government on the recent increases and the fact that it has made some attempt to mention cost of living increases in the memorandum for the guidance of honourable members but I should like to draw to the attention of some honourable members that in respect of several Departments the sum total at the bottom of the present Estimates does not represent the entire amount to be voted to the particular Department.

Mr. MAPP: I too would like to compliment the Government not only on the increased expenditure on social services estimated for but also on its still very sound financial position. I agree with the junior member for the City that some distinction should be made, in the rates of income tax, between earned and unearned incomes but I cannot understand why he should repeat the old criticism that Government budgeted for so much revenue from income tax and collected more than it budgeted for. My idea, Mr. Speaker, is that Government should collect as much income tax as possible because it is the fairest method of taxation. The junior member for the City must remember—I am not defending the Government because its members are quite capable of defending themselves—that in times of good trade we should collect as much as possible—, so that when trade is bad and when we have to budget for an increased expenditure owing to a lack of general prosperity we may then be faced with having to increase the rate of taxation in inverse ratio to the ability of the people to pay such taxation. Therefore, it is better when times are good to collect as much as we can so as to be able to meet our commitments in future times when adverse trade balances may fall upon us. I hope that in future we may see a budget for an expenditure over a larger period than one year. It is customary, of course, to budget for one year but if the Government can average for a period of years, it can then avoid certain excesses in taxation policy and it will have a general programme for a definite period of years. Of course, I admit that that is not customary and that the present system is orthodox but certain things that are orthodox are not always right. We hear a lot about the 10-year plan and I am only hoping that it will soon begin. There is one that I think should be done away with, that is, the vast amount of casual employment we have in certain Government Departments. To my mind, there should be a definite plan to employ people for longer periods.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that is quite a matter for consideration along with the Estimates.

Mr. MAPP: If the Government has a definite plan, Mr. Speaker, it might be able to budget for more expenditure instead of just planning for casual relief. Casual relief, to my mind, actually creates a position of insecurity among the employed; it does not help the position and I am hoping that the Government will, to a great extent, do away with casual employment in this colony.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise under

these Estimates. That is a matter of policy dealing with employment.

Mr. MAPP: I accept your suggestion, Mr. Speaker. Another point I would like to make in reply to the junior member for the City is this. I think the Government should borrow as little as possible if it has the money; for the simple reason that when it pays interest on internal loans that interest goes into very few pockets and the idea of an equitable system of taxation is to do away with some of the inequities in the distribution of income in the community. If the Government take some of the money which it has amassed from taxing the people and pay interest to some of those same persons who have been taxed, it is getting nowhere; so I think the Government should avoid borrowing money and should spend as much as possible out of current revenue.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—I am not going to keep back the house for any length of time because the senior member for St. Joseph has rightly stated that when we come to the different Heads we can then ask for any explanations we want. But I must cross swords with him on one point, that is, the placing of capital expenditure in the Estimates. Putting aside the question as to whether you are going to borrow money or not to meet this capital expenditure I think it does not give a true picture of the financial position of the colony at all if you include capital expenditure in your Estimates and if it be for that reason alone I will oppose any capital expenditure being included in these Estimates. We always have to rush the Estimates through and when you have an item of capital expenditure like the building of a new fire brigade station—a project with which, I think, 99 per cent. of the honourable members of this House are in agreement—we do not have sufficient time to consider it in detail and for that reason also I support the remark of the junior member for the City that items of that sort should not be included in the annual Estimates. Now, Sir, we all realize that the preparation of these Estimates is a tremendous task and it is not possible for the senior member for St. Joseph or any other member of the Executive Committee to go into every item in detail; therefore, they have to rely very largely on the staff in the Colonial Secretary's Office. When we come later on to the different Heads, there are one or two of them in connection with which I should like some information. I regret, like the junior member for the City, that I have not, so far, given notice of my questions to the senior member for St. Joseph but I shall endeavour to do so before the next meeting. I expect that he will not have at his finger tips all the information we will require and he has asked us to try and pass the Estimates within the short time available. As far as the honourable members on this side of the House are concerned we will make every endeavour to do so but he must realize that when we are going through these Estimates item by item, points will occur to us that would not occur when we are going through them at home and, therefore, I am going to ask him to be somewhat indulgent with us. I am perfectly certain that when we come to deal with the items one by one, there are points which will occur to us; therefore, we are bound to take some time over the Estimates. I would just like to repeat that I am not in favour of including capital expenditure in the Estimates, not for the reason that we should raise loans for the purpose but because it does not give a true picture of the financial position of the colony.

The question of raising loans is another matter. I agree not to obtain a loan of £100,000 when you have the money in the Treasury and if a Resolution is sent down to us for £35,000 to build a new brigade station—the sum of £17,000 is put down in the Estimates for the purpose but if we are to judge from the amount which has been spent on the building at the Hospital, it is going to cost about £35,000—the Resolution can be passed and the amount may be refunded from loan funds. Any other criticisms which I have to make will be made later.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—Unlike the speaker who has just sat down, I honestly feel that the present Coalition Government should embark upon some definite programme whereby at this stage money could be provided in the Estimates so as to relieve the hardships which have been experienced by the taxpayers—high and low— island wide—for the past 300 years. I regard, Sir, the amount which has been estimated as ordinary expenditure for the year 1947-48—£1,419,726—as being—I will not say trifling but inadequate. If, Sir, we have a surplus of £970,000 or thereabouts, why should we allow all that money to be lying there? Why suggest loans when we have actual cash in the Treasury? I am not suggesting that because there is £970,000 in the Treasury, it should be taken out one time and used on any ridiculous schemes but I feel that a Coalition Government such as the one we have at present should have some definite programme for the carrying out of certain definite schemes and not keep along the beaten conservative path. Despite this Treasury balance of £970,000, you hear certain members suggesting that money should be borrowed. You borrow £300,000 or £400,000 and pay interest at the rate of 3% or 4% when you already have cash money at your disposal; that is, in my opinion, bad finance. What this Government needs is an expert in economics and I think that the sooner it attaches to the Colonial Secretary's Office a Financial Secretary or, preferably, establish an office for such an official,—because from my experience of matters governmental there is no one competent to deal with matters of this nature,—the better for all concerned. The point, Sir, which I am elaborating is this. For 300 years the taxpayers high and low, many of them paupers, have been longing for the day when this country will have a substantial surplus balance in the Treasury and not only a substantial surplus balance but will have a Government such as the present one is described—a Coalition Labour Government as I understand it—which will come forward with some programme whereby actual results will be obtained. It can no longer be maintained that schemes which will benefit the people should be postponed on the excuse that materials are scarce because to-day we are able to get materials in reasonable quantities and, further, we are in a position to pay for them. All over the island you hear people crying for water and places at which they can bathe. I am not blaming the present Government for the present state of affairs; it existed before they came into power. A lot of things which are thrown at the present Coalition Government were wrong in the past and now everybody is saying that they are responsible for them; with that I do not agree. But the present Government has prepared these Estimates and I am levelling this blame of not presenting a programme from which the people can benefit at their heads. I am saying that a substantial sum of £100,000 should be in these Estimates, so that when we get through with them, provision will have been made for the benefit of the people

not only in Christ Church but all over the island and the people will feel satisfied that this Coalition Government has attempted to do something for them.

Another point is this: What about the tenantry roads? This is the opportunity when money should have been provided in the Estimates for the purpose of putting tenantry roads in order. Do you mean to tell me that at the end of this session we are still to have these roads in such a condition that it will be practically impossible for doctors to get to the sick or children to get to school and back to their homes? Those are things which should be uppermost in the minds of this Coalition Government and for which provision should have been made in these Estimates. But this Government has adopted the old conservative method of preparing the Estimates. I do not know who is responsible for it. I see the Colonial Secretary's name attached to this memorandum but I am not blaming him; probably he has never seen it. I am saying that it is the duty of the Head of the Executive Committee, the one who has put these Estimates before the House, to satisfy us that the Government has some definite programme which will meet the crying needs of the people and not let things remain in mid air as has been done for many years in the past or from time immemorial. If you look at the Estimates properly you will see that the estimated expenditure for the coming financial year is in reality even less than this year's. What sort of position is that? That shows that the Government has no definite programme and that it does not intend to do anything material or beneficial for the workingclass.

Now, Sir, as far as the peasants are concerned, the crop season is now on and the peasants are in a sorry plight in that they are receiving a very uneconomic price for their canes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is going into details, as far as these Estimates are concerned.

Mr. TALMA: The point I am making is that there is no provision in these Estimates for the peasants. The peasants live in Barbados and why ignore them? Do they not exist? and do they mean nothing to anybody? I see nothing in these Estimates to assist the peasants who are fast dying out, as far as the cultivation of their lands is concerned. I was hoping to see some assistance given to the peasants. Although £80,000 has been set aside for irrigation purposes, no mention has been made in these Estimates about that. I am afraid that very soon the peasants will have to stop growing sugar cane as it has proved to be a very uneconomic crop for them. There is one other point I would like to stress before I sit.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member going to be much longer.

Mr. TALMA: Yes, Sir, for another fifteen minutes or so. The point which I am now about to make is in connection with the price of rum and cigarettes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are raising points that may be dealt with much better when you come to the respective Heads in Committee.

Mr. TALMA: I am dealing with the memorandum. An increase of £23,800 has been realized under Head, Excise. Well, the senior member for St. Joseph who is the Leader of this Coalition, said that this increase was due mainly to the increase of the tax on rum and tobacco but I believe, Sir, that if the tax was reduced, it would be possible to realize an increase of even more than £23,800. I think that the price of rum and cigarettes is prohibitive. This is probably the only little form of diversion which the average man in the street can afford, that is, to be

able to buy a rum at the end of the day's work and he is deprived of indulging in it by having to pay this price which results from the increase in the tax.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can deal with that in Committee. It being after 2 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 2.45 p.m.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to Questions Nos. 7 and 9 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the Replies to Questions No. 19 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER HEAD XXXII OF THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. BRANCKER: Before the further Business of the Day is proceeded with, I am asking leave to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate and report on Head XXXII of the Estimates for the year 1947-48 relating to the Department of Highways and Transport.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: In accordance with the notice which I gave this morning, I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and investigate Head XXXII of the Estimates for the year 1947-48. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, this is in accordance with a precedent which we set up during the last Session, to appoint a Select Committee to go into certain matters in respect of this Department, so that we can obtain a lot of information which it will be difficult to secure without having to pillory the members of the Government with numerous questions, many of which they may not be able to answer adequately. This Department is still one which is at a stage where it cannot be said that it is working with the complete approval of a very large section of the community, and we find that it is again necessary to investigate the working of this Department which expends so very considerable an amount of public funds. The estimated amount this year is £164,376 as against £104,371 last year. Without any more ado, I think that I have been able to convince honourable members of the necessity for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into the working of this Department again this year.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second the motion so as to show that I am not opposed to the appointment of the Select Committee, but I do hope that the Committee will meet and report by next Tuesday. I did not know until yesterday that a Select Committee was appointed to go into the working of this Department last year. If a Select Committee was appointed last year, they must have got a great deal of information, and I hope that the Committee which is appointed now will meet early and report by next Tuesday. It is the first time for the last twelve or thirteen years, that I have known a Select Committee to sit in connection with a special Head of the Estimates; however, I hope that the Committee will act as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not think that there is any necessity for the appointment of this Select Committee. A Select Committee was appointed in connection with this Department last year because it was a new Department then. I do not see that it

will serve any useful purpose to do that again after the Estimates have been prepared. We will have to do the same thing in the case of every Head of the Estimates, at least where there is the expenditure of a large sum of money.

The question that a Select Committee be appointed was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. BRANCKER, SMITH, COX, MAPP, ADAMS, CRAWFORD, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING and WARD—13.

Noes: Messrs. RAMSAY, SPRINGER, BLACKMAN, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, thirteen honourable members voting "Aye" and six honourable members voting "No". Subject to the approval of the House, I appoint the following members to serve on that Committee: the senior member for St. Andrew (Mr. HAYNES), the senior member for St. Michael (Mr. COX), the senior member for Christ Church (Mr. TALMA) the junior member for the City (Mr. LEWIS), the junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. MAPP), the senior member for the City (Mr. MOTTLEY), and the junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. BRANCKER).

Mr. BRANCKER: I ask that the name of the honourable senior member for St. John (Dr. WILSON), be added to the Committee.

There being no objection, the name of the honourable member was added to the Committee.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to resume Government Business.

Mr. TALMA: I object to leave being granted to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to withdraw my application for leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a).

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

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS RE APPOINTMENT OF AN ARCHITECT AND PLANNING OFFICER

Mr. ADAMS: I propose to deal now with the Report, which was circulated this morning, in reply to His Excellency's Message relating to the appointment of an Architect and Planning Officer in place of Mr. D. Syllas whose contract expires shortly. I beg leave to move the passing of the following Address as contained in the Report:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 7/1947 dated 28th January, relating to the appointment of an Architect and Planning Officer in place of Mr. L. de Syllas whose contract expires shortly.

The House is in agreement with the proposals contained in Your Excellency's said Message.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Address do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second the motion. This is something which will commend itself to honourable members.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put, in view of the fact that honourable members are asking about the work of Mr. de Syllas, I would like to say that he has done a great amount of work in connection with the planning and surveying of the City. As a result of an early survey, Mr. de Syllas has covered the whole City area, and has made plans for zoning, road direction, town planning and for the necessary demolition in some cases, and reconstruction in others, including a new and wider bridge, the canalisation of the Constitution River and things of that sort. He has done quite a lot of work, and if the appointment of his successor were delayed and Mr. De Syllas were to leave before the new appointee arrives, a lot of the work which Mr. De Syllas has done will have been wasted. The Government considers that the Officer who is appointed in place of Mr. de Syllas should be here for a short time with Mr. de Syllas so as to take over from where he leaves off. I ask honourable members to agree to the passing of this Address.

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

The Address was passed.

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

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ESTIMATES 1947-48.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House was adjourned, the honourable senior member for Christ Church was speaking on the motion that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply on the Estimates.

Mr. TALMA: I was attempting to put before the House my views in connection with these Estimates. I was saying that I view these Estimates with grave concern in that they are far from being what would have been anticipated by any right-thinking member of the community. I regard them as merely an effort to keep in line with the Estimates of the past, and as being entirely conservative in outlook and policy. I cannot see anything new in these Estimates from those which I have had the privilege to peruse in the past, and I am shocked to find that a Labour Government can produce Estimates in which there is nothing new and which hold out no hopes at all for anybody. When you come to the Head "Customs", it is estimated that there will be a decrease of £4,200 in the amount collected; in other words, we will collect less from "Customs" this year than we collected during the last year. One would expect Customs Dues to rise, and that there would be a substantial increase under this Head, because commodities are becoming more available and steamship opportunities are becoming normal. In fact, steamship opportunities are normal. If you look back at the Revised Estimates of Revenue for the year 1946-47, you will find that under the Head "Customs" there was an increase of £203,400. That speaks for itself. If that was the case in 1943-47, it stands to reason that there should be an increase under this Head during this financial year—not a deficit. As I have said, if steamship op-

portunities are becoming more available, I feel that the amount by way of Customs Duties has been terribly under-estimated. There should not be any decrease in the amount collected from Customs, more especially if the Executive were to lend an ear to the suggestion whereby the consumer of rum and tobacco will be permitted to buy these commodities at a reasonable price, and not at a prohibitive price.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has got to deal with the Head "Customs" as a whole; he cannot now deal with any particular item. That is a matter to be dealt with when we are in Committee.

Mr. TALMA: A reduction in the amount of rum consumed is suggested—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can deal with that when the House is in Committee.

Mr. TALMA: I am speaking generally.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the honourable member is out of order now that we are discussing the Estimates as a whole.

Mr. TALMA: I am quite willing to bow to your ruling. As regards the decrease of £17,469 which is estimated in connection with the Post Office, I cannot anticipate that there will be any such substantial decrease. I would like to say that the present Executive have adopted the policy of "playing safe", if I may use that expression, and have attempted to avoid ridicule and criticism from the Conservative element, who may probably feel that this Labour Government has no idea of finance and may only be anxious to spend money which has accumulated in the past, and who will probably blame this Coalition Labour Government for reckless expenditure. I know that that has served as a deterrent to this Government in compiling these Estimates. I am speaking on my own behalf, and I say that I feel that the present Coalition Government has put forward Estimates which are Conservative in outlook and policy just as other Estimates have been in the past. The reason for that is that they fear that the Conservative element will level criticism at their heads and say that they do not know anything about finance. This Coalition Labour Government should have been courageous enough to put forward a programme with benefits for those who have been waiting so long, and are tired of waiting and who, apparently, will have to wait for many years before they can get anything done. Before I sit down, I would like to tell the Executive that although substantial amounts have been derived from Income Tax and Death Duties and so on, and although it took many years before these taxes were introduced, do not let them feel for one moment that all the sources which can be tapped for raising revenue have already been tapped. There are still wide sources from which revenue can be collected, and I hope that if I have the privilege of being here to peruse the financial Estimates for another year, I will see that a surtax has been imposed on large incomes. I cannot for one moment feel, believe or be induced, to believe that anyone with an income of £1,000 per month, whether he gets it from investments or from any other source—I cannot feel, believe or be convinced that the sum of £12,000 per annum is not sufficient for one man and his family to live on. I hope that a surtax will be imposed on large incomes. I feel that 95% of that large income should be given to the Government to bring about the social amenities which are needed in this island. (A MEMBER: Not 95%!) I say that despite the sentiments of other members, I am terribly disappointed at these Esti-

mates. I feel that they are nothing more than the Conservative Element has done in the past. They are far from being on a Labour platform, and it is a disappointment to the right-thinking members of the community to see that we have a Coalition Labour Government, and they are not doing anything more than the "Conservatives" have done.

Mr. COX: I would just like to mention two points in connection with these Estimates. In the first place, I regret that no provision has been made for the improvement of the Water Supply of the colony. I feel that water is one of the most necessary items for the people of any country. Judging from the results which I have seen, it does appear that no tangible improvement has been made in this connection since fifty or sixty years ago. I feel that it is high time that some proper scheme be drawn up by this Government in order that the people throughout the island will have water as plentifully as possible. As regards the question of roads, I will not give the honourable junior member for St. George so much credit for this, because, from the time when the Estimates were compiled, I can say that it was the intention of Government to increase the amounts given to Highway Commissioners of the various parishes so that they may be able to repair their tenantry roads in the various districts. I regret to say, however, that nothing has been done for the parish of St. Michael where the roads have been given over to the Government and the Highway Commissioners cease to exist. When one looks around and sees the deplorable condition of the tenantry roads—I remember that about five weeks ago a person was taken ill in one of these tenancies; the doctor was sent for and when he got near the person's house, he could not get in to him and the result was that that person died without the doctor having seen him. These conditions should not exist indefinitely; from time immemorial when the Estimates are being introduced, you hear that the colony is in a healthy financial position; but the majority of the people are in an unhealthy condition and that should be taken seriously by the present Government. I am sure that it is the intention of this Government to do everything that lies in its power to improve the social and other conditions of the people as a whole. I regret to say that no provision has been made in these Estimates whereby the Government could immediately embark upon some proper scheme for repairing these tenantry roads and supplying water—two of the most necessary or essential things for the people of this island. I do hope, however, that in the very near future, resolutions will be sent down to this House for this purpose. I hope that when the next Budget speech is made, the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be able to say "I am able to report that the people of this island are in a healthy condition". The people matter more so than things.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am going to make a few comments on certain things in the Memorandum on these Estimates. I want to say something about the increase in the amount derived from Motor Spirit. I think that it is time that the Government take the tax off the motor vehicles and put it on the gasoline. To my mind, that would be more equitable. If you wish to use the roads, then you must pay for the increase in the amount of money spent. As regards the surplus which is in the Treasury, I hope that the Government will not spend it in strange places all over the country. I would like them to spend it on works of public utility in this country so that we can get the benefit of it. The Public Works Department is costing the colony something like £29,000,

and I think that it is time that the Department take over all the building projects in this colony as well as the supervision of them. I cannot see why the Public Works Department should cost us so much money, and then we have to pay thousands of pounds on every project. The Education Board spends thousands of pounds, and I do not think that that is a business-like project. As regards capital and current expenditure, I am perfectly in agreement with the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. James; it sounds more economical to me. I am not a great business man, but I cannot see why the present generation should spend such large sums of money and do not hand down some of the expenditure to posterity. I do not agree with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, of course, you cannot expect a human being to be an expert in everything. I think that the suggestion was made in the Other Place some time ago that it is a good business for the Government to allow the unborn generation—if I may use that hackneyed phrase—to come along and take part in the expenditure. With regard to the Emergency Department, I hope that the abolition of that Department will take place, but I hope that the time will never come for the abolition of price control. I do not mind if you abandon the Emergency Department, but I hope that we will never abandon price control. If it had not been for price control, a lot of people would die from starvation and many more would die as a result of murder. I would like the Government to take notice of all these things. There is a scandalous state of affairs in connection with the Public Works Department; we are spending tremendous sums of money and yet we are not getting the value for our money. I am not attaching any blame to the Government, because I do not like the Government. (Laughter). I am always in opposition to the Government. The only way to get a first-class Government is to consistently oppose it. (Laughter). It is a peculiar thing—I mention it in passing—that everything in the Government is all right as soon as an individual gets in it; but when he is out of the Government, everything goes wrong. (Laughter).

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.

HEAD I. — THE GOVERNOR

The items and the amounts to be voted under this Head were read.

Mr. DAMS: I beg to move that the sum of £1,553 be voted under this Head instead of £1,353 as printed in the Estimates. Honourable members will see that a typographical error has been made, the amount of £200 having been omitted opposite the item "miscellaneous." If it is necessary to do so, I ask leave to insert the figures.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: With regard to item 7 "Furniture," I see that the sum of £365 is to be voted and that includes cutlery, linen, etc. This is a matter which I have been talking about every year, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can tell the Committee. I have always been talking about the control and care of linen, cutlery, etc., at Government House. The other day the present Government asked this House to increase the Governor's entertainment

allowance, but they did not realise that there would be a saving of money to the Governor and to the colony by the employment of a permanent housekeeper at Government House. Things have gone from bad to worse at Government House. Honourable members will remember that about five years ago we had to pay £700 for replacements up there; there was not a half-pint tumbler out of which anyone could drink. I have been informed—and I think that my information is correct—that the late Governor had a housekeeper for whose services he paid himself, and the day after he left she removed a quantity of linen and when she was asked about it she said that Lady Bushe had given it to her. I am informed that the Police could not do anything about it, although Lady Bushe wrote to say that she had not given the linen to this housekeeper, and they had to withdraw the case against the person concerned. If there had been a permanent housekeeper up there, that sort of thing would not have happened; the housekeeper would be responsible for the property and it would be protected. Now we have to pay more money for this property and we can save the expense to the Head of the Administration and have the property protected by the appointment of a permanent housekeeper. I hope that this warning which I have now given will not fall on deaf ears as has been the case before. I think that there is quite a lot in what I have said, and I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph agrees with it. I hope to hear his opinion on the matter.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I would like to know how this £365 is made up or itemised. I would like to know exactly because I think that a lot of linen could be obtained out of this money. I do not think that the furniture will disappear so easily, but quite a lot of linen would have to disappear out of this £365.

Mr. ADAMS: Honourable members will see that the sum of £365 was voted last year, and this is a substantial increase on the amount which used to be voted. Included in this amount is the sum of £165 for the purchase of a new refrigerator. That refrigerator has been ordered but it has not yet arrived. If it arrives, we have to pay for it. If it arrives at the end of this month, it has to be paid for out of last year's estimate; if it arrives after the 31st of March, we have to pay for it out of this estimate. That is why the amount has been put in. I have sent for a copy of the old debates to show that when a new Governor is appointed it is nothing unusual to spend money in providing new furniture when he arrives. It is generally found that there is a lot of furniture, linen, &c., to be replaced. A careful check is made by the Public Works Department and a report is made to the Executive Committee. When honourable members remember how careless some people can be with pony whisky and cocktail glasses, they will realise that these will need a lot of replacements. The last report which was before us last month showed the necessity for replacements of crockery, etc. Honourable members must remember that these things will wear out. As regards the linen which was stolen, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew seems to have all the information that the general public has. I would like to say that if a servant steals anything and says that her mistress gave her the stuff which she steals she can say exactly the same thing in the case of a housekeeper. There is nothing to prevent a servant from saying "the housekeeper gave it to me". Honourable members must remember that a

Governor's wife may get on quite well with a housekeeper or may not; a housekeeper may get on quite well with Lady "A", but when Lady "B" comes the position is different. We have to trust to the chance of a Governor's wife being able to get on with a housekeeper. After all, women in every walk of life are peculiar creatures; they may be ordinary in some cases and extraordinary in others.

Mr. WILKINSON: I do not see why this £365 has to be put back in the Estimates because an item which has been ordered may not arrive until after the end of March. If I order anything before the end of March, and it arrives within a reasonable time, the money is still available from the previous year. There is no necessity for an increase of 50 per cent. or 100 per cent. on the previous year's vote.

Mr. TALMA: I would like to know whether a Cost of Living Bonus has been paid to the Clerk at Government House and also to the Watchmen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the item to which the honourable member is referring?

Mr. TALMA: I am referring to item No. 4 under which the sum of £200 is to be voted in respect of the Clerk. I would like to know if any provision is made for the payment of a Cost of Living Bonus so far as the Clerk and also the Watchmen are concerned. The Watchmen are as regards item No. 6.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: There are two Clerks at Government House—not one. (A MEMBER: One is paid out of Emergency expenses.) If one is paid out of Emergency expenses, it should be set out here in the Estimates and let us know what the Governor's office is costing us. That is what I am getting at. If there are two, four or six Clerks here, we should be told all that. Mr. Chairman, I would like honourable members to behave themselves; they are keeping a lot of noise here. (Laughter.) There is an amount to be voted in respect of an allowance to the Governor's Orderly; does that mean his chauffeur? I would like to know whether the chauffeur's fee is included here.

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

VESTRIES (BONUS TO EMPLOYEES) BILL

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 2 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. HAYNES: I object to that. Order No. 1 on the Order Paper has been under discussion for some time now and I think that it is time that we should finish it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to proceed with Order No. 2 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business as the first Order of the Day. An objection having been taken, I shall have to put the question to the House. The question is that Order No. 2 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business be taken as the first Order of the Day. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. LEWIS, BRANCKER, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, CRAWFORD, TALMA, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—15.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, FOSTER, BLACKMAN, GARNER and HAYNES—6.

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

The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business therefore stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the several Vestries of this Island to pay a cost of living bonus to all persons employed by them and the Parochial Boards appointed by them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr Speaker,—The principle underlying this Bill is to empower the several Vestries of this Island to pay a Cost of Living Bonus to their employees and the employees of the Parochial Boards appointed by them along similar lines as the Government is paying their employees. The Bill is respectfully worded, and I take it that honourable members have had some time in which to peruse it. It is a Bill which should commend itself to honourable members. There is very little which I can say in connection with it more than the fact that no one can argue sensibly that if the cost of living has increased in 1946 for Government employees, it must necessarily increase for Parochial employees in the same manner. All this Bill seeks to do is to allow the Vestries of the various parishes to pay retrospectively, as from the 1st of April, 1946, a Cost of Living Bonus as has been set out in the Bill. Representations have been made from the several parishes, but as the Bill stands, it will be optional for any parish to pay this Cost of Living Bonus. I do not think, therefore, that any honourable member should have any objection to this Bill. I repeat that it is optional for any parish to do what is suggested in the Bill. If this Bill is passed, the several Vestries will be in a position to put on their Estimates such sums of money as will meet this expenditure. I will not take up any more time in connection with this Bill because honourable members are aware of the fact that the Bill is a simple one.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second the motion. I do not wish to prolong the argument because I think that this is a matter of plain sailing. Everybody in the Government Service has been given a Cost of Living Bonus; the Parochial servants have asked for similar treatment, and I think that that treatment is due to them. The Vestry of St. Michael have investigated this matter very thoroughly and they have come to the conclusion that, as far as they are concerned, they would like to have this Bill passed so that they can give a Cost of Living Bonus to their employees on the same terms and conditions as the Government has done for their employees a few weeks ago.

Mr. RAMSAY: I intend to vote for the passing of this Bill because I think that it is just and right that the Parochial employees of the various parishes and especially the parish of St. Michael should be given a Cost of Living Bonus. I think, however, that a little more should have been said. The honourable Introducer of the Bill has said that the Bill seeks to put all the Parochial employees on a basis similar to that of Government employees. I think that that is laudable; but in connection with the employment of Government employees there is a clause respecting good behaviour. You will notice that Government employees cannot take any part in politics—they must not take any active part in politics. If this Bill seeks to put the Parochial employees on a basis similar to that of Government or public employees, then I think that the Parochial employees should fall into line. That is quite in order. The Parochial employees of St. Michael can easily be called the Republic of St. Michael; that is to say that you will find the employees of the Sanitary Department of St. Michael taking a very active part in politics. During the course of an election you will see them canvassing. I am speaking of the Sanitary Department; they get in any place, they get time off and they canvass outright. I do not know how the Department conducts its affairs; I am sure that the Government employees cannot do that. You will find these Parochial employees sitting as

chairmen at political meetings when Vestrymen are to be elected. I say that this is a two-fold thing. What the honourable senior member for the City is suggesting quite clearly is that the Parochial employees should be put on the same basis as the Government employees as regards this Cost of Living Bonus, but that affects a principle. Government employees work under certain rules—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member is in order to bring in that.

Mr. RAMSAY: Your Honour says that I am not in order to bring in that when the honourable member is asking that these employees be put on the same basis as Government employees?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not on that particular line.

Mr. RAMSAY: If I say that these employees should not be allowed to take any part in politics would I be in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think you would be in order.

Mr. RAMSAY: I bow to your ruling. Mr. Speaker, but I say that when people are sent to the House to do certain things, it is a matter entirely for the House as to how they conduct their affairs. I think that I have said sufficient, and the sooner a stop is put to these things, the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. COX: I am prepared to support this Bill, but not on the grounds that, because the Government employees are getting a Cost of Living Bonus, therefore the Parochial employees deserve it. Not at all. I feel that these Parochial employees richly deserve this Cost of Living Bonus, and, further than that, I would like to say that the Vestry had no right to allow the matter to reach the stage which it has reached to-day. The Vestry had the power to pay their employees a Cost of Living Bonus from any period from which they wanted to pay them. They have only come to-day to get this Bill passed to pay this Cost of Living Bonus retrospectively whereas they should have laid rates for that purpose ever since. I hope that in future when things are to be done in the interest of the Parochial employees, they will not have to reach the stage of politics before anything can be done. I support this Bill, I say again, purely on the consideration that these employees deserve a Cost of Living Bonus.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that I have to ask my colleague to consider one or two points so far as the principle of this Bill is concerned. I would like him to assure me that there has been a conference among the Vestries of the island in connection with this Bill. I think that that would have been a good thing to say in moving the second reading of this Bill. I see in the title of the Bill that only the word "Bonus" is used, and in Clause 2 of the Bill mention is made of the payment of a "Cost of Living Bonus on the salary or other emolument". I think that the words "Cost of Living Bonus" should be used in the title Clause, and when we are in Committee I am going to question whether the Government is paying a Cost of Living Bonus on emoluments other than the substantive salary. The next thing which I would like to know is whether or not the time has passed for the Vestry to deal with this matter on their own. The Parochial year 1946-47 has not yet passed and they would have had to ask for permission to lay new rates to provide this Cost of Living Bonus in respect of 1946. As far as the Vestries are concerned, they could easily provide for the payment of this Cost of Living Bonus in respect of 1947-48 without a Bill of this nature. I would like the honourable member to explain those matters for my benefit. I would also like to know whether the time has really passed for making retrospective

payments by way of salary or not. The Parochial year has not yet ended and I would like to know whether it is possible to lay a rate for other purposes during the year. I am asking the honourable member for enlightenment on these points; I would like to know whether or not the Vestry have any authority to provide for the payment of a Cost of Living Bonus when they lay the rates this month. I am trying to get an explanation of these matters before we go into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. GARNER: I am supporting this Bill. From what I know of the Vestries, this Cost of Living Bonus should have been paid a very long time ago. If the Vestry of St. Michael have now found out that they have made a mistake in not paying this Cost of Living Bonus and they have now come to the House so as to get sanction to make the payment retrospective, there is nothing wrong in that. I know that in St. Philip we have already paid a Cost of Living Bonus from 1946. We are not asking anybody for permission to make that payment retrospective; we have done that already. (Cheers). It is true that some of the basic salaries are too low and these should be investigated. An investigation of the basic salary is also to be carried out. If these Parochial Boards have the money and can pay this Cost of Living Bonus retrospectively as from the 1st of April, 1946, I do not see that there is anything wrong with that. If the rates have already been laid and these Boards have the money, certainly they can pay this Cost of Living Bonus. I know that the Parochial employees are underpaid, because some of the Vestries and Parochial Boards, I am sorry to say, are very conservative and they hate to depart from any old method. If an employee does not happen to be favourite, he does not get a fair break. The payment of a Cost of Living Bonus will relieve the situation for the time being, and I hope that this Bill will be passed by this House this afternoon.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I would like to say that this Bill is a necessary Bill. The salaries of some of these Parochial employees are limited. However, this Cost of Living Bonus should not be paid whether the money is available or not unless the matter is brought before the House.

Mr. TALMA: I agree with this Bill, but there is one aspect of it which is disturbing my mind. This is in connection with the parish which I have the honour to represent. I am referring to the Inspectors of Highways. Although the parish may be in a position to pay this Cost of Living Bonus, and although it may be fair and right to pay it, the practice up there is a bad one. The Inspector and Assistant Inspector of Highways who have received increases in pay, are paid for working three or four months of the year, and those who work on the roads are paid when they actually work. I would agree to pay the people who are doing the actual work but there are those who sit back for the greater part of the year and use the taxpayers' money as recklessly as they can in repairing roads which are not in need of any repairs. They receive their full salaries—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member is in order. This Bill deals with the Vestries Act and not the Highways Act.

Mr. TALMA: This is the only time which I have to discuss this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the honourable member is not in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think that in duty bound I should reply to my colleague. As the hon. junior member for St. Peter was allowed some latitude, I hope that I will be given the latitude to say this;

whatever you may do with the people, you cannot stifle their right to think as they feel like thinking. As regards the remarks of the hon. member in connection with these employees, if he feels that he has any case to fight—

Mr. SPEAKER: I ruled that the honourable member was out of order, and that being so, you are out of order in dealing with the matter now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I bow to Your Honour's ruling. In reply to the honourable junior member for the City, I would like to say that this question of the payment of a Cost of Living Bonus has been discussed by the Vestry of St. Michael. In this parish a War Bonus of 30% was paid while the other parishes paid 25%. That is a statement of fact. During the year, applications were made for an increase in the War Bonus, and anyone who is accustomed to the administration of affairs of any sort, will realize that you must maintain some sort of economic equilibrium. The Vestry of St. Michael are a responsible body and we could not pay a War Bonus of 50% or 80% when we were watching what is being done. We paid a War Bonus of 30% when the Government was paying 25%. We could not do anything during the year on account of the Act. We are now asking that this Bill be passed so that this Cost of Living Bonus can be paid as from the year 1946 because the Government released the Cost of Living Index only a few months ago. Honourable members know that under the Vestries Act, the rates are to be laid by the month of April. An honourable member has suggested that the Vestry can lay a rate for anything else, but this is not correct. They can only lay another rate for sanitary purposes during the year. Honourable members will appreciate the fact that during the year when applications are made in respect of this Cost of Living Bonus, the Vestries have to say to their employees "We are awaiting the Government's decision." If the Government decides to make the payment of the Cost of Living Bonus retrospective, we can only follow the Government and make it retrospective. The only reason why we had to come here with this Bill is because of the fact that we could not, under the Act, lay a rate to provide for the payment of this Cost of Living Bonus as from last year. We can lay this rate in respect of 1947—48. This Bill is really asking for permission to lay a rate as from 1946 so as to be able to pay this Cost of Living Bonus retrospectively. I would like to say that the Bill is worded as it is because, under the Act, there are Parochial employees such as grave-diggers [A MEMBER: They get wages] and others who can be compared with the unestablished staff of the Government, while the monthly employees would be considered as the established staff. If that explanation is satisfactory to the honourable member, then I need not go any further. I feel that I have given a satisfactory explanation and if there are any details, they can be dealt with when we go into Committee on the Bill. Finally, let me say that we want this Bill passed in time and it is not compulsory for the Vestries to do what is provided for in the Bill. It is not a question as to whether the Vestries agree with it or not. This is a part of the statute law and the Vestries may do what is provided for or not. If this Bill is passed there cannot be any excuse on the part of any Vestry that they have not got the power to do it. I repeat that, under the present set-up, no Vestry could attempt to lay any rate or attempt to pay their employees retrospectively as from 1946.

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

The second reading was passed.

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

Clause 1, the title Clause, was read as follows:—

1. This Act may be cited as "The Vestries (Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am suggesting that the words "Cost of Living" be inserted before the word "Bonus." I beg to make that motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I accept that amendment.

The question that Clause 1 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 1 as amended was passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Vestries Act, 1911, or the Poor Relief Act, 1892, as from the twenty sixth day of March one thousand nine hundred and forty six and continuing until the twenty fifth day of March one thousand nine hundred and forty eight the Vestry for each of the several parishes may, if they consider it expedient so to do, pay to the Parochial Treasurer, the Clerk to the Churchwarden, the Clerk of the Board of Guardians and to all other persons employed by the Vestry or by a Parochial Board which a Vestry is by law required and empowered to appoint and which has specific functions and duties assigned to it by law a Cost of Living Bonus on the salary or other emolument paid to such employees under any or either of the beforementioned Acts at rates not exceeding those hereinafter mentioned as the Vestry shall from time to time, determine namely:—

On 1st £100 of salary or part thereof ..	40%
On 2nd £100 " " " " " " ..	30%
On 3rd £100 " " " " " " ..	25%
On 4th £100 " " " " " " ..	20%
On 5th £100 " " " " " " ..	15%
On 6th £100 " " " " " " ..	10%

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

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that the words "other emolument" occurring in lines thirteen and fourteen be deleted, and the word "wages" be substituted therefor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I accept that amendment.

Mr. LEWIS: For the benefit of my colleague I would like to say that I feel that the several Vestries of the island have it in their power now to lay rates to provide for the payment of a Cost of Living Bonus to their employees. As far as the retrospective payment is concerned, I feel that a Bill of this nature must be necessary. It strikes me that we are giving authority for the payment of this Cost of Living Bonus up to 1948. As far as anybody can see now, there is the likelihood of a similar Bill being reintroduced. It strikes me that there may be some vestrymen who would like to be able to tell the Parochial employees that they would like to pay them a Cost of Living Bonus voluntarily and not wait until this Bill is passed. I would like my colleague to remember that there is such an Act as the Expiring Laws Continuance Act, and perhaps this Bill could have been drafted along those lines so that we can anticipate the situation and there would not be any necessity to re-draft the Bill. I hear that the Vestry is of the opinion that the payment of this Cost of Living Bonus will be discontinued after the 25th of March,

1948. I think that that is a very optimistic view, and I wish that I could share it. It seems to me that the House is being put in a position where a Vestry can say that the period for which the Bill was passed has expired and therefore the payment of this Cost of Living Bonus comes to an end. It seems to me that this Clause needs some re-drafting realistically to meet the situation. Perhaps I am wrong, but that is how it strikes me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I regret that the Vestry is following the Government. The honourable member seemed to have left the Chamber when I was explaining the position and now he is not paying any attention. The Government is actually paying this Cost of Living Bonus up to 1948 and the reason for introducing this Bill is because we are following the Government. Under the Expiring Laws Continuance Act, an amendment can be made at such time as the Act expires. That is done elsewhere for constitutional reasons. It is quite easy to come back in 1948 and have an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill passed.

Mr. COX: I would still like a further explanation from the honourable senior member for the City. As far as I can see, it appears that the Vestry is quite prepared to wait for the salary scale of the Government and then follow on. I feel that the Vestry had the power to pay their employees this Cost of Living Bonus retrospectively until they could have drawn up a proper salary scale.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is nothing wrong about the salaries and wages of the employees. This Bill is asking for authority to pay this Cost of Living Bonus. It is quite easy to say that the Vestry should consolidate the salaries and wages of their employees. The Vestry of St. Michael is very mindful of the necessity for consolidating these salaries and wages. I have followed the recommendations of the Cuke Committee, and I am mindful of the utterances made in this House by responsible members of the Government in introducing the Resolution to provide for the payment of Civil Servants. Honourable members must realise the necessity of following the Government. You cannot do otherwise unless you want to make statements of irresponsibility. As regards the other parishes, I would like to repeat for the benefit of the honourable junior member for the City that if you read the Bill, you will see that it is not compulsory for any Vestry to do what is provided for in this Bill. The Vestries have the right to do it, and it cannot be said that they have not got the power to pay this Cost of Living Bonus.

Mr. COX: It is difficult to understand the honourable senior member for the City. At one time he says that the Vestry led the Government and now he is saying that they are behind the Government. I just cannot understand that.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that the hon. senior member for the City should continue to lead the Government; it is an excellent example to follow. I would like to know if in the consideration of this Bill, the Vestry thought of considering the poor Parochial pensioners. [Mr. MOTTLEY: We are doing that]. I would like to know whether this Bill authorises the payment of a Cost of Living Bonus to the pensioners. I think that there should be some further amendment to this Bill. I see, however, that the Parochial pensioners are going to have their own Bill, and I hope that it will get as easy a passage through the House as this Bill is getting. As regards the Vestries of the other parishes, I feel that if the House is passing a Bill of this nature, they will have to fall in line; there is no question of the Vestries having any option in this matter. I think that the House should be more careful in future. If any honourable member attempts to introduce a Bill which places an obligation on the several parishes of this island, I think that he should know whether it

is their wish or not. This is a kind of Bill which no member of a country Vestry would dare oppose; he could not do it, and the moment the Bill is passed, he will have to fall into line with it because he cannot tell the employees of the Vestry that the Vestry did not have the authority to do what is provided for in the Bill. In passing this Bill, the House should know whether it has met with the approval of the several Vestries or not. The honourable senior member for the City has made a serious admission this afternoon. Think of a Bill being introduced by a private member of this House and the Vestries not having expressed their willingness for it! I do not know if the Vestries realise what is happening. I have always been cautious in voting for these Bills on which the Vestries have not expressed their wishes that the Bills should be passed. I think that the honourable senior member for the City should first of all have used his ability to persuade the Vestries that they are robbing their employees. Do not let us introduce a Bill behind their backs, a Bill which compels them to fall into line with it. After this Bill has been passed, the Parochial employees of any parish would be very foolish not to say that they must have a Cost of Living Bonus because the Vestry has been given the power and authority to lay rates for it. I think that if the employees did not do that, the Vestries would have some of the biggest fools in the island to work for them. I repeat that in passing a Bill of this nature, the House should know if it is the wish of the various Vestries that it should be passed. I say that the honourable member has introduced an excellent principle here, but it might not be an excellent one on another occasion. I would like all the employees to get more money but I think that a principle is involved and it should be one which will commend itself to the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the honourable member would look at the Order Paper under Private Members' Business, he will see that Bills have been introduced by private members and it is the desire of the Vestry of St. Michael that they should be passed. I take it that the honourable member will appreciate the fact that I have given notice of a Bill to increase the number of pensioners and of one to give them a Cost of Living Bonus.

Mr. FOSTER: I am going to support this Bill. It is an optional Bill. There is nothing binding on the Vestries whatsoever, and for that reason I will support it. (Cheers).

Mr. GARNER: Perhaps the honourable junior member for the City is somewhat mistaken. If this Bill is passed this afternoon, the Vestry which does not want to use it will not have to use it. If any Vestry employee says that he wants something done and the Vestry does not see fit to do it, they will not do it. Therefore the Bill will not be binding on any Vestry. The Vestry which wants to use it will use it. If they do not want to use it, they will not use it. I am hoping that what the honourable senior member for the City is asking to be done will be done. We, in the parish of St. Philip, are paying the casual relief people a Cost of Living Bonus and when that is taken off, they will receive increased pay.

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

Clause 2 as amended was passed.

Clause 3 was read and passed.

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

The House resumed.

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

ADDRESS RULED OUT OF ORDER.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to proceed with an Address which concerns the island as a whole. I intended to give notice of it this morning.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to proceed with an Address of which he failed to give notice this morning. I do not know what the Address is about; it is a matter for the House.

Mr. TALMA: The Address is in connection with the price which is being paid for peasants' canes.

Mr. SPEAKER: An Address in that connection is already on the Order Paper.

Mr. LEWIS: I am making an appeal to the honourable senior member for Christ Church. I feel that the honourable member is introducing a principle which is not a bad one, but one which will certainly delay our procedure at some future time. I would not like him to be the honourable member who would be accused of creating this precedent. I appeal to the honourable member not to create this precedent, and I ask him to keep his Address and give notice of it in the proper way at the next meeting of the House. I advise the honourable member to give notice of this Address in the proper way, otherwise he will find other honourable members doing a similar thing.

Mr. TALMA: I am very grateful for the advice which the honourable member has given me, but if honourable members will recall, there is no precedent being created. This is something which has been done in the past; it was done only a few weeks ago in connection with the purchase of the Bay Estate and it is always being done.

Mr. SPEAKER (After reading the Address): I think that this Address is practically the same as one which is already on the Order Paper standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. This Address is so similar to that one that I cannot accept it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is the other Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 63.

Mr. TALMA: I have asked a question on similar lines.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the Address is out of Order.

PAROCHIAL EMPLOYEES PENSION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think we ought to realise that we have to sit two days next week, and I suggest to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that before we leave this afternoon he will give us some indication of the two days which are suitable to the members of the Executive Committee. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 11th day of March, 1947, at twelve o'clock.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am opposed to that. I think that we should keep in accordance with our usual custom; that is to say that when once you enter upon the Estimates, you go right through with them. We have broken that custom to-day in order to deal with some urgent matters which have to be put before the Vestries before they lay their rates. Let us therefore finish these matters now so that we should not have to interrupt the consideration of the Estimates again next Tuesday.

Mr. RAMSAY: I think it is of vital importance that we should carry on from where we left off this morning. I am in entire agreement with the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. George. I beg to second the motion of the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. WILKINSON: I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

The question that Order No. 3 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act, 1944—14.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—This is a very simple Bill. As the position is now, the Vestries and their subsidiary Boards are only allowed to pay pensions according to the law. All this Bill seeks to do is to give the Vestries power to pay a Cost of Living Bonus to pensioners on the same basis on which the Government is paying their employees. I do not think that this Bill calls for any argument at all. Even the honourable junior member for the City will see the necessity for the passing of this Bill and will allow it to go through without any debate. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

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

The second reading was passed.

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

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

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Principal Act as from the twenty sixth day of March one thousand nine hundred and forty seven and continuing until the twenty fifth day of March one thousand nine hundred and forty eight the Vestry for each of the several parishes may if they consider it expedient so to do pay all parochial employees who have retired or may hereafter retire from the service of such Vestry a cost-of-living bonus at rates not exceeding those hereinafter mentioned as they shall from time to time determine, namely:—

Bonus at the rate of twenty five per centum in respect of pensions not exceeding one hundred pounds per annum; and a sum sufficient to bring to one hundred and twenty five pounds per annum any Parochial pension over one hundred pounds per annum and not exceeding one hundred and twenty five pounds per annum;

Provided that no such bonus shall be paid to any Parochial Employees whose total income exceeds two hundred pounds per annum.

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

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: This point is exercising my mind, and I know that you share it, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know whether the word "hereafter" occurring in line 8 of this clause is not ambiguous. Where Parochial Employees have retired or may retire from the service of the Vestry, that can only cover the period of the Bill.

Mr. SPRINGER: The word "hereafter" refers to this day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The word "hereafter" has been used in respect of employees who may retire after the passing of this Bill. This Bill seeks to allow the Vestry to pay this bonus to pensioners up to 1948 in accordance with the proposal of the Government to pay their employees. It applies to employees who have retired and who are now retiring.

Mr. LEWIS: I am perfectly willing to apply it that way but I do not see the necessity for the word and I do not know what is going to be involved. There are employees who will retire before the Bill expires.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This matter has been gone into by the proper legal authorities, people who are well trained in these matters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This tribunal is higher than any firm of solicitors. (Laughter.)

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put, I would like to say that whatever may be the position of the Government in the future—I say this because mention has been made of following the Government—the Government is not paying a Cost of Living Bonus to people who have retired in any circumstances. The policy of the Government so far has been that where a man retires in circumstances which would entitle him to receive a pension or gratuity, he gets a Cost of Living Bonus.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw attention to Rule 131.

Mr. ADAMS: I wish to point out that if the argument is that the Vestry is doing what the Government is doing, the Government's principle has always been to pay a Cost of Living Bonus in circumstances which would entitle the person retiring to receive a pension or a gratuity.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Bill seeks to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act; you cannot give anybody a pension or gratuity.

Mr. ADAMS: I thought what I have said was abundantly clear, but apparently it is not. A Vestry can do what it likes; it can catch a man stealing and fire him and still give a Cost of Living Bonus. I say that that is not the policy of the Government. Of course, it is set out in the Bill that the Vestry may pay this Cost of Living Bonus to employees who have retired "if they consider it expedient so to do". I repeat that the Vestry can catch a man stealing and fire him and still give him a Cost of Living Bonus.

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

Clause 2 was passed.

Clause 3 was read and passed.

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

The House resumed.

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

EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Order No. 4 of the Order Paper be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. GALE seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Education Act, 1890—12.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to amend the Education Act so as to enable the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael to increase the number of Exhibitions which are granted by the Vestries to First and Second Grade Schools. Honourable members will appreciate the fact that the number of children has increased since the Act came into operation, and today you have over 80,000 people in the parish of St. Michael. Time was when Exhibitions went a-begging in this parish; I know as a fact that at one time you had to ask people to apply for these Exhibitions, but to-day you have very many appli-

cants for one Exhibition. The Vestry of St. Michael have discussed the question of increasing the number of scholarships by 100 per cent. and this Bill has been introduced as a result. I think that honourable members will readily agree that the necessity for secondary education is very apparent, and therefore this Bill will commend itself to the House. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

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

The second reading was passed.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were read and passed.

Clause 3 was read as follows:—

3. Section forty seven of the Education Act, 1890, is hereby amended

- (a) by deleting the word "ten" occurring in line two and substituting therefor the word "twenty"; and
- (b) by deleting the word "one" occurring in line six and substituting therefor the word "two".

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: He would be a brave man in this House to oppose a Bill of this nature, but I would just like to warn the House that they are merely creating an occasion for parochial patronage. The proper thing for this House to do is to give free secondary education to the people of this colony who are in a position to have it. I do not think that it should be put into the hands of the Education Board, the Vestry or anybody else to walk around and dispense this form of charity as parochial patronage to the children of parishioners who are in straitened circumstances. That is absolutely wrong. I cannot get this House to see that a mere £15,000 or £20,000 a year will provide secondary education absolutely free, and people will not have to beg for scholarships for their children. That is the most degrading form of charity that I know of. I would not like the House to pass this Bill and not let it be placed on record that they are being used for that purpose. I hope that the most deserving children will get these scholarships, but the moment you say that not only ten but twenty children want scholarships, I say that it is time that secondary education should be given free. By doing that, you will put everybody in the same position. One person can pay for his child, another cannot pay, and when the War comes down both children have certificates, and both of them go to die for the country. I say that it is a degrading form of charity to make a child beg for its education while its father goes and votes for a Vestryman. I raise my voice in the hope that free secondary education will be given to those children in the community who can use it. In this year 1947, a House of Assembly like this should insist that the Government introduce a Bill to make provision for free secondary education and get it passed. I say that it is a regrettable thing to increase the number of people who make capital out of this form of charity, and who continue to do it with your connivance, and who are spreading it. I deplore that fact and I am extremely sorry that I have no alternative but to vote for this Bill.

Mr. GALE: The honourable junior member for the City has made some most reckless statements. He talks about dispensing charity. I am a member of the Vestry of St. Michael, and from the time that I have been there it has been the policy of the Vestry

for a Committee to see that the applications for scholarships have been sent in by people who are in straitened circumstances. When they are satisfied about the straitened circumstances an examination is conducted by the Headmaster or Headmistress of the school for the award of the scholarships, and they are awarded along those lines. It was the policy of the Vestry in the past to award scholarships on the vote of members, but that policy has long been abandoned. Nobody is given any patronage or vote and none of the wicked, disgraceful things of which the honourable junior member for the City has spoken takes place at all.

Mr. LEWIS: If the honourable member looks up the history of the Vestry, he will find that as soon as the year is coming to a close, something happens about a scholarship; something has gone wrong or something must be done to increase the number of scholarships. For all these years they have done without Workmen's Compensation, and a certain honourable member used to bring that up towards the last two months of every year.

Mr. GARNER: I do not see that there is anything to get hot about; I think that the honourable member should urge the Government to bring about free secondary education. I think that the honourable member should compliment the Vestry for having brought up a Bill which will enable them to increase the number of scholarships. This is not doing anything for the purpose of vote-catching; this is a progressive movement, and if the honourable member were a Vestryman, he would have agreed with it. These are necessary things, and when you have a recalcitrant Government, the Vestries have to push things.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not use words such as "recalcitrant" in this connection. (Laughter.)

Mr. GARNER: The Vestry has set a good precedent in coming here and asking for permission to increase the number of scholarships. What is more, the Vestry of St. Philip is doing the same thing; we have sent more boys to the Lodge School now than we did before. (Cheers.) There is nothing sinister about this matter; it is a very progressive-minded Vestry which has the interest of the community at heart.

Mr. COX: I endorse everything that the honourable junior member for the City has said. I happen to know of a few bad cases. Sometime ago a scholarship was awarded to the son of a political hireling, and the child's father was asked to bring him down to the Vestry so that he should not be opposed. I have known of a case in which a wealthy individual was awarded a scholarship for his child when the Act states that parents must be in straitened circumstances. I agree with the honourable junior member for the City: we want a large educational scheme whereby children can have free secondary education. When we get that, we will be sure that there will not be such cases, especially in the parish of St. Michael.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that honourable members will pass this Bill, but I would like to tell the honourable junior member for the City that everything goes as vote-catching to those who have not got socialistic minds. (A MEMBER: Are you a Socialist?) I am very pleased to associate myself with vote-catching in this way.

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

Clause 3 was passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 were read and passed.

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

The House resumed.

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

ADDRESS *RE* PRICES PAID BY SUGAR FACTORIES FOR PEASANTS' CANES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—Before the next Order of the Day is called, in view of the fact that we will be dealing with the Estimates next Tuesday and that there is a matter of urgency at this time amongst persons in agricultural districts in respect of the prices which are being paid for peasants' canes per ton, I am asking the indulgence of the House, although it is a late hour, to proceed with Order No. 63 standing in my name as the next Order of the Day. I beg to move that this Order be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. GARNER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy,—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to prices paid by Sugar Factories for Peasants' Canes.

Mr. BRANCKER: I propose with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to abridge this matter and to make it very much simpler than it appears at present. I am asking leave to withdraw the wording of the Address and to substitute the following therefor:—

The House of Assembly To His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly is of opinion that immediate steps should be taken by Government to appoint Professor C. Y. Shephard, Ph.D., of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture or some other expert to ensure that peasant cane growers shall receive an equitable price for their canes in respect of the 1947 reaping season.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that this year the dissatisfaction among the peasants over the prices which the factories are offering them for their canes is rampant, and one can well understand that with the prices which are being offered to-day, and in view of the increased labour costs which the peasants must of necessity pay for the reaping of their canes, it is only fair that steps should be taken as soon as possible to ensure that they receive an adequate measure of protection. The peasants form an important section of the community, and, in my submission, they are entitled to receive by means of the Government's aid, a full and impartially-conducted enquiry into the prices which are being paid for their canes. At the present time, with the prices per ton which appear on the mark-boards of the sugar factories and those which the peasants have to pay for the reaping of their canes, it would be impossible for anyone to see anything like a reasonable profit—in some cases there has been nothing but a loss—on his cane crop this season. That is why I am commending this Address to honourable members. The matter is one, I feel, of urgency, and we will not have a chance to deal with it during the next few meetings of this House. It deserves our immediate attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to withdraw the Address and to proceed with the one which has been substituted for it.

Mr. LEWIS: Perhaps it would serve a useful purpose if I draw this matter to the attention of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. He has introduced an excellent Address if it is going to remedy a grievance which I have heard aired in this House

from the time I have been a member. I remember quite well that Professor Shephard enquired into the cane-cutting prices, and soon after that this House was asked to vote a certain sum of money for the same Professor Shephard to enquire into the sugar industry. It was stated in this House that that particular investigation would include the proper prices which would be paid for peasants' canes. (A MEMBER: That is true.) If Professor Shephard was to investigate the prices to be paid for canes, I do not see that the Government should be asked to do that again. If it was the intention of the Government that Professor Shephard was to supply them with a proper scale to be paid for canes out of the £2,000 and he has not done it, he has received that money under false pretences. I would like to have the matter clarified. I sincerely hope that some member of the Government will let me know whether I am wrong or not. I would like to know what information Professor Shephard has supplied. This Address does not contain anything about what he has done, and if he has not done anything I do not know that I can agree to the passing of an Address to re-engage his services. I am somewhat in the dark, and I do not know where I am in voting for this Address.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not opposing the application for leave to proceed with the Address, but I hope that this is not going to be a precedent. I am not going to say anything that should come from the honourable senior member for St. George who is in charge of Agriculture in this House. What the honourable member has just said is known to all of us. If the honourable junior member for St. Lucy wanted information as to what has been done in the matter, he should have enquired from the honourable senior member for St. George. I repeat that the honourable junior member for the City has not said anything new; if any information was required, the honourable senior member for St. George could have supplied the exact information. I think that honourable members should have confidence in the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Everything which has been said by the honourable junior member for the City is inaccurate. The honourable member sat down and heard me tell the then honourable senior member for St. James repeatedly that we wanted a specific clause in the Resolution relative to the price to be paid for peasants' canes. I asked Professor Shephard when he was leaving the colony whether he had paid any attention to fixing the price for peasants' canes, and he told me: "No, if the Government want it done, they will have to bring me back or get somebody else to do it." The honourable member knows the controversy which we had in connection with this matter of fixing the price to be paid for peasants' canes. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy is asking leave—

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member is right. I questioned whether the enquiry would have anything to do with the purchase of peasants' canes, and it was suggested that it was not necessary to set that out in the Resolution. One honourable member said that it would be ludicrous to think that Professor Shephard would enquire into the whole sugar industry and pay no regard to the price to be paid to peasants for their canes. The Government's spokesman suggested that it was not necessary to put that in the Terms of Reference where the Resolution was concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I got my information straight from the horse's mouth. I am in sympathy with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy; the wages of the agricultural labourers have been increased and the peasants are faced with disaster unless the Government takes some steps to assist them with regard to the price paid for their canes. I feel that the Government should have this matter settled once and for all.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to withdraw the Address and to proceed with that which has been substituted in its place.

Mr. BRANCKER: For the reasons which I have mentioned earlier, I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second the motion. I am happy to see that the Address which I was seeking to get passed earlier this afternoon is actually going through despite the fact that no credit might come my way. (Laughter). The peasants are in a serious plight because, although the price of sugar has been increased substantially, there is no system whereby a fair and equitable price can be paid to them for their canes. The peasants have to face the same expenses as the plantation owners; the transportation is very difficult and very seldom they are in a position to own their own means of transport. In every respect the burden of the peasants is much greater than that of the plantation owners or the big cane growers. Another point is that the peasants are paid a smaller price for their canes per ton than the plantation owners are paid for theirs. If eighty or one hundred peasants who sent their canes to the factories were regarded as one group, then you can see that they would be entitled to receive just as much for their canes as the small plantation owners receive. A further point is that peasants' canes usually possess a greater sucrose content than the plantation canes, because the plantation canes are usually big and watery and they are reaped earlier in the crop season, than the peasants' canes are reaped. There are several reasons in favour of having Professor Shephard here because a Bill to fix a minimum price for canes will only meet with a similar fate as that of the past. By the time the Bill is passed the crop season will have been finished and the peasants will have been run into ruin. If Professor Shephard or some other expert comes here within a week or two, it stands to reason that a fair and equitable price will be worked out so that the peasants will be saved from disaster.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I suggest that there should not be any differentiation as between peasant cane growers and the big cane growers. I suggest that all cane growers be included in this matter, and that the words "a minimum" should be used in the Address instead of the word "equitable." The sooner that Professor Shephard comes the better it will be for all concerned. If we wait upon the Government, well, it must be remembered that within the next six months the crop will be over.

Mr. SPRINGER: It is perfectly natural at now the wage-earners in the industry have not attended to, and some system has been established by which they are assured of a reasonable share in the price of sugar—it is perfectly natural that the cane grower, particularly the small cane grower, should feel that he has been left out in the cold and at least uncertain as to whether the price which is being offered him is a fair one. I say that because anyone who has taken the trouble to enquire will find that there is a great diversity of prices paid for canes at each factory for various reasons due partly to the efficiency of the factories and whether they make syrup or sugar. I think we all agree that some system or principle or method should be established for regulating the price paid for canes at all factories—a price which is fair to all concerned. It will help the country even if it does not greatly affect the actual prices received. I know that there are places—the parish which the honourable junior member for St.

Lucy represents is one of them perhaps—where it would appear that things are below par; there are other large areas, at least where the best factories are, where things can hardly be greatly improved. There is sometimes a difference between the prices paid to the small cane growers and those paid to the big cane growers; the establishment of some system, principle or method which is uniform would have the effect of creating confidence and of making everyone feel that justice is being done. This question of fixing a price for sugar canes has a long history; we were considering it last year and long before that and we have always come up against the snag of getting accurate information about the expenses of the factory and so on. When Professor Shephard was given instructions to examine the whole sugar industry, it was said—certainly by me at the time—that I hope soon to see his Report because if he made a complete examination of the organization of the industry, we would be able to get the necessary information upon which a proper Bill could be drafted and legislation introduced which would produce a fair and equitable method of paying for sugar canes. I do not think that it was ever said to Professor Shephard "You must fix the price for canes." That would only be for one year. We wanted a statement of fact plus the recommendations for the improvement of the industry—recommendations upon which we ourselves would be able, with a certain amount of certainty, to approach legislation to provide a regular yardstick or method to apply in each year to the changing circumstances of the industry. I spoke with Professor Shephard in July last year on the same question and I told him that I hope his Report would soon be ready because we wanted to give the peasant proprietors the assurance of a fair and reasonable price for their canes in relation to the price of sugar. I told him that it was a matter of such urgency that I wished him to use every possible speed to get out the Report. Naturally, if Professor Shephard was asked if he was fixing a price for sugar canes he would have said "No". This Report will be in keeping with the man's ability and I have no doubt that it will provide us with a basis on which we can work. I owe the House this information; Professor Shephard has written to apologise for not having presented his Report which was due last year, in view of the fact that he is Acting Principal of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, and owing to the present nature of the additional duties which he has to perform, he had to lay aside temporarily the work which he has undertaken to do for us. He hopes to return to the completion of the work as soon as he is replaced. We are therefore in a position to hear from Professor Shephard and to receive his Report upon which we will be able to fix a price which will give satisfaction to the peasants. We must have the machinery for this purpose and we have to deal with the varying factors.

As far as the proposal made by the honourable senior member for Christ Church and adopted by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy is concerned, I am not voting against the Address, but I am wondering whether that is the most effective way to deal with the matter. You are asking the Government to appoint somebody who is a recognized expert in such matters and you mention Professor Shephard; if he will come by plane and make the enquiry we will be relieved, but we must bear in mind the possibility that it might not be possible to get somebody to do it, somebody who is satisfactory to all concerned at such short notice. I would not like anyone to go away with the feeling that if we pass this Address, we can say that the price of the sugar canes will be fixed next week because Professor Shephard is coming to do that. Let us bear in mind that

that cannot be possible at such short notice. Speaking for myself, I am quite certain that the Report is what we want, and upon that we will be able to fix a method in respect of the price of canes not only for this year, but we will have something which will last with us as long as we have the present organization of the sugar industry. I may mention in passing that in order to implement this Address a Resolution would have to be passed by this House before any person could be invited to come here to do this work—at any rate before the person could come. I presume that if the House pass the Address we would be willing to vote the sum of money which would be necessary for bringing the person here. We all know the feeling of the peasants; I feel myself from what I have seen and enquired about, that owing to the great variation in methods of calculation, the efficiency of the factory, and so on, the peasants feel uncertain as to whether the rates at which they are being paid for their canes are equitable or not. In some districts in the parish which I represent, the peasants do not feel that they have been "thrown down the drain"; they fear that the minimum price may be less than what they are getting. I feel that something should be done to make the peasants feel that they are not left without any chance, but that there is some guarantee of fair and equitable conditions.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will not associate myself with any weak-kneed policy with regard to this question. It is perhaps right to say that the Government can do anything except to make a male a female and *vice versa*. I will not sit here with the idea that we should not make it emphatically clear that we intend to see to it before the season ends, that the peasants or small cane growers are definitely assured of an equitable price for their canes. The honourable senior member for St. George has made some observations in connection with some remarks which I made about Professor Shephard being employed to fix a price for canes. A delegation of the Congress Party asked Professor Shephard whether in his investigation he hoped or intended or was asked to lay down the machinery in consequence of which the Government would be able to fix a minimum price to be paid for canes. The honourable junior member for St. Lucy was present and Professor Shephard said this in answer to me: "Crawford, I hope they will not ask me to do it; I hope if they want it done, they will get somebody else to do it." On the floor of this House when we were discussing the Resolution for £2,000 to underwrite the expenses of the final investigation, I tried to pin the Government's spokesman down to some dogmatic statement to the effect that the peasants would have benefited in this respect as a result of the investigation. This was never done under the Resolution when we voted this sum of £2,000 and we are in the same position as we were before. Before Professor Shephard left this colony, I had his assurance that he did not pay any attention to this matter. It may be possible to find in Professor Shephard's Report some facts and figures which may be of some assistance to us, but they will not give us the amount of assistance which we want. They will not enable us to arrive at a proper conclusion. As a matter of fact, I will go so far as to say that it is most improbable—it would be extraordinary—that a Report of this nature would be published without divulging figures which would assist us to form the basis of some system in arriving at the end desired by the peasants. I am of the opinion that the peasants of this colony deserve better treatment at the hands

of the present Government than just to be told that it is likely or unlikely that somebody will be appointed to fix a price for canes in respect of this crop. We can do better than that and we shall have to do better than that. The peasants are faced with the position of wage rates being increased and unless everything possible is done so that they can get their proportionate part of the increase in the price of sugar, very few of them can survive this year. I speak personally and I am making it perfectly plain this afternoon that everything possible must be done to ensure that, for this crop, the peasant cane growers will receive their due share of the increase in the price of sugar.

Mr. GARNER: One thought is really predominant in my mind and it is that of the old Barbadian custom of giving a mason the work which a carpenter should do. I see that that is being done this afternoon. I have prefaced my remarks by saying that in order to say this: the factories and the large plantation owners who grow canes can take care of themselves because they have their various Associations and they have shares in the factories, and even if they were not paid a remunerative price for their canes, they will still share in the profits of the factories. The peasants are at a terrific disadvantage because they get so much for their canes and nothing more. In fact, as I see it, it has been the policy of the factory owners to buy peasants' canes at so cheap a price as to make money out of them irrespective of what Professor Shephard does. I have proved that only too often. To come to the point, the peasants are faced right now with increasing the wages of the agricultural workers, and these workers richly deserve an increase in their wages; but, Sir, from what I hear that some of the factories are paying, I do not know how, in this world the peasant proprietors will be able to carry on. They cannot, it is impossible for them to do so, and if this Government fails to see to it that the peasants of this island are protected, I think that they should be kicked out of office, to use a common term. We want a Minister for Agriculture who likes agriculturists, a man who is in sympathy with agriculturists and who knows something about them. (A MEMBER: Like you, perhaps). And why not? It is a fact that if you ask a man to do agricultural work, you discuss the matter with him and he can get more money. But you also have the peasants who must till their soil and live. They incur debts, they have to rear up their children, and so on, and should the Government not protect them in respect of their crop? I say that the Government should protect the small man, the small cane grower; I am not in sympathy with the large cane growers because they have their Associations and they have shares in the factories as I have already said. Do not let us confine ourselves to the general term: it is the small man who has no shares in the factories who needs protection, and this Government ought to see that something is done for him before this crop is ended. It is true that we have a Minister for Agriculture, and I would ask him to bestir himself and get something done for the peasants. That is the job of a Minister for Agriculture. He is supposed to know how the peasants are getting on, what are their misgivings, if they have any grouse, and so on; but we have someone standing here and apologising for having left undone the things that should have been done, and not bringing down concrete proposals to show that he really wants something done. We have a large number of peasants in this island who have to go hat in hand and beg for loans so as to carry on, and the capitalists

like that. The independent peasant proprietor is not going to do that, and I say that the peasants should be paid a better price for their canes. I am hoping that this Government will wake up and have proper representations made where agriculture is concerned. Everything depends upon agriculture and no one class of person should profit at the expense of the other. I am sorry if Professor Shephard is coming here again because I do not want to see him here again. I have lost confidence in the man. When I interviewed Professor Shephard in the first instance, I told him that something should be done to help the peasant. He said "If you vote some money to keep me here, and put that in the Terms of Reference I will do it." I was asked to vote £2,000 for him and got nothing from him. I remember that the hon. senior member for St. Philip asked the Attorney General if Professor Shephard's Terms of Reference included the fixing of a price for sugar canes and he suggested that it was not necessary to put in that. After months of waiting I have not heard anything about it. Something is wrong somewhere. Professor Shephard can fix everything except the price to be paid for peasants' canes! He has got contaminated; somebody has done something to him and he has changed entirely. That is my opinion in the matter. Professor Shephard came very well in the first instance, but when he got £2,000, he left the peasants in the lurch. I think that it was his duty to prepare some sort of machinery whereby the Government could arrive at some figure as a result of which the peasants could be protected. He has enough money to do it. I must remind hon. members that the peasants are different from some other people; they have to go out in the hot sun, sometimes they carry their children with them and very often there is nothing in the larder when they go back home. They are different from those who work by their brains; they are a hard-working lot of people and the Government should see that they are protected. The Minister for Agriculture says that it is six o'clock and they want to go home—

Mr. SPRINGER: I have not said anything about six o'clock or about going home. I think it would be far better if the honourable member would generate less heat and stick to the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member, but I do not think that there is any opposition to the passing of this Address.

Mr. GARNER: That is how I feel about the matter and I express my views.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no opposition to the passing of the Address so far as I can see.

Mr. GARNER: Because of the position which the Minister for Agriculture took in making his speech, that caused me to generate so much heat. I take it that he will get on and introduce a programme of policy for the people who are suffering.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister for Agriculture probably has more information than you know of at the moment, therefore you should look at the matter with an unprejudiced eye. I do not think that the Minister for Agriculture has suggested that nothing can be done.

Mr. GARNER: If he has information, that is all right; but I would like to have it too. It is really getting late, and I feel that I have said enough although I have not said enough because this matter goes very far back. It is getting late, but time means nothing when a matter like this is being considered.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only thing is that if the Address is passed this afternoon it will reach the

Governor more quickly than if it is delayed until next Tuesday.

Mr. GARNER: Yes, Sir, and I do hope that in the near future the Minister for Agriculture will see that a measure is brought down to this House to help the peasants of this colony, and that he will be a Minister not merely in name but in spirit and in truth.

Mr. LEWIS: During the course of this debate when application was made for leave to proceed with this Address, I was accused of saying something which was entirely wrong and I think that I ought to be allowed the opportunity of giving the history of this matter. A Resolution for the sum of £2,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of carrying out an enquiry into the organization of the sugar industry was passed by the Legislature on the 19th of February, 1946. The Addendum to that Resolution reads as follows:—

"It will be recalled that by Resolution No. 79/1945, the sum of £200 was provided for the purpose of an enquiry into the method of remuneration and into the rates of pay of cane cutters. Professor Shephard who conducted that enquiry has recommended that it should be followed as soon as possible by a full survey of the industry. The Government has accepted this suggestion and, in addition, has reason to believe that both the parties concerned i.e., the management and the workers would welcome such an enquiry.

Accordingly, with the assistance of the Secretary of State, arrangements have been made, subject to the approval of the Legislature, for Professor Shephard to undertake, at an early date, a full enquiry into the organization of the sugar industry and to make recommendations for any improvements or adjustments which may be desirable and this Resolution is to provide the necessary funds . . ."

The senior member for St. James at that time, in introducing the Resolution, said this: "The next Resolution is for the sum of £2,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of carrying out an enquiry into the organization of the sugar industry. The Addendum to the Resolution is quite full, but what is worrying me is that it is five minutes to two o'clock . . ." We were pressing for time. I took the opportunity to point out to the Government that the sugar industry was a private enterprise, and by passing a Resolution for £2,000, that could not compel private enterprise to furnish them with the necessary data. They would have to appoint a Commission of Enquiry with powers to command and compel private enterprise to produce papers, books and so on. The senior member for St. James said: "The wording of the Resolution is as wide as it can be. It says that the Resolution is for the purpose of meeting the cost of carrying out an enquiry into the organization of the sugar industry. In the first paragraph of the addendum it is stated that Professor Shephard, who conducted the enquiry into the method of remuneration and into the rates of pay of cane cutters, has recommended that the enquiry should be followed as soon as possible by a full survey of the industry . . ." The senior member for St. Philip said: "It goes without saying that this enquiry or proposed re-organization would be useless unless it includes an attempt to fix a minimum price for canes bought at the factories; and it is presumed that, after the present crop or during it, if any recommendation is made in the Report as to the price to be paid for

canes, it will then be too late to apply the recommendation to people who are selling canes during the current reaping season. What I should like to suggest is that there should be a definite undertaking that the factories will be compelled to pay during this crop the price specified by Professor Shephard in his Report. In other words, in case where the price paid by the factories falls below that recommended by Professor Shephard or whoever presents the Report, the factories should be compelled to make up the deficit” The junior member for St. Peter said: “As far as the cane cutting enquiry is concerned, Professor Shephard’s Report far exceeds anything which we might have suggested. It would be ludicrous to think that Professor Shephard would enquire into the whole sugar industry and pay no regard to the price to be paid peasants for their canes.....” On that occasion it was thought that I was keeping back the Resolution because I wanted the very thing that we are doing now put in the terms of Reference. Finally the senior member for St. James said: “I do not think anybody would be opposed to the principle that peasants should be paid for their canes such price as is recommended for the crop. No one could be opposed to that because it is reasonable. I do not think that Professor Shephard would make recommendations which would not be taken into account. Any price recommended would be based on this year’s crop. I do not think that Professor Shephard would raise any argument against that.” I would like to ask honourable members if I have not proved the case to the hilt. The Attorney General was bound to take to the Government the feeling of the House that they were paying this £2,000 to a man in whom confidence had been created as a result of the cane-cutting enquiry, and that as a result of this Report he would furnish some scale by means of which you could calculate what is an equitable price to be paid for peasants’ canes. I am saying that I am unable to vote for this Address as it stands. If the Government has not got Professor Shephard’s recommendations, will they employ some competent person to do this work? We are at the disadvantage of having Professor Shephard’s name in the actual text of the Address, but if the Government can employ Professor Shephard or some other expert to do this work, it means that we are admitting that this Government has no previous Report by Professor Shephard. I am asking the honourable junior member for St. Lucy to accept an amendment to the Address to the effect that if the Government has not got any Report from Professor Shephard, they will employ some other expert to do the work.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member moving an amendment to the Address?

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to get an assurance from the honourable member. What I feel is that we have already voted this money to supply us with this information and we may have to employ Professor Shephard again. If the honourable member is not accepting the amendment, I do not wish to vote against the Address because the Address may have the effect of getting something done.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you moving an amendment?

Mr. LEWIS: I will make a motion, but I am at the disadvantage of not having the Address before me. I beg to move that after the word “steps should be taken by the Government”, the following words be inserted: “if Professor Shephard’s Report for this

purpose is not ready.”

Mr. BRANCKER: I accept that amendment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am asking the honourable junior member for St. Lucy if he will accept an amendment—

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you speaking on the amendment?

Mr. MOTTLEY: No Sir, I am speaking on the original motion. In view of the fact that it is a local custom for a person to own ten acres as a peasant and there are several persons in this colony who own from ten to twenty-five acres, I beg to move the words “and/or other” be inserted after the word “peasant”.

Mr. BRANCKER: I accept that amendment.

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to make a personal explanation. I am remaining in my seat because if I left and if other members of the Government left the House, there would not be any quorum. I wish to say that members of the Government must accept the principle that they must not vote on Addresses to themselves.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second the amendment of the honourable junior member for the City.

Mr. BRANCKER: I accept the amendment of the honourable senior member for the City, but so far as the amendment of the honourable junior member for the City is concerned, it is hardly adequate, and I must crave Your Honour’s indulgence to withdraw my acceptance.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this Address do now pass: An amendment has been moved and that has been accepted. A further amendment has been moved and that has also been accepted. The difficulty is that the honourable member who moved the first amendment has left the House and the only thing I can do is to put the amendment. The question therefore will be that the words “if Professor Shephard’s Report for this purpose is not ready” be inserted in the Address. Honourable members in favour of that will please say “Aye”, those against will please say “No”. I think the “Noes” have it.

The question that this Address as amended do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, Mr. SPEAKER declaring “I think the ‘Ayes’ have it.”

The Address as amended was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and the honourable senior member for Christ Church to present this Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. TALMA: As Your Honour pleases.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: In moving the adjournment of the House I would like to say that it is proposed that we should sit twice next week. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 11th day of March, 1947, at twelve o’clock noon.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 11th day of March, 1947, at twelve o’clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House was accordingly adjourned to meet on Tuesday next, the 11th day of March, 1947, at twelve o’clock noon.