

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th May, 1948.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, K. N. R. HUSBANDS, M. E. COX, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, and E. L. WARD.

Prayers are read.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 11th May, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs MOTTLEY, CRAWFORD, SYMONDS, GARNER, and MAPP enter the House and take their seats.

PAPERS LAID

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

Message No. 6/1948 from His Excellency the Governor with reference to Sir W. Robertson's Message No. 22 of the 1st September, 1927, and to the reply of the House of Assembly dated the 25th of October, 1927, on the subject of this colony's adherence to the Intercolonial Repatriation Agreement, and inviting the views of the House whether this Colony should now accede to the Agreement.

Progress Report No. 34 on the Further Improvement of the Water Supply Scheme to the 31st March, 1948.

NOTICE.

Dr. CUMMINS gives notice of a Bill to amend the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1897 (1897-6).

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Settlement of the Poor and Bastardy Act, 1897 (1897-6) is read a first time.

Dr. WILSON and Messrs GALE and FOSTER enter the House and take their seats.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Cox) is appointed Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to enable the House to take Orders Nos. 28 and 5 respectively as the first and second Orders of the Day.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 60 be now suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE EMERGENCY POWERS (HURRICANE AND EARTHQUAKE) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—Second reading of a Bill to make provision for the welfare and the safety of the community in cases of hurricane and earthquakes.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill, as honourable members will see from its title and the Objects and Reasons, seeks to make provision for the welfare of the community in the case of hurricane and earthquakes. It is drafted on the lines of the Emergency Powers Act, 1939 (1939-3) because such legislation as would be helpful is contained only in the Emergency Control of Prices Act, 1931, and that does not sufficiently provide for power, for instance, to enter on

lands and clear up debris, to requisition all forms of transport, to requisition and regulate the supply and distribution of food, clothing, water, fuel, and light and other necessities of life and to fix maximum wholesale and retail prices in respect thereof. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

MR. SPEAKER SPEAKS TO VISITORS ABOUT SEATING ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed any further I want to notify visitors to the House that they cannot sit in the windows. The only accommodation is seating accommodation and if any visitor cannot get seating accommodation he or she will not be allowed in the House.

THE EMERGENCY POWERS (HURRICANE AND EARTHQUAKE) BILL.

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

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

Clause 1 is read and is agreed to.

Clause 2. (1) It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee after the occurrence in this Island of a hurricane or earthquake to declare by proclamation in the Official Gazette that a state of emergency exists.

(2) No such proclamation shall be in force for more than one month, without prejudice to the issue of another proclamation at or before the end of that period.

(3) Where a proclamation of emergency has been made, the occasion thereof shall forthwith be communicated to the Houses of the Legislature, and, if the Legislature is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within five days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of the Legislature within five days and the Legislature shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by that proclamation, and shall continue to sit and act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

(4) Where a proclamation of emergency has been made, and it impossible to communicate the occasion thereof to the Houses of the Legislature owing to the dissolution or the expiring of the term of the House of Assembly and members of a new House of Assembly have not yet been elected, a proclamation shall nevertheless be issued for the meeting of the Legislature within five days, and thereupon notwithstanding the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1901, or any Act amending the same, the members of the late House of Assembly shall assemble and the House of Assembly shall stand revived and shall sit as the competent body of the Legislature, but only for the purpose of considering such proclamation of emergency, and the Legislature shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by that proclamation.

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

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—Sub-clause 3 of this Clause says:—"Where a proclamation of emergency has been made, the occasion thereof shall forthwith be communicated to the Houses of the Legisla-

ture and if the Legislature is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within five days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of the Legislature within five days . . ." Does that mean if the House is elected because I understand that the Speaker has the power to summon the House if it is necessary to do so in the public's interest. I do not know if by this sub-clause I am not giving the Governor the right to summon a meeting of this House and I am not prepared to do that. I should just like to have the point made clear. Who is to issue the proclamation for this House to meet? Has not the Speaker the power to say when this House should meet as long as it is elected?

Mr. WILKINSON: It would appear from this clause that if the House should die or be prorogued, the old House would be called back to deal with an emergency of this sort. I would like to know if that is so because it seems to me rather curious.

Mr. ADAMS: My recollection is that a similar thing takes place in England on the death of the King as when the House of Commons is prorogued. It is not unusual. You have to do something: you ought not to allow a state of emergency to exist without the Legislature approving of it. A state of emergency is like martial law. If a state of emergency exists the Governor-in-Executive Committee can make laws during the period of its existence but those laws ought not to last for a long time without the approval of the Legislature. The Legislature should come together as quickly as possible thereafter and approve of what the Administration would have done. If the Legislature is dead, you have to have a fresh Legislature but it is easier to summon the old Legislature than to hold an election overnight, so to speak. I did not look the matter up but I believe that it is customary to revive the old Legislature on the death of the King if the Legislature is dead at the time of such a regrettable occurrence. If the Speaker has power to summon the House when it is adjourned, that does not mean that the inclusion of this provision in this Bill in any way deprives him of that power. Of course the Legislature, as usual, means both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—From the explanation which has been given I find that we are giving His Excellency the Governor, who is probably the person to make this proclamation, the right to summon a meeting of this House, the members of which have been elected by the people, if a hurricane or an earthquake takes place while it is adjourned. I could never agree to any such thing. I feel that after this House has been elected and the House, in turn, elects its Speaker, His Excellency the Governor, the Administration and everybody else should have sufficient confidence in him that if an emergency exists and it is in the interest of this community for this House to meet, he would summon a meeting of the House. That is the only way in which a meeting of this House should be convened if it is adjourned and the members of this House would be far more willing, I take it, to honour a request from their Speaker to meet than to obey a command from His Excellency the Governor. As far as the other phase of the matter is concerned, if the House is prorogued at the time a hurricane or earthquake takes place and His Excellency the Governor is willing to call up the old House I am willing that that should happen. If sub-clause 3 of this clause means that the Governor-in-Executive Committee can summon a meeting of this House whether it is adjourned or prorogued I counsel honourable members to be very particular before they give the Head of the Administration any such right.

We would be undermining the confidence we have in the Speaker of this House if we did a thing of this sort. We elect one of our members as Speaker and the person so elected should be better able to say whether a state of emergency exists in Barbados than His Excellency the Governor; he is a responsible member of, and should have a greater interest in, the community. I cannot agree to sub-clause 3 as it stands and, if necessary, I shall move the deletion of it. I really think that this is too revolutionary; it is too dangerous. After all, an emergency does not exist for the Head of the Administration; it exists for the inhabitants of the colony. Mr. Chairman, I really have no alternative but to move that sub-clause 3 be deleted.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second that motion. I feel that sub-clause 4 is reasonable because if the House is prorogued or out of session there is no Speaker. But sub-clause 3 says that if the House is adjourned or prorogued and such adjournment or prorogation will not expire within five days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of the Legislature within five days. The House may be adjourned for a week and there is nothing wrong in the Governor asking the Speaker to summon a meeting of the House or the President of the Legislative Council to summon a meeting of the Council. If the House is prorogued I am quite willing to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee the right to summon the old House but if it is adjourned, it is actually in session and I feel that the Speaker is the proper person to summon the meeting at the Governor's request.

Mr. ADAMS: The Governor as Governor summons the Assembly anyhow. But it is not the Governor who is going to issue this proclamation; it is the Governor-in-Executive Committee and does the honourable member think that the members of the Executive Committee are less respectful of the Speaker? Does the honourable member think it will be less respectful of the President of the Legislative Council if we pass this clause as it is? Can there be a greater waste of time than debating the honourable member's motion? And when the honourable member talks about the Speaker being in a better position to judge a state of emergency, has one got to ask anybody when a hurricane has actually taken place? What provision is going to be made, if this is deleted, in case the House is prorogued at the time a hurricane or an earthquake takes place?

Mr. LEWIS: Sub-clause 4 says: "Where a proclamation of emergency has been made, and it is impossible to communicate the occasion thereof to the Houses of the Legislature owing to the dissolution or the expiring of the term of the House of Assembly and members of the new House of Assembly have not yet been elected, a proclamation shall nevertheless be issued for the meeting of the Legislature within five days....." I feel that that is all that is necessary. In case the House has not yet been elected I am perfect willing to give the Head of the Administration the right to summon back the old members; but after this House has been elected and we have elected a Speaker, the Speaker is the person to summon the House in case the public's good demands it. I do not know that the Governor would have any difficulty in getting the members of this House and of the Other Place to agree with him that an emergency exists. Another thing is this. How are you going to compel members of the House to attend? I fail to see why the people's representatives in the year 1948, after 300 years of representative or misrepresentative government should give this right to the Governor. I would not give it to His Majesty the

King—the right to summon a meeting of this House after it has elected a Speaker; the Speaker of the House should summon a meeting of the House if he feels that it is in the public's interest to do so. I do not see how we can sit here as a representative body and allow this House to be summoned by the Head of the Administration if it is in session and an emergency exists. Let the Head of the Administration summon the members of the Legislature whom he has appointed. Do you mean to say that we are so dead, so dumb, so insensible to our rights and privileges and to our responsibility to the community that we would have to ask the Governor to summon us in case there is an emergency? I cannot see it at all. This is a point that is of vital necessity to a representative body. No person in this world, outside one of our number, should have the right to summon us to a meeting of this House; it would be an insult not only to the Speaker but to the integrity and representative character of every member of this House if a meeting of this House was concerned at the request of somebody other than the Speaker. I counsel honourable members not to give away this right. This provision is absolutely unnecessary; it is already provided for and I repeat that I would not give this right to the King himself.

Mr. TALMA: Without attempting to assist the Leader of the House who, I know, is quite capable of handling a measure like this and many others, I would like to draw the attention of the junior member for the City to sub-clause (1) of this Clause, as it does not seem as if he has read that sub-clause very carefully. It says:—"It shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee after the occurrence in this Island of a hurricane or earthquake to declare by proclamation in the Official Gazette that a state of emergency exists." The honourable member spoke of the Governor but if he recalls the constitutional set-up in this island he would realize that the Governor-in-Executive Committee is not comprised of the Governor alone. Probably the honourable member who has just sat down could be a member of the Executive Committee. It is not the Governor alone who will issue a proclamation to the effect that a state of emergency exists; it will be the Governor-in-Executive which includes certain members of this Chamber whoever they are or will be; so that point is easily answered. The second point is this. We all know how the hands of the clock works, as far as getting things done by the Legislature is concerned, and if a hurricane or an earthquake takes place and a state of emergency exists and we have to wait for five days or two weeks for the Speaker to summon a meeting of the House, half of the population would be wiped out by the time the House meets. In other words, let the Authority who is to declare that a state of emergency exists also issue the proclamation for the meeting of the Legislature, so as to save the population as a whole.

Mr. GALE: I cannot agree to this at all. There is quite a lot in what the junior member for the City has said. I do not always agree with his views but on this occasion I think there is a lot in his argument. If a state of emergency exists I think the Speaker of the House of Assembly and the President of the Legislative Council would be quite aware of it and if the Executive Committee wants the Houses of the Legislature to be summoned I am quite sure that they would not experience any difficulty in getting them summoned to an emergency meeting. I do not think that this is the correct thing to do. The House elects

a Speaker and he should summon the meeting in case an emergency exists. We have had hurricanes in Barbados before; we have had states of emergency before and there had been no difficulty in getting the Houses of the Legislature to meet. I agree with the honourable member that this sub-clause 3 is not necessary.

Mr. MAPP: It appears to me that certain honourable members are keeping a lot of noise about the infringement of our constitutional rights by this clause and are enlarging that alleged infringement many more times than it should be enlarged. Let me explain what I mean by that statement. Our Constitution is modelled after the English Constitution and if a state of emergency exists as a result of war or hurricane or earthquake in England, the Act provides, as in this case, that the King in Parliament can summon Parliament but the King himself does not summon Parliament; the King communicates with the Prime Minister who in turn communicates with the Speaker who summons the House of Commons. This Bill is drafted along lines of the English custom. We are apt to take things in Barbados very literally. Why should we imagine that the Governor-in-Executive Committee would ignore the Speaker and the President of the Legislative Council and not request them to summon meetings of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council respectively in case a state of emergency exists? Another thing which certain honourable members have overlooked is this. It is amazing. At one time, the Governor-in-Executive Committee does something and they say that it is the "Adams" Government that has done it; at another time the same Governor-in-Executive Committee does something else and they say that it is the Government that has done it. They cannot have it both ways. Either the elected representatives of the people from this House on the Executive Committee dominate the situation as far as that body is concerned or they do not. Personally, I am in favour of another member from this House being appointed to the Executive Committee. As I said, if the elected representatives have the weight of opinion on the Executive Committee and their words are carried, as is likely to be the case so far as this Bill is concerned, then all we are doing is giving our representatives the right to declare that a state of emergency exists and to issue a proclamation to summon a meeting of the Houses of the Legislature—which is not a matter of revolutionizing the island.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: We are only quibbling. When this Bill was moved from its place on the Order Paper, it struck me that if provision is already made for the Speaker to summon a meeting of the House, there is no reason why it should not be allowed to remain but if there is no such provision then we should make that provision by this Act. I can see no harm in the Speaker summoning a meeting of the House when he realizes that an emergency exists. I sincerely hope that we will not have a hurricane or an earthquake so as to cause a state of emergency to be brought about but if the Speaker already has authority to summon a meeting of the House I see no earthly reason for changing it and I feel that the status quo should remain.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I really feel that you should allow me to reply to the junior member for St. Thomas. I would like to tell him that the members of this House who are on the Executive Committee are in the minority, as far as that body is concerned. I have been to Government House and discussed a certain matter with His Excellency the Governor, the present incumbent of Government

House, and in the course of the conversation he told me that there was absolutely no desire on his part to appoint anybody to any Board—advisory or otherwise—unless the four members of the House who are members of the Executive Committee recommend it to him. After the Leader of this House repeated that in this Chamber, the spokesman of the Government in the Other Place—I can confirm this because I got it first-hand, as well as I can produce the debate which took place in the Other Place—the Acting Colonial Secretary said: "If that is so, I am surprised to hear it."

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable member is breaking two very important Rules. In the first place he refers to a debate of the Other Place and in the second instance he refers to a conversation which he had with the Governor in order to influence this debate.

Mr. LEWIS: If I refer to the Governor's name I could be accused of using it to influence the debate but I am referring to what the Leader of the House said in this Chamber and was confirmed by the Governor but was practically refuted by the Government's spokesman in the Other Place; so that it is impossible for me to take seriously what the junior member for St. Thomas has said. I promise the honourable member that I will show him the debate in the course of which the Government's spokesman in the Other Place said that he was surprised that the Leader of the House should have made such a statement. Mr. Chairman, there is only one last remark I would like to make and it is this: If this provision has been put in this Bill with or without the knowledge of the four members of the Executive Committee who are members of this House, then this is my opinion why it has been put in: There are certain people getting into this House whom the Head of the Administration cannot trust to come out in an emergency and do what they should do; therefore, he has to make it a law to compel them to attend a meeting if circumstances such as these should arise. If there are honourable members of this House who cannot see that and are willing to accept this insult, then all I can do is to keep my conscience clear and vote against it. If a state of emergency exists, it exists for the 200,000 people whom this House represents; it does not exist for the earth. We cannot prevent a building from falling down. We will need to ensure that food, water, fuel and light are provided for the people whom we represent, not the incumbent of Government House, and do you mean to tell me that we are going to insult ourselves at a time when the people need representation most by allowing somebody to compel us to meet when we have it in our power to come here whenever we like? I cannot stand for it and I am going to clear my conscience, as a representative of the people, by voting against it. In my humble opinion, the Leader of this House and the other honourable members should co-operate with me in deleting this sub-clause 3 and let us get on with the rest of the Bill.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want to add a few words to what has been already said. I think it is high time that honourable members stop giving up their rights and ancient privileges; that we should put a definite halt, not only in this matter, to the handing over of the powers of this House to Director after Director or dictator after dictator in such a way that the wishes of the majority of this House are continually being flouted. As far as the policy of the Government is concerned, only a few days ago I got it from the highest authority in this land that the wishes of the elected representatives of the people will be faithfully

carried out and I am hoping that honourable members will run true to form and definitely put their feet upon the practice of the elected members on the Executive Committee flouting the wishes of this House when, by a majority vote, it asks that certain particular things should be done.

The CHAIRMAN: I seem not to be able to follow the argument of the honourable member.

Mr. SYMMONDS: It is no use blowing hot and cold. To-day, for the purpose of a hurricane or an earthquake we profess we are not satisfied with the way in which things are going. Let us stick to that as a general policy and stop giving up our rights and privileges. I am supporting the junior member for the City in this particular matter but, as I have said, do not let us observe this policy in the case of a hurricane only; let us stick to it as a general policy and let us be really representative of the people of Barbados.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of Clause 3 is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes. Messrs. SMITH, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, and Dr. CUMMINS.—7.

Noes. Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, F. L. WALCOTT, HUSBANDS, FOSTER, LEWIS, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD, and Mr. SPEAKER.—16.

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

Clauses 3 and 4 are read and are agreed to.

Clause 5. The Emergency Control of Prices Act, 1931, is hereby repealed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that that be Clause 5 of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like to know what the Emergency Control of Prices Act has to do with this Bill. Why is it to be repealed as a result of the passing of this Act?

Mr. ADAMS: That question by the honourable member is indicative of what has been happening and what has happened in respect of Clause 3 of the Bill. The Government has attempted to do nothing in this Bill that this House has not done before. It is difficult for me to control myself when I see such an absolute waste of the time of this House going on. What power is being given up by the passing of this Bill? It is to enable the people's representatives to keep a check on everything that the Governor-in-Executive Committee may do if a state of emergency exists. Every clause of this Bill was, incidentally, drafted by the late Acting Attorney-General, a man who not only knows his constitutional law, but is acquainted with any rights that this House may be giving up. As to the question of giving up rights and privileges, let me remind honourable members that the Governor-in-Executive Committee issues Writs for the election of members of the House of Assembly. Provision of this sort is made all over the world to meet emergencies and in order that the Administration should not be running the country, the Legislature must come together as soon as possible, after a state of emergency has been proclaimed, to approve or otherwise of what the Administration has done. If the honourable member look up the Emergency Control of Prices Act he will see that it deals with emergencies but it is not sufficiently wide to cover hurricanes and earthquakes. Sub-Clause 3 of this Bill is drafted on the lines of the Emergency Powers Act, 1939 (1939—3) and is word for word of sub-section 2 of section 2 of that Act which has been

passed by this House. As I said in my opening remarks, this is the usual practice in times of war or on the declaration of martial law and I should imagine that there is no part of the British Empire which does not have this particular statute.

Mr. WARD: I should like to point out that the Emergency Powers Act was a War Measure but this Bill provides for a hurricane or earthquake which is a different thing altogether.

The question that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

THE VOLUNTEER (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Volunteer Act, 1909 (1909—6).

Mr. ADAMS: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, seeks to amend the present law relating to the Volunteer Force. As honourable members will see, it is, in effect, re-constituting the Volunteer Force and already, I am informed, quite a substantial number of persons are making application to join or re-join the Force. It is, therefore, considered necessary that this Bill should be passed as quickly as possible because while the names of applicants are being taken, there is no Act to cover the re-constituted Force. As honourable members will see from the Objects and Reasons, the Barbados Volunteer Force Re-Constitution Committee—I think the honourable member on my immediate left would know more about it than myself because he was a member of that Committee—made certain recommendations for the re-constitution of the Force. One of the principal changes sought to be effected by this Bill is to pay members for attendance at parades, training camps and courses of instruction; it is a practice that obtains in some of the other colonies but under the existing Act, officers and members of the Force are only paid when they are called out for service by the Governor under sections 19 and 23 of the Act. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: So far as this Bill is concerned, it has been pointed out to us that it proposes to effect three principal changes in the existing law; in other words, there are three principal points involved in this Bill. So far as the point about limiting the appointment of the Commanding Officer to a period not exceeding five years from the date of his appointment is concerned, I have no objection to that. In respect of the second point, namely, that the person appointed as Staff Officer and Adjutant must be an officer of His Majesty's Regular Forces because it is felt that an appointment of this nature is calculated to increase the efficiency of the Force I am not prepared to agree to that. We have, only recently, emerged from a War in which many West Indian officers took part and saw active service, and of these West Indian officers some are members of United Kingdom Regiments. I happen to know two, at least, one of whom is a member of a famous English Regiment. If I understand this Bill correctly, unless an officer is actually in the Army—if, for instance, he was demobilized a year or so ago—he would not

be eligible for appointment as Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Barbados Volunteer Force; he must be a "fit and proper person being an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces." That means, if I understand it correctly, that the person so appointed must be, at the time of his appointment, a member of the British Army; so that if a very efficient West Indian Officer was a member of the British Army but happens at the moment not to be so employed, he would not be eligible for appointment as Staff Officer and Adjutant. Even though he might have seen service under Field Marshal Montgomery, yet the fact remains that his not being on active service may debar him from securing this appointment. The third point relates to the payment of members of the Force and with that I am entirely in agreement. We really cannot expect these unemployed ex-servicemen and ex-volunteers who may be coming from distant parishes, because of their love of service and their interest in the Volunteer Force, to borrow cash and pay for transportation, as much as 52 cents in some cases, to attend parades, training camps or courses of instruction. I am, therefore, entirely in favour of the payment of out-of-pocket expenses to members of the Force who attend camps, parades, or courses of training and I commend to the Executive Committee that the amount should be adequate to cover bus fare with something over. Those are the three principal changes which are sought to be effected by this Bill and I repeat that I am not in favour of overlooking West Indian officers who have seen service in His Majesty's Regular Forces. I would not attempt to call names but we have had extremely efficient officers from this island and other West Indian colonies who may be fresh, even though they may not be as fresh as somebody else in the Regular Forces, and is capable of filling this post. If this Bill is given its second reading I am going to oppose that clause whereby it is proposed that only an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces may be eligible for appointment as Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Barbados Volunteer Force.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I regret that this Bill has been taken out its place as No. 5 on the Order Paper and made Order No. 2. Quite recently the Orders of the day are taken so irregularly that one does not know where one is when one comes to the House. This is a matter in which I have a great interest but I regret to say that I have not come prepared with my facts because I did not expect that it would be dealt with at to-day's meeting. I am in entire agreement with what the junior member for St. Lucy has said in regard to the appointment of the Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Volunteer Force. The British West Indies Regiment — the Barbados Battalion as it was called in the last War—suffered at first from the fact that England did not have efficient officers enough to send to it, with the result that all types and all sorts of officers were sent. Today Sir, you have several West Indian officers, not only Barbadians, who are as highly trained and as efficient as any in any British Regiment and I do feel that some opportunity should be given to West Indian Officers in this Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing in the Bill to exclude anyone. It simply says that the person must be in His Majesty's Regular Forces at the time of his appointment.

Mr. DOWDING: It says in Clause 4 that a fit and proper person being an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces must be appointed Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Force. As I understand it, our Force is not a part of His Majesty's Regular Forces.

I am wondering what is the reason for rushing this Bill through in this manner. I am also wondering whether it may not be advisable for honourable members to be given a little more time to consider it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Whenever it comes to matters in connection with which there is the semblance of discrimination I like to speak my mind. There is something in this particular Bill about which I am not happy. I appreciate that if you want to keep the Volunteer Force up to the standard of a modern Force, you have to draw as regularly as possible from a big country and there is no denying the fact that there is in the United Kingdom the possibility of obtaining more efficient officers than there is in the West Indies and the reason is obvious; they maintain a Regular Army and we do not maintain a Regular Army in the West Indies. There is the possibility, as I say, of getting more officers of a higher efficiency in the United Kingdom because there is a larger number to draw from. But my submission is that in view of the fact that the Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Volunteer Force will be appointed for only three years I venture to say that we have some West Indians who have gained some knowledge of Army life during the War and for whom an appointment of this nature would be a good start. We would have to pay the passages of, and allowance to, this officer in addition to the other things for which we have to make provision under this Act. In my opinion, it would be better to send some of our men to be trained and let them come back and give us the benefit of their training and experience. If that were done, we would not have to pay the passages of officers from abroad and, in some cases, of their families too. The Barbados Volunteer Force is not going to be an Army and you cannot compare it with the British Army. This is going to be a Volunteer Force for local purposes, because if War should ever start again, the officers and men of this Force would have to be trained in warfare, inasmuch as they would have had no training in the use of tanks or anti-aircraft guns. I think the Government's attention should be drawn to the fact that West Indians should be trained for these posts and I believe that there are some who are available now. As one honourable member said, I am not thinking of Barbadians only because Barbados is not the only West Indian colony in which efficient officers are to be found.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to point out to the honourable member that there is no question of a West Indian or a person from any other particular place to be appointed. It is purely a person in His Majesty's Regular Forces.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but you will appreciate that the number of West Indians who are officers in His Majesty's Regular Forces may be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may delete the words "being an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces" if you like.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am getting to that point, Mr. Speaker. If those words are retained in the Act, they will preclude some of the people in our area from applying for this post.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put I would like to say that I am somewhat in a difficulty because I am a pacifist. I do not believe in military force at any time. This point about an officer in the Regular Army being appointed to this post was raised at the Executive Committee and the reply we got from the best source was that the value of a man's

services from the last war was lost considerably. That is the advice from the War Office; he deteriorates so rapidly, so to speak. Or to put it the other way, military science advances so rapidly that a man who has been demobilized for the last two years is not good enough. We were also advised that in the Volunteer Force, as is the case in the Territorial Army, we should get an officer from the Regular Army for this key position but the Commanding Officer will be a local man. The Committee that sat and reported on this matter was comprised of the junior member for St. John (Mr. Blackman), Major Chase, Major Connell, Major Bowring, Major Foster and Lt. Jordan, and one would have expected that they would have had some inclination to come down on the side of a local man but this was their recommendation. Speaking as a pacifist I will say that having obtained this advice from the highest possible source, that is, that the Staff Officer and Adjutant and the Inspector of the Volunteer Force should be men from His Majesty's Regular Forces, we, of course followed it. The argument that was used before the War is being used more strongly now and one of the reasons why the Committee recommended that these two officers should not hold their respective posts for longer periods than three years each is that they will get rusty, so to speak, and will need to be replaced and the Committee was unanimous in its recommendation.

Mr. LEWIS: I have listened very carefully to the debate and I have come to the conclusion that, perhaps, it is a great advantage to have persons who are fresh from the centre of military training and military activity filling these posts. It seems to me that if these appointments are limited to three years so as to get people with fresh knowledge, it would be putting local men in very unfortunate positions if they were appointed as the Staff Officer and Adjutant and the Instructor respectively of the Volunteer Force for a period of three years and then were to discover that they could not be re-appointed under this Act. Where would they be? The Staff Officer and Adjutant would probably have to join the Force as a Lieutenant or go on the Reserve. In that case, he would not be making his living as a military man. I would be inclined to make it possible for local men to be appointed and leave to them to decide whether they are going in for this irregular employment or not. If they feel that they are qualified to fill the posts, I would be inclined to give it to them, all things being equal.

Mr. SYMMONDS: As I see it, this is a country which teems with unemployed people and these provisions in this Bill affect the principle of it in the sense that I see no reason why some of our own people who served the Empire with great distinction in time of danger should not be given the opportunity, since military science advances so rapidly that it is necessary to have constant refresher courses—

Mr. SPEAKER: Where does that come under the principle of the Bill?

Mr. SYMMONDS: It has just been pointed out, Mr. Speaker, by the junior member for the City that there may be some of our own people who having been appointed to these posts may be looking for another job after the expiration of three years. Where the principle comes in is that two unemployed men will have secured jobs for three years—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the principle of this Bill at all. The principle is whether in making these appointments, the appointees should be men who are actually in His Majesty's Regular Forces. The point which you are making, as far as I can see, is whether people who have gone out of the

Regular Forces should not be considered for these appointments.

Mr. SYMMONDS: That is exactly the point I am making. We have a number of people who have served with distinction during the last War and are now out of the Regular Forces and I was hoping that we would make it possible for those men who served with such distinction and who desire to serve in these posts if only for three years, to be appointed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can deal with that, in Committee, when the Committee comes to this particular clause.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I will take your advice and deal with the point when the House is in Committee on the Bill.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

Clause 4. Section six of the principal Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"6. (1) The Governor shall from time to time appoint a fit and proper person being an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces as Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Force for a period not exceeding three years.

(2) The Governor shall from time to time appoint a fit and proper person being a warrant officer or a non-commissioned officer of the Regular Forces as Instructor of the Force for a period not exceeding three years, and such officer shall hold the local rank of Warrant Officer Class I.

(3) The Staff Officer and the Instructor so appointed shall perform such duties in connection with the local Forces as the Governor may from time to time determine. They shall be provided with quarters or allowances at rates to be fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and approved by the Legislature in lieu thereof, and shall receive such salaries as may from time to time be approved by special resolution of the Legislature.

(4) There shall be paid from the Public Treasury of the Island on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee such sums of money as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may think fit for the purpose of defraying the expenses necessary for the transport of the Staff Officer and the Instructor and their families from the places at which they are respectively stationed in the United Kingdom to this Island and from this Island to the United Kingdom on the termination of their appointments respectively."

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

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—This is the Clause to which I have already referred in connection with the appointment of a person as Staff Officer and Adjutant,—a person who must be an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces. Now, I have listened very careful to the point which was made, when we were discussing the motion for the second reading of this Bill, in answer to my criticism. The senior member for St. Joseph said that members of the Executive Committee had been advised that a man's services from the last War have been lost considerably. That may well be so. I take it, however, that a person who

has not any interest in a three-year appointment would not apply at all. But if a man who is interested applies and is appointed and he makes representation to the Government I have no doubt that the Government will not hesitate to come to us and ask us to pass a Resolution to enable the appointee who does not happen to be a member of the Regular Forces to take a refresher course in the United Kingdom. If he is appointed for three years and takes up his appointment, we would not be averse, in the third year, to voting money and let him get an up-to-the-last minute refresher course. If he has brought himself completely up-to-date, at the end of the third year, obviously he should be eligible for re-appointment for another three years if he is willing to continue in the post. The honourable member went on to point out that the Volunteer Force Re-Constitution Committee also tendered that advice and he mentioned the names of the members of that Committee — gentlemen for whom we have a high regard—but, nevertheless, that high regard we have for those gentlemen should not prevent us from using our commonsense, much as we value their opinions. A man who is demobilized in the last two years may be almost useless and military science may progress rapidly but I understand that the most rapid progress in military science actually takes place during a War, not when the war is over. I still feel that a man who fought up to the end of the last war and who may have seen service in the active theatres of the war, who fought under most able Field Marshals like Montgomery and Eisenhower and gained distinction while so serving in His Majesty's Forces, should be good enough for the post of Staff Officer and Adjutant of the Volunteer Force. In the previous Clause to which we have just agreed, it is stated that the Governor shall appoint "a fit and proper person to be Commanding Officer of the Force" and so far as this Clause 4 is concerned I am moving that the words "being an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces" in lines 2 and 3 of sub-clause 1 be deleted. That will still leave His Excellency with power to appoint a fit and proper person; we would not expect him to appoint somebody who would not be fit and proper but we should not leave this reservation in the Bill. Although I quite appreciate that we want an up-to-date man for this post, yet a man who has served in the last war and saw service in its most active phases should be a fit and proper person. A man who withdrew from the Army last month or month before last would not be eligible for this post, according to the wording of this sub-clause, and I feel that it is sufficient to leave it that the Governor shall appoint a fit and proper person to the post; that is all that we need. As regards the period of three years, that will be entirely a matter for the individual who applies. We have many West Indian officers who have passed through the most bitter phases of the last war and who will be good enough for this post; so, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this clause be amended by the deletion of those words.

Mr. SYMMONDS : I want to second the motion for the deletion of those words and in doing so I want to stress that this is a period in our history when we are trying to do something to show our appreciation of the services of those patriotic Barbadians who, true to our name of Little England, answered the call to the Colours and offered their lives in defence of the Empire and Democracy. And to-day the opportunity offers itself to show a little appreciation of those services. If those men have already been discharged from His Majesty's Forces, that is all the more rea-

son why in this over-populated country in which there is a large degree of unemployment among various sections of the community, we should give one of our own people the same facilities for employment as we are offering to other members of the British Empire. We are not ignoring the latter in the least but this is a time when we should be proud of Barbadians and see to it that Barbadians have every opportunity to live just as other people live. We have been told, a short while ago, that the situation in England has not changed as regards employment there, and that there is no work for loyal Barbadians in England, although work can be found for thousands of Europeans who fought against the Mother Country. We are still loyal; we have not changed our loyalty but when we have the opportunity to give our people jobs, let us give it to them. It is for that reason I second the honourable member's motion.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—As far as I know, the Instructor to be appointed is a coloured Barbadian who has served in the Regular Forces abroad and only recently returned. The term "being an officer in His Majesty's Regular Forces" is used loosely to cover the point mentioned by the honourable member. It is not a question of forgetting people who went and risked their lives but it is thought that the jobs should be given to persons who would not have to take refresher courses and that is why these words have been put in the bill. Honourable members need not fear that fit local persons who would come within that term will not be appointed.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of sub-clause 1 of Clause 4 is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, HUSBANDS, MAPP, FOSTER, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GALE, WILKINSON, WARD, Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. SPEAKER.—12.

Noes. Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, SMITH, CRAWFORD, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, and S. A. WALCOTT.—10.

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

Clauses 5 to 8 are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61(A)

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—At the risk of being accused of dealing with matters of secondary importance earlier to-day, I am asking leave to move the suspension of Rule 61(a) so as to resume Government Business. I was hoping that the Emergency Powers (Hurricane and Earthquake) Bill and the Volunteer (Amendment) Bill would have been completed by 1.30 o'clock and we could have dealt with the Resolutions on the Order Paper. I think that we should deal with these Resolutions, one of which is in connection with the purchase and equipment of a lorry to take water to St. Lucy. I am therefore asking leave to move the suspension of the Rule.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object to leave being granted. There must be some sense of responsibility displayed in the selection of matters which should

have priority during the time allotted to Government Business. If these money Resolutions are matters of urgency certainly they should have been dealt with in the first place this morning rather than the Emergency Powers Bill. The hurricane season comes off in October and this is only May. After all, we must have some sense of proportion. I have here a matter of some urgency and I want to request the leave of the House to proceed with it this afternoon. I therefore object to leave being granted to resume Government Business.

The question that leave be granted the hon. member to move the suspension of Rule 61(a) was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. COX, BRANCKER, SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, MAPP, FOSTER, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, and Dr. CUMMINS.—10.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and MOTTLEY.—8.

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

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I would just like to make my position perfectly clear in this matter because I am always very jealous about giving up the time for Private Members' Business. It is becoming more than a habit on the part of the Government, it is becoming monotonous for Government members—sometimes for good reasons and at other times for reasons which are not too good—to ask for the suspension of the Rules as if Private Members' Business is not worthy of being discussed. I am voting for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in the hope that it might help to relieve to some extent the hardship under which the people of St. Lucy are suffering at the present moment. Up to yesterday the people were unable to get water between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph says that he wants to deal with the Resolution in connection with supplying water for St. Lucy which I hope the Official Reporter has got down, and I hope that the hon. member will stick to his word.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: One hon. member spoke about responsibility and I want to say that if we come here as members to serve in this Assembly, we have to be frank enough to realise that even if Government Business encroaches upon Question Time and the time for Private Members' Business, Government Business is the people's business. There are something like 84 items on the Order Paper calling on the Government to do things and then when the Government proposes to take action in respect of some of the things we say "No!" We should be frank enough to realise that we have two hours for dealing with Government Business and then we have from a quarter to three until whenever the lights go out to deal with Private Members' Business. That is not the best thing for us to have because no Government can work effectively with that allocation of time. That was all right in the old days but not to-day. I repeat: there are 84 matters on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business asking the Government to do things and then when the Government asks for time to deal with some of the things we say "No!" When the Government brings forward measures we either pass them or we do not pass them; and when we look at the measures that are brought here we cannot say that they are not important. When we vote against giving the Government time we are not voting against the individual; and we should not raise objections on personal grounds as some hon. members do.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is unfortunate that in this Chamber there are not more people who can appreciate what is being said. I am sure that Your Honour and the other hon. members who are capable of appreciating remarks which are made in this Chamber, understand quite clearly that objection has been taken on the ground that no sense of responsibility has been displayed with regard to the giving of priority to items on the Order Paper under Government Business. It is true—we know it is true—that the people in St. Lucy want water, but are you telling me that it was more important to spend more than an hour to-day in discussing the Bill to give the Governor power to summon the House after a hurricane than proceeding with some of the other important and urgent matters under Government Business? If we had followed the usual procedure which has been adopted from the time I have been a member of this House, that is to say, start with the money Resolutions first, the Resolutions for which time is now being asked to consider, would have been considered especially an urgent Resolution like that relative to the supply of water for St. Lucy. I am not going to sit here and allow the earlier session of the House to be devoted to matters of secondary importance and then be told in the afternoon that we have important matters to be dealt with under Government Business.

Mr. ADAMS: This is Question Time, not time for Private Members' Business. (A MEMBER: I have to discuss the reply to a question). Surely the Government are the best judges as to priority of matters on the Order Paper. Two Tuesdays ago the Administration was hoping that these two Bills would have been dealt with, and nobody could have foreseen the useless waste of time which took place in connection with a Bill which is already on the Statute Book.

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

RESOLUTION WITHDRAWN

Dr. CUMMINS: Before Your Honour leaves the Chair, I am asking leave to withdraw Resolution No. 1 on the Order Paper—the Resolution to place the sum of £2,740 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of engaging on contract for a period of two years a Fire Brigade Officer. (Cheers). Another Resolution of a similar nature will be sent down very soon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking leave for this Resolution to be removed from the Order Paper?

Dr. CUMMINS: Yes Sir.

There being no objection, leave was granted the hon. member to remove the Resolution from the Order Paper.

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

RESOLUTION POSTPONED

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for £3,000 to supplement the provision

in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1948-49 under Head VI, Customs, Item 23, Rent of warehouses. It is estimated—

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I have agreed and I will always agree to the suspension of the Rules when we are dealing with anything of such paramount importance as water. I understood from the Leader of the House that it was the Resolution in connection with the supply of water to certain districts—and an hon. member intimated that it was for St. Lucy—with which he was going to deal. If the hon. member is going on with the Resolution with which he is now dealing, I do not think that we will be able to get through with the Resolution relative to the supply of water.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Rule was suspended so as to consider Government Business and the Government can deal with any Resolution they want to deal with.

Mr. MOTTLEY: May I respectfully draw to your attention that there is such a thing as a breach of faith? I listened carefully to the Leader of the House and I was impressed that the Resolution dealing with the supply of water would have been dealt with. (Mr. ADAMS: I mentioned all the Resolutions). If I am mistaken I will apologize, but that is how I was impressed.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member should know better than accuse me of any breach of faith.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not accusing the hon. member of any breach of faith; I am reminding him about what he said when asking for leave to move the suspension of the Rule. I understood that the Rule was suspended principally to deal with the Resolution in respect of the supply of water and that was brought out by the reply of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member said that that Resolution would be dealt with among other Resolutions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not see how we can get through with that Resolution if we continue to deal with the Resolution which is now before us.

Mr. WILKINSON: I suggest that we proceed with Resolution No. 4 first.

Mr. BRANCKER: I agree with the suggestion that we proceed with this Resolution first. The Resolution in connection with the storage of rum is going to cause a lot of debate and meanwhile people in St. Lucy are suffering from the lack of water.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is strange to hear hon. members after we are in Committee of Supply rising on points of order where there is no order existing. It has been said that if we deal with Resolution No. 2 first we will not get through the one dealing with the supply of water, and I know that hon. members will purposely do that. I know that if the hon. senior member for St. Joseph deals with the Resolution in respect of the storage of rum there are certain members who will talk on that Resolution until 3.30 o'clock and then they will not be so discreet as to agree to the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to deal with the Resolution in respect of the supply of water. I therefore appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to proceed with this Resolution No. 4 so that when hon. members begin their usual stunts in dealing with the other Resolution we will have already got through the one for the supply of water and the people will not suffer. I represent one of these areas where the water supply is inadequate and I would like to put certain points to hon. members. I am sure that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is capable of understanding the attitude of hon. mem-

bers in respect of anything which he proposes in this House, and he should not allow himself to fall into any trap that is being set for him.

Mr. WILKINSON: I would like to see some business done and I beg to move that Resolution No. 2 be postponed.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I accept that.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE FOR SUPPLYING WATER TO CERTAIN DISTRICTS.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution is one for £300 to supplement resolution No. 55 of the 10th June, 1947, to provide for the supply of water to districts where the supply is inadequate.

The Addendum states that by resolution No. 55/1947 the sum of £1,500 was granted to provide for the supply of water to districts where the supply is inadequate. Two lorries were taken over from the Rehabilitation Committee and fitted with tanks and a third lorry has been purchased and similarly equipped. These lorries are now in use.

Owing to the continued drought there has been a further deterioration in the water supply. It is therefore proposed to purchase and equip a fourth lorry at a cost of £678 to augment the present delivery system to those parts of the Island most seriously affected by the drought.

Under resolution No. 55/1947 there is an available balance of £400 and a further sum of say £300 is required. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: We must render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. I must congratulate the Government on having the foresight to accept the suggestion to deal with this Resolution now. I should like to say that it is a question of seeing that the best use is made of the additional lorry which it is proposed to purchase. At the present time the people of St. Lucy cannot get any water between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., and I would recommend that when this lorry is going around the parish it must stop at the recognised places where water is not available during these hours of the day. This lorry should make no fewer than two trips during the course of the day between the hours which I have mentioned when the people cannot get any water. As a matter of fact, I am wondering if one tank is really enough; however, I will not say anything more about that now. The Government must not feel that they have done enough and they must take steps to inform the Waterworks Department within the shortest possible time after water is unavailable in any district. This question of water supply is a very vital one and if hon. members suffered from the lack of water, they would know what it means. It is not a matter of waiting for two days before the Head of the Department is aware that water is not available in any district; the Waterworks Department should be informed about the matter at an early time and a tank should be on its way to the district. I repeat that the Government must take steps to ensure that as soon as water becomes unavailable in a district a tank is on its way to supply water. The people in the country districts feel worried when they cannot get any water and they hear that it can be obtained in the fashionable districts like Hastings and St. Lawrence.

Mr. TALMA: I would like to assure hon. members that the Navy Gardens district seldom has water and that is a fashionable district.

Mr. BRANCKER: I hope that this Resolution will be passed without any further delay and that the Government will take steps to send a supply

of water to any district as soon as water is not available in the district.

Mr. ADAMS: Whenever the parishes of St. Peter and St. Lucy lack water the Government is promptly informed. The Manager of the Waterworks Department has been instructed to make enquiries in St. Peter and St. Lucy where people have complained about the lack of water and a list is to be put up in certain shops so that it can be known when the lorry is coming. Three lorries are to be stationed at the Police Station in St. Peter so as to prevent them from coming to Bridgetown for water when it is needed. I am sure that if the hon. junior member for St. Lucy will tell his constituents to notify the nearest policeman or the drivers of these lorries of the water going off or of any complaints that are made, the list will be revised from time to time in order to ensure that people get water. I was surprised to hear the hon. member mention two trips a day; more than two trips per day have been made to St. Peter in the last month or so. I assure the hon. member that this is not a matter for complacency and the Government is only too anxious to hear complaints from people who say that some people get water and others do not get any. Of course, what I have said also applies to the St. David's district; people will be notified as to when the lorrier will be coming.

Mr. BRANCKER: As regards these trips, what I said was that at least two trips should be made during the period between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., when no water is available. Another point is this; the hon. member has made a suggestion about hon. members getting in touch with the Government; but what about getting in touch with the Head of the Waterworks Department? Is the hon. member conceding that it is a useless waste of time trying to get in touch with the Officer of that Department if you want quick action taken?

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am not opposing this Resolution but I want to say that the sending of a lorry with water does not increase the water supply; that only takes water from one district to another, and no district is over-supplied at present. The right course to adopt is to take Dr. Senn's Report, see where the available sources of water are and get that water into the mains. We should not wait until Mr. Roddam's scheme comes into force because that will take five years from now. My suggestion is to get the water into the mains and not rely on lorries to transport water. A lorry can only transport about 7,000 gallons of water a day whereas a little pump could supply about 30,000 gallons more.

Mr. HAYNES: I think it is rather shortsighted to leave the existing means of water for filling these tanks. I think the Government should try and find out whether they cannot obtain this water from local wells. I am not informed as to the conditions, but there is a fine well at Mount Poyer and I cannot see why these tank lorries cannot be filled from this well. In that way they would save pulling away water from mains which are very low in pressure at the present moment. I would like to know if some enquiries could not be made along the lines I have mentioned.

Mr. ADAMS: In reply to the last two hon. members who have spoken, I should like to say that mention had been made of certain wells to the Manager of the Waterworks Department who said that they were tainted. We have an agreement with Carrington's for the supply of water and I would suggest that they give us the water and let us pay for pumping it. We are considering other wells along the lines suggested in Dr. Senn's Report to see if we can

do with them as we have done in the case of Carrington's and get the water into the mains.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think the Government has to be extremely careful as to how it attempts to tap some of these wells in order to get water. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has referred to the Mount Poyer well and I think that it was through this well that we had a dangerous epidemic in St. Peter. (A MEMBER: That is not correct). I speak under correction but I know the well to which the hon. member has referred and I am almost sure that it was the Mount Poyer well which caused a number of deaths in St. Peter some time ago. I do not know what the experience of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has been, but I was pained to hear his statement about there being a waste of time complaining to the Waterworks Department. It is to be assumed that the hon. member has some reason for making the statement but I have found the Department rather co-operative and willing to assist in any way to relieve the water shortage. As a matter of fact, this very mode of conveying water by tanks was adopted by the Government on the recommendation of the Manager of the Waterworks Department. After a private individual had begun it and the Manager of the Department saw how advantageous it was, he in a very strong minute to the Government urged the adoption of the method of conveying water to the districts which needed it. He displayed commendable energy in endeavouring to get vehicles equipped for transporting water, and whether or not he is confined to working within the limits of a schedule arranged by the Government, my experience has been that you have only to go and satisfy him that there is an acute water shortage in a particular area and with the utmost expedition he tries to get water there. Residents in Christ Church and St. Philip can testify that immediately after complaints were made they have received some relief. I repeat that I do not know what the experience of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has been, but my own experience has been, and from remarks which have been made by hon. members they are in agreement with me, the Department certainly does its best to the limit of its resources and capacity to assist in relieving this acute water shortage.

Mr. SYMONDS: Before the question is put, I should like to support those hon. members who have expressed themselves in favour of this Resolution. I hear everybody talking about St. Lucy and about the disabilities under which the people live: but in the parish of St. George in districts such as Free Hill, Applewhaites, Drax Hall, Melverton, Lower Newbury—as a matter of fact, in every section people have to walk for miles in order to get water. While it is not the fault of the Waterworks Department, there is the need for some immediate relief to be granted to the people. I remember that the Government promised me that they would make some money available for the services of a lorry to be requisitioned for supplying water in St. George. In certain districts people have to travel for miles in order to get a drink of water, apart from getting water for the ordinary daily bath. People have to travel for miles in order to get water which is carried in buckets through dust-ridden streets. I appeal to the Government to carry out its promise to place a lorry at the disposal of the people of St. George so that they can get some relief where the water shortage is concerned.

Mr. DOWDING: I would like to be certain, if there is any information available, as to what steps are being taken to procure the pipes necessary for the water supply. As my colleague has said, the

water question in St. George is a big one, it is not a question of getting water from the pipes, but people have to travel considerable distances in order to get water. I know that it has taken years to implement something which has been done in this island before and I hope that it will not take years to implement the installation of pipes at Drax Hall for which money has already been voted by this House. I hope that some information as to what is happening will be given. Is anything being done about the matter? The information would be of great use.

Mr. ADAMS: Whenever the Crown Agents for the Colonies tell us that the pipes are available we will get them. That is all I can tell the hon. member.

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

The Resolution was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, the postponement of two and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

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

STATEMENT RE EMIGRATION

Mr. ADAMS: Inasmuch as we have less than a minute before half past three, I take the opportunity of making a statement, and it might save some of the debate with which we are threatened. The Governor received information this morning in one of those derided communications, on this occasion it was a telephone message from Mr. Sabben-Cleare, that the United States is willing to have 20,000 workers from the West Indies and that 1,000 had been allocated to Barbadas. (Hear, hear and Cheers). Some of the other islands seem to be getting an allocation of 2,000. We want an allocation of more than 1,000 and the Governor proposes to instruct Mr. Burrowes and Mr. Chase to get around in the United States and see if we can get a larger quota. (Cheers). When all sorts of things are being said I am glad that I have been confirmed in what I hinted in the House. When Mr. MacDonald was attacked in here—

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 3.30 o'clock and I do not think I can allow the hon. member to go beyond the time.

Mr. ADAMS: I just wanted to say that it was as a result of negotiations between Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Sabben-Cleare, Head of the Colonial Supplies Mission who is now in Sir John MacPherson's place, that we have been able to get the quota which we have got. It is nothing to do with any talk which the hon. member has had with the Head of the Executive.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to go any further.

Mr. ADAMS: Shall I move the adjournment of the House for five minutes?

Mr. SPEAKER: For what reason?

Mr. ADAMS: Merely to finish the statement which I began to make before 3.30 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is whether I am justified in allowing the hon. member to do that. I gave you the opportunity to make a statement which is reasonable, but now you are debating the question.

Mr. ADAMS: This is nothing controversial. (Mr. CRAWFORD: I will have to reply).

Mr. SPEAKER: There cannot be any debate on the statement as to the quota of Barbadian work-

ers for the United States. The time has now come for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think it will be conceded that something very practical should be done and with the utmost despatch.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member is making a motion he will have to ask the leave of the House.

ADDRESS RE RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am doing that. I was saying that it will be generally conceded that something should be done in order to relieve the widespread unemployment in this country, and therefore I am asking leave—

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be purely a consideration of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate that. I ask leave to move the passing of an Address expressing dissatisfaction with the Government's refusal to start local projects which were enumerated in an Address passed by this House last year, and also to support additional projects to provide work for some of the unemployed people in this island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the question to the House. The hon. member is asking leave to move the passing of an Address in the terms in which he has mentioned. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (After a pause). There being no objection, the hon. member is granted to make the motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move the passing of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly is deeply concerned over the widespread unemployment which is affecting an increasingly large section of the population.

The House notes, with considerable dissatisfaction, that the Government has made no appropriate effort to relieve the condition of the people and provide assistance, and further the House is of the opinion that the conditions outlined above have created a situation in the Colony which is fraught with danger.

The House is of the considered opinion that urgent action should be taken with a view to the improvement of the economic position in which a large section of the masses of the people finds itself, and requests that steps be taken to implement the following recommendations before the end of the current month:—

- (1) Reclamation of the Constitution Swamp.
- (2) Construction of the proposed East Coast Road and the Cycle track from Thickets.
- (3) The taking of steps to enable the individual parochial authorities to relieve the land tax for the past year on all owners of one acre of land or less throughout the island, who can establish that they are unable to pay it.
- (4) Development of the Airport at Seawall and construction of a new runway suitable for use by larger aircraft.
- (5) Repairs to wharf walls.
- (6) Construction of proposed new Elementary and Secondary Schools.
- (7) Laying of all water mains and erection of standpipes which have been requested or suggested by parochial sanitary bodies or by petitions.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say much in support of the passing of this Address. We have in this country to-day no fewer than 10,000 people—and that I submit is a conservative estimate—who are unemployed, and even emigration on a very much larger scale than we can expect will be insufficient to provide work for this large number of unemployed people. It is therefore necessary that urgent action be taken in order to begin local public works in an endeavour to provide work for the large number of skilled and unskilled workers who find themselves without any chance of obtaining a livelihood to-day. With regard to the items enumerated in this Address, the reclamation of the Constitution Swamp has been urged for some time now and the Legislature has actually voted money for the purpose. The last official reason given for not starting this work was that the rainy season was about to set in, that was November last year, and the work could not be undertaken during the rainy season. Those expected rains never came. All the equipment for doing this job is in the colony, and I should like to submit that the time has more than come when some effort should be made to start this highly essential public project. The construction of the proposed East Coast Road and the Cycle track from Thicketts is also long overdue and the Legislature has also voted money for the commencement of this scheme. The only obstacle, in so far as I have been able to gather, which exists with regard to the starting of this project is the fact that it may be found necessary by the Government to acquire certain areas of land along the proposed route in order to obtain the necessary width for the proposed road; and the fear has been expressed that there would be considerable delay involved in acquiring this land, and also that steps should be taken first to ensure that the increased value of the adjacent land does not go to the present owners although the Government benefits from it. I feel that this matter is so urgent, the road is needed and the people in these parishes also need work, that the Government would be well advised to start this road. The Government has power under the Compulsory Land Acquisition Act to acquire any areas which it wants and the question of the price to be paid for them can be gone into by the Government and the respective owners even while the road is being constructed. As a matter of fact, I recall that in Trinidad during the War years when the American Government had to acquire comparatively large areas for defence construction, the Trinidad Government empowered the American base constructors to start work and then enter into legal arrangements and general negotiations with the owners of the land with regard to the compensation for any areas so acquired. I believe that the same thing can be done here and it should be done. We should start the construction of this road and, if necessary, the provisions of certain Bills which are now before us which might apply to owners of land in this area could be made retroactive in order to apply to these relevant transactions. I do not think that the obstacle of land acquisition can be regarded as anything insurmountable or the cause of any further delay before the scheme is commenced. With regard to the exemption from land tax on areas of land between an acre or less, it is well known that we have had a very severe drought for the past eighteen months or so in this colony, and I know from my own experience that quite a few of the small land owners are finding it impossible to get food to eat, and they would find it difficult to get money with which to pay their taxes. I know it will be argued that the Parochial Authorities have it within their power to

grant exemptions from taxation, but it will be observed that I have asked the Government to take steps to enable the Parochial Authorities to relieve the land tax; because we know that if this question is left entirely in the hands of the Parochial Authorities, ten out of the eleven Vestries will claim that they cannot afford to do that and they need to collect these taxes in order to underwrite the running expenses of the parishes each year. I am therefore suggesting that the Government should make it clear to the Parochial Authorities that it is prepared to reimburse them to the extent—

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members must give the hon. member who is speaking an opportunity to be heard. There will be a plenty of time for them to speak later on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was suggesting that the Central Government should inform the Parochial Authorities that it is prepared to reimburse them to the extent of the amounts involved. I am not suggesting that there should be any indiscriminate relief given to people; because there are certain small holders in certain parts of the colony who may have had good crops. There are also certain small holders who, because of irrigation or because of the use to which they put their small bits of land, are in just as good a position to pay their land tax as any large landowner. Provided that these small landowners can establish that they are unable to pay their taxes, the Parochial Authorities should be enabled to give them some relief. I have made an estimate and I have discovered that there are about 26,000 small holders who would come within this category and the number of acres they own is slightly over 10,000, roughly 10,211 acres. I believe that for the purpose of this suggestion we can safely assume that we may have to afford exemption to the owners of about 5,000 acres and if we use, say, the sum of \$3 as an average tax on an acre of land, it will cost the Government about £3,000 to afford this deserving relief to these unfortunate people. That sum of £3,000 is neither here nor there. Only this morning there was withdrawn a Resolution for over £2,000 to bring out a Fire Brigade expert and his family on a holiday trip to Barbados, and if we can afford to give a holiday to some undeserving Englishman we can afford to spend £3,000 in granting relief from taxation to people who, for the greater part, have lost money on their small holdings last year, and who certainly did not make a single cent out of these holdings with which to pay their taxes for that particular year. I hope that hon. members will agree to that suggestion and that relief will be afforded to these people. The next item in the Address is the development of the Airport at Seawell and the construction of a new runway suitable for use by larger aircraft. It is unnecessary for me to speak at any length on that. As a matter of fact, on the recommendation of the Public Works Department we have already included the sum of £3,000 in the current year's Estimates for the purpose of improving the Terminal Building at Seawell, and I am urging that this work be started at once in conjunction with the construction of a new runway which is being urged in this Address. As regards the repairs to the wharf walls, I think that money for this purpose was voted as far back as 1946 before the beginning of the present session. We did some of it last year and when the remainder should have been done, the argument was advanced that the rainy season was coming in and nothing could be done during that season. I think the time has come when we should start to expend the remainder of the vote on the necessary repairs to the wharf and at the same

time provide some employment for people who have been engaged in this work. With regard to the construction of the proposed new elementary and secondary schools, every year for some years now we have done a certain amount of school buildings; hon. members will recall that we have spent money on quite a few new buildings for elementary schools in some parishes, St. James and St. Philip, for instance, and we have also spent a sum of money on the construction of the new Combermere School and in the repairs to other secondary schools. This year it is proposed to build the new Parry and Coleridge School and a few new elementary schools. Regret has already been expressed that the building programme for new schools is not much more extensive than has been contemplated by the Government; but whether or not we agree with the extent of the work proposed, I do feel that the time has come when we should start work on these schools. The crop has been finished; we have about seven or eight months before another crop starts and the policy is that we should not do extensive works during the reaping season, therefore if this money is to be expended and the vote is not to lapse, I think that steps should be taken immediately on the construction of these schools. Finally, there is the question of the laying of all water mains and the erection of standpipes which have been requested or suggested by Parochial Authorities or by petitions. If we are really trying to provide work for unemployed, unskilled workers who have been displaced on the sugar estates either through mechanization or lack of rainfall or both, then we will see that the laying of these mains will provide work for these people. A few years ago the Parochial Authorities throughout the island submitted a fairly extensive schedule covering all the needed water mains and standpipes in their respective parishes; and sometime last year we voted £112,000 for purchasing equipment for extending the water supply of the island as had been recommended by Mr. Roddam, and we were told that we could expect this equipment within about two years. It is therefore fairly safe to expect that by June next year we may get the equipment which has been ordered as a result of the passing of this Resolution for £112,000. But I want hon. members to bear in mind that this £112,000 was voted only for the purchase of machinery and pumping equipment; and after we shall have got the machinery here we will have no mains laid in order to provide the people with water in the areas which have been outlined by the Parochial Authorities. If we get the equipment here next June, it will take some months to erect and install it. (A MEMBER: Ten years). If we have not laid the mains before, we shall then have to lay them and we will already have had the water. I want to suggest, therefore that the Government should start now on the laying of these mains. The hon. senior member for St. George asked a short while ago about the possibility of getting water mains for an area in St. George and he was told by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that as soon as the Crown Agents say that we can get the mains we will get them. I want to say two things in answer to that; if the Colonial Office is made to understand that we want these mains in order to provide some work for our unemployed, and is also reminded that we already have a large order for equipment from the United Kingdom, that we need these mains in order to distribute the increased supply of water which we hope to get, I am sure that we will get these mains without any delay. As a matter of fact, there is a certain amount of pipes in the island now. The amount that is here now can do a considerable amount of work,

and while we are using these pipes we can send a rush order to the United Kingdom for more. I am sure that by the time we have finished using what pipes we have, we will get more. No mains can be found for Drax Hall or Marchfield and yet a lot of private individuals are getting all the material they want! I see that in Christ Church little Welches and Maxwell have got mains recently and Amity Lodge has also been putting down mains although I understand the Government is safeguarding itself by telling the owners of these properties that the mere fact that they have got the mains does not guarantee that they will get water. My suggestion is that we should start an extensive scheme of putting down mains all over the island wherever we have the water, and by the time that we have finished doing that, the equipment for supplying the water will be here. Let us stop supplying mains to private estates even although the people pay handsomely for them. I understand that it cost the owner of Amity Lodge £5,000 to get the mains there; I suggest that we stop supplying mains to private properties and start supplying them in some of the districts which are densely inhabited and which are without water and fire protection. I have been reminded that in the entire Bank Hall district there is not a single fire hydrant and that is a densely-populated district. In the same area there are large districts in which there is no water supply. I want to impress upon the Government the necessity for dealing with this question of laying water mains. Roads and water are of the greatest importance to the colony: we have started with the tenantry roads and now let us get down to the matter of laying water mains. Let us impress upon the Colonial Office the necessity for getting pipes and let us try and make a start with laying the pipes to take water to residents in those areas where there is no water so that it will be available when the new equipment which we have on order is installed. I believe that it would require about £100,000 to implement the recommendations made by the various Parochial Authorities with regard to the laying down of water mains. I do hope that in the same manner in which work is being done on the tenantry roads—the result of action initiated from the floor of this House—we shall soon see work being started on the extension of the water supply. As a matter of fact, I have made a list of some of the areas in all the parishes which are very urgently in need of water and in which repeated requests have been made either by private individuals or by the Parochial Authorities to the Government for years, even before the War, in order to get relief in this respect. I want to suggest finally that the projects enumerated in this Address, if they are undertaken, will provide a considerable amount of work for a considerable number of unemployed people throughout the island for a reasonable length of time. I want to remind hon. members that we have lying idle in the Treasury to-day millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money and some of it at least should be spent in providing these necessary public utility services and simultaneously employing people. I also want to remind the Government that we are not going to come here repeatedly and express our endorsement of certain works being undertaken and actually going so far as to provide money for the work to be undertaken and then have our requests completely ignored by the Government. If hon. members will recall they will realise that a lot of the important matters which have been undertaken this session have been undertaken after they have been urged by hon. members in this Chamber. The inference is that if they had never been urged here they would not have

been undertaken at all. As a matter of fact, I should like to say incidentally that if, for instance, as it is now claimed, America needs 20,000 workers—nearly seven times the number mentioned by Mr. MacDonald a few weeks ago—is it not safe to assume that if we had representatives on the spot—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not now dealing with this Address and I cannot allow any debate on anything else. The honourable member must confine his remarks to this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am trying to make this point; apparently it is absolutely necessary for members of this House to indicate the direction in which the Government should travel. Your Honour will note that in the second of the introductory paragraphs to this Address it is stated: "The House notes, with considerable dissatisfaction, that the Government has made no effort to relieve the condition of the people and provide assistance and further the House is of the opinion, that the conditions outlined above have created a situation in the Colony which is fraught with danger." Inasmuch as that paragraph has been inserted I feel that I should be allowed to say something in connection with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think so. The House passed an Address in connection with emigration last week and if you go back on that, other hon. members will do the same. Let us confine ourselves to this particular Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I presume the opportunity will come when we get a reply to the Address which was passed last week. I want to re-emphasize that it is highly important for hon. members to take every possible step to ensure that requests made on the floor of this House by the people's representatives are not flouted by the Executive. If we are elected by the people to sit here either to initiate or suggest legislation for the improvement of their conditions, we should be betraying their trust if we allow a handful of people who are selected from this House to sit on the Executive, to completely ignore our expressed desires. Therefore we have to make it clear that we do not propose to permit this Address to suffer the same treatment which a former Address along the same lines and which was passed in this House nearly a year ago, has suffered. We sat here and voted no less than £75,000 with the understanding that the Government would utilise it to repair the tenantry roads, to do work on the East Coast Road, the Constitution Swamp and other improvements; and all that has been done is to spend some of the money on the repair of the tenantry roads and on the construction of roads at the Pine, which work was also included in the Resolution under reference. I sincerely trust that other hon. members will join me to-day in reiterating for the benefit of the Head of the Administration that when the House takes action of this sort, sends up an Address of this nature to the Government and actually provides the money for the work being done, the House does so not because there is an opportunity for making speeches but because it wants something done. If the Government is going to undertake to treat the House as it likes, some reasons should be given; and so far we have not received from the Government any reasons as to why none of the works suggested in a previous Address has been started or will be started with the minimum of delay. I think I have said enough on all these items to substantiate the claim that the work should be started at once, and I think that they are all so obviously essential and for the good of the country that there should be no opposition or objection on the part of any hon. member to supporting them.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want to support the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down; I want to second the motion for the passing of this Address. There seems to be something definitely wrong and rotten in the state of Denmark, this little island of Barbados. Hon. members of this House, conscious of the starvation rampant among the unemployed in this island, went out of their way almost a year ago before I had the honour of a seat in this Chamber, to pass a Resolution for £75,000 to be spent in relieving the unemployed, to prevent the continuance of the deaths from starvation of babies and of grown-ups; and those who continue for one reason or another to stand in the way of implementing this Resolution are deliberately guilty of the murder of these innocent people. (Cheers from the strangers' gallery). I do not want to incite anybody to mutiny, but if I do not speak, the stones outside will cry out. This kind of obstruction must be definitely stopped; the wishes of the majority of the elected representatives of the people in this Chamber must be respected. This policy of ignoring most contemptuously the wishes of the majority in this House on the people's behalf when the people's need should be given first consideration, cries to high heaven. I do not know what kind of hearts those who advise His Excellency the Governor must have when many of them in their election campaign walked through the villages and saw the dying state of the little children because their parents were unemployed. Here we have an example of that kind of pettiness, definite pettiness, which will cause thousands of people to experience a living death; because you will find that people have to walk from their homes from day to day with the worms gnawing at their vitals and people who have been sent to this House by those same people, use their position to advise that relief works should not be started in this colony for the relief of the people! That is adding double insult to injury. I cannot speak too strongly in this matter. I do not want to criticise the Government or anybody else for the sake of criticising them in this matter on which I feel most strongly. Hon. members on my left can talk as much as they like about Carrington's Village but a lot of people have had to pay more for land in Carrington's Village than they would have had to pay otherwise because of the action of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter cannot be raised in this debate; the matter of this Address is what we are debating.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I was merely replying to asides from hon. hecklers on my left. I want to compel the attention of hon. members to the fact that whereas we pass measures in this House ostensibly to help people, there are those at the head of this set-up who advise the Head of the Administration to do the very opposite to what the majority of this House time after time ask the Head of the Administration to do on behalf of the people. The entire policy of this Government in relation to relief works and in relation to the implementation of proposals which would supply with work thousands of needy people in this colony, is one which deserves the greatest condemnation. I support this Address because I feel that the people should have somebody to champion their cause or they will continue to be fooled and they will die being fooled by some members in this Assembly. (Cheers).

Dr. WILSON: The hon. senior member for St. Philip has treated this question in a very able manner and I would also like to make a few observations relative to this Address. I should like to say that this question is not any new one; a similar Address was

passed in this House earlier this session, in June last year to be exact. A certain sum of money was later voted expressly to help the unemployed but nothing has been done by the Government except in relation to the tenantry roads. With respect to the tenantry roads, I happen to know that work was started, prior to and immediately after the crop, in the parish of St. John but in view of the number of tenantry roads which need re-building, I am suggesting to the Government or rather that the Government should urge the Commissioners of Highways to redouble their efforts so as to expedite the work. Furthermore, since it is a question of helping the unemployed, I feel that a greater number of people should be employed. I happen to know that in Sherbourne Tenantry there are three roads, and I cannot understand why only two of them have been completed and the other left. It seems to me that the quicker the other road is done the better it will be for all concerned. I want to say now that £75,000 was voted not only for the repair of the tenantry roads but also for doing work in connection with the Constitution Swamp, Seawell air base and the East Coast Road. The Constitution Swamp, as its name implies, covers a vast area of low-lying land which affords a favourable breeding-ground for mosquitoes. Apart from the question of finding employment for people, I am looking at this question from a health point of view.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before us is one of the employment of people; let us keep to that particular point.

Dr. WILSON: I just want to suggest that this work should be started as quickly as possible. When we look at the position of Queen's College with its numbers, I feel that work in connection with the Constitution Swamp should be done without any delay.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I feel that we should go into Committee on an Address such as this because I think it is highly discourteous for any hon. member to go to the extent of introducing an Address of this length and not think it fit to circularise it to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House gave permission for the consideration of the Address. The point which the hon. member is now taking should have been taken at the time when permission was to be granted the hon. member to proceed with the Address. But that permission having been granted, I cannot allow that question to be gone into at all.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Apart from the Rules of the House, from the point of view of courtesy, the hon. member could have had some copies of the Address made so as to pass them around the table.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are now dealing with the Address.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There are some statements made in the Address, they have not been read back slowly and we should go into Committee on this Address. You cannot ask hon. members to discharge their duties in dealing with an Address like this without having copies of it. The hon. senior member for St. Philip spoke on this Address for about an hour and I want to point out that I am not going to be a party to doing anything when I have not been given a fair chance to consider it. If the hon. member knows that he is going to deal with something in the House, I feel that hon. members should have an opportunity of considering it. It has been said that the Government has refused to implement any schemes for the relief of unemployment; I find, however, that the sum of £25,000 out of the £75,000 which was voted has been spent in respect of the tenantry roads and it cannot be said that the Government has refused to

implement that scheme. To say that the Government has refused to implement the scheme would mean that the £75,000 is in the Treasury. But £25,000 has been spent and therefore it is not accurate to say that the Government has refused to implement the scheme. I am not an engineer and therefore I cannot say anything about the Constitution Swamp. I think we should go into Committee on this Address so that we can deal with it Clause by Clause.

Mr. ADAMS: I appreciate the difficulty under which the hon. senior member for St. Philip is labouring. I am speaking at this time because possibly hon. members will not say some of the things they were preparing to say if they pay attention to what I am saying. What is the burden of this complaint? That the House voted £75,000 for carrying out certain schemes, that the Executive contemptuously ignored them and that the House has to make the Executive realise that they have got to do what it tells them. (Mr. CRAWFORD: That is correct). Let us examine the Executive and let us examine their mentality. I should imagine that an infant absolutely not versed in politics would know that if you want to catch a vote you should find work for somebody to do. There are remarkable people on the Executive; thousands of people want work, we have millions of money; work is there and we do not want people to get any! Putting it at its lowest, the Executive should go to Black Rock and see if they could catch votes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Philip suggested that the Government should give reasons why this work has not been proceeded with.

Mr. ADAMS: I am coming to that. We get constant attacks as to why we have not done these things; we can get thousands of potential friends, we have millions of dollars with which to do work and we do not do it! I say that we are not fit to be outside the Mental Hospital if we did not do this work. (A MEMBER: That is exactly what we think). This House voted £75,000 and in respect of these schemes let me remind hon. members that the members of the Executive took it that the House was keener about the repair of the tenantry roads than anything else but they thought that these other things should also be done. We have spent the sum of £25,000 on the tenantry roads and the expenditure of another \$30,000 is being considered by the Executive. The sum of £75,000 will not go half way in all the parishes. We are coming to these schemes but we have to come down with other Resolutions in respect of them. Far from the Executive sitting down and doing nothing with the money, we have spent a substantial amount of it and an even more substantial amount is in the course of getting approval to be spent. The last note from Mr. Skinner shows the list of the extra roads which are to be done. After all, we have to get expert technical advice in respect of technical schemes. We were assured by Mr. Harris that more people would be employed if we did the tenantry roads than if we began the East Coast Road, let alone having to survey it; and we considered that it would be better for Mr. Harris to be used in connection with the tenantry roads than on the East Coast Road. I wonder if the hon. member who raised his voice to high heaven really meant what he said, that the Executive have wilfully turned down these schemes, because not one of the schemes has been turned down by the Executive. We asked for priority with regard to the tenantry roads and Mr. Harris feels that more people could be employed on the tenantry roads than on the East Coast Road; naturally we took his advice. There are two reasons why we have started on the tenantry

roads first; one is that Mr. Harris has advised that more people could be employed and the other is that an infinitely more Conservative House in their Resolution in respect of the East Coast Road said that the House was of opinion that the Government should take active steps to get something done with regard to the value of the land. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has offered the Government to give up the increased value of his land which might go from £10 to £50 per acre. The present Compulsory Purchase Act is one of the most damnable Acts in its operation; the jury of assessors soak the Government. The present Act is for the express purpose of making it impossible for a jury to value land at £5 per acre because the Government wants it. It is intended by the Government to bring up the amendment to the Act immediately after the Public Health Bill has been passed and when the amendment is passed we will be in a better position to make sure that the Government gets back some of the additional value of the land on account of the road being constructed there. As regards the Constitution Swamp, that is a matter of technical advice. The honourable senior member for St. Philip and I along with other persons sat as members of the Ten-Year Plan Committee and according to the advice we had, we reported thus: "The canalisation and drainage of Constitution Swamp is a subsidiary scheme which cannot be taken until the present Victoria Bridge has been widened so as to permit of rapid disposal of flood water." The hon. senior member for St. Philip signed that and so did the hon. junior member for St. Michael and I. Since then we have had advice that that is not strictly accurate; and we have also had advice that we would be throwing away money if we did not first control the tides by widening the Victoria Bridge, putting the necessary gates and so forth. That is why the canalisation of the Constitution Swamp has not yet been started. In 1940, or thereabout, I was a member of the Unemployment Committee along with the hon. senior member for St. Philip and on our suggestion the sum of £2,000 was passed in this House for doing work in respect of the Constitution Swamp. At that time it was also likely that there would be a short crop and we thought that we would make the money available and employ people as soon as the crop was over. The only reason why any of these schemes has been postponed is because we got this technical advice that we should wait until something else has been done. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has made a suggestion as to the relief of land tax; that will not help unemployment but it is a matter which needs careful consideration and while the Executive will naturally consider it carefully, I repeat that it will not help unemployment. That is merely a relief scheme for the peasants because of the short crop. As regards the work at Seawell, we are advised that in the absence of more heavy equipment including rollers we should not start work there; that is the only reason why that work has not been started. In connection with the repairs to the Wharf walls, I must confess that that has not been substantially brought, recently at any rate, before the Executive Committee but there are regular reports made as to the condition of these walls and if there is any recommendation to the Department that such and such a wharf wall should be repaired, naturally that is something which brooks no delay. With regard to the construction of the proposed new Elementary and Secondary Schools, does the hon. senior member for St. Philip think that we will not start

the erection of St. Leonard's School, for instance, when we say that we are starting it? We are starting the building of the Science Room for Queen's College; we are not neglecting any of these things. As regards the laying of water mains, a small water main going into a person's premises from a large main is a vastly different thing from the large mains which we intend to lay. We run small mains for people who want them but we say: "We do not guarantee that we will be able to give you the pressure and we may not give you the water at all. You will get the mains until the water is available." The hon. senior member for St. Philip says that if the Secretary of State for the Colonies knows our condition the mains will be available. Every colony in the British Empire is being told the same thing: "As quickly as possible we will make them available to you." We are not being accused of sloth or wickedness but of absolute imbecility; and indeed we on the Executive would be absolute imbeciles to have the means of making thousands of friends and put away the means of doing so from ourselves. If the hon. senior member for St. Philip did not want to incite people against the Labour Government, he would have asked what progress has been made in respect of these schemes. As a matter of fact, I see from the file before me that when the hon. member went with the deputation to Government House, he did ask certain questions and got certain replies. (Mr. CRAWFORD: I have them here too). I am sorry that I cannot quote from this file. The hon. member must appreciate the fact that it is sometimes necessary for persons in the position of the Head of the Executive to point out that the Head of the Executive cannot act alone; in other words when people attempt to suggest to others that they should do something wholly unconstitutional, they are to be reminded of the constitutional way of doing things. I cannot say anything more on that particular point but the hon. member knows exactly what I am referring to. It would have been the easiest thing in the world for the hon. member to question the Government and have clear and explicit reasons as to why any of these schemes had not been started. We have tried to get Executive engineers along with Mr. Harris so that while he was doing the tenantry roads they could be doing something else. Everybody cannot use a theodolite, and the East Coast Road should be a substantial road if it is to be at all useful. The Secretary of State for the Colonies sent us the names of people from England and we said that we did not want these people—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to stop the hon. member from further confusing himself. For the sake of the other speakers I want to say that the proposal with regard to the East Coast Road is different from that of the Cycle Track. The hon. member has suggested that you would have to do something far more elaborate in the case of the East Coast Road.

Mr. ADAMS: I am referring to the scheme which originated when Sir Frank Stockdale was in office. My recollection is that it was a matter of both the East Coast Road and the Cycle Track.

Mr. SPEAKER: They are two distinct things.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Perhaps if I had stopped the hon. member earlier he would not have said that. The House passed a Resolution embodying certain items to which it wanted attention paid and the Government sent down a Resolution for £75,000—its own figure—as an instalment towards doing this work. The East Coast Road alone would cost £75,000; the original estimate was £100,000.

Mr. ADAMS: This House passed a Resolution for £75,000 for doing a number of things and in the Addendum to that Resolution we said that the sentence which appears as paragraph 106 of the Ten Year Development Plan is not strictly accurate. That is what I was quoting. The point which I want to make is this; as far as we are concerned, as long as we employ as many people as possible, it does not matter where we begin. I should like to remind hon. members that the Government's schemes are not schemes that will employ only carpenters and masons but also skilled and unskilled labourers: The schemes are for the employment of as many people as possible and for as long as possible; and the Unemployment Committee is still engaged in working out schemes that will employ people in all the parishes—not merely artisans but every type of worker. It is necessary that we find employment for people in their own parish and keep them from drifting into the town where there is no work for them to do. I ask the House to see that we who are members of the Executive Committee must of necessity have a lot more information or knowledge of the situation which other honourable members have not got. If we do "A" rather than "B" we do not do it out of our own heads; we do it because the Head of the Department or the Engineer consider that we should do "A" before we do "B". It is not to say that the Government is doing nothing or that it sits down with the means of finding work for people and refuses to do the work. Honourable members do not realise how money is swallowed up: for instance, Mr. Skinner estimates that this further £30,000 which is to be spent on the tenantry roads will last for about two or three months. We have to watch how we are doing work: we have to allocate certain amounts of money to be spent on various types of work rather than spend money on one type of work and none on the others. I assure honourable members that we are not yet senile; we are very conscious of our responsibility in trying to find work for people. We do not want, for instance, to build an abattoir and then knock it down before an animal is killed in it. If we were to start buying some people's cement to canalise the Constitution Swamp and then at the first heavy rain we saw it washed down, there would be a howl made in this House that we should have got proper advice first before we started this work. That is our reason for postponing work on the Constitution Swamp. We are waiting until Mr. Crowe, the Town Planning Expert, has completed his plans for beginning the widening of the Victoria Bridge because it would be necessary to start work on the Swamp from that end. There is only one thing for which the Government can be blamed and it is that we have not been constantly remembering that the people of Barbados, perhaps more so than any other colony, are extremely critical and suspicious and they prefer to hear ill of a person than good. As you begin to think that anybody can do any good, people will have their doubts. It is quite easy to throw bricks at the Government and say that it is guilty of murdering children and so forth, and you will get more attention paid to you. You will always get people ready to support you in that. Before I sit down, let me say that the Government will give careful consideration to any suggestion that comes from the House, but the House must remember that there is far more knowledge possessed by the Government than mere suggestions made from the floor of the House. We have to consider honourable members' suggestions and we also have to ask our technical experts: "What do you think about so and so; what do

you recommend?" And we cannot abandon our own judgment because there are conflicting claims being made between Heads of Departments. For instance, the Commissioner of Police is asking that we start work on the Eagle Hall Police Station while the Director of Education is asking for work to be started on a school. If we are advised not to build the Police Station unless we have steel and steel is not available we have to consider carefully if we will ignore that advice and build the Police Station of wood, or take the advice and build something else until we can get steel. I repeat that the members of the Executive Committee will take care to pay due attention to all that comes from the House, but they also have to use their own judgment with the advice which they may get. I hope that we are not going to hear that we may reach the stage of wondering if we have enough people to do the work contemplated to be done in Barbados.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—Knowing that I shall be accused of throwing bricks at the Government I take this opportunity to do so hoping that the bricks which I throw will result in the building of schools in St. George (Cheers). Now, Sir, what is the burden of complaint? The burden of complaint is unemployment and after the speech of the senior member for St. Joseph I can only say this: we need technical advisers to advise the Government how to govern this place; they had better, Sir, import some experts and put them in the Government. It is said, Sir, that the Constitution Swamp cannot be done. (Mr. ADAMS: We have not said that it cannot be done). Well, it has not been done. Why? For the lack of technical advice. The East Coast road cannot be done for want of technical advice; the Seawell runway cannot be done for want of technical advice and so the refrain goes on. There seems to be only one man in this world who can use a theodolite. Sir, this is a disgraceful state of affairs, especially when we know that so many people are unemployed. It would appear that we are incapable of finding people in this island who are capable of putting into operation schemes that will provide employment for the people. Do we need people to come here and tell us how to cut soft stone, how to build walls with it and how to plaster the walls? Mr. Speaker, I happen to know that if the Government is waiting on steel and material of that nature, it is not going to get them. Wood can be used to the same advantage as steel, especially in these days when we have to improvise. Are private individuals sitting down and doing nothing because they cannot get steel? No, Sir; they are putting up buildings of stone and wood. It is said that these schemes cannot be done but I say that they are not being done. There must be in this island men who can use theodolites. There are several engineering firms in this island who can be paid fees to survey these areas and have the work started. The complacent attitude of this Government is to be deprecated; it is in my opinion one of thinking only of getting votes at the next election. I am not thinking of getting votes. I am here to carry out my responsibility to the people. I think it is time that this Government wake up and do something to give the people the employment which they so much need.

Mr. GARNER: There is nothing I can add to this debate that I have not said already. The projects mentioned in this Address were first introduced in this House by your humble servant, Mr. Speaker, sometime in June last year. I was at pains to point out that the Government would be reluctant to implement these various schemes and, Sir, I can only come to the conclusion that where you have a recalcit-

trant body of men or men filled with inertia, no people can hope to get anything done. I have always said that we need in this island of Barbados a combination of men on the Executive Committee, so that there will be no one-man show but a display of talent and initiative (Hear, hear). Perhaps it is because this group of schemes has come from the other Party that there is no implementation of them, for fear that the other Party would get the credit. The initiative, as far as these projects are concerned, was not displayed by the Government side, therefore, no implementation; that is how I feel about it. It is about time that this foolishness is stopped and let us get some work done because people are starving—purely and simply starving. I had hoped that by now the East Coast Road would have been nearly finished. I had hoped that by now work would have been started on Seawall runway and employment provided for people in Christ Church and St. Philip on the border of Christ Church; we have heard a lot about technicalities but there is no technicality in that. It would appear that unless the people are forced to the point where they must force their leaders to do something to give them relief, the Government will not move; that will be a very sad hour and I hope not to see it. It is no use, time after time when an Address of this sort comes before the House, the Leader of the House and members of his Party getting up and making excuses and then sitting back complacently and doing nothing; excuses are not enough. That will go on for a certain time but it cannot endure. Somebody said sometime ago "You can fool some of the people some of the time but you cannot fool all the people all the time." While you sit here and argue these things out in detail and try to make a pretty picture as to why the Government has not done this or that, the people are outside starving and are expecting something from the Government. You cannot do that all the time. The rope is of a given length and you run that length until you come to the end and when the people say "Halt! we want work", you will find that your excuses mean nothing and you will have to face facts. I feel that it is time the Government wake up and get a Coalition so that there can be some initiative and some movement. As I see it now, what has it got? What is this Government made up of? Not a young man to do anything at all! No virility, no strength! You want youth and vigour on the Government, Mr. Speaker. They are becoming incapacitated because they have lived their days. In other advanced countries they say to men like these "Go; we want new blood." Why should we not do the same here? It is not always that men who have been to Harrison College or Oxford University have ideas; sometimes they are devoid of ideas. Look around and see the people who really run the affairs of this world—people who have commonsense and tact. I can say a lot by way of attack on this Executive Committee. I do not however want to attack them very seriously but something must be done. All these projects would be implemented if there was a coalition of Parties; there would be no jealousy but because this is a one-man show anything that comes from the other side is set aside. All we hear is that this or that has been considered in detail and it cannot be done; everything cannot be done. That cannot go on for long. The people will know exactly who are their leaders, will get what they want and what has been denied them. After all, we do not come here merely to change the Vestry system or vote money to bring some expert here to investigate conditions in the Fire Brigade, for instance. We do not have time for those things now. There is a

time for everything under the sun. Owing to the serious drought we have experienced, we should take a glimpse into the future and see if we can do something to really help the mass of people who are unemployed. That is the work of the Executive Committee and because it has not initiative it refuses to implement these projects which have been put forward by other people; that is the keynote to the whole thing. They are jealous and cannot rise to great heights. I am sorry that the people of this country have not yet secured the true, natural leadership to which they are really entitled.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is trying to show that the reasons given by the Government are ill-founded.

Mr. GARNER: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far, you have not attempted anything like that.

Mr. GARNER: I consider that it is only inertia on the part of the Government that has caused these schemes not to be carried out. We have in this island at the present moment an engineer with whom I have had many conversations and it is not beyond his ability to supervise the execution of some of these schemes. We have had interviews with him at the Highways Board in St. Philip and he has impressed us that he is quite capable of doing some of this work; therefore, it is not a matter of waiting on the Crown Agents to select somebody and send him here to do this work. That is a joke.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member must not misquote me. I said that the Secretary of State for the Colonies submitted the names of two Englishmen and the Government turned them down.

Mr. GARNER: We all make mistakes; it is human to err. I am saying that we have the men and the material on the spot. It is not to say that we cannot get engineers to supervise this work. We have a capable man by the name of Harris in the island at the moment. He is only doing work on contract, therefore, it is up to him to do as little as he can at a time so that the work can be spread over a period of years. Mr. Speaker, I do not care what apology or excuse members of the Executive Committee make. It is in their hands to see these schemes carried out but they do not want to carry them out. They do not propose to carry them out because they have shown no signs whatever that they intend to carry them out. All the progress that has been made is the result of the efforts made on the floor of this House by members other than members of the Government and of the Party in power. That does not speak well for the Government, therefore, they do not want to implement these schemes. That is the point I want to make. Mr. Speaker, this sort of behaviour cannot go on all the time because while they are here discussing various aspects of the Government, the mass of people is suffering. There is no maybe about it, Mr. Speaker; the people are suffering and that is not putting it in any exaggerated form at all. It is time somebody censures this Government for its inability to initiate something to relieve the lot of the masses in this island; it is about time, Mr. Speaker. And what is more?—this is a very serious point—when the Resolution came down in reply to my Address the Government said that the £75,000 was the first instalment, which shows that it had it in mind that those schemes would require a lot more money than that amount; so that to get up here and make apologies as to the whys and wherefores is only making sport. We have just reaped a short crop. The plantations are

not employing people because no rain is falling and it is the duty of the Government to protect the people and see that they get sufficient to keep body and soul together while there is hardship in the land. And I think that that should come from a Labour Government. If it does not come from a Labour Government what charge can it make against a Conservative Government?

Mr. SPEAKER : The point which the honourable member is making is not in keeping with the terms of this Address.

Mr. GARNER : They have made an attempt to show that they have not been able to implement these schemes but I am disagreeing with them in toto because it is the business of the Government to find work for the people while there is no private employment going on. It is the Government's duty to do that and if these schemes were put before them a year ago, by now all or nearly all of them should have been implemented and work provided for the people. So that to make excuses as to why they have not been carried out cannot satisfy the propounder of these schemes. I happen to be that person and I feel strongly on the matter because it is doing me an injustice; that is the way I feel about it. If I were a member of the Party to which members of the Government belong, those schemes would be carried out but because I do not happen to be a member of that Party, they are hidden away. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have had to speak so long on this question but it is quite time that this Government wake up to its responsibilities. We have begun to find out that the sugar industry cannot employ all the people because of the mechanization of it and the Government will have to devise ways and means to give the people some aid either in the form of work or in some other form. It cannot go on like this forever. Something must happen, otherwise our society will deteriorate; it must deteriorate because in the final analysis when a man who has a family goes home week after week with no money to buy food for his children, their morale must weaken. I am hoping that this Government will not only make excuses and apologise as to why it has not started this or that scheme but that it will get down to business and will find itself initiating some scheme whereby workers will get something to do. Throughout the world, there are times when Public Works Departments or some other Departments of Governments have to do things even if they borrow the money to find work for people. We cannot only rely on planning and budgeting and having a reserve in the Treasury. What, after all, is a large reserve in the Treasury when so much misery and suffering are prevalent amongst us? Money is nothing when compared with hunger, sickness, privation, disease, and other ailments. I repeat that when these things are rampant in the island you have a demoralized society. I say that it is about time that this Government cease to make excuses, but fight the issues as it were and fall into line with more advanced thinkers in the House. The Executive Committee, as it is comprised, may have one or two alert minds on it but it is not truly representative of this House and when only one Party is represented on the Executive Committee, that is not a true sign of what the people really want. If we had a strong Coalition, I repeat, it would be quite different; initiative and talent would be brought to bear.

Mr. SPEAKER : Do not let us discuss that any longer.

Mr. GARNER : I am not going to discuss it any longer but I hope that this Government will wake up before long and present something tangible which

will give relief to the suffering masses in this colony because there are those who are really suffering through no fault of their own. I know that there are people who will not work if you offer them the post of Manager of a Bank. We are not talking about them at all; we are talking about people who really want work. Finally, I would like to say that we are thankful that we have secured a small quota for U.S.A. and I hope that the delegation that is about to leave for the U.S.A. will get a little more for us, so that we will be relieved of some of the unemployed we have in our midst.

Mr. MOTTLEY : Mr. Speaker,—A debate of this nature can do a lot of good and I hope there will be no display of political bigotry and that members of this House who are members of the Government will take what is said as having been said in good faith. There are certain qualities lacking, Sir, in the Government; some of its members are lacking in tact, are apparently too suspicious and are sometimes a little too irritable. I feel, Sir, that these criticisms, constructive in many ways, should give the Government the urge to do things. Now, the Address which has been brought in by the senior member for St. Philip has for its main object the question of employment immediately. I do not suppose that anyone, even the supporters of the Government, would attempt to say that the Address is inopportune, unnecessary or anything of the sort. I suppose all agree that the necessity for this Address is very apparent, more especially when we see around us everyday people who are unemployed, who are really in need of work, who are in search of work and who are not being helped. I am more concerned with the reply which has been given on behalf of the Government this afternoon. I was at pains to note some of the things which were said by the Leader of this House in reply to the criticisms offered by the mover of this Address. He said that more people can be employed if the tenantry roads were done than if some of the other things were done and mentioned the East Coast Road as one of the other things. The question which I would like to be answered is this : would it not be possible in the circumstances—the circumstances being rampant unemployment—to carry on with the tenantry roads and also with the East Coast Road under the supervision of the newly employed engineer, Mr. Harris? That is what I would like to know and that has not been stated yet. Would it not be better to embark on the two projects at the same time and give relief to more people than to wait until the tenantry roads are finished? I take it that that is a question which the Government could, at least, answer. As regards the reclamation of the Constitution Swamp, do not let the honourable members of this House who are members of the Executive Committee think that all the brains are on that body. Expert advice is necessary in some cases, and all the Government has told us up to now, in regard to the reclamation of this Swamp, is that it is necessary to get expert or technical advice. We know that it is necessary to get expert advice and I agree with the Leader of the House 100 per cent. that it is necessary to get expert advice but he has not told us yet that the Government has taken steps to get that advice.

Mr. ADAMS : The honourable member seems to have forgotten what I said. We have had contrary advices and the latest advice is that we must not start until the Victoria Bridge has been done.

Mr. MOTTLEY : "It is necessary," he said, "to get technical advice for doing the Constitution Swamp."

Mr. ADAMS : I said that we must get technical advice when certain things are being done, particularly the Constitution Swamp, the latest advice in connection with which is that the Victoria Bridge must be done first.

Mr. MOTTLEY : Up to now he has not said that the Government has got that technical advice. Obviously, the Government has been told that it should get technical advice but up to now he has not said if it has obtained this technical advice. I am sure that honourable members of this House appreciate that this technical advice is necessary and feel that if this Government has obtained it, they are entitled to a fuller explanation of the matter; at least I would do that if I were the Leader of the House. Now, as regards the other projects—construction of the East Coast Road, development of the airport and construction of the runway at Seawell, repair to the wharf walls and so on—here again I wonder if the honourable member realizes that we who are outside the Government know that there are several qualified engineers in this country; we have Thomas, Simpson, Hutson, Pilgrim, Williams—all of these engineers, among others in this country. During the War, we had to call on these men to do construction work for the Government, for example, the Cassava Factory. If at this time you agree that there is all this unemployment, then is it necessary to argue that you cannot get qualified men from England through the Secretary of State for the Colonies when you have so many qualified engineers in this island? Can't you find one, at least, who would be willing, if called upon to carry out some of these schemes? There is no sense in the Government feeling that because of these criticisms repressive or reactionary measures should be taken to prevent people from congregating or coming together; there is no sense, I repeat, in doing that. The next thing we shall see in the Official Gazette is that people cannot come into the Public Building yard.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must leave that out of this debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But it is an action which I deplore.

Mr. SPEAKER: I tell the honourable member that it has nothing to do with this debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, because I am the last person to associate myself with mob rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing that point any longer. I have left that and will discuss something else. The Government talks about these experts which are necessary. What about the Colonial Engineer? Is he not a qualified engineer? I agree that you must have some expert advice but, as I have said, there are qualified engineers in our midst whose services, I am sure, could be secured, if the Government take steps to secure them, to assist in some of these schemes. This, as I have said, is a matter in which there should be no display of political bigotry; there should be no political jealousy as has been hinted to. The suggestions which have been made have been put forward, in my opinion, with the view of assisting in relieving unemployment in the island and the Government should do something in the matter. Finally, I should like to say this: It is true that we might pass an Address in this Chamber which, when it is studied with moderation, the elected members advising the Government might see the necessity to amend but the actual refusal to implement the

terms of that Address must, some day, have its repercussions. I know honourable members may be overzealous in having Addresses put through and after those Addresses have been passed they may be amended, but as far as the actual substance of those Addresses and what they stand for are concerned, the Government should be very careful how it deals with those Addresses. I have heard a great deal to-day about giving away our rights, interference with the Constitution and things of that nature but nothing in my opinion is more a giving away of our rights than if we sit here from time to time and pass Addresses and then, in due course, the recommendations in some of those Addresses are not implemented and there is passive resistance as is apparently being shown in this House. I repeat that the Government should not only state that it must have technical advice but it should take steps to get that technical advice and some of our local engineers can be used to relieve the situation. The Leader of the House has told us that the Secretary of State for the Colonies actually recommended two unqualified men and the Government, may be quite rightly, turned them down. If the situation in Great Britain is such that the Colonial Office recommends unqualified men, should we not make use of the qualified men in our midst? I am one of those people who like to be moderate. I cannot imagine any sane person to-day in public life who would willfully attempt to block any measure which tends to relieve the unemployment situation but I must admit that on the face of it, it would appear to me that there is not that amount of initiative which is necessary on the part of the Government. I do not believe that any person or persons in the Government or outside the Government would be so stupid as to block any measure which has for its object an improvement in the standard of living of the people—election or no election they cannot afford to do it. There must be more initiative, more original thinking on the part of the Government if the mass of unemployed people in this island is to be given relief.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am supporting this Address but I hope that it will not be just a waste of time as has been the case with other Addresses passed in this House. This Address is practically on the same lines as one which was passed about a year ago and what has the Government done? They have spent £25,000 in repairing the tenantry roads. The Resolution which this House passed specified several things to be done. We have heard today from the honourable senior member for St. Joseph the reasons why the other things have not been done: they want technical advice.

Mr. ADAMS: That is not true. I said that members of the Executive Committee must take technical advice. We are not sending for any experts or anything of the sort.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Well the honourable member has the technical advice and he has done nothing. He has had the materials and I think he has very freely expressed what honourable members on this side of the House think of the members of the Government, that some of them are fit for the institution down Black Rock. I would like to say however that it takes men with brains to go to that Institution so that all the advisers of the Governor could not go down there. We are passing a serious Address this afternoon and here it is that two members of the Executive, two of the advisers of the Governor, are not in their places to hear what honourable members have to say! They cannot tell the Governor what members of the House say. Mr. Harris is put to look after the

tenantry roads, but these roads could easily be looked after by the Highway Commissioners of the various parishes and Mr. Harris could see after the East Coast Road. In that way two sets of people would be employed, but they are taking a sledge-hammer to kill an ant when they put an engineer to repair the tenantry roads. For a year this Government has spent £25,000 on an unemployment scheme and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that another £30,000 is contemplated being spent. If they are spending £25,000 a year on an unemployment scheme, God help the unemployed in Barbados.

Mr. HAYNES: I rise wholeheartedly to support this Address and in doing so I would like to offer some constructive ideas to help the Head of the Administration and his advisers. As the honourable senior member for St. James has said, I see no reason why Mr. Harris should be tied down to the tenantry roads alone. After all, Mr. Harris is only there in an advisory capacity; he could undertake seeing after the tenantry roads and he is also fully qualified to undertake the survey of the East Coast Road. I have listened very carefully to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph but I feel that there is no urge to get on with the various projects which we all know were wholeheartedly supported in this House in an Address from the representatives of the people of this island. It looks to me as if there is no use in our getting here and passing Addresses to the Head of the Administration with regard to certain matters and then no attention is paid to them. My advice to the Government is that they have not got enough technical ability. An item in the Address which this House passed was the canalisation of the Constitution Swamp; why can't they ask the neighbouring colony of Trinidad, for instance, to send up a man to give expert advice as to the removal of that awful eyesore to the City of Bridgetown? I am not too sure if Mr. Boyle is not in the island at the present moment making surveys in Carlisle Bay and he could be brought to do that work at which he is quite an adept. Mr Boyle was asked some years ago when he was in our employ to go to Jamaica to give advice as regards harbour improvement and surely he could help us in this matter. Unless some urge is forthcoming from the so-called head of the spring in relation to the Government, matters will always lie in abeyance. To my mind, the time is ripe for them to take action; let them put their heads together, follow the terms of the Address and get ahead with these projects. I do not want to be any pessimist, but I think that most of us feel and realise that this year is going to be a similar year to last year as regards the crop. If that is the case, I would like to know how we are going to employ all the agricultural labour that is available in this island apart from emigration. Even if the Government failed with some of these schemes it would be far better for the Government to carry on with them and see that something is done than leave them over until tomorrow. As regards the much-debated East Coast Road, a Resolution came down from the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation some years ago in connection with the construction of this Road. I was in support of it and later when I asked a question about the Road I was informed that the scheme had been washed out, that the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation was quite through with it. Money which was not even ours and which could have been spent is all gone. Now we have to find money of our own and we are told that nothing has been done and we have all this pressing need around us! The present time is the opportune time to go ahead and get something begun in connection with this scheme. I know that I will

be told that I am personally concerned with the matter, but we are all personally concerned with it because we all live in Barbados; and if we are not concerned with it in one way we are concerned with it in another. I know that four or five very heavily-signed petitions in connection with the construction of this Road are lying down in the Colonial Secretary's Office now. These petitions have been signed from all parts of Barbados asking that the construction of this road be undertaken. I have been told that it was pathetic to see people crowding into the little park at Bathsheba on Whit Monday; there was no room for them and there are four miles of undeveloped coast which could be looked after so that people could be allowed to enjoy themselves! This is not Venezuela or one of those big places with unlimited areas; every square inch of land in Barbados is of great value because our people want it, and if we do not try and develop it, we are, to my mind, committing a great sin. I am hoping that this Address will bear fruit. I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has listened very carefully to the remarks that have been made; I am sure that some of these ideas will be considered and we will get some activity at least out of the presentation of this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before the question is put, I just want to make a few final observations in reply to some of the remarks which have been made. A lot of the criticism which I intended to make will not be made now because of the fact that I have realised that in many cases the remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph are the result of ignorance of matters under discussion. If a man does not know a thing it is really uncharitable to criticise him for not knowing it, although if I do not know Portuguese and I attempt to speak it, I lay myself open to a lot of criticism for venturing into a field of which I know nothing. But let us recall one or two of the observations that have been made. With reference to the inclusion of the Wharf Walls in this Address, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that there had not been any recent report about these walls. Well, in the Estimates which were passed a few months ago, in one of the Appendices it was pointed out that of the total amount voted since 1946 for repairs to the Wharf Walls there is still a balance of £2,400 unexpended. A few months ago the Government issued a statement to the effect that no work would be done on the wharf Walls until after the rainy season; but the rainy season is now over and since this money was made available two years ago, it is time that we utilise the remainder of the amount voted. We do not want any report from the Public Works Department or from any engineer with regard to that; we agreed to do that work two years ago and it should be undertaken more especially at this time in order to provide employment. With regard to the Constitution Swamp, the remarks made were very illuminating and in this connection I want to say this: on the last three occasions when I enquired from the authorities about the failure to start this work, I had a different answer given me on each occasion. I was told that the equipment for doing it had not yet come from Trinidad and when the equipment came, the rainy season was expected and we could not start. What I know has held up the matter for a few months is that the Government were haggling with the Church Authorities over the price of a piece of land near the Dearnery and the Colonial Secretary was authorised to bring the owners to the Secretariat and discuss the matter. Mr. MOTTLEY: I was there). The honourable senior member for the City says that he was there. I think the price

asked for the land was £3,000 or something like that and the Government could not make up their minds as to what was to be paid for the land. Instead of telling the House that that was holding up the matter, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph refers to the Ten Year Development Plan and says that I along with himself and others signed the statement to the effect that we cannot do anything with the Constitution Swamp until we have attended to the Victoria Bridge. Months after both he and I signed the Ten Year Development Plan, the honourable member made this statement in the House: "The statement in paragraph 106 of the Ten Year Development Plan that the work cannot be undertaken until the present Victoria Bridge has been widened is not strictly accurate." The honourable member made that statement in this House only in July last year; and why does he bother to refer now to the Ten Year Plan? He has said that they have got different advice but the latest advice is that they are haggling over the price of the piece of land near the Deanery. I want to submit that even although the Government realises that the best way to catch votes and make political capital is to give work to people, the motivating factor in their decision, the over-ruling factor, the more important factor than catching votes is, as has been emphasized by the honourable junior member for St. Philip, that they should not touch these projects because they were brought up by their political opponents. There is no justifiable reason, no scientific reason for not starting on the work outlined in this Address. Mr. Speaker, let us take the observation that the Government has spent almost all of the £75,000 which was voted; they spent £25,000 on the tenantry roads last year and they envisage spending about £30,000 again this year on these roads. They are going ahead like a wild fire and they will soon be finished spending all of it. Apparently the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was assuming that it was the desire of the House that this £75,000 should be the beginning and the end of the expenditure on works to relieve unemployment, but nothing could be further from the truth. In the original Address passed by this House on the initiative of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, this was stated: "The House is convinced that work on the above, if undertaken, as far as possible simultaneously, would provide employment for some time, for upwards of 3,500 workers from every parish in the island, would place upwards of a million dollars in circulation throughout the island, and in addition to the economic advantages which would accrue, would also provide improvements which are needed vitally in the island." In other words, the House in passing the Resolution declared that they envisaged that these projects would cost over one million dollars, over £200,000, and nearly a year afterwards the honourable senior member for St. Joseph attempts to make it appear that because they have spent one-third of the first instalment and hope to spend another one-third in another year or so, they are doing fine; whereas we envisaged an expenditure of over £200,000 on these projects. That Resolution was merely to start the work. As a matter of fact, the Government in the Addendum to the Resolution stated this: "This Resolution is to provide funds to enable work to be started on the schemes mentioned therein." The Government admitted that this £75,000 was merely for beginning the work; not to spend one-third of it at the end of a year and another one-third at the end of another year. The Government went on to say this in the Addendum to the Resolution: "In some cases detailed estimates are not yet available and it is possible that additional funds may be required." We have not yet been asked for a single cent in addition to the

first instalment and the first instalment has not yet been spent a year after it was made available to the Government; and the honourable member tells us that what it amounts to is buying cement from somebody and the rain washing it away.

Mr. ADAMS: Those of us who know the honourable senior member for St. Philip would expect him to tell an untruth. I never said anything about the rain washing it away.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would like to ask the Official Reporter to read out what the honourable member said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member said that he was advised by the technical adviser that to use cement in putting down the Constitution Drain would be a waste of money except the Bridge was done.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He quoted the Ten Year Plan to that effect and he did say also that what it amounts to is buying cement from somebody and the rain washing it away. Of course, he ought to know. His Board bought a lot of cement, to erect latrines, etc. at Black Rock, nobody used them yet and they remain as white elephants. They would therefore waste cement on this project. As regards the East Coast Road, it is a very debatable question as to whether that road will take less labour than the tenantry roads; the estimated cost of the construction of this Road is £100,000. We have been working on the tenantry roads for a year, and we have spent only £25,000 and from these two sets of figures any reasonably intelligent person can deduct reasonable conclusions. To say that we will work on the tenantry roads because they will provide more employment than the East Coast Road is not strictly in accordance with the facts. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has advanced the excuse that they are planning to bring down the Land Acquisition Bill immediately after the Public Health Bill so that the Government will be legally enable to acquire any land it wants in that area at the cheapest possible price; but what is there to prevent the provisions of the Land Acquisition Bill from being made retroactive if we start on the East Coast Road now? We must bear in mind that if the Government is desirous of doing some of the East Coast Road they should start to survey it now, because the Director of Highways and Transport has said that the surveying alone would take about three months to be done. Therefore if they are planning to start this Road after the Land Acquisition Bill has been passed, at least they should start the surveying now; so that by the time that the surveying is finished the legislation would have been enacted and they could start the Road immediately. But what we have heard is only just another attempt made to try if you can to apologise for the delay in starting this work. A part of what the new Engineer Mr. Harris is doing is to inspect the work done by the various parishes after they have finished spending their grant before the Department of Highways and Transport gives another grant towards the repair of the tenantry roads. Mr. Harris can undertake both the tenantry roads and the survey of the East Coast Road. I am sure that if he were asked tomorrow, he would say that it is quite easy to do both at the same time. The Director of Highways and Transport has admitted that Mr. Harris is perfectly capable of undertaking the survey of the East Coast Road and there are other people who are employed in Trinidad who can use a theodolite and who could assist in getting this survey done. If this survey is going to take three months, although I do not see it can take that time, at least the time to begin that survey is now. At the

rate at which we are going at present, we will not start this survey by this time next year, if, of course, the people's representatives allow that. Finally, as to the question of laying water mains I want to say that it is not true to say that if the Colonial Office or the Crown Agents supply these mains we will get them. I would like to know how the Colonial Office knows or the Crown Agents know that we want large mains; as a matter of fact, no money has been voted to acquire any mains for extending the water supply. All we voted is £112,000 for the purpose of acquiring equipment and additional machinery for bringing the water to the surface. In other words, if the House agree to the passing of this Address today, a Resolution will have to be sent down by the Government to provide money to order the mains for which the Address is asking. If people do not know what they are talking about, they must make a lot of egregious mistakes. My opinion is that we should use the large mains which we have in districts which are populated rather than supply them to small properties. The first thing which the Government has to do is to accept the suggestion to start an extensive laying down of mains; they should come to the House and ask for the money to do it. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph says that other colonies are also trying to get mains then I say that the small quantity which we use from time to time is what we have asked for. As a matter of fact, in his Report Mr. Roddam said nothing about water mains. From page to page of his Report Mr. Roddam says: "Get the machinery here", and I presume his idea was that he is concerned with the engineering end of the matter and it is the business of the local Government to get the mains. We have not yet informed the Colonial Office that we want any large quantity of water mains. (Mr. ADAMS: He does not know). I know more about it than you; I am quite willing to sit down and let you say what is true. I repeat that the Government has not yet ordered through the Colonial Office the necessary water mains which the extension of pumping machinery envisaged in the Roddam Report will necessitate. On such a vital question as water we cannot afford to go to sleep. We expect the machinery next year so let us put down the mains, install the machinery when we get it and we will have everything ready to supply the people of this country with the water which they need. If there were more time at my disposal I could produce other information which will substantiate the position. I am asking honourable members to adopt in passing this Address; but I think I have said enough as to make it unmistakably clear that the House will be well advised to intimate to the Executive that we expect action to be taken along the lines suggested in the Address. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more but to ask honourable members to agree to the motion for the passing of this Address and remind the Government, as honourable members have already reminded them, that we expect them to take action before we do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable junior member for St. George to present this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SYMMONDS: As Your Honour pleases.

ACCOMMODATION OF VISITORS TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. ADAMS: The Order Paper remains as it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member moves the adjournment of the House, I want to inform honourable members that for today's sitting I have made certain arrangements for the accommodation of visitors to the House and I hope that honourable members will agree with those arrangements. If honourable members are not satisfied with the arrangements they can speak to me about them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Will the arrangements be published?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. I did not think of doing that; I have informed honourable members of the arrangements and I feel that is sufficient. The arrangements which I make are for the benefit of members of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Provided that they will not restrict the attendance of the public.

Mr. SPEAKER: The public cannot get more accommodation than we have to give them. When the House has more accommodation then we will be able to accommodate more visitors, but not until then. Tomorrow there is to be a meeting of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the amenities of the House and I hope that the honourable member will attend.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the public feel like standing I do not think that we should interfere with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The arrangements are for the convenience of the House as well as for visitors.

Mr. MOTTLEY: These arrangements are only for today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and tomorrow I am hoping to have a meeting of the Select Committee appointed in connection with the matter.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week at twelve o'clock, noon.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the words "this day week" be deleted in order to insert the words "this day fortnight".

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House now adjourn to this day week. An amendment has been moved that the words "this day week" be deleted in order to insert the words "this day fortnight". The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs HUSBANDS, MAPP, COX, ADAMS and BRANCKER—5.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs SYMMONDS, CRAWFORD, GARNER, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WARD and MOTTLEY—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the negative, five honourable members voting "Aye", and nine honourable members voting "No". The question now is that the words "this day fortnight" be inserted in the blank created. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day fortnight at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday, the 1st day of June, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.